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1 Introduction: Global demands and local concerns

Globalisation is one of the defining characteristics of our late modern society. The term encompasses a wide range of meanings, but first and foremost it is linked with greater mobility across national borders and an increase in global communication. With the advent of new and faster forms of transportation and communication, the world has become smaller - to use a popular phrase. But with increased mobility and communication comes increased complexity. The possibilities offered by new technology also put new demands on organisations and on individuals. Today a large number of people in a large number of countries need to communicate with people of other nationalities not only virtually via email or the Internet, but also face-to-face because people move across borders as part of their educational, recreational or working life. And in order to communicate successfully across cultures, they need to either learn enough about the other party’s culture and language to communicate with them on their territory or to meet on common ground, for instance by using a common language. Since the middle of the 20th century, English has increasingly gained foothold as the lingua franca of globalisation. It is used by a significant proportion of the world’s population as a first, second or foreign language and for a multitude of purposes. It is not the language with the largest number of mother tongue speakers (that would be Mandarin Chinese), but it is probably the language most widely used in communication between people from different language backgrounds.

The use of English as a global lingua franca has obvious advantages when it comes to intelligibility, but also gives rise to concern. Some worry about the implications of English replacing local languages in a number of situations, the consequences of which include possible language death and loss of national and cultural identity. Others worry about the unequal distribution of English language skills, the consequences of which include native speakers of English possessing an advantage over non-native speakers and the predicament of people without any English skills.
For speakers of smaller languages the need for a lingua franca to communicate globally is particularly pertinent. In Denmark, Danish is the mother tongue of the majority, but it is rarely enough if Danes want to communicate across borders. Since the middle of the twentieth century, English has been the first foreign language taught in Denmark, and the foreign language most often used to communicate with foreigners. The status of English in Denmark today goes beyond that of a foreign language, however. When you turn on the TV, see an advertisement on a bus, take a university course or hear young people speak, English is often used. In other words, the presence of English in Denmark today is indisputable. The English language is present in the Danish media, in advertising, as part of youth language, in higher education, in research and as a corporate language in several large Danish companies.

Although Denmark has always been influenced by foreign languages, it was not until after World War II that English became the most influential foreign language. And it is only within the last few decades that English has gained the position it holds today in Denmark. Since the beginning of the 1990s the use of English in Denmark has been a much debated topic, both in academic circles and in the media. While some attention has been given to the increasing number of English loanwords, focus has been on the perceived threat to the Danish language in the form of so-called ‘domain loss’, a term used about areas of society where Danish is no longer used. The areas of Danish society most often mentioned in connection with ‘domain loss’ to English are research, higher education and the corporate world. ‘Domain loss’ once again became the topic of debate in January 2007, both in the Danish parliament, Folketinget, and in the media. The Danish Language Council argued in a memo that it was necessary to take action in order to ensure the status of Danish as a “komplet og samfundsbærende sprog” (Danish Language Council, 2007), an expression perhaps best paraphrased as “a complete language capable of supporting all the functions of a modern society”. The use of English instead of Danish in higher education was here cited as the biggest threat to the Danish language, but the memo also mentioned research, the media and the corporate world as other areas to watch. Professor of English and at the time chairman of the Danish Language
Council, Niels Davidsen-Nielsen, stated to a Danish newspaper that he feared that the advance of English would lead to a state where Danish was no longer a complete and fully equipped language. He singled out the corporate world as an area where the displacement of Danish was on the increase as a growing number of companies were introducing English as a corporate language (Hjortdal, 2007).

Others shared this concern for the Danish language. A proposal for a Danish language law aimed at preventing ‘domain loss’ to English was put forward, and one of the politicians behind the proposal, Søren Krarup from Dansk Folkeparti, commented: “We are afraid that Danish is disappearing. We are afraid that Danish gradually will decline into a peasant language which can not be used by everyone in the country in all situations” (Krarup, 2009, my translation1). The parliamentary debate closed with a decision to have a committee decide whether there was a basis for a Danish language law. In response to this, professor of Danish Jens Normann Jørgensen said to one Danish newspaper: "The Danish language has been under influence [from other languages] since the time of Christ. There is no threat in that and the panic you can sense spreading among people who do not know what they are talking about is unfounded” (Hein, 2007, my translation2).

1.1. Research questions

Whether there is cause for concern or not remains to be seen, as not much is known about how English is used in those areas of society purportedly threatened by ‘domain loss’. In this thesis I limit myself to focussing on the use of English in one area of Danish society, namely the corporate world. I will leave the study of the use of English in these other, equally interesting, areas to other researchers.

---

1 Text in original: “Vi er bange for, at dansk er ved at forsvinde. Vi er bange for, at dansk efterhånden synker ned til at være et almuesprog, som ikke kan benyttes af alle i landet i alle sammenhænge.”

2 Text in original: “Det danske sprog har været under påvirkning siden Kristi fødsel. Det er der ikke nogen trussel i, og den panik, man føler brede sig blandt folk, der ikke ved, hvad de snakker om, er ubegrundet.”
A 2007 study commissioned by the Confederation of Danish Industry reported that 25% of Danish companies have English as a corporate language (Pedersen and Holm, 2007), yet no studies have investigated what it means to have English as a corporate language. Does it mean that English is used in all situations by all employees? Probably not. When is English used then? What makes the employees decide when to use English and when to use Danish? And is there a basis for linking the use of English as a corporate language with ‘domain loss’? These are some of the questions this thesis seeks to answer under the heading of the following research questions:

- In what situations do Danes use English at work and why?
- Can the use of English as a corporate language be said to constitute a ‘domain loss’ for Danish?

Using the company Lundbeck as a case study, I will seek to answer the above questions through three different studies:

1) **An ethnographic study** which seeks to answer the following questions: What does it mean to have English as a corporate language? What do employees and management understand by a ‘corporate language’? How much is English used, by whom and in what situations?

2) **A study of language choice** which seeks to answer the following: What are the factors influencing language choice in a specific situation? Does the formality/informality of the situation play a role? How important is language competence?

3) **A study of language ideologies** which seeks to answer these questions: Why is English used? What discourses about Danish, English and language choice are constructed? What are the symbolic values attached to Danish and English respectively?
1.2 Theoretical and methodological preliminaries

In this section I deal with the theoretical and methodological foundations of the study. This section thus situates the project within the theory of science and the higher levels of disciplinary-specific theory, while the theories and methods applied in the individual analyses will be discussed prior to each analysis. I begin by outlining the overarching theoretical approach taken, namely the integrationist-interactionist approach, and its implications for the choice of theory and methods. Following that, I provide an overview of the historical background of some relevant branches of linguistics concerned with language in context, more specifically the ethnography of communication, interactional sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology, since it is within these lines of research that this project is situated. Finally I discuss some of the key terms used in the thesis.

1.2.1 Integrating macro-micro and structure-agency

On the continuum from essentialism to social constructionism, this project is situated towards the constructionist end, although not at the extreme end of that continuum. Coupland (2001a) distinguishes between three perspectives in current sociolinguistics. The first he calls socio-structural realism. Research of this type deals with the analysis of social structure and stratification, and views social structures as impinging on the lives and choices of individuals. The focus in this perspective is on the macro level. The second type, social action perspectives, prioritises the study of social action and individual agency at the micro level. From this perspective, social structures have no meaningful existence outside of social interaction, and the goal is thus to establish how individuals make sense of social life through local actions and interactions. The third type, which tries to reconcile the distinctions between the first and second types, Coupland labels integrationism. The work of Foucault, Giddens and Bourdieu all belongs to this perspective, as does Hymes’ ethnography of communication. The premise in this type of research is that discourse and society shape each other. I see my study as belonging within this third perspective which seeks to overcome the dualisms of macro-micro and
structure-agency. I include both micro and macro perspectives in my analyses. With its focus on ethnography and interaction, my research design clearly emphasises agency. At the same time, by also attending to the larger societal influences the analysis acknowledges the role of structures in meaning creation.

In addition to an integrationist perspective, I want to highlight the interactionist perspective of my research. I subscribe to the point of view that the meaning of an action or phenomenon is at least partially created in interaction between people. This means that “[m]eaning is … not an independent thing for the researcher to uncover. Meaning is a relational phenomenon which can only be determined locally through including the context” (Järvinen and Mik-Meyer, 2005:10, my translation3). In conclusion, my research takes its point of departure in what could be termed an integrationist-interactionist perspective. As a consequence, I include both micro and macro levels of analysis, and I view ideas about reality as “being partially reproduced, constructed and sometimes revised in social interaction”, but I also acknowledge that “there are conventional structures that both configure and constrain [these] actions” (Rampton, 2005:390).

Positioning my research within an integrationist-interactionist perspective has consequences for my choice of theory, the way I design and carry out data collection as well as for my data analysis. With the above theoretical presuppositions in mind, it follows naturally that my study should be positioned within the field of ethnography of communication, while the analyses of language choice and language ideologies in addition draw on the related fields of interactional sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology.

One methodological implication of adopting an integrationist-interactionist perspective is that instead of searching for the inherent meaning of the empirical material, focus is on “the ambiguity, context dependency and productivity of the empirical material” (Järvinen and Mik-

3 Text in original: “Betydning er … ikke en uafhængig størrelse, man som forsker kan afdække. Betydning er derimod et relationelt fænomen, som kun kan bestemmes situationelt med inddragelse af konteksten.”
Another methodological implication of the focus on interaction is that I as a researcher necessarily am a part of the data collection in a much more integrated way than researchers belonging to other paradigms. Interaction is central for the analysis, and not just the interaction between informants, but also the interaction between researcher and informants. The researcher is not a neutral or invisible collector of data, but part of the interaction, however unobtrusively she may partake in the scene. The role of the researcher is consequently an aspect which needs to be taken into consideration both during data collection and data analysis. Questions to be taken into consideration include: How does the interviewee position him/herself in relation to the researcher during an interview? Would the same points have been stressed in a different situation, with a different researcher? And what are the different roles of the researcher at different times and with different people during participant observation? It is easy to imagine that the role of the researcher changes from the first visit to three months into the fieldwork. It is equally obvious that the role of the researcher is perceived differently by the head of department hoping to get useful information from the project and by the employee fearing that the researcher is someone sent by the manager to check up on her. The impact of the observer on the data, or the ‘observer’s paradox’ as Labov terms it (1970:47), is often discussed in relation to ethnographic fieldwork, but a central point of an interactionist approach is that the impact of the researcher on the data is not a problem or a source of contamination. Since

---

4 Text in original: “det empiriske materiales flertydighed, kontekstafhængighed og produktivitet”
there is no pure truth to uncover, it cannot be contaminated. Instead, the role of the researcher is acknowledged as a factor which needs to be taken into account both in the data collection and in the data analysis.

1.2.2 Ethnography in the study of language

In this section I account for the historical tradition of using ethnographic methods in studies of language, thus positioning my own research in relation to relevant lines of research within the study of language in context.

While ethnographic methods were originally used in anthropology, there is also a long tradition for using ethnography in the study of language, initially in linguistic anthropology. In the beginning of the twentieth century, Franz Boas in the US and Bronislaw Malinowski in Great Britain contributed significantly to the development of methods for ethnographic study. Boas and other North American anthropologists were concerned with the description of Native American cultures, attempting to preserve the knowledge of these cultures in ethnographic descriptions before they were destroyed. These ethnographic descriptions included basic linguistic descriptions of the phonological systems and grammatical structures. The British anthropological tradition following Malinowski was concerned with the social and cultural meaning of actions, events and objects in specific cultures. The British tradition strongly influenced the American tradition of ethnographic fieldwork which continued with Whorf and Sapir in the 1920s and 1930s. At this point in time focus was still on mapping the language and culture of Native Americans. In the middle of the twentieth century, the number of studies using ethnographic methods within anthropology declined, however, as interest in studies of social structure increased (Saville-Troike, 2003:6).

Ethnography had a revival on more than one front in the 1960s. Concurrent with a newfound interest in interactionist studies and hence ethnography within sociology, the use of ethnographic methods in the study of language use had a revival at a time when the majority of linguists were focussed on the study of grammatical systems. Noam Chomsky led this wave of generative grammar, and his focus on the linguistic competence of “the ideal speaker-hearer” in a “completely
homogeneous speech-community” (Chomsky, 1965:3) meant that he did not deal extensively with actual linguistic performance. At the same time, however, other linguists began to focus on a more social approach to language and started referring to their research as sociolinguistics. William Labov’s studies of social variation in Martha’s Vineyard and New York City (Labov, 1966; 1972a; 1972b) were central in this new direction within linguistics. Labov emphasised the need for data from the local context on both language use and language attitudes in order to explain linguistic variation and change. Also Gumperz and Blom’s study of language choice in the Norwegian town Hemnesberget from the early 1960s drew on both linguistics and ethnography in the investigation of the social meaning of linguistic variation in a small bidialectal community (Blom and Gumperz, 1972).

This newfound interest in ethnography lead to the launch of a whole new discipline of language studies, the ethnography of communication. The ethnography of communication took its beginnings as a separate discipline, distinct from both linguistics and sociolinguistics, with a special issue of American Anthropologist edited by Dell Hymes and John J. Gumperz in 1964. In the introduction to the special issue Hymes argues for the need for a new approach to the study of language, a need to investigate language use in context. He terms this new approach ‘Ethnography of Communication’, an approach covering studies “ethnographic in basis and communicative in scope” (Hymes, 1964:9). Hymes acknowledges the influence from American anthropology and the linguists of the Prague school, among them Roman Jakobson, and their focus on functional and structural analysis. In defining the scope and frame of reference for the new discipline, Hymes states that while linguistics has a vital role in the new discipline, ethnography provides “the frame of reference within which the place of language in culture and society is to be described” (Hymes, 1964:3). It is important, he continues, that cultural values and beliefs and the social institutions and forms of a community are examined together in relation to communicative events.

This emphasis on ethnographic data in linguistic analyses is also central in the tradition known as interactional sociolinguistics, which grew from the ethnography of communication tradition (Gumperz, 1982).
Within this view on language and communication, the focus is on face-to-face interactions, and data is in the form of audio or video recordings supplemented by participant observation and retrospective commentary from participants. The purpose in interactional sociolinguistics is to produce detailed and fairly comprehensive analyses of key episodes of interaction, drawing on a range of frameworks to describe both small- and large-scale phenomena and processes (e.g. pronunciation, grammar, genres, institutions and social networks). These analyses are given coherence by the theoretical view of communication as an ‘on-line’, moment-to-moment process (Rampton, 2006:24).

The emphasis on ethnography is one of the main features that separates interactional sociolinguistics from conversation analysis. Where conversation analysis presupposes shared inferential procedures between interlocutors, interactional sociolinguists believe that the presuppositions that enter into conversational inference vary with the speaker’s and listener’s communicative background. Hence it cannot be taken for granted that inferential procedures are shared, rather this must be demonstrated through “ethnographically informed in-depth analysis” (Gumperz, 1999:459). Furthermore, interactional sociolinguistics focusses on how linguistic variation and varieties, e.g. codes or styles, are related to social meanings. Within interactional sociolinguistics, interaction is seen as a key site for the construction and reproduction of social identities. Therefore the microanalysis includes a consideration of the social positions participants occupy and how these identities are reproduced, contested or changed in interaction.

The newest tradition to spring from the work of Hymes and Gumperz is British linguistic ethnography (Rampton, 2007). The central tenets in linguistic ethnography are that contexts for communication should be investigated rather than assumed and that analysis of the internal organisation of data is essential to understanding its significance. Several different lines of research contribute to British linguistic ethnography, most notably interactional sociolinguistics, new literacy studies and

---

5 Rampton describes linguistic ethnography not as a cohesive school, but rather as “a site of encounter where a number of established lines of research interact” (2007:585).
critical discourse analysis. While ethnography and linguistics traditionally differ in a number of respects, e.g. object of study (culture vs. language) and the tendency to dwell on particularities in ethnography vs. the tendency to generalise in linguistics, there are clear advantages in combining the two, according to Rampton. Ethnography opens linguistics up, inviting reflexive sensitivity to the potential importance of what gets left out, while linguistics ties ethnography down, providing local description with robust and subtle frameworks drawn from outside (2007:596).

Ethnography also continues to be central to the endeavours within the field of linguistic anthropology. From the 1950s onwards, researchers in this field have undertaken ethnographic surveys of language structure and usage often in remote, exotic locations, in the process revealing a diversity of languages and language use, e.g. the finding that bilingualism or bidialectalism in many places is the rule rather than the exception (Gumperz, 1982). In recent years a large number of studies within linguistic anthropology has focussed on language ideologies, and again ethnography plays a central role.

1.2.3 Three studies, three perspectives

I have chosen to approach my research questions through three separate studies which each brings a unique perspective to the project. At the same time, the three studies relate to each other and feed into each other. This research design is meant to provide both width and depth to the investigation. The ethnographic study provides the basis for further explorations and contributes with what could be called a mezzo perspective, as the focus here is on the language practices of the organisation. It is in this study that I attempt to provide ‘the bigger picture’ of language practices at Lundbeck, the company where I did my fieldwork. The language choice study in contrast provides a micro perspective. In this study the attention turns to the details of language choice in one relatively small setting, namely a single department. While the language choice study is a separate study drawing on its own set of theories and methods, it is at the same time intimately connected with the ethnographic study and the knowledge obtained here. Finally, drawing
again on the results of the ethnography study, the language ideologies study links local beliefs about language with widespread language ideologies and contributes in this way with a macro perspective on language practices in the company.

1.2.4 Clarifying key concepts

In this final section of the theoretical and methodological preliminaries, I will briefly define three of the key concepts used in the thesis.

Language

The term ‘language’ is often used to refer to national languages such as Danish, English and German, and in a way so as to suggest that languages are fixed categories with clear boundaries between them. In a thesis of this type, however, I feel the need to point out that such categorisation is to some degree an ideological construct. As Gal puts it:

Languages in this limited sense are assumed to be nameable (English, Hungarian, Greek), countable property (one can ‘have’ several), bounded and differing from each other, but roughly inter-translatable, each with its charming idiosyncracies that are typical of the group that speaks it. The roots of this language ideology go back to the European Enlightenment and the Romantic reaction that followed. (2006:14)

While this notion of languages as discreet structures easily discernible from each other is an oversimplification of a complex issue, it is also a necessary abstraction in discussions of language use. And, as Thøgersen points out in relation to Danish, Swedish and Norwegian, the fact that the status of these languages is to some degree an ideological construct does not mean that it does not have real social and political consequences (2010:292). In sum, while acknowledging it as a simplification at best, I do use ‘language’ to refer to national languages as if they are stable and clearly bounded entities.
Norms
Norms for language use is a central term in my analyses and is discussed in detail in chapter 4.3. For now, suffice it to say that in this thesis I see norms as social conventions about appropriate language use which function at group level. In my case this means that norms are company- or department-wide. In relation to language ideology, I see ideologies as more widely distributed than norms, being society-wide or even distributed across most of the Western world (as in the case of the one-nation-one-language ideology).

Competence
Another central term in my analyses is competence. While in second language teaching especially, the terms ‘competence’ and ‘proficiency’ are laden with multiple meanings, it is not my intention to engage in a debate about proficiency vs. competence. I have chosen to use the term competence, and I use it to mean ‘the ability to use a language’. With the focus on language use, my definition of competence thus owes less to Chomsky’s linguistic competence and more to Hymes’ communicative competence. In addition to competence, I use the term linguistic repertoire. Where language competence is used to discuss competence in one language or another, a speaker’s linguistic repertoire is meant to capture the full inventory of a speaker’s language competences, i.e. all languages and styles.

1.3 Outline
The thesis is organised into three introductory chapters followed by three analyses, each preceded by a chapter on the theories and methods applied in the analysis. The three analyses are followed by a discussion chapter and a concluding chapter. After this introductory chapter, I provide more background for the thesis in the form of chapter 2 on English today. This chapter covers a discussion of relevant literature on English as a global language and English as a lingua franca as well as studies of English in Denmark and of the use of English as a corporate language. In chapter 3 I discuss my fieldwork methodology and present my data. Chapter 4 of the
thesis provides the theoretical and methodological foundations of the
ethnographic analysis in chapter 5.

The same structure is used for the subsequent four chapters, where
chapter 6 provides the theoretical and methodological foundations for the
language choice analysis in chapter 7, while chapter 8 does the same in
relation to the analysis of language ideologies and symbolic values of
languages in chapter 9. The discussion in chapter 10 focusses on the social
consequences of the use of English as a corporate language. In chapter 11 I
present a summary of the main results of the thesis and discuss their
implications for future research.
2 Background: English today

In this literature review I discuss relevant literature from three fields of study: English as a lingua franca, English in Denmark and English as a corporate language in order to position my study within these fields.

2.1 From global English to English as a lingua franca

My investigation of the use of English as a corporate language should be seen in the context of English as a global language and the use of English as a lingua franca. In this section I will discuss the ways in which English has been conceptualised in the literature over the past few decades in order to position my study in the context of the study of global English and English as a lingua franca.

From the Anglo-Saxon or Old English spoken by Germanic tribes around the 5th century to Chaucer’s Middle English in the late medieval period, English was still used exclusively in the British Isles. This began to change when the British crown sent the first expeditions to America in the late 16th century. During the next 300 years, English, which was now Modern English, spread with the British empire, and colonies in Africa, America, Asia and Oceania used English as a first or second language. The 20th century saw the demise of the empire, but also the creation of a number of new nations, former colonies, many of which kept English as an official or unofficial language. The 20th century also saw the rise of a new superpower, again a nation with English as its primary language. Since 1945 the status and power of the USA has contributed to the high status of English in the world. In the same period technological advances have made two trends possible: increased international communication and increased transnational mobility. These two factors have also contributed significantly to the spread of English in the world.

Today the number of non-native speakers of English is estimated to be greater than that of its native speakers (Fishman, 1998; Svartvik, 1998; Trudgill, 1998). Accurate numbers are hard to come by, however. Crystal estimates that 337 million people use English as a first language, 235 million use English as a second language, and somewhere between 100 and 1,000 million use English as a foreign language (1997:60). Which
figure to use for the number of speakers of English as a foreign language depends, however, on what level of English skills is required for someone to count as a speaker of English. Crystal lands on 1.2-1.5 billion speakers of English worldwide. Around the same time Fishman (1998) estimates that 1.6 billion people use English every day. While Crystal uses his figure to argue for the special status of English as a truly global language, Fishman, although acknowledging the unprecedented reach of English, emphasises that English actually is only used by a minority of the world’s population.

2.1.1 Global English

The fact remains that the spread of English today is unprecedented. In de Swaan’s model of a linguistic galaxy, English is the language of global communication, the hypercentral language at the hub of the galaxy that holds the entire constellation together (2001:6). The question is, however, whether English really can be described as ‘the language of global communication’ (singular) or whether it is more accurately described as ‘languages’ (plural). When discussing the use of English in the world today, researchers use a variety of terms: ‘Global English’, ‘World English’, ‘English as an International Language’, ‘World Standard English’, ‘Global Englishes’ and ‘World Englishes’ (Brutt-Griffler, 2002; Crystal, 1997; Duszak and Okulska, 2004; Kachru, 1992; McArthur, 1998; 2004; Pennycook, 2007; Strevens, 1992; Trudgill, 1998). The use of the singular vs. the plural often corresponds to an ideological position: a focus on convergence vs. divergence. Some researchers foresee a future where the English language becomes increasingly standardised, while others fear that English will go the way of Latin and break up into mutually unintelligible dialects, and eventually into different languages (Trudgill, 1998). But it does not necessarily have to be either/or: Crystal (1997) envisions a future where a great number of national varieties of English

* But this is not always the case. Especially ‘World English’ has also been used as a term for “all English: standard and non-standard, mother-tongue and other-tongue, dialect, pidgin, creole, lingua franca, and importantly, such ‘Anglo-hybrids’ as Hindlish and Spanglish” (McArthur, 2004). Also, see McArthur (2004) for a discussion of the historical use of the terms world, international and global English.
are supplemented by World Standard Spoken English, a variety used to communicate internationally. This variety would not replace the national varieties, but supplement them.

The division of speakers into first, second and foreign language speakers is widely accepted in the literature and is mirrored in both McArthur’s list of ENL, ESL and EFL territories (1998:53) and in Kachru’s often used concentric circles model (1992). This model places countries in either the inner circle, which refers to the traditional bases of English, i.e. countries where English is the primary language, the outer circle, which is comprised of former colonies where English is used as a second language, and the expanding circle, which includes countries where English is used as a foreign language, but where it does not have special administrative status. The countries in the inner circle are also described as the norm-providing countries.

The model has some problems, however. The distinction between second and foreign language is not always clear, and the categorisation of countries according to their status as former British colonies has little contemporary relevance and does not necessarily reflect the status or use of English in the country. As Crystal (1997) argues, English is used much more in some countries from the expanding circle, e.g. Denmark, than in some countries where it has official status as a second language. McArthur also acknowledges this fact when he places English in Denmark, Norway, Sweden and the Netherlands on a list of countries where English is “a virtual second language … which everyone learns and many use for personal and professional purposes at home and abroad” (1998:41). In these countries English does not have official or special legal status, but it is nonetheless significant. This category contrasts with the category for the rest of the EFL countries that are described as countries where “English is learned as the global lingua franca” (1998:54).

2.1.2 English as a lingua franca

A more recent way of conceptualising English in the world, and a different model for the analysis of the global use of English is to speak of English as a lingua franca, often abbreviated ELF. Research into English as a lingua franca is predominantly empirically based. This type of research
took its beginning in the 1990s (e.g. Firth, 1996; Gramkow Andersen, 1993) and has gained increasing attention in the new millennium (e.g. Canagarajah, 2007; Cogo, 2008; Firth, 2009; House, 2003; 2008; 2009; Jenkins, 2000; 2002; 2006; 2007; 2009; Klimpfinger, 2009; Mortensen, 2010; and Seidlhofer, 2001; 2002; 2004; 2009). In the following I will discuss key areas of research into English as a lingua franca with particular focus on issues relevant to language choice.

The term ELF has been used both for a sociolinguistic function, i.e. its use as a tool for interpersonal communication among speakers with no single language in common, and for the system of the forms that are peculiar to a specific variety of a language (Berns, 2009; Saraceni, 2008). In order to avoid this confusion where ELF denotes both linguistic form and communicative function, I speak of ‘the use of English as a lingua franca’ and use the abbreviation to mean that exactly to pinpoint that I understand English as a lingua franca as a sociolinguistic function, not as a variety.

While ‘lingua franca’ originally was used about a trade language of Romance origin in the Mediterranean area in the Middle Ages, it has more recently taken on the general meaning of contact language. One of the first definitions of English as a lingua franca is Firth’s. According to this, English as a lingua franca is “a ‘contact language’ between persons who share neither a common native tongue nor a common (national) culture, and for whom English is the chosen foreign language of communication” (1996:240). In early studies of English as a lingua franca (e.g. House, 1999 and Seidlhofer, 2002), native speakers were by definition excluded from the data collection (as also Firth stresses by emphasising ‘foreign language’). In some more recent studies this position is somewhat more nuanced. In the ELFA corpus (English as Lingua Franca in Academic settings), native speakers are included when they participate in multiparty dialogic events because “it is in the nature of things in ELF discourses that L1 speakers mix with L2 speakers” (Mauranen, 2006:129). And in the VOICE corpus native speakers are now included, but make up less than 10% of those recorded (VOICE, 2009).

In a recent article Seidlhofer makes this somewhat surprising comment on the question of whether English as a lingua franca is a separate variety:
“While this question is not one that exercises the minds of many ‘protagonists’ of ELF research, it seems to be important to some people, linguists as well as linguistic laypersons” (2009:42). It is surprising because this topic has been dealt with in a number of works by ELF protagonists, and thus would seem to exercise their minds. Jenkins (2007:2) describes English as a lingua franca as “an emerging English that exists in its own right and which is being described in its own terms rather than by comparison with ENL”. When she calls English as a lingua franca ‘an English’, she seems to be suggesting variety status on a par with other Englishes. Also Cogo seems to make this suggestion when she writes that “[s]cholars of English are finding it difficult to recognise ELF alongside Inner and Outer Circle varieties of English” (2008:59). House takes it one step further when she writes that “ELF is neither a language for specific purposes nor a pidgin, because it is not a restricted code, but a language showing full linguistic and functional range” (2003:557).

Mollin (2006) investigates whether English as a lingua franca is a new variety, but concludes that it is better classified as a register. In a corpus study of lingua franca interactions she finds no evidence of the common structural features suggested in previous literature, e.g. the loss of the third person singular –s on verbs in the present tense. Instead Mollin’s findings suggest a commonality in communication purpose: to get meaning across from one non-native speaker to another. Because it seems that the characteristics of English as a lingua franca depend on the situation and on communication purposes, Mollin concludes that English as a lingua franca should not be classified as a variety, but as a register, i.e. a language used for a specific function rather than by a specific group.

Also Firth (2009) investigates variety status, but concludes that English as a lingua franca is neither a form of discourse nor a variety of English: “ELF does not exist as a ‘thing’ or ‘system’ out there. Instead, as

7 Interestingly, Cogo and Dewey (2006) find in their corpus of ELF interactions that the zero morpheme is used more than the –s variant and conclude that “the feature [is] emerging as the default option in informal naturally occurring communications” (2006:77). They also find that while the zero variant is found in a variety of linguistic contexts, the use of the –s variant is more limited and is most frequent in more formal settings in the presence of a native speaker.
Canagarajah (2007:926) has it, ‘[i]t is constantly brought into being in each context of communication’” (Firth, 2009:163). Firth finds that what transcends ELF interactions is an inherent variability which he terms the ‘lingua franca factor’. This variability is found in language proficiency, linguistic form and sociocultural knowledge. ELF is also inherently hybrid in that participants borrow each other’s language form, create nonce words and codeswitch. Firth’s findings here echo those of House (2003), who identifies negotiability, variability and openness to integration of forms of other languages as the three most important ingredients in English as a lingua franca.

In a recently completed PhD thesis, Mortensen (2010) proposes that English as a lingua franca should not be taken to denote a distinct variety of English, nor an interactional type *sui generis*. Instead, he suggests that “the characteristics of ELF talk frequently reported in the literature (but sometimes contested) in part can be attributed to the fact that ELF mode interactions are based on certain language scenarios” (2010:42). It is these language scenarios which lead participants to adopt the norms characterising ELF interactions, e.g. enhanced accommodation. What Mortensen suggests is that these characteristics are not unique to ELF interactions, but that they are enhanced in lingua franca talk. Following this suggestion, what distinguishes ELF communication seems to be a matter of quantity rather than quality.

**Deficit vs. difference**

One of the ideological goals of prominent researchers into English as a lingua franca has been to conceptualise ELF as an equally valuable alternative to native-speaker English. House (2003), Jenkins (2006) and Seidlhofer (2004) among others make a point of arguing against the ‘deficit view’ typically associated with English as a foreign language and argue instead for a ‘differential approach’ to English as a lingua franca. In the deficit view, non-native speakers of English are measured against a native-speaker norm, and any deviation from this norm is conceived of as an error. House (2003) argues that instead of measuring ELF users against the norms of native speakers, the norm should be something like ‘expert in ELF use’. House defines this expert in ELF use as “a stable multilingual
speaker under comparable socio-cultural and historical conditions of language use, and with comparable goals for interaction” (2003:573).

Firth also argues for this change in perspective in an early article:

the term ‘lingua franca’ attempts to conceptualize the participant simply as a language user whose real-world interactions are deserving of unprejudiced description, rather … than as a person conceived a priori to be the possessor of incomplete or deficient communicative competence, putatively striving for the ‘target’ competence of an idealized ‘native speaker’. (1996:241, emphasis in the original)

Jenkins (2009) argues that “all speakers make adjustments to their local English variety for the benefit of the interlocutors. Hence: ELF is not orientation to a norm, but mutual negotiation involving adjustments from all parties” (2009:201). Jenkins here seems to suggest that rather than adhering to a norm which is “something like ‘expert in ELF use’” (House, 2003:573), the norm that speakers of ELF orient to is a kind of mutual accommodation in order to ensure intelligibility.

Preisler (1995, 2008) represents a different point of view when he argues that native-speaker norms are important in lingua franca interactions. His argument is that even if no native speakers are present, non-native speakers still orient to a language norm, and most often it is the norm that was used when the speaker was taught English as a foreign language in school. In the absence of a stable form of English as a lingua franca, speakers still need something to look to, and the native-speaker variety they were taught in school provides that. A compromise between the two positions can be found in Lesznyák (2004). Her suggestion of making a distinction between model (e.g. American English or British English) and target (i.e. the kind of competence a speaker aims for) seems useful (2004:247). So, while the model or norm for a user of English as a lingua franca may still be American or British English, the target can be something like ‘competent ELF user’.
Language choice and identity

My particular interest in this project is language choice in relation to the use of English as a lingua franca, but until now not much research has been done in this area. A few researchers have investigated functions of codeswitching in English as a lingua franca. Klimpfinger (2009) investigates forms and functions of codeswitching in a corpus of institutional ELF talk. Her study identifies four main functions of codeswitching in ELF situations: specifying an addressee, appealing for assistance (e.g. asking for a term), introducing another idea (implying that another language than English is more appropriate to talk about the new subject) and signalling culture (2009:351-352).

When Klimpfinger and Pölzl and Seidlhofer speak of codeswitching to signal or retain culture, they focus on speakers' need to express their national identity by switching into their native language, i.e. they only look at switches from English into other languages. The question of what kind of identity the use of English as a lingua franca signals is left largely untouched. The reason for this bias is undoubtedly connected with the predominant position in ELF research on ELF and identity, a position which contends that English as a lingua franca is a language for communication devoid of any cultural symbolic value. In House (2003) a

8 She adds that in most cases a codeswitch has more than one function and thus allows for an interplay between the functions.
distinction is made between languages for communication and languages for identification, and House concludes that ELF is “a useful and versatile tool, a ‘language for communication’” (2003:560). She argues that local languages, particularly a speaker’s mother tongue, are likely to be determining for identity, but since ELF is not a national language, but “a mere tool bereft of collective cultural capital” (ibid.), it cannot be used for identity marking. Firth also focusses on the instrumental use of ELF in his study of codeswitching in English as a lingua franca. He concludes that his informants attend to the task-as-target rather than linguistic-form-as-target (2009:155). This focus on the “task-as-target” means that codeswitching is used if this is thought to get the job done. In this view codeswitching is employed for instrumental ends, to accomplish a specific work task.

Pölzl (2003) also focusses on ELF as a language of communication. She analyses the specific ways in which lingua franca speakers activate cultural identity through embedded use of their L1 or their interlocutor’s L1. Pölzl proposes that English in lingua franca situations is used as a ‘native-culture-free’ code. In this connection I find it curious that Pölzl does not explore any other potential links between culture, identity and ELF apart from national identity. Especially since she finds that ELF is “flexible enough to allow its users to signal not only their ELF group membership, but also their individual cultural identity which is part of the ELF interculture” (2003:20). Her suggestion that ELF is used to signal ELF group membership is never followed up on, however. In an interesting aside, Pölzl mentions situational cultures:

The term ‘culture’ here is used to refer to primary culture/s (membership by shared ethnic origin, e.g. Greek or bilingual Arabic/Greek). However it could also refer to situational culture (e.g. special interest groups such as linguists, where membership is based on specific shared knowledge). Wherever linguists or philosophers, for example, meet internationally they identify with their like-minded group through their own terminology and thus create a self-contained culture.
Situational cultures would seem to be important in connection with ELF and identity, since ELF interactions typically take place in such situational cultures.

A few researchers have made this connection, most notably between English as a lingua franca and international situational cultures. Mauranen links the use of English in international university programmes with participation in international communities:

> It is membership in the international discourse community that is presumably the ultimate goal of those who participate in international programs. It is to be expected, then, that the primary identity constructed with the use of English is international, with its diverse associations. The linguistic form of such an identity is likely to be lingua franca English. (2006:128)

In a similar setting, Ljosland (2008) connects language choice with a concept related to situational cultures, namely Anderson’s ‘imagined communities’ (1996). In a study of the use of English as a lingua franca in a higher educational setting, Ljosland links the use of English with the wish to belong to such imagined communities. In conclusion Ljosland writes:

> I have looked at how one particular group of people in a university in Norway connect to and contribute to creating several imagined communities. One of these is the international expert group within their subject field. … The participants in my study connect to these imagined communities by using the international language of English. (2008:340-341)

### 2.1.3 Criticisms of the ELF paradigm

Not all researchers of English today are content to work within the ELF paradigm. Two alternatives are presented by Berns and Seargeant. Berns (2009) focusses on English in Europe and questions the adequacy of using the term lingua franca to represent the sociolinguistic realities of world Englishes. Berns points out that English in Europe serves a wider range of purposes than just that of an international lingua franca. As an alternative
to the ELF paradigm, she suggests the introduction of a framework of sociolinguistic profiles of English. According to Berns, English in Europe serves four distinct functions: the innovative (e.g. the use of English in advertising), the interpersonal (e.g. the use of English for socialising among exchange students), the instrumental (e.g. English as the medium of instruction in higher education) and the institutional (e.g. the use of English as official language in the EU). While her claim that English in Europe has distinctive properties, as English in Great Britain or the United States does (2009:196), remains to be proven, her suggestion that the use of English in Europe goes beyond the scope of English as a lingua franca definitely has merit. In addition to the four functions outlined by Berns, an identity function also suggests itself, as evidenced both in the above studies of English as a marker of professional, international identity and in studies of English as a marker of youth and subcultural identity discussed in the subsequent section (Andersen, 2004; Lønsmann, 2009; Preisler, 2003).

Seargeant (2009) also takes a critical view of the ELF position. He argues that the mere statistical fact that English is now spoken by a higher number of non-native speakers than native speakers does not automatically mean that people orient to and adopt a lingua franca norm. Economic power and influence still reside to a large degree with the native speakers because they live in economically rich and politically powerful countries. Seargeant argues that the standard which is recognised by those who hold economic power will by default be the model to which those wishing to gain access to this power are likely to aspire (2009:159). In other words, people do not necessarily orient to native speaker norms because they are native, but because they are the varieties spoken by people with economic and political power. This ideological side of the argument is frequently ignored by ELF researchers.

### 2.1.4 Conclusion

Although participants’ linguistic repertoires in ELF settings by definition include more than one language, not much attention has been given to language choice, or, in other words, to the question of when a speaker switches into and away from English and why. With its focus on
The presence of English in Denmark today is indisputable. English is the first foreign language taught in schools, it dominates the media landscape and it plays a strong role in...
higher education and the corporate world. This omnipresence of English in Danish society is the local backdrop against which the use of English as a corporate language at Lundbeck should be understood. This section begins with a brief discussion of the domain concept as the term is frequently invoked in debates about English in Denmark. The following sub-section details the results of previous studies of the use of English in Denmark. The third and final sub-section provides an overview of recent years’ Danish language policy initiatives, focussing on those parts of the initiatives mentioning the use of English as a corporate language.

2.2.1 The domain concept

Originally introduced by Joshua Fishman in a number of articles in the 1960s and 1970s (1966; 1972a; 1972b), the domain concept was conceived of as an analytical tool for explaining language choice in speech communities characterised by “widespread and relatively stable multilingualism”, i.e. settings where “a single population use two or more varieties for internal communicative purposes” (1972a:437). The focus on stable multilingual speech communities means that Fishman is interested primarily in intragroup multilingualism. He defines a domain as a class of situations for which the same language variety is chosen. Examples of domains include school, family and church, but according to Fishman the domains for each speech community are to be determined empirically.

In Denmark (and the rest of Scandinavia), the domain concept has in the last two decades been used in connection with the influence from English, particularly in the term ‘domain loss’. ‘Domain loss’ is used about cases where the number of areas or situations in which a language is used decrease (Jarvad, 2001:30). The differences from Fishman’s domain concept are clear: Denmark is not a stable multilingual speech community, and the situations where English is used are only rarely intragroup communication. Jarvad acknowledges that ‘domain loss’ is a somewhat vague term, as is also discussed e.g. by Haberland (2005) and Preisler (2005), but suggests a definition of ‘domain loss’ as that which happens

78% of the most popular music in Denmark that week was in English (http://www.hitlisterne.dk/ 21 Oct. 2010).
when a language loses terrain in parts of society to another and stronger language (2001:34).

2.2.2 The status of English in Denmark

In section 2.1 I discussed Kachru’s circle model, according to which Denmark belongs in the expanding circle where English is used as a foreign language, but does not have special administrative status. Both Crystal (1997) and MacArthur (1998) find this categorisation problematic, however, and McArthur instead describes the status of English in Denmark as “the second language, which everyone learns and many use for personal and professional purposes at home and abroad” (1998:41). Neither Kachru’s nor MacArthur’s model is based on empirical studies, however, and their categorisations are very general. In order to understand some of the complexities surrounding the use of English in Denmark, we now turn to some recent Danish studies which do investigate the use of English in Denmark empirically.

Jarvad (2001) is a study of the status of the Danish language, but with a focus on ‘domain loss’ to English. She investigates a large number of domains and finds that ‘domain loss’ has already happened within the domains of research and the EU. In research, the natural sciences in particular are in danger. With as many as 86% of publications in this domain in English, Jarvad concludes that Danish will eventually lack the necessary vocabulary to discuss scientific topics (2001:106). And while Danish is an official language in the EU, in reality the working language for Danes in the EU is English, and this domain is therefore already lost, Jarvad concludes. The study also finds that English has a strong presence in the Danish educational sector where the number of programmes offered in English both at high school level and in higher education is increasing.

Madsen (2009) also takes its point of departure in the fear for ‘domain loss’. Madsen shows, however, that ‘domain loss’ is not a useful concept for an analysis of language choice among natural scientists at a Danish university. The study shows that the scientists use both Danish and English, and Madsen concludes that research therefore is not ‘a domain’. She finds that Danish and English are functionally distributed with
English used for international publication and communication with non-Danish-speaking colleagues, and Danish used for publications aimed at the Danish public and communication with Danish colleagues. Madsen concludes that this distribution is stable, hence there is no danger that Danish will be replaced by English among natural scientists.

English in Denmark has been dealt with most thoroughly by Preisler (1999). In the questionnaire part of this study, Preisler examines attitudes to English, the presence of English in daily life in Denmark and the Danes’ English proficiency. The study confirms that English is massively present in the everyday life of the Danes. Almost 90% of the respondents claim to see and hear English every day or every week (Preisler, 1999:33). The connection between the media and the presence of English is evident, as films, television, music, advertising and the radio are pointed out as areas where people most often see or hear English. The Danes use their receptive English skills, such as listening and reading, more often than they speak or write English. Still, 47% claim to speak English at least once a month, and for young people under the age of 25 the number is 71%. Mostly young people who are employed and/or have completed tertiary education speak English. A large number of respondents with little or no education and most elderly Danes answer that they never speak English (ibid.). Another questionnaire survey confirms this frequent use of English among younger Danes. Andersen (2004) finds that 75% of her respondents, who are between the ages of 15 and 21, read English at least once a week, and as many as 90% speak English with other Danes at least once a week. Andersen also shows that the young Danes use English to signal youth identity (2004:74).

In the interview part of his study, Preisler investigates the influence from Anglo-American subcultures in the spread of English in Denmark. In an analysis of interviews with performers from five subcultures, Preisler finds that the use of English in these subcultures takes the form of codeswitching between Danish and English. The frequent codeswitching to English is a value symbol through which speakers position themselves socially and culturally (2003:112). Preisler argues that the language style spreads from the subcultures to the surrounding society through commercialisation of the subcultures, a process which transforms the
subcultures from underground to mainstream. Thousands of ‘wanna-be’ imitate the performers of e.g. the hip-hop subculture by buying the music, dressing in hip-hop clothes, and codeswitching to English like the hip-hoppers. It is through this process that codeswitching to English spreads. Lønsmann (2009) finds that Preisler’s theory can be supported by empirical data from the computer gamer subculture in Denmark. The study shows how a group of adolescent computer gamers maintain their distinctive subcultural language style, characterised by frequent codeswitching to English, through collective discipline in the subculture. The data also shows how the computer gamers spread the style to their peers outside the subculture either by widening the semantic scope of words with specific subcultural meanings or through enlarging the context in which an expression is used from the subculture to other, more mainstream, contexts.

Another important finding in Preisler’s study is that 20% of the Danish population have little or no English skills (Preisler, 2003:124). The majority of these ‘English-have-nots’ are between 50 and 75 years old, but the problem is not solely encountered among older people. 1-3% of adults under the age of 45 share this problem. This means that rather than expecting this problem to disappear with future generations, it could be expected to grow as the influence from English increases. Preisler concludes that

The use of codeswitching to English in a wide range of text types aimed at the general public means that this large minority of English-have-nots is increasingly suffering from a new variety of functional illiteracy. The lack of awareness of this, in the population and in government, is partly because victims of functional illiteracy feel ashamed and do not like to admit that they have difficulty reading. The English-have-nots’ own awareness of the extent to which they are exposed to English is low, indicating that they learn to ignore messages they do not understand. (2003:125)

The above studies all agree that the English language has a strong presence in Denmark. While the great majority of the Danes use their receptive English skills daily or weekly, mostly younger Danes speak or
write English. For younger Danes, English has a strong symbolic value, either as a marker of youth identity or as a marker of a particular subcultural identity. The Anglo-American youth subcultures are also important in that English spreads from these subcultures into mainstream youth culture. Finally, an important finding is that a large minority of the Danes have very little or no English knowledge, a problem which is largely unacknowledged in the public debate but which means that this group is increasingly suffering from a new variety of functional illiteracy.

2.2.3 Language policy debates

In the past decades the increasing presence of English in Danish society has led to some concern among laymen, among politicians and among some academics. With regard to the use of English in Danish companies, the introduction of English as a corporate language in some companies has been linked with fear of ‘domain loss’.

In 2003 the Danish Language Council drafted a number of suggestions meant as input to a scheduled parliamentary debate about the need for a Danish language policy. One overarching goal of such a language policy should be, the council suggested, to secure Danish as a complete language, and a prerequisite for reaching this goal was:

that in areas where Danish now gives way to English, i.e. where so-called domain loss is taking place, parallel-lingualism is introduced … Within the areas of science, higher education and the corporate world, the goal thus is to ensure that Danish is used, not instead of, but alongside the international auxiliary language of our time (international English) (Danish Language Council, 2003, emphasis in original, my translation11)

The main argument is that it is important to ensure that Danish is used alongside English in science, higher education and the corporate world. In

11 Text in original: “at der på de områder hvor dansk nu viger for engelsk, dvs. hvor der foregår såkaldt domænetab, indføres parallelsproglighed … Inden for områder som videnskab, højere uddannelse og erhvervsliv er målet altså at sikre at der bruges dansk, ikke i stedet for, men ved siden af vor tids internationale hjælpesprog (internationalt engelsk).”
relation to this last, the council says: “with regard to the corporate world it is a bigger problem [than the quality of the Danish used] that Danish is dropped in favour of English (e.g. in advertisements, job ads, websites and as a corporate language)” (ibid., my translation 12). The writers of these quotes seem to assume that the use of English as a corporate language means that Danish is no longer used in the company.

This assumption is further spelled out in a proposal for a language policy from a committee under the Danish Ministry of Culture. After some recommendations on the necessity of using a clear and understandable Danish in the corporate world, the report continues: “The main challenge with regard to language policy is, however, that the corporate world increasingly drops Danish and starts using English instead” (Danish Ministry of Culture, 2003:51, my translation 13). Although English as a corporate language is not mentioned outright, again the use of English in the corporate world is taken as a sign that Danish is dropped.

In 2007 the Danish Language Council published a memorandum (Danish Language Council, 2007) which follows up on the 2003 proposal for a language policy. The Council here proposes a yearly status report on language development in both the public sphere and in the corporate world. These status reports would make it possible to determine whether Danish is still a complete language. One of the parameters the Council suggests included in these reports is the number of companies with English as a corporate language.

Most recently, a committee was appointed by the government in order to consider whether a language law or another kind of language regulation was necessary. Regarding language in the corporate world, the resulting report concludes that the implementation of a corporate language in general has had the desired effect for the companies: both communication and recruitment conditions have improved. Two possible

12 Text in original: "hvad erhvervslivet angår, er det et større problem at dansk fravælges til fordel for engelsk (fx i reklamer, stillingsopslag, på hjemmesider og som koncernsprog)."

13 Text in original: "Den sprogpolitiske hovedudfordring er imidlertid, at erhvervslivet i stigende grad fravælger dansk og går over til at bruge engelsk i stedet."
side effects are mentioned, however, ‘domain loss’ for Danish and a lack of knowledge sharing in companies with English as a corporate language. The conclusion is that Danish is not threatened in the corporate world, but that Danish and English thrive side by side in a state of parallel-lingualism (Danish Ministry of Culture, 2008:63). The committee concludes, however, that more knowledge in this area is required and recommends that scientific investigations of language conditions are carried out with the purpose of identifying the extent of the communicative efficiency and correctness (2008:66).

In many of the above initiatives Danish is perceived to be under threat because the introduction of English as a corporate language is thought to mean that English gains ground at the expense of Danish. Although the 2008 report concludes that Danish is not threatened, this does not mean that the issue has now been laid to rest. In 2009, Sabine Kirchmeier-Andersen, the current director of the Danish Language Council, commented on the frequent use of English as a corporate language: “It is a domain loss. Another area where Danish is losing terrain to English” (Ejsing, 2009b, my translation14). Elsewhere Kirchmeier-Andersen has the following to say about the consequences of not introducing a language law for the universities:

Danish will slowly be phased out at the universities and in workplaces. Today every fourth company organised in the Confederation of Danish Industry has English as a corporate language. When they recruit candidates who have studied in English it creates a self-perpetuating movement towards even more English. (Ejsing, 2009a, my translation15)

These statements further illustrate the tendency to connect the use of English as a corporate language with ‘domain loss’ in debates about

14 Text in original: “Det er et domænetab. Endnu et område, hvor dansk taber terræn til engelsk.”
15 Text in original: “Dansk vil langsomt blive afviklet på universiteterne og arbejdspadserne. I dag har hver fjerde virksomhed organiseret i Dansk Industri (DI) engelsk som koncernsprøg. Når de rekrutterer kandidater, der er uddannet på engelsk, skaber det en selvforstærkende bevægelse mod endnu mere engelsk.”
English in Denmark. This is done either directly as in the first quote, or indirectly as in the second quote where the fact that 25% of the members of the Confederation of Danish Industry have English as a corporate language is used to qualify the prediction that Danish will be slowly phased out in Danish workplaces.

2.2.4 Conclusion
While the presence of English in Denmark in general is well documented empirically (Preisler, 1999; 2003), ‘domain loss’ to English remains more of a postulate than an empirically researched fact. One notable exception is Madsen (2009), who does not find any evidence of ‘domain loss’ in the area she investigates, namely research at Danish universities. With regard to the use of English in the corporate world, there is a clear lack of empirical studies.

Furthermore, the assumptions on which the above debate rests beg a number of questions. One relevant question is whether the introduction of English in Danish companies means that Danish will be phased out, or in the terms of the above reports and quotes, ‘lose domains’ to English. Another question is whether counting the number of companies with English as a corporate language (as suggested in the 2007 memorandum from the Danish Language Council) tells us much about the influence of English in Denmark. Until we know what it means to have English as a corporate language – until we know how much and how English is used in these companies – it seems premature to talk about Danish being phased out. The continued debate about ‘domain loss’ coupled with the lack of empirical studies suggest the need for scientific investigations. Before turning to my own such investigation, however, the next chapter is devoted to a review of some of the existing literature on English as a corporate language.

2.3 English as a corporate language
English as a corporate language has not been given much attention in the sociolinguistic literature, but a few Danish studies have dealt with the topic, and it has been given some attention in the international business
communication literature. As a consequence of the business perspective, most of these articles focus on communicative or organisational difficulties resulting from the introduction of English as a corporate language. In this literature review, I first discuss the Danish studies and then the international business communication literature.

2.3.1 Danish studies
Jarvad (2001) is the first Danish study to focus explicitly on English as a corporate language, albeit only as one among many so-called domains investigated (see also section 2.2.2). In a chapter on the corporate world, Jarvad concludes that although English as a corporate language has been discussed previously, no studies have been carried out of language choice and ‘domain loss’ in this area (2001:140). She then provides the following definition of the Danish word ‘koncernsprog’ which is usually translated as ‘corporate language’: “language used as working language in a company, especially a larger company which communicates externally to a particularly high degree” (2001:147, my translation). It is not clear why she includes this focus on external communication in her definition. Jarvad investigates potential ‘domain loss’ through ten phone interviews with Danish companies with English as a corporate language. Four of the companies are Danish-owned, while six have parent companies in Europe or the US. The study shows that Danish has a strong presence in all the companies. 9 out of the ten interviewees state that they use Danish both with their closest superior and subordinate, and none of the ten use English with other Danes. Of the five companies with personnel magazines, three are in Danish, one in both Danish and English and one in English. Danish is customary for department meetings in all the companies, but English is used if foreigners are present. The majority of the companies use English daily for communication with both native and non-native speakers of English, and eight out of ten use English for reading instruction manuals, reports and letters. These findings lead Jarvad to conclude that when companies state that they have English as a

---

16 Text in original: “sprog som benyttes som arbejdssprog i en virksomhed, især større virksomhed som i særlig grad kommunikerer ’ud af huset’.”
corporate language, this may in fact be just for show, since very few large companies in reality use English in the daily communication. Danish is the routine choice for spoken communication, while English is used frequently in written communication. Jarvad concludes that by using the term ‘corporate language’, Danish companies signal that they have a high level of English competence, which is important in part because the level of English is used as a parameter when judging the economic potential of a company (2001:23-24). In Jarvad’s terms then, if English is not used for daily oral communication, it is not used as a corporate language (2001:151).

Another survey from the same year confirms that Danish has a strong position in spoken company communication. Erhardtsten and Langer’s survey (2001) of the board culture in the 56 largest companies on the Danish stock exchange reveals that 40% of the companies have one or more international board members, but that the working language is Danish in two thirds of the boards. The need to use English as a working language is cited as the main barrier preventing more companies from adding international members to the board.

In 2007 the Confederation of Danish Industry carried out two studies of English as a corporate language (Pedersen and Holm, 2007). A survey of 400 of their member companies shows that 25% have English as a corporate language. An interview study reveals that the majority of the companies has introduced English as a corporate language because they see themselves as global companies with international relations, and also because English is a prerequisite for international recruitment. The study also shows that English is used as a supplement to Danish rather than as a replacement. English is used only when necessary, i.e. when an international employee or customer is present. Many of the interviewees in this second study responded that the introduction of English as a corporate language increased knowledge sharing, and that they did not experience any negative consequences in the form of exclusion of international employees or group formation according to language preferences. The Confederation of Danish Industry concludes on the background of these two studies that the introduction of English as a corporate language does not mean that Danish is losing ground, instead
the use of English increases the amount of communication in the companies.

In a report on the perception of the need for foreign languages in Danish companies, Verstraete-Hansen (2008) finds that almost 60% of the companies use only English in communication with foreign trade partners. 31.5% have experienced that the lack of language competence can be a barrier for international activities, particularly negotiations. Interestingly, 41% have experienced problems due to a lack of language competence on the part of their foreign trade partners. This means that the companies experience these barriers more strongly when the source of the problem is placed outside their own company. Verstraete-Hansen concludes that the level of preparedness with regard to foreign languages does not make it possible for the companies to initiate and retain international trade relations at a satisfactory level. However, despite experiencing these difficulties, the companies in this study do not think their need for employees with a language education will increase in the future. One reason is that, unlike technical, legal and economic knowledge, language knowledge is not regarded as profit generating in a way that warrants investment. Even among the companies that have experienced difficulties with foreign language communication, one third responds that they do not need further language competencies. On this background Verstraete-Hansen concludes that there is an unrecognised gap between the objective need for foreign languages (understood as the required conditions for successful foreign language communication) and the subjective, i.e. recognised, need (the companies' perception of their future requirement of competencies) (2008:71).

One of the few Danish studies to deal specifically with English as a corporate language is Sørensen’s (2005) master’s thesis. Using questionnaires completed by an employee from each of the participating 70 companies, Sørensen investigates why companies in Denmark introduce English as a corporate language, and whether it is possible to define what it means to have English as a corporate language. He concludes that “whether or not a corporation is officially adhering to English as CL [corporate language], this is no indicator of the scope nor the extent of its English usage” (2005:67). He also concludes that all the
companies in his study use English according to the principles of best practice, not according to a fixed set of guidelines, whether English is an official corporate language or not. In conclusion Sørensen offers the following definition of ‘English as a corporate language’ as it is currently performed throughout corporate Denmark: “English is the preferred language when board and executive meetings are attended by non-Danish speakers and when oral communication is carried out between HQ and subsidiaries” (2005:70). He emphasises the oral use of English in his definition because his survey shows that English in writing is used primarily as a transit language between local languages, e.g. with documents being translated to and from English.

The most recent and largest Danish study of the use of English as a corporate language is done by Tange and Lauring (2009). Through ethnographic analysis of 82 interviews with employees from 14 Danish companies, they investigate the communicative practices which have emerged from the management decision to implement English as a corporate language. Starting from the point of view that language diversity is an obstacle to knowledge-sharing, Tange and Lauring come to the conclusion that introducing a corporate language does not necessarily solve this problem. Instead two processes emerge in these companies. One is ‘language clustering’, which means that speakers of the same national language tend to gather informally (as also shown by Marschan-Piekkari et al., 1999a; 1999b). Language clustering is particularly frequent in relation to Danish. Because Danes are in the majority in these companies and the setting is Denmark, Danish has a certain symbolic power and is frequently used in informal interactions. Therefore, one result of language clustering is that international employees find themselves excluded by the Danes’ linguistic practices which prevent them from participating fully in the social life of the organisation. Furthermore, Tange and Lauring find that informants’ classifications of their colleagues are based on linguistic, rather than national criteria, which leads them to conclude that language skills are important in relation to social identity. The second process described by Tange and Lauring is ‘thin communication’. They conclude that the introduction of English as a corporate language results in a decrease in the amount of communication in the company because non-
native speakers withdraw from non-essential exchanges in English. In other words, people withdraw from gossip, small talk and story-telling sessions, and knowledge-sharing on an informal level disappears. Hence the introduction of English as a corporate language means that communication becomes more formal and task-oriented.

### 2.3.2 International studies

Few international studies focus on investigating when, where and by whom English is used in multinational corporations with English as a corporate language, but Fredriksson et al. (2006) is one study which does. The study is a case study of the use of English as a corporate language in the German multinational Siemens. The data consists of 36 interviews with employees from the German headquarters, a German subsidiary and a Finnish subsidiary. While the former CEO of Siemens has stated that English is the corporate language, Fredriksson et al. find that the status of English as a corporate language is not something all their informants can agree on. Not only were respondents unable to pinpoint when and how English had been introduced as a corporate language, some informants even claimed that German or both English and German were corporate languages. Fredriksson et al. conclude that a common corporate language in their case does not refer to a language used throughout the corporation on all organisational levels. Furthermore, Fredriksson et al. conclude that managerial fiat alone is not enough to make a corporate language common. They base this on the fact that several other languages are still used within Siemens and on the fact that opposing views on what is actually the corporate language – German or English – still exist. They further suggest that the issue of a common corporate language actually may have been left ambiguous intentionally so as not to provoke reactions from either the German or non-German part of Siemens.

Nickerson (2000) does not directly investigate English as a corporate language, but focuses on the use of English in Dutch companies. Her study is interesting because she is able to shed light on where, when and by whom English is used in these companies. She finds that the use of English is very closely connected with certain departments. For instance, 95% of the participants respond that the sales department uses English
regularly, 54% say the same for management and 44% for administration. In comparison only 15% respond that the production department uses English. Furthermore, Nickerson reports a concentration of the use of English in senior positions, as 87% of the companies report that a position at manager level requires the use of English. It seems then that both rank and activity (sales, marketing etc.) are important in determining when an employee will use English. In summary Nickerson concludes that English is used regularly in the Dutch subsidiaries for communication with the British head office, but also in communication with other subsidiaries and customers. English is also used for internal communication, especially where native speakers of English are involved, although 48% of the companies use only Dutch internally.

Louhiala-Salminen et al. (2005) investigate internal communication in two mergers. In both cases the merging companies were from Sweden and Finland respectively, and in both cases the merged company adopted English as a corporate language. Louhiala-Salminen et al. find that the amount of English used had increased after the mergers to approximately 20% of the internal communication. In contrast with Nickerson’s findings, the amount of English used does not correspond to the employees’ organisational position, since individuals at all levels report using a large degree of English. In relation to language choice, Louhiala-Salminen et al. find that the most important factors affecting language choice are target group and group members’ language skills. Louhiala-Salminen et al. conclude that “pragmatic reality decided language choice ... and effectiveness and efficiency in communication governed language use rather than linguistic correctness” (2005:418).

Ehrenreich (2009) does not focus on English as a corporate language per se, but approaches the use of English in multinational corporations from an ELF perspective. She introduces a useful distinction between language-focussed and content-focussed speakers (e.g. language teacher vs. business professionals) and uses this distinction to explain the different attitudes to the use of ELF found in different studies. Ehrenreich’s empirical data is from two German multinational corporations and includes interviews, observation and recordings. The majority of her informants are “members of [the] business elite”
Ehrenreich finds that ‘linguistic respect’ and ‘efficiency’ are two key principles guiding international business communication, including language choice. In the case of Ehrenreich’s German companies, the first principle means that English is used whenever a non-German-speaking person is present. With regard to the second principle, efficiency, Ehrenreich concludes that the business managers in her study adjust their use of English to what is required in these professional communities, leaving behind “traditional notions of appropriateness as experienced in ELT classrooms” (2009:146) and instead developing into skilful users of English as a business lingua franca for whom what they say is more important than how they say it (2009:147). Ehrenreich’s results thus confirm Louhiala-Salminen et al.’s findings that efficiency is more important than correctness and echo those of other ELF researchers, e.g. Firth (2009).

In a review of the literature on the use of English as a lingua franca in business contexts, Nickerson concludes that “the realities of the business context are often considerably more complex than the simple label of English as a lingua franca would imply” (2007:354). A number of studies reveal that English is not the only language used in international business, but that both local languages and other linguae francae play important roles. Nickerson furthermore concludes that although a decision to adopt English may be a strategic one which facilitates some communication to some extent, it may also give rise to issues of power, including inequalities and powerlessness due to a lack of language skills, as well as creating certain practical difficulties associated with a lack of comprehension and the sometimes false assumption that everyone speaks English. (2007:359)

The remainder of the literature reviewed here focusses on such problems in companies with a corporate language, both in relation to power and comprehension. A series of studies are based on a case study of the Finnish multinational corporation Kone Elevators where English has been the official corporate language since the early 1970s (Charles and Marschan-Piekkari, 2002; Marschan-Piekkari et al., 1999a; Marschan-
Piekkari et al., 1999b). Marschan-Piekkari et al. (1999b) find that language functions both as a barrier and a facilitator in the company. Most of the international contacts at Kone are focussed around staff with competence in English. In practice this means that employees from other subsidiaries contact the one English-speaker in a unit rather than the person they otherwise would have contacted. This leads to the conclusion that the most powerful people in the company are those proficient in the corporate language English (Charles and Marschan-Piekkari, 2002). In addition to English, the parent company language Finnish is central in the organisation. Finnish expats in the subsidiaries function as language mediators between the subsidiaries and headquarters, which means that they often become involved in problems outside their own area and hierarchical position. Along with the fact that Finns occupy many important positions at headquarters, this means that the status of the Finnish staff is strengthened in inter-unit communication, while non-Finnish staff feel disconnected from decision-making and critical information exchanges (Marschan-Piekkari et al., 1999b:429). Some informants used the term ‘Finnish mafia’ to describe this selective transmission of information by parent company nationals. The conclusion is that communication clusters emerge around multilingual employees, and that language skills in English or Finnish can supersede the official organisational hierarchy leading to the existence of a shadow structure within the company based on language skills. Marschan-Piekkari et al. here show how language skills are closely connected to power in multinational corporations. Interestingly, not just mastering the corporate language, but also the parent company language can bestow power upon employees.

Two other studies of the same data focus on language-related problems in communication and human resource management. Charles and Marschan-Piekkari find that the use of a corporate language may cause comprehension problems, e.g. insufficient translations into local languages or difficulties understanding different English accents. It is interesting here that native speakers of English are thought to be particularly hard to understand (Charles and Marschan-Piekkari, 2002:17). Marschan-Piekkari et al. (1999a) focus on the human resource
management implications for companies adopting a common company language, a process they describe as ‘language standardization’ (1999a:379). They conclude that while an established corporate language is an important entry path to corporate training programmes, international assignments and promotions, this also means that employees who do not acquire competence in the corporate language are excluded from participating in company-wide activities and confined to local operations (1999a:383). This has implications not only for the individual employees, but also for company performance: exclusion from corporate training courses prevents employees from gaining the requisite technical knowledge and from the ensuing networking possibilities which could enhance informal communication and knowledge transfer across units.

In their study of merging companies discussed above, Louhiala-Salminen et al. (2005) find that foreign language use is the main source of communication problems after the mergers. It is important to remember in this connection that mergers differ from other companies introducing English as a corporate language where the process of adopting a company language is often more gradual. In the case of the Danish company Vestas, the official adoption of English as a corporate language in 2010 was considered a formality by the chairman of the board, Bent Erik Carlsen, who said that the corporation already communicated mainly in English (RB-Børsen, 2010). In mergers, the changes are often sudden and entail switching to a foreign language in tasks previously carried out in the mother tongue. While one of the companies in Louhiala-Salminen et al.’s study immediately after the merger announced English as a corporate language, the other company chose Swedish as language of management. This was problematic because the Finns felt handicapped in relation to the Swedes who could use their mother tongue. Swedish is an official second language in Finland and is taught in Finnish schools, but many of the Finns in the study felt that Swedish was not their best foreign language. Finnish informants said that they found it difficult to act assertively in negotiations and to find the right expressions for small talk in Swedish (Louhiala-Salminen et al., 2005:407). According to Louhiala-Salminen et al. these problems were alleviated through the introduction of English as a corporate language three years later, since BELF (Business English as a
Lingua Franca) does not have native speakers and learners, but only BELF users or business communicators. The question is, however, whether the introduction of English as a corporate language in another setting may not cause exactly the same problems Swedish did in this case. Language skills differ, also when the language in question is English, and in many other settings native speakers of English will be a part of the personnel group. It follows that the same problems with acting assertively in a foreign language and being excluded due to a lack of language skills might as easily occur in a company with English as a corporate language.

In a literature review Welch et al. (2005) sum up language issues emerging from the language diversity in multinational corporations. They find that the introduction of a corporate language does not eliminate language-related problems. On the contrary, having a corporate language may lead to relevant information being ignored by employees because of a lack of skills in the corporate language; communication flow may be distorted during translation from the corporate language to local languages; a lack of skills in the corporate language may lead to isolation of subsidiaries; and finally, language use may lead to social exclusion, e.g. when expats discuss issues in the parent company language rather than the corporate language, or when subsidiary management use their skills in the corporate language to exclude their subordinates and monopolise contact with the rest of the organisation.

2.3.3 Conclusion

The literature reviewed here shows that a corporate language does not mean a language which is used at all levels or by everyone in the organisation (Fredriksson et al., 2006; Jarvad, 2001; Sørensen, 2005), neither is English the only language used in these companies (Marschan-Piekkari 1999b; Nickerson, 2007; Tange and Lauring, 2009). Furthermore, the use of English may be unevenly distributed within these organisations, as Nickerson (2000) finds that rank and activity determine whether an employee will use English. Louhiala-Salminen et al. (2005) cannot confirm this, however, as they find that English is used at all organisational levels.
Language choice in these companies is guided by pragmatic considerations, and communicative efficiency is deemed more important than correctness (Ehrenreich, 2009; Louhiala-Salminen et al., 2005; Sørensen, 2005). This pragmatism does not mean, however, that the introduction of a corporate language is without difficulties. Several studies confirm that English as a corporate language does not necessarily enhance communication. On the contrary, knowledge-sharing on an informal level may disappear which can lead to corporate communication becoming more formal and task-oriented (Tange and Lauring, 2009); a lack of language skills may lead to comprehension problems and difficulties understanding different English accents (Charles and Marschan-Piekkari, 2002); and employees who are not native speakers of the corporate language may find it difficult to act assertively in negotiations and to find the right expressions for small talk (Louhiala-Salminen et al., 2005). Furthermore, having English as a corporate language may give rise to issues of inequality, powerlessness and social exclusion (Nickerson, 2007; Welch et al., 2005). Where proficiency in the corporate language or the parent company language may lead to powerful positions within the organisation (Charles and Marschan-Piekkari, 2002; Marschan-Piekkari et al., 1999b), employees who do not acquire competence in the corporate language are excluded from participating in company-wide activities and confined to local operations (Marschan-Piekkari et al., 1999a). Also a lack of proficiency in the parent company language can lead to exclusion, as international employees are prevented from participating fully in the social life of the organisation (Tange and Lauring, 2009).

From these investigations into the use of English as a corporate language it is clear that the topic is far from exhausted. On the contrary, a number of possible research agendas emerge. As Marschan-Piekkari et al. (1999a:379) note, little is known about when the decision to introduce a corporate language is taken, or if it even occurs formally. English may simply become the corporate language by default because of its dominance as an international language. Furthermore, the above studies do not shed much light on what it means when a company says that they have English as a corporate language. The results indicate that English as
a corporate language does not mean that English is used by everyone, for everything, but they do not conclusively confirm what English is used for. Studies of language choice in companies with English as a corporate language are few (Ehrenreich, 2009; Louhiala-Salminen et al., 2005), and this is one area which would benefit from further investigation. In this connection, the importance of the parent company language has been pointed to in a number of studies (Marschan-Piekkari, 1999b; Tange and Lauring, 2009; Welch et al., 2005), and this topic clearly also bears further investigation.

Most of the above studies focus on the management level (e.g. Ehrenreich (2009) who focusses exclusively on top level management, Welch et al. (2005) who focus on management processes, and the Kone study where 74% of interviews are with managers). Nickerson (2000) shows that English use is very unevenly distributed according to rank and activity, whereas Louhiala-Salminen et al. (2005) find that English is used at all organisational levels. Further investigation into the use of English as a corporate language could benefit from a more comprehensive research design aimed at including the perspectives of a wider range of employees. Finally, there is a lack of studies investigating English as a corporate language from a sociolinguistic perspective, i.e. with a focus on language choice and language change. The majority of studies focusses on human resource management, business communication and other more business-oriented genres. And while a study such as Ehrenreich’s has a sociolinguistic component, it is primarily focussed on ELF. In addition, further ethnographic studies would provide the basis for a deeper understanding of what it means to have English as a corporate language, a depth which is lacking both in questionnaire surveys and interview studies. In order to remedy some of these gaps in the literature, I now present my own study.
3 Methodology: an ethnographic case study

I have chosen to do my data collection in the form of a single case study. Case studies have the advantage of allowing the researcher to study the language practices of the case in depth, but the disadvantage of being difficult to generalise from. Fredriksson et al. (2006) (discussed in section 2.3.2) is also single-case study. In their data collection they have used ‘unit triangulation’ which means that they have collected data from three units within the same company and thus been able to contrast the perspectives of multiple organisational units. Fredriksson et al. argue that “the detailed and rich insights gained by such a research design far outweigh the potential disadvantages frequently associated with single-case studies, such as a lower degree of generalizability” (2006:411). I have also opted for prioritising detailed insights, and in my research design I also include different departments and different types of employees in order to enhance the depth of the understanding.

Rampton also discusses generalisation in relation to case studies. He argues that where e.g. surveys seek an ‘enumerative’ generalisation,

case studies seek generality by speaking more directly to existing theories and ideas, and they use their detailed analyses of particular circumstances to probe at the general principles, processes and relationships that these theories and ideas normally see at work in the worlds they refer to. (2006:387)

He further argues that case studies always should be positioned within some wider setting or context and quotes Hymes who suggests that “‘feet on the ground, one eye on the horizon’ might be [the] motto” for ethnography (Hymes, 1999:xl in Rampton, 2006:387). As should be clear from the previous chapters, I strive to keep an eye on the horizon by positioning my case within several wider contexts, most importantly globalisation, English as a global language and English in Denmark.

Finally, Ljosland provides a convincing argument for how a case study contributes significantly to a field of research when she invokes the image of ‘a piece of the puzzle’:
Even if the results of a case study … cannot be generalised without further ado, it is nevertheless valuable as one of the pieces of the puzzle on the way to a more thorough understanding of the complete picture. (Ljosland, 2008:9, my translation17)

It is my intention that this thesis should provide an important piece of several puzzles, first and foremost in its contribution to our understanding of the influence from English in Denmark, but also to the fields of language choice and language ideologies research.

3.1 A multi-method ethnographic approach

Ethnographic research has been described as a cyclical process. Spradley (1980) identifies six stages in the ethnographic research cycle: selecting a project, asking ethnographic questions, collecting data, making an ethnographic record, analysing data and writing the ethnography. The cyclical aspect means that each step of the process is repeated. Once data collection is under way, and observations have been noted and a preliminary analysis done, new questions will emerge. It is then necessary to collect additional data to try to discover the answers to these questions. The cyclical aspect also means that ethnography as a method is hypothesis-generating rather than hypothesis-testing. I do not take hypothesis-generating to mean that the ethnographer enters a culture without any preconceived ideas or hypotheses (since that would be practically impossible), but rather that as an ethnographer it is important to keep an open mind towards any new directions the research might take or any new hypotheses that suggest themselves during the data collection. It is this approach I have taken in my own fieldwork.

I have chosen to use a combination of several methods in the study. My understanding of ethnographic research as hypothesis-generating is one important reason for this. Using a combination of methods allowed me to

17 Text in original: “Så selv om resultatene fra et kasusstudium … ikke uten videre kan generaliseres, vil det likevel være verdifullt som en av puslespillbitene på veien til en grundigere forståelse av det helhetlige bildet.”
use different methods at different stages of the data collection, e.g. participant observation in the initial stage to discover important topics and hypotheses, and later on focus group interviews to investigate these hypotheses further. Another reason for using a combination of methods was the complex nature of my research interests, resulting in the division of my research into three separate studies each with a different perspective on language practices in a company with English as a corporate language.

Saville-Troike argues in relation to using both ethnography and interactional microanalyses that they are in a necessary complementary relationship to each other. She continues:

Ethnographic models of observation and interview are most useful for a macro-description of community structure, and for determining the nature and significance of contextual features and the patterns and functions of language in the society; interactional micro-analyses build on this input information, and feed back into an ethnography of communication clearer understanding of the processes by which members of a speech community actually use and interpret language. (Saville-Troike, 1997:139)

It is an important feature of my research design that the different methods and analyses do not simply stand alongside each other, but feed into each other and in this way increase the analytic value of each study.

For the ethnographic study, I needed data on the linguistic and social practices. For this purpose I chose to use the traditional ethnographic methods of participant observation and ethnographic interviews. I also kept a field journal and collected written material, e.g. prints from the intranet, letters and personnel magazines. For the microanalytic study of language choice, I used as the principal method a technique deriving from interactional sociolinguistics, namely self-recordings of naturally occurring interaction. In addition to this, I collected emails. For the third study, which looks at language ideologies, my primary data came from focus group interviews. In the following two sections, the process of data collection and the nature of the collected data are discussed in detail.
3.2 Data collection

The main criterion for the company where I was going to collect data was that it should be a Danish company with subsidiaries in other countries, or alternatively a Danish subsidiary of an international company. Being part of a larger corporation would ensure that the employees had frequent contact with subsidiaries in other countries or with company headquarters. Also, this type of organisation was more likely to ensure an international environment in the Danish part of the corporation, i.e. an environment with employees from a number of different nationalities. I also wanted the company to have English as their corporate language. Since one of the aims of this project is to investigate what it means to have English as the corporate language, I did not set up any specific criteria for how the company would define English as corporate language, but it had to be a common assumption in the company that English was the corporate language.

3.2.1 Gaining access

I knew of Lundbeck and the fact that they have English as their corporate language through an acquaintance. I made the initial contact through this acquaintance who put me in contact with the head of Internal Communications. He set up a meeting with employees from Employee Relations as well as Human Resources. These contacts at Lundbeck were from the beginning interested in participating in the project and welcomed the study out of an interest in learning more about the potential problems and solutions in relation to having English as the corporate language. In the course of a few more meetings, I was able to begin to form a picture of Lundbeck that enabled me to decide that this was a suitable site for my data collection.

Although my contacts were committed and helpful from the beginning, gaining access still proved to be a time-consuming and demanding process. At Lundbeck they were worried about two things. Firstly, that even if they granted me access to the company, I would have difficulty finding informants willing to participate in observation, interviews and recording. Secondly, they were reluctant to give me unlimited access due
to concerns about confidentiality. For me as a researcher it was important that I could freely decide how and where to do the data collection. It was necessary for me to be able to choose informants according to my methodological priorities as well as my theoretical interests rather than according to what would be most convenient for the company, or what they felt should be investigated. Being barred \textit{a priori} from observing certain departments or from talking to certain people would seriously impede my work and limit the scope of the study. One problem was that my contacts did not think that it was relevant for me to do fieldwork in departments where they thought English was not used much. Also, when I mentioned board meetings as a potential setting for data collection, one of my contacts exclaimed “Board meetings, what business could you have there?”\textsuperscript{18} She felt that board meetings (and presumably other interaction at top management level) were not part of the daily interaction. I wished to begin my fieldwork with as wide a scope as possible, therefore I did not wish to exclude any individuals or departments based on what my contacts felt was uninteresting. As time passed and our discussions progressed, I was able to explain my aims and motivation in more detail, and these issues were resolved. I also signed a confidentiality agreement, promising not to reveal any confidential information regarding the company’s operations. Once these formalities had been agreed on, gaining access was not a problem. And once I had been let on to the company premises, gaining access to individual departments and informants was in fact very easy. The large majority of the people I approached were very interested in the project and gave freely of their time. A few people declined to participate personally due to time constraints, but agreed to my presence in meetings and other interactions where they were being observed as part of a larger group.

\textbf{3.2.2 Lundbeck}

Lundbeck was founded in Copenhagen, Denmark, in 1915 as a trading company. In the 1930s Lundbeck moved into the pharmaceutical industry, and during the next fifty years the company expanded its operations in

\textsuperscript{18} In Danish: “Bestyrelsesmøder, hvad skulle du dog dér?”
this area. At the end of the 1970s the trading part of the company was phased out, and from then on Lundbeck focussed solely on pharmaceuticals. In the mid 1980s Lundbeck further narrowed its focus when the company chose to focus on central nervous system disorders. The first Lundbeck subsidiary was established in Sweden at the beginning of the 1940s, but the internationalisation did not begin in earnest until the 1960s with the establishment of subsidiaries in a number of European countries as well as in the US. It was not until the 1990s, however, that Lundbeck became truly international with the number of employees abroad exceeding the number of employees in Denmark. During this period Lundbeck expanded rapidly, creating many new subsidiaries, and experiencing a huge increase in turnover. In 1999 Lundbeck was listed on the Copenhagen stock exchange, a decision that provided access to new capital with which to continue the international expansion.

At the time I conducted my fieldwork (September 2006 – January 2007), Lundbeck had subsidiaries in 58 countries and more than 5300 employees worldwide. I limited my fieldwork to Lundbeck headquarters, which is placed in Valby, a suburban/industrial neighbourhood in Copenhagen, Denmark. Approximately 1700 of Lundbeck’s employees work at the headquarters. The largest group of employees in Valby conduct research and develop new products. Another large group is employed in the production department. Other departments include marketing, purchasing and a number of support functions such as human resource management, service and IT. The 1700 employees have a wide variety of job types and educational, national and linguistic backgrounds.

3.2.3 The three phases
From among these 1700 employees and a large number of departments, I of course had to narrow my field of investigation. Although I wanted to have a wide scope for the first phase of my data collection and narrow the scope later, I still had to select a limited number of departments for this first phase. I wanted to collect data both from departments where English would be used routinely and from departments where the expected use of English would be very low. This approach would ensure that I would learn about the use of English in widely different parts of the company
and from very different types of employees. I divided my fieldwork into three phases. During the first phase, which lasted two months, I carried out participant observation and ethnographic interviews with the aim of gaining an overview of the linguistic and social practices in a variety of departments. In the second phase, which also lasted two months, the scope was limited to two departments where I asked informants to self-record their daily interactions. Finally, in phase three, which covered the final month of my fieldwork, the scope was widened again as I carried out focus group interviews with employees from a wide range of departments.

In reality my fieldwork began already during the initial meetings with my contacts at Lundbeck. In these meetings I gained the first insights into the organisation of the company, the demographics of its employees, the physical premises and some of the issues relating to language use and language choice that later became central in my investigations. Formally my fieldwork began after all negotiations as to when, where and how had been settled. I officially became an employee of Lundbeck for a period of five months, without pay, but with my own office, computer and employee card. In many respects the first days at Lundbeck were like the first days of any other new job. I spent a lot of time getting to know my way around and getting to know the right people. Although I had been given access to the company, I still needed access to individual departments and employees. Therefore a lot of my time during the first weeks was spent recruiting informants, for instance by giving presentations to heads of department and later to employees at department meetings. In these presentations I told employees that I was interested in English as a corporate language, but did not go into any details about my project.

During my fieldwork, I was able to observe a wide variety of employees in a wide variety of job functions. I followed the service assistant who cleaned the laboratory as well as the research scientist designing the experiments and the laboratory technician carrying them out. I interviewed a vice president, a groundskeeper and an engineer working on chemical safety regulations. I spent time in a range of different locations, at all times of the working day, participating in a range
of activities from feeding the rats in the laboratory to sitting in on the presentation of the new corporate health policy. In addition, I spent a substantial amount of time in my office at Lundbeck, planning fieldwork, writing up field notes and browsing the Lundbeck intranet for information. I went to the canteen every day for lunch, most often in the company of some of my informants, but also sometimes alone. In all these situations, I observed keenly and took field notes, a practice that soon became second nature to me.

3.2.4 Doing fieldwork in a business environment

One characteristic of doing fieldwork in a business environment struck me early on and remained an integral part of my daily interactions at Lundbeck: I constantly had to explain who I was, what I was doing, and why I wanted to do it. In my previous fieldwork with teenagers in the computer gaming subculture, I had initially introduced myself to my informants as a researcher from the university doing a project on youth language, and they never asked any more about it. At Lundbeck I needed to introduce myself to new people constantly as a result of the far larger number of informants involved. I must have presented myself and my project to hundreds of individuals as well as to participants in dozens of smaller and larger meetings. And I repeatedly had to explain why I was doing what I was doing.

While it was important for me to explain enough so that my informants felt comfortable having me around, at the same time I did not wish to influence the interaction by focussing their attention on their language use and language choices, which I feared I would do by making it overt that this was the focus of my research. This conflict of interests was resolved by making my introductions in suitably vague terms. Informants were generally told that I was a PhD student working on a project about the use of English as a corporate language. Often people would press me for more information. This interest, I think, arose partly out of concerns about access and confidentiality. People wanted to know that I had a legitimate errand before they opened their doors to me. They needed to know that they were not wasting their time on me. But part of it was also a sincere interest in my project and my results. In this way although no official
announcement was made within the company about my presence, word about me and my project spread. And while it is hard to judge whether this approach actually caused people to modify their language when I was around, it did lead to the fortunate circumstance that strangers would come up to me and talk to me about language use and language choices, providing me with valuable information about language use and suggestions for topics to look into.

I also repeatedly had to deal with the question of why I was doing what I was doing. This most often took the form of me assuring my informants repeatedly that I actually did want to observe them work, that it would not be boring for me, and that I indeed was going to get useful data out of it. In addition to answering these concerns, doing ethnography in a pharmaceutical company meant having to explain my position as a qualitative researcher. Since many of my informants worked within the positivist tradition of biological and chemical research, I repeatedly had to justify and explain why I was not counting things and how following people around could be valid research.

Ethnographic methods such as participant observation and ethnographic interviews are often very time-consuming and quite demanding on the fieldworker who becomes personally involved to a great extent. My fieldwork was no exception to this rule. I quickly found that my own social skills, my ability to talk to people and make them talk to me, were instrumental in gaining access to the meanings of interactions. It was not enough for me to observe people from a distance, I also needed to ask questions, either informally or during ethnographic interviews. And in order to get close enough to people to do this, I needed to gain their confidence. These demands led me to reflect on my role as ethnographer in a business environment. In her work with high school students, Eckert (1997) took great care to refrain from placing herself in a position of authority in relation to the students. Because she wanted them to talk freely to her, she needed to avoid being seen as siding with the teachers. She therefore stayed out of classrooms and limited her observations to the halls, the cafeteria and outside areas of the school. Working with informants in a work setting led to different concerns for me. I discovered that I needed to position myself both as an insider and as
an outsider. It was necessary for me to become an employee at Lundbeck in order to gain access to the premises. The insider status was also important because employees were more willing to spend time with me when they heard that the research was done in cooperation with Lundbeck. At the same time, I needed to make it clear to my informants that I was not sent by management to spy on them, to check on how well they did their work or to listen to what they were saying about their boss. Therefore I also needed to emphasise my outsider status by explaining that even though I was affiliated with Lundbeck for the duration of my fieldwork, the project was my own, funded by the university.

Furthermore I had to make my position as a PhD student clear to my informants. Working in a pharmaceutical company focussed on research, a lot of my informants had experience working with PhD students, and a number of them had themselves at one time been PhD students. Contrary to some instances in the literature (e.g. Eckert, 1997) where the researcher needs to avoid being seen as a high status outsider in order to gain access to the culture, I felt in some situations that I had to avoid being seen as ‘just a PhD student’. In the world of research, a PhD student is invariably at the bottom of the career ladder, perhaps particularly so in research done in the private sector. In order to gain access to places and people I found that I had to emphasise the importance of my research, because people clearly expressed the opinion that I was just one more student doing one more school project. While it probably helped me gain access initially, the tradition of allowing students to work on their master’s theses in cooperation with Lundbeck might have worked against me when it came to being seen as doing genuine research and not just a student paper. On the other hand, it was also necessary for me to downplay my status as a researcher on a couple of occasions, for instance in the interaction with the service assistants who admitted to feeling somewhat apprehensive about my presence at first. In this case being seen as a student was an advantage, as it made my informants more comfortable with the situation. Instead of feeling as if they were being studied or that I was checking up on them, it made them feel as if they were helping me out (which in fact they were).
3.3 Data material

In this section I will discuss each of the methods I used in my data collection. I will explain why I chose these methods, and how I used them at Lundbeck to gather the data.

3.3.1 Participant observation

Participant observation was my way of getting to know Lundbeck. As the basic ethnographic method of data collection, it allows the researcher to become acquainted with the culture she is interested in by immersing herself in the culture. I was interested in finding out what it means to have English as a corporate language, including how much people actually use English. For this reason I chose participant observation as one of my methods instead of for instance questionnaires. Questionnaire data is data on what people say they do. Often informants are unaware of what they actually do, including what languages they use, hence the data I required would not be available to me in a questionnaire study. Using participant observation would give me access to the interactions and allow me to see for myself. I was also interested in finding out how language variation is linked with social practice. This interest also pointed to participant observation as the method of choice, since I would be able to learn about the local social practices while observing people’s language choices.

The aim initially was to get a bearing on language use in the company. For that reason I wanted to do participant observation in a variety of locations. One relevant distinction was between departments where English was used frequently and departments where English was not used much. Including both would allow me to study both situations where employees who used English routinely made language choices, and situations where employees who did not use English routinely made language choices. Another relevant distinction was between people with good English skills and people with less. As discussed in section 2.2.2, Preisler (1999) shows that 20% of the Danish population speak very little or no English. These ‘English-have-nots’ belong mostly to the older part of the population and to the part with the least education. My main reason for including employees with limited education as informants was thus
that I expected at least some of them to belong to the category of ‘English-have-nots’, and that I assumed that as such they would have different experiences working with English as a corporate language than employees with master or PhD degrees and good or excellent English skills.

With this in mind, the six departments selected for participant observation covered both areas where English was used frequently, either because of the presence of non-Danish-speaking employees (as in the research and marketing departments) or because the routine tasks of the department required the use of English (as in the IT support and employee relations departments), and areas where English was not used very frequently (the service department and the health, safety & environment department). My observations in employee relations and health, safety & environment functioned as pilot studies, hence I spent only two days in each of these departments, in the other four I spent approximately one day a week for a period of eight weeks.

Doing participant observation means that you are not only observing people from a distance, you are participating in their everyday lives, in my case in their working lives. There is, however, a continuum that stretches from very little participation and a lot of observation to a high degree of participation and consequently less focus on observation (Spradley, 1980:58-62). In the course of my fieldwork I engaged in different degrees of participation and observation, according to what was possible and most useful at the time, and I agree with Duranti when he says that

a variety of modes of participation is necessary for a rich description of any event or social situation. This means that ethnographers must routinely alternate between moments of high involvement and moments of low involvement in the activities that surround them. (1997:102).

Doing fieldwork in the six departments proved to be very different experiences. First of all the physical layouts differed. In the marketing department, the employees had offices along the same corridor, allowing
me to drift from one office to another during an observation day. In the research department, the employees spent much of their time in the laboratory, and I therefore arranged to follow one employee during each observation day. In the service department, my observations had to be scheduled rigidly, since the employees here were dispersed over the entire compound pursuing each their own work, or working in small autonomous teams, such as the groups of service assistants responsible for cleaning the buildings. Here the head of department selected a small group of employees as informants for participant observation, though of course the voluntary nature of participation was stressed. I then set up dates with the individual employees, so that I one day followed one of the service assistants, another day one of the guards etc. I would typically arrange to meet them at the gate at the beginning of their working day and then follow them around as they carried out their work and took their breaks. Finally, in the IT department the employees all shared an open-plan office, but spent some of their time in separate rooms answering support calls or repairing computers and other equipment. Since all rooms were interconnected, I could drift from one employee to another during the day. In all departments I had lunch and coffee breaks with the employees. During my fieldwork I covered all working hours in each department, which for instance in the service department meant coming in at 4.30 a.m. when the first of the cleaning staff arrived and staying until 6.15 p.m. when the last guard left.

As mentioned above I frequently had to assure informants that observing them would not be boring for me. Almost every single one of my informants answered my request to spend time with them along the lines of “You’re welcome, but this will certainly be very boring for you”. Every time I assured them that it most certainly would not - and it never was. On the contrary, my days were very varied. One day I would follow a laboratory technician while she sat at her computer planning the day’s tests, while she fed the rats in the laboratory and while she carried out the tests. The next day I would sit in the office of a marketing manager and follow her around to a whole string of meetings on different topics. And the day after that observe one of the service employees as he carried out
his duties as combined groundskeeper and warehouse manager, cutting down branches and retrieving material from the warehouse.

3.3.2 The field journal

During participant observation I always carried my field journal with me. I wrote down observations on what my surroundings looked like, on what my informants did and said, and what people around them did and said. My focus was of course on language use, particularly on whether Danish or English was used, when people codeswitched, who they were talking to at the time, and what they were talking about. Since I was also interested in the relation between beliefs, ideologies and language use, I wrote down what my informants said about language use and about having English as a corporate language. The fact that I had explained in advance that I was interested in English as a corporate language made most informants talk to me about their views on language use and having English as a corporate language without me having to prompt them. In quieter moments, for instance when informants were working at their computers for long periods of time, I would have time to jot down ideas for the analysis. At the end of each observation day I typed up my notes and added any other observations that occurred to me while reading through the day’s notes.

3.3.3 Ethnographic interviews

While doing observations I also conducted 24 ethnographic interviews with informants from the six departments. At a later stage I had the opportunity to interview an informant from the top tiers of management, bringing the number of ethnographic interviews to 25. All interviews were recorded. Informants were selected for interviews based on two criteria: 1) I wished to interview as wide a variety of employees as possible, both in terms of type of job, time of employment with the company, proficiency in English and Danish, age and gender. 2) I wished to interview employees who seemed more likely to be making language choices or having experiences with language choice. In addition to these criteria, I could of course only select informants from among those who had indicated that they were willing to participate in an interview.
According to Spradley (1979), the aim of ethnographic fieldwork, including ethnographic interviews, is to learn about cultural meaning. This is done by asking about use, not about meaning. When you are trying to learn what the informants as experts in their culture know, it is necessary to ask broad descriptive questions. As I was interested in how language choices took place at Lundbeck, and how language choice was related to social practices, I used the ethnographic interviews as a supplement to my observations of linguistic and social practices in the different departments and at Lundbeck in general. I asked questions about daily life in the departments (in order to learn more about the social practices) and about language use (in order to learn more about the linguistic practices). I also included questions about groups or types of employees at Lundbeck in order to get informants to define the categories that were important to them.

The interviews were semi-structured ethnographic interviews. They did not follow a set list of questions, instead informants were allowed to talk about the descriptions and experiences that were relevant for them. I had prepared an interview guide\(^\text{19}\), but this was not followed minutely. If the informant steered the conversation in another direction, I was prepared to follow in order to hear what my informant found interesting. Also, I did not enforce the order of items on my interview guide. Instead topics were discussed in the order that seemed natural in each interview. The interviews were conducted in the informant’s office, if they had one, or in another room in the department where they worked, and I made a point of creating a relaxed and informal atmosphere in order to make the informants talk as freely as possible.

Spradley suggests that the ethnographer conducts a series of interviews with each informant in which different kinds of questions are introduced progressively (1979:67). In contrast with this recommendation, I only interviewed each informant once. This meant that the progression from descriptive over structural to contrast questions, which Spradley suggests, was not followed for each informant. Instead the first interviews in each department were more broadly descriptive, and as I discovered more

\(^\text{19}\) The interview guide is included in Appendix 4.
themes and topics during subsequent observation and interviews, I was able to ask more specific questions in later interviews with other informants.

Most interviews lasted between 30 and 45 minutes, with a few being shorter and the longest lasting 79 minutes. Typically informants with higher levels of education and in higher job positions talked for longer, perhaps because they are more used to stating their opinions at length, and perhaps also because they felt more comfortable in the interview situation than did informants in low status jobs. One of my informants from the service department said at the end of the day where I had observed and interviewed her that she had been very apprehensive about my coming there because she did not know what was expected of her. I think this kind of insecurity may have been why it was much more difficult to get her and (and informants in similar positions) to speak freely during interviews than it was with others.

Interviewing a journalist also proved to be difficult, however. Because she was so familiar with journalistic interview situations, she thought she knew what an interview should be like. Even though I tried to explain the conditions of an ethnographic interview, e.g. that I viewed the informant as the expert, that I did not have a set list of questions and was not looking for specific answers, but rather was interested in hearing what the informant found important, she insisted on applying the rules of the journalistic interview. When at the end of the interview I asked, as I did in all the interviews, whether she had anything to add about language and language choice, she surprised me by responding:

nej kun hvis jeg bliver spurgt om jamen det det har jeg sådan
set ikke
no only if I’m asked about well I guess I don’t

I took that to mean that she expected me as the interviewer to ask the questions that would lead to the answers I desired. Her reply in this situation left me with the impression that she did indeed have more to add, and that perhaps it was something slightly controversial. In any case she would only reveal it if she was asked the right question, in other words if I were skilled enough as an interviewer to make her say it.
Schultz (2005) uses Bourdieu to describe her experiences interviewing journalists as a meeting between the journalistic habitus and the academic habitus. Her point is that when the academic interviewer and the journalist meet in the interview situation, what actually takes place is a struggle for the power to describe reality. Where the journalist seeks to uncover the truth, the academic interviewer working within the social constructionist paradigm sees news as constructed. Schultz describes how interlocutors position themselves in relation to symbolic positions, in her case those of journalist and academic. In the same way in the excerpt above, what appeared to me as her failure to understand the method of ethnographic interviewing can also be seen as my journalist informant positioning herself as a journalist in opposition to me as a member of academia.

3.3.4 Self-recordings
Collecting high quality recordings of natural interaction and associated information from a workplace setting presents a number of challenges. My methods for obtaining self-recordings are inspired by the methodology developed at the Language in the Workplace Project at Victoria University of Wellington. According to Stubbe (2001), at least the following requirements should be met:

- the data collection should not be allowed to interfere with the core business of the workplace
- the technical side should not be overly time-consuming for either the individuals or the organisation involved
- the method of recording should be unobtrusive, so that the interactions recorded are as natural as possible
- the data collection has to be achievable within a limited time frame, yet allow sufficient scope for informants to collect samples of a full range of their typical interactions
- the technical quality of the recordings has to meet a minimum standard so that analysis is possible
- each recording has to be accompanied by a certain amount of demographic and contextual information
In my data collection, I adopted these requirements. Furthermore, it was important for me that my informants felt comfortable being recorded. I accomplished this by utilising what Stubbe calls a ‘hands-off’ approach to data collecting. This approach gives participants as much direct control as possible while at the same time minimising the impact of having outsiders present in the workplace. The five informants participating in this part of the data collection agreed to carry a recorder and microphone for a period of three days each. I would meet with the informants in the morning and help them with the equipment, and then come back in the afternoon to collect the recorder and microphone. In this way my involvement with the physical collection of data was minimised, and the informants were given control over what to record. I told them that I was interested in all kinds of interactions, work-related as well as informal conversations. They were told to keep the recorder running, but also that they could turn it off if they felt the need to, for instance during meetings where the subject matter was personal. Furthermore, participants were told that they could ask me to delete material which they felt in retrospect they did not wish me to use in any published material, or even want me to listen to. This method ensured that the data collection was as unobtrusive as possible, interfering as little as possible with participants’ work, while at the same time ensuring that they felt comfortable doing the recordings. Although the option of having recordings deleted was important to the informants in advance, in the course of the actual recordings, I was only asked to delete a recording once. Likewise, the informants chose to turn off the recorder only during a few meetings with sensitive topics, e.g. hiring and firing.

While being unobtrusive was one concern, I also wanted to make sure that everyone who was recorded had been informed and had agreed to participate. Therefore the informants were told to inform both their immediate colleagues and other participants e.g. in meetings that they would be recorded, and they did this either by sending out an email in advance, or simply informing them at the beginning of the interaction. In all cases, the recording was allowed to proceed. On some occasions this asking permission to record led to longer conversations about my project
and the recordings. Although one argument for using self-recordings is their unobtrusiveness, participants are aware of the recorder especially at the beginning of interactions, and they are aware of the fact that their interaction will ultimately have an audience. This last is evident for instance from the recordings where an informant addresses the recorder, i.e. me, directly, by greeting me with “godmorgen, Dorte” when the recorder is turned on. Schøning and Møller (2009:255) similarly describe how their informants establish the contextual framing of the recording situation initially in the interaction e.g. by discussing the linguistic norms (e.g. whether swearing is acceptable) and by noting the virtual presence of the field worker (by addressing him or her directly). As also Schøning and Møller argue, instead of regarding the informants’ awareness of (or even preoccupation with) the recorder as a problem (a la ‘observer’s paradox’), the recorder simply should be taken into consideration as part of the local context in the same way that the researcher is in general in interactionist research (as discussed in section 1.2.1).

The self-recordings and the collection of emails took place during the second phase of the data collection. I narrowed the scope of the investigation for this phase, choosing two of my original six departments. I settled on the IT and research departments because codeswitching was frequent in both departments, but in very different ways. In the IT support department the employees had Danish as their mother tongue, and Danish was always the language of choice in meetings and work-related talk as well as in informal communication between colleagues. English was used frequently with people from other Lundbeck departments calling or writing to the support hotline, including colleagues from the subsidiaries. English IT terms and other English words and expressions were also frequently used in intra-sentential codeswitching. In the research department, although all the laboratory technicians were Danish, the scientific staff was comprised of one British, one German, one French and one Danish scientist, making it one of the more international departments in the study. Both Danish and English

---

20 Except for one informant who had Arabic as her mother tongue and Danish as her second language, and one who was bilingual in Danish and Spanish.
were used in work-related and informal interactions. Although I obtained self-recordings from both departments, for reasons of limited time and space only the recordings from the research department are used in the analysis of language choice in chapter 7.

Three days of recording from each participant provided me with samples of the full range of the participants’ typical interactions, including samples from different times of the working day and from different situations, e.g. meetings, working in the office and lunch in the canteen. The required demographic and ethnographic data was collected by a combination of methods. Firstly, the participant observation and ethnographic interviews from the first phase proved valuable in this regard. The fact that I had previously observed all the informants who did the recording for extended periods of time greatly helped when it came to interpreting what was going on in the recordings, as the different situations occurring in the recordings were all familiar to me. Secondly, the participants provided contextual notes for each day of recording, including notes on the place, time and people present for the recording. Thirdly, since I talked to participants before and after each recording, I was able to obtain additional contextual information in these informal debriefing sessions.

3.3.5 Emails
Concurrently with the self-recordings, the same informants collected their written interaction, i.e. emails. The collection of emails only contains participants’ outgoing emails, since it proved impossible to get informed consent from the sender of every email the informants received during those three days. In cases where the informants had replied to an email, the original email was included and consent was sought from the sender of the original. At the end of each day the informants would print out their outgoing emails and hand them over to me, again with the option to remove emails concerning particularly sensitive topics. To my knowledge this option was only used once.

Due to time constraints, the emails have not been analysed in detail, but have been part of the data used for the ethnographic analysis as well
as a supplement to the self-recordings used in the language choice analysis.

3.3.6 Focus group interviews

In the third phase of the data collection, I conducted five focus group interviews. The focus group interviews took place after all my other data had been collected because I wanted to be able to use input from the first phases of my fieldwork to design the focus group interviews. Categories and topics emerged during the initial phases of the fieldwork that I was able to use in selecting informants and designing the topic guide. What distinguishes focus group interviews from individual interviews and other kinds of group interviews is the emphasis on interaction and the use of interaction as data. In a focus group interview the participants are interacting with each other, influencing and being influenced by the other participants. In this way “focus group interviews use group interaction to generate data and gather insights into a research topic that would be less available without the interaction found in the group” (Crabtree et al., 1993:142).

I decided to use focus group interviews as one of my methods of data collection because I was interested in how meaning is constructed in interaction. Focus group interviews are good for generating data on the meanings of actions, because they provide access to group norms and processes, as well as to group meanings. The first keyword here is norms. The normative order underlying much of human behaviour is rarely verbalised. The rules for behaviour are supposed to be shared, and are therefore to a large extent unspoken. There simply is no need to be explicit about norms in everyday interactions. In a focus group, on the other hand, these unspoken norms become verbalised. When participants discuss topics relevant to their everyday lives, these rules are not only put into words, but elaborated upon and frequently questioned. While rules and norms may at first seem to be stable, clearly defined entities, there will always be exceptions to the norm, conditions under which rules do not apply. And the discussions taking place during the focus group process bring these exceptions and conditions into the light. So while focus group interviews are a prime method for having group norms articulated, at the
same time the focus group process also reveals that the stability of such rules is illusory (Bloor et al., 2001:6). The discussions that are central to focus group interviews give researchers access to rich data on the group processes that lead to and underlie group meanings and assessments, and hence provide the social constructionist researcher with data material on the construction of meaning in interaction.

Another advantage of using focus group interviews is that they can supplement the data from participant observation and ethnographic interviews on the “native” categories and terms that the ethnographic researcher is so interested in. Because focus group participants ideally discuss the topics at hand with each other and not with the moderator/researcher, they use the everyday language of the group, and this makes focus group interviews extremely useful in “examining participants’ shared understandings of everyday life, and the everyday use of language and culture of particular groups” (Litosseliti, 2003:18).

One of the first choices I had to make was the number of participants in each group and the number of groups. The literature on focus group interviews usually recommends between six and ten participants in each group, but also describes groups as small as three or four and as large as 12 or 14 participants (Bloor et al., 2001; Litosseliti, 2003; Rieper, 1993). Some refer to groups with four to six participants as mini focus groups (e.g. Litosseliti, 2003). For my purposes smaller groups were an advantage because I wished to analyse the material in depth both with regard to what was said and how participants interacted. The data material produced in groups with a large number of participants can be too large for an in-depth analysis and specifics of the interaction can be hard to track on the recording afterwards. I therefore settled on using smaller groups. One of the drawbacks of working with smaller groups is the risk that the groups are not dynamic enough, particularly if the group is too homogeneous. I tried to ensure that this did not become a problem by taking it into consideration when I selected participants for each group. With regard to the number of groups, I wanted to do enough focus group interviews to cover a wide range of employees. One further consideration to be taken into account was the limitation of working with informants while they were at work. This meant that the number of participants as
well as the number of focus group interviews had to be decided on in collaboration with Lundbeck, since the company paid for the work hours used for the focus group interviews. However, since Lundbeck was also interested in hearing from as many different employees as possible, our interests in this respect coincided. In the end I settled on five focus group interviews with each five participants and a maximum duration of two hours.

The next stage was the selection of participants. At the time when I planned the focus group interviews I had considerably more insight into the composition of the employees at Lundbeck than I had when I planned the first stages of my fieldwork. This allowed me to include in the focus groups key employees who had not been included in the first two phases. I chose to recruit participants through a network approach. I approached five informants who I knew firsthand because I had worked with them during the first two phases of fieldwork, and asked them to recruit participants for one group each through their own networks. This meant that each focus group included participants both from the original six and from other departments. The network strategy also ensured that the participants in each group knew each other in advance. On the one hand, Halkier (2002:34) suggests that participants might be more willing to speak their mind freely when with strangers, but since I was doing the focus group interviews in a work context where people already had a relation, this would not be possible anyway. On the other hand, participants feel more secure when they are in a group with people they already know. Participating in a discussion can be a lot easier for people when the group is relatively homogeneous and they think they know how the other participants will react. Using existing networks also means that participants are operating in a familiar social context, which is an advantage when you are interested in the norms and beliefs expressed and created in that context.

It is also possible, however, for the familiar social context to influence the discussion negatively, especially if the group contains participants with different statuses, e.g. employees from the same department but from different positions in the hierarchy. In groups with participants from different levels in the hierarchy, participants from lower positions might
defer to participants in higher positions during discussions. In order to avoid pre-existing group structures influencing the interaction negatively in this way, I made sure that all participants in each group were from the same level in the organisational hierarchy.

In order to ensure a lively discussion, it is necessary to balance the above-mentioned homogeneity with the need for heterogeneity in the groups. If the group is too homogeneous there is a risk that they will agree too much, leading to a lack of discussion. I chose that my focus groups would be homogeneous with regard to language, level of education and position in the organisational hierarchy. Each group was composed of employees from different departments, which meant that the participants had different daily practices with regard to language use and language choice. The one exception from this pattern was the group of service assistants. Where the instructions to the other recruiters were to find participants from other departments, the service assistant recruiter was asked to recruit the other members of her team. I based this decision on my experience from the ethnographic interviews with two service assistants, both of whom seemed unused to and uncomfortable with the interview situation. Their replies were very brief, and as a result the two interviews are among the shortest of the ethnographic interviews. I felt that focus group participants from the service department would be more comfortable if they were allowed to interact in a familiar setting, i.e. with members of their own team. Therefore this group was more homogeneous than the others.

I also wanted to have a large degree of heterogeneity across the groups because I wanted the groups to reflect the experiences of different employees at Lundbeck. My fieldwork in the first two phases indicated that language competence (in Danish and English) and place in the organisation (research, IT, marketing, service) were defining for the social and linguistic practices of the employees. This led to my planning the following groups, ranging in language proficiency from international experts who spoke little or no Danish, but who were either native speakers of English or very proficient in English, to unskilled workers who knew very little or no English at all, and covering a range of professions and departments:
Since I was interested in the interaction as well as in the contents of the discussions, I decided to do the focus group interviews semi-structured in order to allow for freer discussion. I began with a descriptive question to get the participants started and then introduced the four topics, one after the other, all about language use in the company. The use of focussing exercises is recommended in a lot of the literature on focus group interviews (Bloor et al., 2001; Halkier, 2002; Litosseliti, 2003). I used excerpts from the ethnographic interviews and self-recordings to focus the discussion on topics that were important for my research22.

When selecting participants I concentrated on finding employees who would have experience with the topics at hand and therefore, presumably, a lot to say about them. When I was carrying out the focus group

---

21 Based on informants’ self-evaluations (see section 3.3.8) and my observations.

22 The discussion guide for the focus group interviews is included in Appendix 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Language proficiency21</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Job type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>native/very good English proficiency, no/little Danish proficiency</td>
<td>research and marketing</td>
<td>research scientists and marketing managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>good English proficiency, native speakers of Danish</td>
<td>research, communication and health, safety &amp; environment</td>
<td>‘language experts’ (administrators and secretaries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>good/medium English proficiency, native speakers of Danish</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>IT supporters and developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>medium English proficiency, native speakers of Danish</td>
<td>research</td>
<td>laboratory technicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>very little/no English proficiency, native speakers of Danish</td>
<td>service</td>
<td>service assistants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Focus group participants
interviews, it became clear that I had succeeded in this, but also that my informants had very different experiences and tended to emphasise different issues. Therefore a topic that took up very little time in one group could take up the majority of the time in another group. All groups did cover all four topics to some extent. The five groups varied in duration from approximately 1½ to 2 hours. One group (where the participants were internationals) was conducted in English, the other four in Danish. Three groups were conducted with the target of five participants, one group was reduced to four due to illness, and one group was conducted with six participants, maintaining the pre-existing work team of service assistants.

3.3.7 Other sources: the intranet and other written material

In addition to the data types mentioned above, I also collected written material during all three phases. I had access to Lundbeck’s intranet where I carried out what might be termed virtual observations. The intranet gave employees access to global and local news about the company as well as to a number of resources, from lists of terms to courses offered. In my capacity of Lundbeck employee, I used the maps on the intranet to find my way around, especially in the beginning, I checked the lunch menu and I followed the local Lundbeck news. As a fieldworker I also browsed the pages of different departments with an eye for the language choices that had been made. Other written material includes agendas and minutes from meetings, the Christmas letter sent out to all employees, issues of the employee magazine, and prints of a discussion about language policy from a closed intranet forum for employees interested in language issues.

3.3.8 The questionnaires

Before starting the data collection in each department I asked for written consent from all participants. Attached to the consent form was a questionnaire with demographic information which participants were also asked to fill in (the consent form and questionnaire is included in Appendices 2 and 3). The questions concerned age, gender, nationality, education, job title and years of employment at Lundbeck. In addition I
asked informants about their mother tongue, proficiency in other languages, and language use at home and at work. In some cases I was present while the informants filled in the questionnaires, in other cases I had to ask the head of department to distribute the forms which I then collected later. The information obtained in these questionnaires was mainly used to select informants for the first phase of the fieldwork.

3.3.9 Overview of data material
All in all, the data collected during my fieldwork comes to:
5 months of participant observation and field notes
25 ethnographic interviews
67 hours of self-recordings
177 emails
5 focus group interviews
A variety of written material, e.g. employee magazines and prints from the intranet
70 questionnaires with background information
4 Ethnography of communication: theory and methods

In this chapter I discuss the theoretical and methodological background for the ethnographic analysis of language practices at Lundbeck. The first section focuses on the discipline of ethnography of communication and pays special attention to the key terms ‘communicative competence’ and ‘speech community’. The following section focuses on ‘communities of practice’ theory and its application to the Lundbeck setting. In section 4.3 I elaborate on the definition of ‘norms’ given in the introduction. Finally in section 4.4 I turn to the methods used in the ethnographic analysis.

4.1 The ethnography of communication

The ethnographic analysis of language use at Lundbeck is based on the theoretical framework provided by the ethnography of communication. As described in section 1.2.2, the ethnography of communication seeks to integrate linguistic analysis with analysis of cultural values and beliefs, and thus places focus on the study of language in context.

One key concept introduced by Hymes and Gumperz is ‘communicative competence’. Challenging Chomsky’s insistence on separating linguistic competence from competence in language use, Hymes (1974) introduces the term communicative competence for a competence that encompasses the rules of performance. Linguistic, interactional and cultural phenomena are all part of a speaker’s communicative competence. In other words, it includes the social and cultural knowledge that people use in order to communicate, including knowledge of social categories and social structure, and knowledge of values and attitudes about language (Saville-Troike, 2003:19). In an ethnography of communication the researcher aims to discover this social and cultural knowledge.

The ‘speech community’ is another key concept in the ethnography of communication. Originally introduced by Bloomfield (1933), the speech community was reintroduced by Labov in his Martha’s Vineyard and New York City studies (1966; 1972a; 1972b). Where Bloomfield defined the
speech community solely in linguistic terms, Labov defined a speech community as “a group with a common set of normative values in regard to language” (Labov, 1972b:535). Hymes also stresses “norms for the use of language” in his definition of the speech community, and in contrast to Bloomfield his definition takes as the basis of description “a social, rather than a linguistic, entity. One starts with a social group and considers all the linguistic varieties present in it, rather than starting with any one variety” (Hymes, 1972:54). He defines a speech community as “a community sharing rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech, and rules for the interpretation of at least one linguistic variety” (ibid.), i.e. members of a speech community share both rules for language use and at least one language.

Since then focus has shifted from speech community to ‘community of practice’, and with this shift has also come a shift in focus to how meaning is created in interaction and how linguistic resources can be applied for stylistic and identity purposes. Introduced in Lave and Wenger (1991) and Wenger (1998) as part of a theory of learning as social participation, the community of practice has in recent years become the point of departure for a number of ethnographic sociolinguistic studies, most notably Eckert (1989; 2000).

4.2 The community of practice

Penelope Eckert was one of the first to introduce the community of practice to the field of sociolinguistics. Her study of language variation at Belten High used the community of practice as a starting point and linked sociolinguistic variables with style (Eckert, 1989). The community of practice approach views styles as directly associated with identity categories, and explores the contribution of linguistic variables to styles. Implicit in the community of practice thinking is the understanding that meaning is constructed locally, in the community of practice, which is defined as “a group whose joint engagement in some activity or enterprise is sufficiently intensive to give rise over time to a repertoire of shared practices” (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet, 1999:185). Compared to Hymes’ speech community, focus has shifted from shared rules for speaking to
shared practices. The emphasis on locally constructed meaning and shared practices makes ethnographic methods particularly useful in exploring language variation from a community of practice perspective.

In relation to the duality of structure and agency, communities of practice as a social theory is situated between theories of structure and theories of action. As Wenger puts it:

> Learning as participation is certainly caught in the middle. It takes place through our engagement in actions and interactions, but it embeds this engagement in culture and history. Through these local actions and interactions, learning reproduces and transforms the social structure in which it takes place. (Wenger, 1998:13)

The communities of practice theory is thus consistent with an integrationist-interactionist approach as it emphasises actions and their potential to change structures, while not disregarding the importance of existing structures in the form of culture and history.

In a Danish context, several recent studies of language use among urban youth have shown how the communities of practice approach can be applied fruitfully to investigations of language variation and language choice (Quist, 2005; Madsen, 2008; Maegaard, 2007). In relation to the use of English in Denmark, Madsen (2009) shows that membership of the international community of practice of natural scientists influences the language choices of the scientists at a Danish university. The role of the international communities of practice of IT and scientific research is discussed in relation to language choice at Lundbeck in sections 5.3.4, 5.4.1 and 7.1 below.

One advantage of the communities of practice theory is that it captures the nature of postmodern society with more transient communities and ways of organising society. Furthermore, the communities of practice theory allows the analyst to focus on the language user as an active agent. However, while the community of practice concept has been applied to a wide variety of research fields, including sociolinguistics, it is not a sociolinguistic theory as such. It lacks the infrastructure to explain the role language plays in social life, as Creese (2005) puts it. For this reason I have
not used communities of practice as an analytical framework for this study, but rather as a general theoretical framework with which to capture the relationship between language and context.

4.3 Norms

Shared norms or rules for the use of language is an important part of the definition of Hymes’ speech community. Wenger talks about ‘relations of mutual accountability’ as an important aspect of a community of practice. These relations include

- what matters and what does not, what is important and why it is important, what to do and not to do, what to pay attention to and what to ignore, what to talk about and what to leave unsaid, what to justify and what to take for granted, what to display and what to withhold, when actions and artifacts are good enough and when they need improvement or refinement. (1998:81)

In a community of practice, some parts of the mutual accountability may be reified as rules or policies, while others are not. But they still become shared in the community of practice and thereby allow participants to negotiate the appropriateness of what they do. While Wenger writes that these relations of accountability are “not just fixed constraints or norms” (1998:82), he, however, seems to equate norms with “static agreements”, where I see norms as less static, with the potential to develop through interaction. His definition of relations of mutual accountability thus seems to me an excellent definition of norms.

Wenger notes that the fact that the relations of mutual accountability are sometimes taken to be violated only confirms their existence. The same can be said for norms. Norms can be broken, and in fact norms are often made explicit exactly when they are broken. As Hymes says in an early discussion of communicative competence: “existence of a pattern is often shown by response to its breaking” (2010(1963):577). This breaking of a pattern is also the focus in ethnomethodological definitions of norms. Here a norm is seen as a ‘scheme of interpretation’ (Garfinkel, 1967:120), and social norms are seen as accounting for the orderliness of social life.
Norms are considered to be background assumptions, visible only when they are deviated from: “by observing members’ own reaction to their activities while they are accomplishing them, one can tell the norm as it has been told by members themselves” (Gafaranga and Torras, 2001:198). This methodology of looking for instances where norms are broken is also known as deviant case analysis (Heritage, 1988).

In chapter 1 I preliminarily defined norms as social conventions about appropriate language use, social because they are shared. Where language ideologies are widely shared, across societies or even larger parts of the world, norms are in my understanding shared among smaller groups, e.g. in an organisation. Furthermore, drawing on Wenger’s definition above, I see norms about language use as shared expectations about what to do and not to do with language, when communicative actions are good enough and when they need improvement or refinement. And I agree with both Wenger, Hymes and Gafaranga and Torras that norms are often made visible when they are broken.

4.4 Methods of analysis

The main material for the ethnographic analysis is my field journal and the ethnographic interviews. I chose not to transcribe the interviews in full, instead I listened to them repeatedly, taking notes while doing so, and transcribed selected parts. In addition, the written material collected during my fieldwork was used in the analysis, as was to a lesser extent the focus group interviews and self-recordings and emails.

Ethnographic analysis is about “the search for patterns of a culture and their relationships as conceptualized by informants” (Spradley, 1979:93, italics in original). Central to ethnographic analysis is the rejection of the idea that analytic categories can be imposed by the researcher, instead salient categories emerge from the data through ethnographic analysis. In this way the search for patterns takes the shape of an interchange between the researcher and the data.

Doing ethnographic research is a cyclical process rather than a linear progression. This means that both data collection and data analysis take place recurrently during the research process, and sometimes
concurrently as well. While keeping in mind the cyclical aspect, it can be advantageous while doing the ethnographic analysis to divide the process into a number of steps. Spradley outlines twelve such steps beginning with locating a social situation and ending with writing an ethnography (Spradley, 1979; 1980). I will focus here on the four steps corresponding to the four types of analysis: domain analysis, taxonomic analysis, componential analysis and discovering cultural themes.

The first important unit of analysis is the domain, defined as a symbolic category that includes other categories. It is in discovering the domains of the cultural scene under investigation that the researcher faces the difficult task of setting her own analytic categories aside, as far as this is possible. In the next step of the ethnographic analysis, domains are extended into taxonomies, specifying relationships between members of domains. The goal is to grasp the cultural meaning by tracing all the relationships among the symbols of the culture, how things are similar and how they contrast. After that, in the componential analysis, focus is on discovering the attributes associated with cultural categories. An attribute in this sense can also be described as a component of meaning. In doing the componential analysis, attributes for different cultural categories are systematised into paradigms as a step on the way to mapping out the system of cultural meaning. Following these steps in the analysis meant that I went through the material and coded it thematically. I then gathered all the excerpts with the same code, e.g. ‘the use of English among Danes’, and proceeded to organise the categories into taxonomies and then to discover their components.

The fourth and final step of ethnographic analysis is the discovery of cultural themes. Cultural themes are cognitive principles that people in the culture believe and accept as true and valid. They often take the form of assertions with a high degree of generality, meaning that they apply to numerous situations and domains in the culture. In other words, cultural themes connect subsystems of the culture, relating parts to the whole.

23 ‘Domain’ in this connection is unrelated to Fishman’s domain concept and ‘domain loss’ in the Danish language policy debate.
While Spradley’s four levels of ethnographic analysis form the basis of the analysis in the following chapter, it has also been informed by grounded theory (Strauss and Corbin, 1998). Grounded theory is a methodology for systematically analysing qualitative data which has its origin in sociology. Grounded theory focuses on theory-building, and similarly to ethnographic methods, the underlying belief is that theories should emerge from the data. Using this methodology, data is systematically coded and organised, allowing the researcher to arrive at new theories grounded in the data.

My goal in this project has not been to do a complete ethnography of Lundbeck, or even of any of the individual departments, my goal has been to investigate language choice at Lundbeck. This means that the focus in the ethnographic analysis is on language use and the values and meanings attached to the different languages and language choices.
5 Ethnographic analysis

This chapter is a presentation of the results of the ethnographic study. The aim of the ethnographic analysis is to answer the question: What does it mean to have English as a corporate language? The use of ethnographic methods and the focus on daily language practices mean that this chapter provides 1) an analysis of the organisation and culture of Lundbeck, 2) an analysis of the language practices in the company and 3) a discussion of the relation between the two. In the same way that I began my fieldwork with a wide focus which was later narrowed, I begin this chapter with a panorama view of the whole company and later narrow the focus to individual departments. In section 5.1 I present the organisation and culture of the company as far as those issues are relevant to language use. In 5.2 I present the language policy (or lack thereof) as well as an analysis of the different interpretations of 'English as a corporate language' that exist in the company. In 5.3 I present an overview of the language practices at Lundbeck. With sections on communicative events, languages and speakers, the focus here is on how much is English used, by whom and in what situations. In 5.4 I focus on the company-wide norms for language use and language choice. Finally, in 5.5 I leave the company-wide view and focus narrowly on three individual departments. The language practices in these departments are presented as three case studies, highlighting the huge differences between different parts of the organisation. But we begin with the panoramic view.

5.1 Lundbeck: organisation and culture

A brief history of Lundbeck was presented in section 3.2.2. In this section I present the organisation and culture of Lundbeck with a focus on the themes and developments which, as I later show, have had an impact on language use in the company.

5.1.1 The site, the organisation and the employees

The Lundbeck compound is a large fenced enclosure with approximately 50 buildings. In addition to offices, laboratories and production halls, the site also houses a large canteen. Access to the compound is through one of
two manned gates, and visitors are picked up at the gate and accompanied around the site. Security is an important consideration due to concerns about confidentiality regarding the research taking place within the compound. In some ways Lundbeck is like a small town with its own guards, caretakers and gardeners as well as its own mail delivery system, canteen and shop. The outdoor areas are mostly occupied by roads and parking lots, but there is also space for an outdoor eating area outside the canteen and several green belts.

While the Lundbeck subsidiaries each focus on one area (most are sales companies, three are production companies and one is a research company), the headquarters in Valby (from now on referred to as Lundbeck) is unique in that it includes a multitude of functions within its walls and fences. Most of my informants describe the company as divided into three broad categories: research, marketing and production. Research includes also development and related departments such as the patents department. Marketing broadly covers the business side of Lundbeck: sales, purchase and marketing. The production part of Lundbeck includes, in addition to the actual production department, packaging and storage facilities and the service department, which handles cleaning, mail delivery, groundskeeping and mans the gates and the reception. Some informants also include a ‘remainder’ category and place in here management as well as the corporate support functions IT, human resource management and communication. The physical layout to some extent reflects this division, all research facilities are for instance placed within three adjacent buildings, nicknamed “forskerlane/scientist lane”. Close together in another part of the compound are the departments for sales, purchase and marketing.

The employees at Lundbeck are a very diverse group reflecting the very diverse tasks undertaken in the different departments. Most of the employees in research and development are either research scientists or laboratory technicians. In marketing most employees have university degrees, the majority with a business background, but some with a medical or scientific background. In the production part of Lundbeck, employees include unskilled workers filling positions such as service assistant or warehouse worker, tradesmen such as carpenters or plumbers
as well as engineers. In the ‘remainder’ category most employees come with a university degree, e.g. in management, communication, human resource management or IT. The IT department is somewhat special in that a number of the employees are self-taught. In addition to these groups, all parts of Lundbeck also employ secretaries and other administrators. And the diversity is in fact even greater than this brief summary portrays. Among the Lundbeck employees we also find e.g. veterinary nurses, accountants, lawyers and security guards. To sum up, the educational level and the types of jobs at Lundbeck range widely.

The Lundbeck employees also differ in terms of their organisational roles. In an organisation the size of Lundbeck the roles cover a large number of levels from the CEO over vice presidents, divisional directors, heads of departments, heads of sections down to the employees without any organisational responsibility. In addition many employees have other roles and responsibilities at work, such as employee representative in the cooperation committee, member of the board or department safety representative. My observations reveal that all ages and both genders are represented, although a large number of employees are in their thirties and forties. It was not possible for me to obtain information about employees’ nationality, since Lundbeck keeps no records of this. From my observations it is, however, very clear that the vast majority at Lundbeck are Danes, but also that a number of other nationalities are present. The largest group of foreign nationals appears to be the Swedes, probably partly due to the fact that Lundbeck’s location in Copenhagen is close enough to the Swedish border, so that it is possible to live in Sweden and work in Valby. Also, many Swedes understand Danish and are understood by Danes when speaking Swedish, meaning that the linguistic barrier is minimised. Other nationalities at Lundbeck include at least American, Australian, British, Canadian, French, German, Mexican and Turkish, and probably a number of other nationalities represented by a very small number of employees. Some of the international employees come from Lundbeck subsidiaries and are working at headquarters for shorter or longer periods of time, others have been recruited directly to Lundbeck. In addition to these foreign nationals, a number of ‘regular’ immigrants (i.e. who did not come to Denmark for the purpose of
working at Lundbeck) also contribute to the diversity of the workforce. Immigrants or refugees who have come to Denmark from e.g. Iraq, Gambia, Germany and the Faroe Islands a number of years ago are also part of Lundbeck.

As this overview reveals, Lundbeck has a diverse workforce with regard to education, job types and nationality. Not surprisingly, it is also diverse with regard to language. I will return to the topic of the speakers at Lundbeck in section 5.3.3.

5.1.2 The corporate culture
An understanding of the corporate culture is important in an ethnography of a company, and also in relation to language policy and practices. My daily observations and interactions at Lundbeck gave me my first impressions of the culture. Reading the employee magazine, using the intranet and going through the company website provided further input. Finally the corporate culture became an important theme in the ethnographic interviews, often intertwined with narratives about the company history, especially recent history and changes.

The life blood of the company
One very salient aspect of the corporate culture is the emphasis on research and the importance of helping people through this research. On the official Lundbeck webpage, CEO at the time Claus Bræstrup introduced the company with these words:

Welcome. We are a research-based company. We engage in research to find new drugs for treatment of CNS disorders, including depression, schizophrenia, Alzheimer’s disease and Parkinson’s disease.24

The official Lundbeck values on the website also focus on research and responsibility25. Not just official presentations of Lundbeck highlight the importance of research in order to help patients, this emphasis is also

---

24 http://www.lundbeck.com/aboutus/default.asp (date of last access 06/10/2007)
25 http://www.lundbeck.com/aboutus/our_culture/vision_mission_values/default.asp (date of last access 06/10/2007)
found in employee narratives about the company. One employee describes research as “hjerteblodet i denne her virksomhed/the life blood of this company”, while another puts it like this:

vi vil jo frem for alt gerne fremstå som et seriøst forskende lægemiddelfirma som lægger vægt på at selvfølgelig skal vi tjene penge men det er for at kunne komme videre forske nyt og vi er her for at kunne hjælpe patienterne i den sidste ende more than anything we want to appear as a pharmaceutical company doing serious research who attach great importance to the fact that of course we need to make money but that is in order to go further to do new research and ultimately we are here to be able to help the patients

(Hans, Danish marketing employee)

While acknowledging the importance of making money, Hans also stresses that making money is just the means to an end: to be able to do more research and help patients. Not surprisingly this focus on research is felt to be closely connected with being an ethical company, particularly in comparison with other pharmaceutical companies. Again this view can be found both in official statements and in employee narratives. The official Lundbeck mission is “to improve the quality of life for those suffering from psychiatric and neurological disorders”26. Another employee talks at length in his interview about Lundbeck as an ethical company, a company that is different from other pharmaceutical companies:

I would say it’s a very ethical company very scientific and although the reputation of the pharmaceutical industry is known to be a very bad one or whatever I think we are ranking close to the petrol industry weapons industry and then I think xox pharmaceuticals so we have a very bad reputation I think Lundbeck actually is doing it in a different way although we earn money with pharmaceutical products I think we are doing it in a very ethical and very responsible way very scientific … I think we are very we are different among the pharmaceutical companies

(Peter, international marketing employee)

Others phrase it differently, but still emphasise the ethical aspects:

det er ikke min fornemmelse at Lundbeck tænker på kroner og øre på den måde i hverdagen føler jeg meget at det er at man tænker

26 http://www.lundbeck.com/aboutus/our_culture/vision_mission_values/default.asp (date of last access 06/10/2007)
With this emphasis on the importance of research, it is not surprising that researchers and others with specialised knowledge within the company are accorded a high status. The Danish communication employee Martin describes Lundbeck as "i høj grad en videns- og faktabaseret virksomhed/very much a knowledge and fact-based company" and continues "dem der er noget i Lundbeck det er dem der ved noget/the important people in Lundbeck are the people with knowledge". Also the marketing department is highlighted as an important and prestigious part of Lundbeck:

Overall, it is clear that the informants consider the research done in the company the central enterprise. And they claim that the focus on developing new products is what makes Lundbeck different from other pharmaceutical companies. It is what makes Lundbeck an ethical and decent company.

Not run by manuals

Another very salient feature of the Lundbeck corporate culture, and one often repeated in interviews, is harder to capture in a few words, but has to do with the way the company is run, in large things and in small. It can be described as the freedom to do things your own way or as a lack of control from the top. Almost all the employees I interviewed talked about this, either directly when discussing the company values or indirectly in
their narratives about their working day at Lundbeck. When asked in the interview about the company values, Janus, a Danish health and safety employee, responded:

jeg tror hvis man skræller alle de der buzzord af ... så er Lundbeck en rigtig rigtig synes jeg sund virksomhed en supersund virksomhed på den måde at der er plads til at ville nogle ting altså der er plads til initiativet og det er sundt

I think that if you peel off all those buzzwords ... then Lundbeck is a very very I think healthy company a really healthy company in the way that there is room for wanting things you know there is room for initiative and that is healthy

For the non-Danish employees in particular this way of running things is perceived as a radical departure from previous work experiences, and like Kate in the following quote, they link it with a particular Danish way of doing things:

the thing I have noticed I would say here is that I don’t know if it’s a Lundbeck culture or a Danish culture I haven’t quite managed to tease the two apart yet but the discussion is definitely one of the key words here so everyone kind of gets together and discuss sometimes at quite slow in actually getting to a decision point whereas having come from a US company there is far less discussion and far more I say kind of dictatorship or we’re doing like this ... they are willing to seek people’s opinions and they actually listen which I guess is quite rare (chuckles) ... and I would say from my limited interactions that’s I would say a strong Danish influence

(Kate, international research employee)

This democratic style is evident at all levels, and it is remarked upon by everyone from heads of department to lab technicians and service assistants. When we discussed her working day, one service assistant emphasised: “man har det som man vil have det det hedder frihed under ansvar/you can do it your own way it’s called freedom with responsibility” (Berta, Danish service employee). What she so succinctly expresses with “freedom with responsibility” seems to be the same thing William, the international marketing manager, is trying to describe when he says that “it’s not so much about micromanaging every minute”. One long-term employee quotes the former CEO when he tries to explain the corporate culture to me:
den tidligere direktør sagde engang at vi er ikke et firma der er run by manuals altså vi er meget uformelle … der er altid mulighed for at gøre det på din egen måde i Lundbeck the former CEO once said that that we are not a company run by manuals meaning that we are very informal … it is always possible to do things your own way at Lundbeck (Hans, Danish marketing employee)

To sum up, the employees describe a company culture which allows room for initiative and which takes pride in this absence of rules.

Lundbeck, a small Danish company?

Many of the employees draw on narratives about Lundbeck’s history to explain the present day company culture. And one of the most important changes over time is the growth from a small business with a family feel to it to a global corporation. The story of how and when Lundbeck changed is an important part of Lundbeck history. Lundbeck has expanded significantly in recent years, and the most drastic development in recent company history is the global expansion in the 1990s. Until this point in time Lundbeck was a Danish company cooperating with few international partners. After Lundbeck was listed on the Danish stock exchange in 1999, the subsequent cash flow allowed a rapid expansion into a large number of new markets. And this expansion changed the company in a number of ways. Perhaps because these events are relatively recent, and because they have had such a big impact, the expansion narrative is told by several employees in the interviews. Else, Danish communication employee, gives this version of the events:

Lundbeck blev børsnoteret i nitten hundrede nioghalvfems det er et ret stort skridt at blive det for en virksomhed og det gjorde man for at få penge til udvikling af selskabet og på det tidspunkt var virksomheden allerede inde i en meget kraftig vækstperiode som blandt andet betød at man knyttede stærke kontakter til eksterne samarbejdspartnere blandt andet samarbejdspartnere i USA men også at firmaet etablerede datterselskaber i et meget højt tempo og mange steder rundt om i verden … fra otte-nioghalvfems og frem til to tusind og et-to stykker der har man måske etableret femogtyve datterselskaber rundt omkring i verden det er en fuldstændig vanvittig ekspansion i sådan en virksomhed ik … man kom til Kina Argentina Estland Letland og Litauen det var alle vegne Lundbeck was listed on the stock exchange in nineteen hundred and ninety nine that is quite a big step to take for a company and that was done to secure money to develop the company and at
that time the company was already in a period of very rapid growth which among other things meant that strong contacts were forged with external partners among them partners in the US but also that the company established subsidiaries in a very fast pace and in many places around the world ... from ninety eight ninety nine and until two thousand and one or two maybe twenty five subsidiaries were established around the world that is a completely insane expansion in such a company you know ... the company came to China Argentina Estonia Latvia and Lithuania it was everywhere

The establishment of new subsidiaries also meant that the composition of the workforce changed, and with it the character of company:

... around that time suddenly more employees were coming to the company outside Denmark than in Denmark and actually they were the reason we were making money and therefore there was in general not just in relation to language you know not just do you speak English or do you speak Danish but also the mentality to move people from saying we are a Danish company to saying we are an international company and I think we are still struggling with that

(Martin, Danish communication employee)

When Martin says that they are still struggling with changing the mentality as well as the language use in the company from a Danish to an international outlook, he expresses a sentiment that many other Lundbeck employees share. The feeling among the employees is that the company is in a transition phase. On the one hand, the international aspect is stressed in official material such as the corporate video presentation employees use when they introduce Lundbeck to outsiders. One of the first slides in this presentation is a map of the world showing all the subsidiaries one by one, until they are all there. On the other hand, while many of the employees remember the way things were before the global expansion and acknowledge the changes this led to, many feel that Lundbeck still has not become a truly international company. The employee in the following quote stresses the fact that the management is still very Danish:
At the time of my fieldwork all four members of the executive management were indeed Danish. The executive board was comprised of six Danish and one Swedish member as well as one newly-elected British employee representative. The largest shareholder was and still is the Danish Lundbeck Foundation. The company has deep and strong roots in Denmark and in Danish workplace culture. But the majority of the more than 5000 employees work outside Denmark, the majority of Lundbeck’s products are sold outside Denmark and of the more than fifty subsidiaries, only two are in Denmark. The employees tell a story about a company in a transition phase, the story of a small Danish company on its way to becoming an international corporation. What is interesting from a sociolinguistic point of view is how this transition phase is handled linguistically, by the company and by the employees. This is the topic I will explore in the rest of this chapter.

5.2 Language policy at Lundbeck

Initially my goal was to find out what the official language policy was. Since everyone seemed to agree that Lundbeck had English as a corporate language, I assumed that some document or memo must exist in which this had been clearly stated. Through five months of fieldwork, including extensive searches of the company intranet and website, interviews with employees from the communication department and human resource

---

27 As becomes evident in the next section, Swedes are not really regarded as foreigners, possibly due to the fact that most Danes and Swedes can understand each other.
management28 and interviews with several long-term employees, I did not find any such document. Furthermore, no one was able to tell me exactly when English became a corporate language and who made the decision. What I did get were narratives linking the introduction of English as a corporate language with the global expansion in the 1990s. When I asked employees more widely about language policy, I learned that a few employees had made their own suggestions for a language policy. In this section I will present the narratives from employees about the introduction of English as a corporate language. I will also present the suggestions from employees for a language policy as well as their narratives about how these suggestions were received.

While the specific date and origin of English as a corporate language seem lost in the mists of time, the narratives about the introduction of a corporate language all link this event with the rapid establishment of subsidiaries in the mid-1990s:

jeg tror det er omkring det tidspunkt i midt-halvfemserne eller sådan noget at man gik ud og sagde at nu går vi fra at være en skandinavisk virksomhed til på det tidspunkt at være en europæisk virksomhed og vi vil gerne være en international virksomhed og det vi i hvert fald tog af initiativer for at understøtte det var at sige jamen på vores intranet der skal koncernnyheder være på engelsk på det tidspunkt var de kun på dansk vores magasin skal også udgives på engelsk hvor tidligere havde man kun et personaleblad for danske medarbejdere i Danmark vi lagde også op til at vores eksterne hjemmeside er på engelsk I think that it is around that time in the mid-nineties or something like that the company said that now we go from being a Scandinavian company to at that time being a European company and we want to be an international company and what we certainly did initiate to support this was saying well on our intranet corporate news must be in English at that time they were only in Danish our magazine should also be published in English where previously we only had a staff magazine for Danish employees in Denmark we also planned that our external website should be in English

(Martin, Danish communication employee)

28 There are no language experts as such at Lundbeck, but the closest they have are the employees in the communication department and in human resource management. When I approached Lundbeck with this project, I was assigned contacts from these two departments. And while no one seemed to know who should be responsible for implementing a language policy, the general agreement was that the responsibility would lie somewhere in or between these two departments.
Another narrative, this time from a long-term employee, supports the explanation that English as a corporate language was introduced when the subsidiaries were established, in his words because "vi skal have en fælles ting"/"we need a common thing" (Bent, Danish health and safety employee). He also dates this decision to the mid-nineties.

What it means exactly that English is the corporate language at Lundbeck has not been defined. My search for a Lundbeck language policy failed to turn up any documents detailing this. I did find one document specifying that "The language for high level, administrative and general Steering Documents will be British English." As the search for a written language policy turned up nothing but this one sentence, I concluded that Lundbeck does not have an explicit corporate language policy, although there is a consensus that English is a corporate language. This conclusion was supported by statements from several informants, including the following:

vi har ikke en sprogpolitik eller sådan noget i den stil men det giver god mening for alle at selvfølgelig er koncernsproget engelsk men i praksis hvad det så betyder det er der ikke nogen nedskrevet regel om det tror jeg generelt også har været fordi at vi har været en virksomhed med meget få politikker så man har i virkeligheden gerne ville være sådan lidt pragmatisk og sige jamen vi finder løsninger hen ad vejen på de opgaver der er we do not have a language policy or anything like that but it makes sense for everyone that of course the corporate language is English but in reality what that means there is no written rule about that I think generally that has been because we have been a company with very few policies so really the company has wanted to be pragmatic and say well we will find solutions to the tasks at hand as we go along

(Martin, Danish communication employee)

Martin links the lack of a language policy with the corporate culture described in the previous section. When it comes to language policy, the corporate culture is not just a pragmatic attitude to running the company, but an actual resistance towards too many rules. At first it seemed odd to me that while everyone agreed that English is a corporate language at Lundbeck, no one had wanted to define this further. As I later found out, that was not the case. The issue of a language policy had been broached a number of times over the years. In fact, more than one employee had made suggestions for a language policy.
In 1998 an employee from the finance department submitted a memo suggesting a language strategy. The memo included a list of the advantages of having a language policy, e.g. a focus on the quality of written texts, the introduction of a standard terminology and the inclusion of language as a measure of quality. The author of this memo sent it to at least two different people in management, including the director of public relations, but nothing came of it. In 2004 an employee in the communication department submitted a suggestion for a language policy. This suggestion focussed on standards for English and Danish spelling and grammar, including general availability of electronic dictionaries. This attempt to introduce a language policy at Lundbeck did not come to anything either. The employee herself says that she did not manage to win through and that this annoys her a great deal. Again the general resistance towards too many rules seems to play a part, or possibly her superiors just did not think language policy important. She has, however, managed to implement this language policy for the documents she is responsible for.

In 2005 a discussion took place on the sub-forum for administrative staff on the Lundbeck intranet. This discussion was initiated by a third employee who had met with resistance when she suggested that Lundbeck implement a language policy. When her suggestion on the intranet page “Ideas for the management” was rejected on the grounds that “Lundbeck does not need a policy which we do not have ‘policemen’ to enforce”, the employee took the discussion to the administrative forum instead. The discussion is a collection of posts with input regarding the need for a language policy at Lundbeck. One area frequently mentioned in the posts is the need for better access to dictionaries. Several forum members describe that no one knows who is responsible for paying the licenses for the electronic versions of the dictionaries, so when the licenses expire, they are not renewed. Other suggestions include a term base with a list of titles and ideas for useful internet resources. The participants in the discussion all agree on the need for a language policy for Lundbeck. Several members commend the idea of opening up the topic and stress the need for discussing language policy in the company. One employee writes:
An employee stresses the need for a language policy in a company with a majority of non-native English speakers, saying that there is an urgent need for tools and guidelines enabling employees to write documents in a consistent way. Although the original suggestion about a language policy was rejected, the communication department did invite members of the administrative forum to a meeting. The general feeling among the members of the forum was, however, that it was going to be uphill, and no one had the energy to do that. Hence no meeting took place.

These narratives about the unsuccessful attempts to introduce a language policy highlight the connection between the particular corporate culture characterising Lundbeck, a culture which is informal and without too many rules and regulations, and the lack of a language policy. This way of doing things, which seems to permeate the company, could explain why it was not clearly defined from the beginning what was meant by English as a corporate language. And as shown by the narratives about the unsuccessful attempts at having a language policy introduced at a later point, the corporate culture also plays an important part in maintaining the status quo.

The question of language choice in relation to a language policy does not seem to have been brought up. The above suggestions for a language policy focus on written texts, predominantly documents. Nothing is mentioned about language choice in meetings and presentations, and nothing is said about written texts in the public domain, e.g. signs. Furthermore, all three suggestions focus on which English standard to use (British vs. American, Oxford vs. Cambridge), rather than on the choice between Danish and English. Despite this lack of a corporate language policy and a lack of even discussion about language choice at a corporate level, local language policies are in place in some departments, detailing for instance the appropriate language choice for department meetings or
documentation. I will return to the subject of these local language policies in section 5.5 where I present case studies of the language practices in individual departments. Furthermore, the lack of a corporate language policy does not mean that employees do not think about language choice. As the next section will show, the fact that they do leads to a range of different interpretations and expectations in relation to English as a corporate language.

5.2.1 Interpretations and expectations

While I quickly discovered that English as a corporate language had not been defined from the top, it also quickly became evident that almost everyone in the company had a clear idea of what it meant – and it became evident that while each person had an understanding of what it meant, these understandings ranged very widely. The following quotes illustrate the range of these different ideas:

for mig betyder det at al kommunikation er tilgængelig på det sprog som er koncernsproget … det betyder ikke at vi sidder på et møde som det her og alt skal foregå på engelsk to me it means that all communication is available in the language which is the corporate language … it does not mean that in a meeting like this one everything has to be in English

(Kirsten, Danish communication employee)

at alle møder ville blive holdt på engelsk og alt hvad der kom af data og andet skriftligt materiale var på engelsk that all meetings would be in English and every bit of data coming in and other written material would be in English

(Sofie, Danish research employee)

engelsk er koncernsproget det er det sprog man bruger når man ikke deler et andet sprog English is the corporate language that is the language used when you don’t share another language

(Else, Danish communication employee)

jo det ville jeg da tro at det betyder at alt er engelsk yes that is what I would think that it means that everything is in English

(Gitte, Danish service employee)

hvis man erklærer at man har et koncernsprog som er engelsk så betyder det alt officielt er på engelsk … et koncernsprog betyder ikke at man i daglig tale skal bruge sproget engelsk
if it is stated that there is a corporate language which is English then that means that everything official is in English ... a corporate language does not mean that you in daily interactions have to use English

(Ida, Danish IT employee)

jeg ville tro at det var det som var hovedsproget altså det der blev snakket mest
I would think that that was the main language you know what was spoken most frequently

(Anna, Danish research employee)

In the first quote Kirsten says that in her opinion having a corporate language means that all communication is available in that language, but it becomes evident when she elaborates that she means all written communication, since she does not think that meetings necessarily should take place in English. When she says “a meeting like this one”, she refers to the setting of the focus group interview and presumably the fact that all participants are Danes. In contrast with Kirsten’s view, Sofie in the second quote specifically mentions “all meetings” as the kind of communicative events that would take place in English, along with written material. Else in the third quote takes English as a corporate language to mean that English is the preferred lingua franca within the company, it “is the language used when you don’t share another language”. Gitte, however, thinks that it means that everything is in English, but she does not elaborate further on this. In the fifth quote Ida says that she thinks having English as a corporate language means that everything official is in English, but that it does not mean that English is the language used for speaking. This contrasts with Anna’s view as expressed in the sixth quote: that English would be the main language, the language spoken most of the time.

The range of interpretations covered in these six quotes are captured in the following continua:

1. English is used only for official, written communication English is used for all communication

| ←-----------------------------------------------→ |
| English is used only for official, written communication | English is used for all communication |
The differing expectations of English as a corporate language are not just related to the amount of English and Danish being used in the company, however, they also relate to the need to learn Danish and the need to learn English:

når det er det officielle koncernsprog … så har man en eller anden form for en forpligtelse til at kunne engelsk eller lære sig det

when it is the official corporate language … then you have a kind of obligation to be able to use English or to learn it

(Kasper, Danish IT employee)

at det forventes af en at man kan engelsk i ja i tale og skrift

that it is expected of you that you are able to use English in well in speech and in writing

(Jesper, Danish research employee)

det betyder at man kan blive sat til nogle ting som foregår på engelsk og man kan risikere at man står og skal holde en præsentation og så får man at vide at det her skal altså være på engelsk i dag

it means that you can be assigned tasks to be done in English and there is a risk that when you are about to do a presentation then you are told that this needs to be in English today

(Jens, Danish IT employee)

These quotes suggest the need for a third continuum, one that captures the competence dimension:
Not only do employees disagree in their interpretations or emphasise different aspects in the definitions, many employees experience a difference between their own definition of English as a corporate language and the reality at Lundbeck:

Hans doubts that there even is a decision about English being the corporate language. As evidence for this he mentions that the executive board meetings take place in Danish, and that the need for foreigners on the board was solved by including a Swede, allowing the board meetings to continue in Danish. It seems that Hans concludes that if English is not used at the top, it cannot be a corporate language.

It is a common expectation particularly among the international employees that English as a corporate language means that the company is run in English. Several international employees describe how their expectations of the use of English were not met upon arrival. One marketing employee describes how he was told during the job interview that “English was fine”, i.e. that he did not need to learn Danish. He took this to mean that not just the external, but also the internal communication
would be in English. During his first months at Lundbeck, he found that this aspect of his new job did not live up to his expectations:

externally Lundbeck gives the signal very strongly [that English is used] but actually internally with their computer systems a lot of it is in Danish ... so I’m excluded from a lot of information that is shared but I can’t understand it and that was a little bit of a surprise because I had felt that a company sort of this progressive with English would have their internal information in English ... I do miss out a lot on information both in terms of social events or sort of the fun aspects of work as well as policy and even you know regular information about being an employee here yeah so that's interesting that was disappointing I guess that did fail to meet my expectations

(William, international marketing employee)

Other foreigners report similar experiences. One foreign research scientist was told that apart from the language being English, there was no language policy. She assumed that this was “like a blanket coverage”, and did not ask any more questions about language policy. She found, however, a “mismatch between the expectations you are given as you are joining the company versus actually what everyday life here is about” (Kate, international research scientist). Another foreign research scientist says that although she was not expecting to never hear Danish, she did expect all things critical to her daily work to be in English. But when she started working at Lundbeck, she found that a lot of the “underworkings” took place in Danish. She goes on to argue that what Lundbeck means by having English as a corporate language is that English is used to communicate to the outside world.

But the problem is not just that the foreigners encounter more Danish than expected. Another closely connected problem is that contrary to what is communicated during recruitment, there is an expectation from the top that they learn Danish. Several employees present anecdotal evidence that members of top management not only prefer to use Danish themselves, but that they in fact expect foreigners to learn Danish as soon as possible:

vi har faktisk den øverste direktør som selv har været udstationeret eller han har været i Tyskland som gjorde meget ud af at fortælle at inden det var nogle få måneder så kunne han altså så var det bare tysk for ham ik og det forplantes jo også hans holdning ned igennem systemet
we actually have the CEO who has been stationed abroad or he has been in Germany who made a strong point of telling people that within a few months it was just German for him you know and that spreads his attitude spreads down through the system  
(Julie, Danish research employee)

Other anecdotes include the CEO saying directly that when people have been at Lundbeck nine months, they are expected to know Danish. Even though no policy on the issue has been made official, the attitude of the CEO is clear, and that influences the rest of the organisation. International employees develop certain expectations of language use just from learning that English is the corporate language, for instance that you can get by with English, or that English is used for all work-related activities. Some foreigners are even assured during job interviews that they can get by with English, but both expectations and assurances are contradicted by expectations both from top management and in individual departments that they learn Danish. These differing expectations can be summed up by the following continuum:

4.  
\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{Internationals} & \text{Internationals} \\
\hline
\text{need to learn} & \text{can get by with} \\
\text{Danish within} & \text{English for all} \\
\text{9 months} & \text{communication,} \\
& \text{so there is no need} \\
& \text{to learn Danish}
\end{array}
\]

To sum up: The lack of a corporate language policy leads to a variety of definitions among employees, who have very different interpretations and expectations of English as a corporate language. The above four continua sum up these different expectations. The first continuum illustrates that while some employees expect English to be used only for official written interaction, others expect that English is used for all communication, written and oral. The second continuum illustrates that other employees focus on English as the chosen lingua franca of the company, i.e. as the language used when interlocutors do not share another language. As the
third and fourth continua show, expectations of English as a corporate language are closely linked with expectations of language learning and language skills. And while some employees are concerned with the level of English skills needed, others are concerned with the need to learn Danish. It is clear that a wide range of expectations form in the minds of employees when they encounter the phrase “We have English as a corporate language”. Employees form expectations not only about the languages used in their own daily interactions, but also in other parts of the organisation, e.g. board meetings. And they form expectations of the language skills required of both themselves and others and of the obligations to learn languages.

5.2.2 Language resources

In a company with English as a corporate language and at least two languages in use, it could be expected that there would be some kind of resources available to non-native speakers. The resources at Lundbeck range from dictionaries and electronic aids to language courses, but the lack of a corporate policy is evident in the way that the available resources differ from department to department. The most important language resource, however, is the informal and ad hoc help from colleagues.

All Lundbeck employees have electronic dictionaries installed on their computers. Even those employees, such as service assistants, who do not work at a computer have access to one, and they usually use it once a day to check email and news on the intranet. Although the electronic dictionaries are available to all employees, and although they are frequently mentioned in my data material, not everyone is using them. One service assistant says that she knows about the dictionaries, but if she encounters a word she does not know in an email she asks a colleague about it. Other electronic resources are also mentioned, but less frequently, e.g. the sub-forum on the intranet where employees can find links to online dictionaries and search engines and start discussions with the other members of the forum about language-related questions.

A variety of language classes is offered at Lundbeck, but there is no corporate policy or budget for this. The expenses for language classes are paid for by the individual departments, and often language lessons are
written into the contracts of individual employees as part of their benefits. The lack of a centralised policy means that employees in different parts of Lundbeck have very different opportunities for improving their language skills, since it is up to each head of department to prioritise language lessons among the other department expenses. Of course the need for language classes also differs widely between departments, which means that the expenses of language training are very unevenly distributed across the company. Some departments have a high proportion of internationals with a need to learn Danish, while in other departments all employees are native speakers of Danish who might need to improve their English skills. Also this need varies greatly, both because of the differences in educational level and therefore in English skills between employees from different departments, and because of the very different demands on employees to actually use English in their daily work.

The following examples illustrate the different offers to employees in similar situations, but in different departments. When Peter arrived from Germany to work in a marketing department, he was offered unlimited Danish classes with a private tutor who came to his office once a week. After a year, he has enough Danish competence to carry out some communicative events at work in Danish, and he still receives Danish lessons. When Kate arrived from Britain to work in a research department, she was offered a one-week intensive Danish course. A year later she rates her own Danish competence as 2 on a scale from 1-9. She has asked for more Danish lessons and was at the time of my fieldwork doing weekly lessons with three colleagues. She describes, however, that it is very difficult to fit in the lessons during her work day, because her superiors give the lessons very low priority when they come into conflict with meetings.

Danish lessons are also offered to Danes in departments where employees have left school early and work as unskilled labourers. Also highly specialised Danish employees, such as administrators, participate in classes to improve their Danish skills, typically in one particular area such as syntax. The offers of English classes vary as much as the Danish classes. Some employees are offered private lessons with a tutor during the work day; those are often employees in high hierarchical positions
with good English skills. Others are offered class-based lessons outside working hours, typically blue-collar employees with little or no English skills.

Not all employees who are offered language lessons choose to accept. A minority of the international employees choose not to learn Danish, typically those who have English as their first language. One employee says about his choice not to learn Danish:

_to be honest I guess it’s easy enough in Denmark that you can be lazy you know you can get by quite comfortably with English_

(William, international marketing employee)

Not all Danes take the opportunity to improve their English either. The service department offers English classes after work to all employees, but only a few take the offer. The problem is that the service employees think the courses are too difficult for them. In other departments employees have different reasons for not wanting English lessons. Some feel that they do not need to improve their English skills. In the ethnographic interviews I asked all the Danish informants whether they had been offered and/or had taken English lessons. Some informants responded quite defensively, e.g. Lars, a Danish IT employee, who said: “Jeg har ikke nogen problemer med engelsk/I don’t have any problems with English”, clearly indicating that he felt a bit offended that I would imply that he needed lessons. Others did acknowledge some gaps in their English skills, but did not believe that lessons would remedy that e.g. because the difficulties were related to specific terminology used at work.

In addition to dictionaries, internet resources and language lessons, another resource is very frequently drawn upon by the Lundbeck employees when their own language skills do not suffice. In keeping with the informal corporate culture, when the employees look for help with language, often “it is all ad hoc and informal” as one employee puts it. In other words, they go to a colleague for help. Several people mentioned getting help from close colleagues when I asked them about language resources in the company or places to go for help, for instance this head of department:
English-speaking colleagues, either native speakers or just those with better language skills, help out by replying to emails in English, answering phone calls in English, proofreading reports and translating words or whole documents. And native Danish speakers help their international colleagues by translating during meetings held in Danish, by correcting them and thereby improving their Danish, by proofreading emails and by translating words, emails and other documents.

To sum up, Lundbeck does not have any language experts employees can turn to. Furthermore, not all employees are sufficiently informed about the available language resources to make full use of them. While some tools are available for all employees as described above, not all employees are aware that these tools exist. A variety of language classes are offered to the employees, both Danish and English classes, but because the responsibility for language training rests with the individual departments, there are huge differences in what is offered from one department to another. One resource is available to all employees, however, and is frequently used, that of asking a colleague for help.

5.3 Language practices at Lundbeck

In this section I present an overview of the language practices at Lundbeck. I look at the communicative events, speakers and languages. As could be expected from a company situated in Denmark, Danish is used a lot. And as could be expected in a company with English as a corporate language, English is also used a lot. In addition to Danish and English, however, a number of other languages are also used at Lundbeck, e.g. German, Swedish, Spanish and Arabic to mention some of the languages I heard, saw or was told about during my fieldwork. But it is not just a question of listing the languages, because a lot of the time speakers at Lundbeck use a mix of two languages, special technical jargon,
an accented version of a language or a kind of interlanguage as learners of a language.

5.3.1 Communicative events

One of the first things to strike me when I started my fieldwork was that many forms of communication at Lundbeck apparently went unnoticed by a large number of speakers. When I asked informants during interviews when was the last time they had used English, they often responded as if I had asked them when was the last time they had spoken English, giving me answers such as “two days ago” (from the head of department who had just responded to an email in English) or “I never use English” (from the service assistant I had observed using her receptive English skills several times during that day). While most language users at Lundbeck are more conscious of their own use of spoken language, signs, menus, posters and computer programs are also part of the communicative events that the employees have to deal with every day. In this section I present an overview of the communicative events at Lundbeck and some generalisations on the languages used for the different types of communicative events.

Using ‘communicative events’ as an analytical tool allows me to analyse the communication at Lundbeck in a comprehensive way. Hymes (1964, 1974) places the communicative event at the centre of investigation in studies of the ethnography of communication. According to Hymes the question to ask is: “What are the communicative events, and their components, in a community?” (Hymes, 1964:25). His SPEAKING taxonomy includes 16 components, grouped together so they fit the mnemonic code word SPEAKING. The components are setting, scene (S), speaker, addressee, audience, addressee (P for participants), goals, outcomes (E for ends), message form, message content (A for act sequence), key (K), channels, forms of speech (I for instrumentalities), norms of interaction, norms of interpretation (N) and genres (G). Hymes specifically mentions that at the time he presents this taxonomy there is no evidence to suggest a hierarchy of precedence among these components (1974:63). Also Gumperz underlines the centrality of the speech event, as he terms it, when he names the speech event as the unit of analysis in
speech communities, due to its focus on interaction and the fact that speech events establish a relationship between content and verbal routines (Gumperz, 1972). The following analysis of communicative events at Lundbeck uses Hymes’ understanding of the communicative event to build a taxonomy which functions as an overview of the language practices at Lundbeck.

**Taxonomy of communicative events**

Only a minority of the employees communicate with the world outside Lundbeck. The larger part of the external communication is written and often with a large audience as in the case of the annual reports, the environmental reports and the annual accounts. The Lundbeck website is another case of mass communication directed to recipients outside of Lundbeck. The website contains general information about Lundbeck, job advertisements and an introductory video about the company. Finally, employees at Lundbeck also communicate with external partners at meetings and conferences.

Communication with Danish authorities is exclusively in Danish, whereas conferences are international and therefore in English. The corporate website is in English. There is no Danish version, except a few pages, e.g. the “Facts about Lundbeck” page. Official documents, such as the annual report, are typically available here in both English and Danish. These official ‘products’ directed at a large audience are interesting in relation to English as a corporate language, since they can be said to reflect an official, if unwritten and unspoken, language policy. In the case of Lundbeck, this policy seems to be Danish with Danes, English in all other cases.

While only a few of my informants communicate with the outside world on a daily basis, everyone in the company of course communicates with colleagues within Lundbeck daily. In the following taxonomies I present the wide range of communicative events found internally at Lundbeck. I have divided the events into written and oral events. This categorisation is important since the two types of events differ in relation to conditions for language choice. For written communication, the available resources (time, money, manpower) often influence language
choice, explaining e.g. why only a few pages on the intranet are available in both Danish and English. It takes more time and effort, and it costs more, to do two versions. And perhaps it also explains why the canteen menu was only available in Danish, even though it left many of the employees in the dark about what they were actually eating for lunch. For oral communication, doing two versions is rarely an option, and language choice is often more on the spur of the moment than it is for written communication.

Figure 1 illustrates the variety of written communicative events. The variety of documents existing and constantly being created in a large company like Lundbeck is of course almost endless, and the list should not be seen as exhaustive. It does, however, serve to illustrate the wide range of communicative events at Lundbeck. Focussing on specific events allows for making some points about language choice. The employee magazine is available in both Danish and English. Ideally international employees would receive a copy of the English version, while Danish employees get the Danish version. Some international employees are not even aware, however, that the magazine comes in an English version. The Standard Operating Procedures are for the larger part in English, although some are in Danish. The exception seems to apply for areas where it is judged that the target group would not understand English, e.g. the production. In the case of documents with a smaller audience, variation is even greater. But while the language in letters, reports and emails varies from department to department, from person to person and sometimes from email to email, there is a strong tendency to produce PowerPoint slides in English.

On the intranet English dominates in the first few layers, but the majority of the text further down is in Danish, even key documents such as the form for documenting travel expenses which is used widely at Lundbeck. On the opening page of the intranet is a box of news items from different departments at Valby, each line linking to the full text of the news item. Here the topic of the messages is important in relation to language choice: while the more practical information is announced in either Danish, English or both, all social information is announced only in Danish. Furthermore, the sender of the message is important: all messages
from the IT department are in English, as are most messages from research departments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written communicative events:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Documents</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o To-do lists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Manuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Standard Operating Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Employee magazines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Memos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o HRM brochures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Emails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o PowerPoint slides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Meeting invites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intranet</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o News stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Steering documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Standard Operating Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Lundbeck Thesaurus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Form for travel expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Department websites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Administrative Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signs etc.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Canteen menu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Canteen notice board messages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Department names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Signs with rules for garbage disposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Smoking point signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Emergency exit signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Fire regulations signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Employee cards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1
The signs around the compound are predominantly in English, e.g., signs with department names. Interesting exceptions to this rule are signs about fire regulations, emergency exit signs and rules for garbage disposal, these signs are all in Danish. All job titles at Lundbeck are in English, hence the employee identity cards are all in English. In the kiosk in the canteen, signs with prices and other information are in Danish, as are all the messages on the notice board about social activities and things for sale.

Figure 2 presents the oral communicative events. The language choice in meetings is difficult to describe in general terms and is treated at length in chapter 7. The language choice in courses varies with purpose and participants. Some management courses are only offered in English with the aim of enabling employees at a certain level to communicate better in English. The introduction courses for new employees are only offered in Danish, to the annoyance of some newly arrived international employees. The list of informal encounters includes some of the situations most often mentioned by my informants, but again this is not an exhaustive list. Interaction with international visitors to the site took place in English, but while meetings with international participants routinely took place in English, the small talk at the boundaries of meetings was often in Danish (and this is a topic I will return to in section 5.4.3 and again in chapter 7). Talk at lunch or at coffee breaks would be in either Danish or English. As we shall see later on, the language competence of the others at the table played an important role in relation to language choice.
This section shows the range of communicative events at Lundbeck and gives a first impression of language choices at Lundbeck. It also shows that language choice is a complex matter which is difficult to generalise about. The following section looks at some of the most relevant distinctions in the taxonomies and at the question of salience of different communicative events in relation to language choice.
One communicative event = one language?

While a categorisation into communicative events provides an overview of the language practices, it would be an oversimplification to assume that only one language is used in each communicative event. In many cases both Danish and English are used within the same event, typically Danish for the spoken part and English for the written. I observed this for instance in an information meeting where the CEO addressed the employees in Danish while the accompanying slides were in English, and in meetings in the research department where a lab technician would present in Danish, again with slides in English. I also encountered it in the marketing department, e.g. in this example from my field notes:

På vej til frokost er Caroline inde ved Tom og Kenneth, de diskuterer et nyt program [på dansk]. Tom står ved whiteboardet og skriver noter på engelsk, selvom der kun er de to, og de begge er danskere. Han taler også dansk med Caroline.

On the way to lunch Caroline stops by Tom and Kenneth, they are discussing a new program [in Danish]. Tom is at the whiteboard writing notes in English, even though only the two of them are present, and they are both Danish. He also speaks Danish to Caroline.

Tom and Kenneth speak Danish to each other as well as to Caroline when she enters, but they take notes in English. While these three examples illustrate a tendency to use Danish for oral and English for written communication within one communicative event, they also illustrate one problem with using the analytic concept ‘communicative event’ in a discussion of language choice. As these examples show, more than one language is often used within the same communicative event, and the researcher should therefore be careful not to equate one communicative event with one language choice.

Noticeable or ‘under the radar’

As I discussed at the beginning of section 5.3.1, many forms of communication at Lundbeck go unnoticed by the speakers themselves, including their own use of their receptive English skills. Typically, communicative events necessitating the use of active, oral skills are at the forefront of people’s minds, while the many uses of receptive, written
skills are pushed to the back. For some employees, however, these communicative events are particularly noticeable. While all employees engage in communicative events such as reading the signs around the compound and using the intranet, these events are most noticeable to the employees who experience difficulties due to language choice. Consider for instance the following two cases where the communicative events take place in a language the informants do not understand:

All signs with department names and locations are in English. Many of the service assistants have limited or no English skills. Very few know enough English to understand department names like “Psychopharmacology” or “Toxicology”, which would be difficult enough to understand in Danish. This means that some service assistants do not know or understand the name of the department they clean. In the focus group interview, the service assistants are talking about how all signs are in English, and one of them says:

ja på hvilken afdeling arbejder vi ja kan du forklare det på dansk
well which department do we work in well can you explain that in Danish
(Margrethe, Danish service employee)

The service assistants daily encounter a lot of signs they do not understand, but not even knowing the name of the department they work in is understandably frustrating to them. Not all signs, however, are in English. When I started my fieldwork at Lundbeck, the canteen menu was only displayed in Danish. The lunch at Lundbeck is a big buffet with a number of dishes to choose from, and without the menu to guide you, it is hard to know what the different choices actually are. Or as one of the international research scientists put it during one lunch-time observation: “Dorte you can write down that lunch is always a surprise when you don’t know Danish”.

In summary, for the employees who have some skills in both Danish and English, many communicative events take place ‘under the radar’, i.e. language choice is not consciously considered for these, often written, events. Only those employees who lack skills in either Danish or English notice the language choice – because it excludes them. If employees with a
high level of competence in both Danish and English are the ones who make decisions about language choice, e.g. on signs and menus, language choice is not given much consideration - to the frustration of employees with fewer language skills.

In this section I have presented an overview of the communicative events which make up the language practices at Lundbeck. I have sketched some general tendencies with regard to language choice as well as suggested some parameters important for the subsequent analyses (written vs. oral, formal vs. informal). Very briefly put, external written communication tends to be in English. Internal written communication, such as emails, signs and administrative documents are in Danish or English, except for PowerPoint slides which are almost always in English. Meetings and courses are in Danish or English, while the informal communicative events involving only Lundbeck employees most often take place in Danish. While these might seem like very vague generalisations about language choice, what emerges very clearly from the analysis is that it is necessary to know both Danish AND English in order to understand everything that takes place at Lundbeck.

5.3.2 Languages at Lundbeck

It appears from my observations that Danish is the default spoken language, and this is confirmed in the ethnographic interviews. When asked what languages they use at work, many informants reply that they use Danish, unless there is a good reason not to:

så vidt muligt jeg kan snakke dansk gør jeg det
as far as it is possible to speak Danish I do that
(Lisa, Danish research employee)

Practices are different when it comes to writing. The language chosen for written communication is English much more frequently than for oral communication, especially in communication intended for a large audience. One employee explains:

jeg bruger dansk når vi taler her i afdelingen og også når jeg taler med folk i ledelsen ofte hvis det er at der er nogle produkter vi laver så er det stort set altid på engelsk
I use Danish when we talk in the department and also when I talk to people in management often if we are creating a product it is almost always in English

(Martin, Danish communication employee)

A ‘product’ in this connection refers to written documents such as the annual report intended for a larger audience. As mentioned above, while many presentations are held in Danish, the accompanying PowerPoint slides are almost always in English. The intranet is another important means of written communication at Lundbeck, and while far from everything is in English, a large number of pages are available either only in English or in both Danish and English. The most frequently used form of written communication at Lundbeck is email, and it is one that is used by all employees, although to very varying degrees from the medical marketing manager who spends hours every day answering emails to the service assistant who almost never writes an email herself, but checks her account regularly. Both Danish and English are used for emails, and the pattern varies between departments and between buildings. In some buildings and departments, the norm is to send emails to large numbers of recipients in Danish, in others they are sent in English. Occasionally an email will be in Danish, followed by the same text in English or vice versa.

Although this fact is easy to overlook, Danish and English are not the only languages used at Lundbeck. In the questionnaires my informants also report the use of Spanish (2), Swedish (3), German (2) and French (2) at work, and one native speaker of Arabic reports the use of Arabic in her interview:

der er også folk fra Israel folk fra arabiske lande folk fra alle mulige lande [der ringer] så vi taler engelsk jeg taler også arabisk i en telefon engang imellem engang imellem så spørger de efter mig fordi det er nemmere for dem at tale arabisk

people also call from Israel people from Arabic countries people from all kinds of countries so we speak English I also speak Arabic on the phone sometimes sometimes they ask for me because it is easier for them to speak Arabic

(Mariam, Danish IT employee)

In my observations I encountered Swedish and German several times, mostly in informal spoken interactions between native speakers, but also in emails. Spanish, French and Arabic seem to be used mostly in
interactions with employees in Spanish-, French- or Arabic-speaking subsidiaries who prefer their native language to English in interactions with e.g. the IT support hotline.

To sum up, Danish is the default spoken language at Lundbeck, but English is also used. English is used more frequently in written communication. Other languages are also used, mostly by native speakers.

5.3.3 Speakers: natives, non-natives, learners and English-have-nots

Most employees, but not all, speak Danish. And most of those are native speakers of Danish. Most employees, but again not all, speak English. Unlike the Danish speakers, most English speakers are non-native speakers. This means that in addition to “what languages?”, it is also necessary to ask “what kind of language?” Danish is not just Danish, and English is not just English. Danish is used by native and non-native speakers, by beginners and advanced learners. English can be Australian, British, American or another variety, and again is used with varying degrees of competence and fluency. Therefore the kinds of language used range widely. Given the composition of the workforce at Lundbeck, Danish is used predominantly by native speakers. But a number of non-native speakers also use Danish, from the newly arrived employee who can read short sentences in Danish to the advanced learner who can manage short meetings as well as all informal interactions in Danish. Contrary to this pattern, most of the English used is by non-native speakers, be they Danish, German, Swedish, Mexican or of some other nationality. Again the degree of fluency ranges from near-native skills to very rudimentary receptive skills. At one end of the continuum we find the research scientist who uses English routinely in meetings with non-Danish colleagues, in publications, when reviewing literature and participating in international conferences as well as for lunch-time conversations with her international colleagues. She is most likely in her thirties or forties, has a PhD and has worked in an international environment throughout her career.

At the other end of the continuum we find the service assistant with very little knowledge of English. She has had little or no further education since leaving school, and she is nearing retirement. She encounters
English at work when she, as is required, turns on the computer every day
to check her email, since all computer programs are in English. And she
occasionally encounters foreign visitors who ask her for directions within
the compound, to which she probably responds by pointing or signalling
that she does not understand. One such service assistant says in her
interview about her language use at work:

\[ \text{I use Danish I don’t know any English} \]
\[ \text{(Gitte, Danish service assistant)} \]

Although she may have very limited receptive English skills, for most
purposes her own feeling that she does not know any English is accurate,
and she would belong in the group of Danes with very little or no English
competence that Preisler labels ‘English-have-nots’ (2003).

When it comes to foreigners learning Danish, the divide seems at first
stance to be between those who speak Danish and those who do not.
Danish colleagues sometimes describe their foreign colleagues in terms of
their Danish competence, saying for instance that “I have a German
colleague, but he speaks Danish”, signalling that this somehow makes
him less foreign, or makes his German-ness less important. Looking more
closely at the way Danish employees speak about their colleagues, it
becomes clear that the real divide is between those foreigners who make
an effort to learn Danish and those who do not. The actual Danish
competence is of course important in a number of practical situations, but
the way their Danish colleagues see them depends on their efforts, not
their actual achievements. On the one hand then, we have the foreigners
who are willing to learn Danish, and who make an effort, for instance by
taking Danish classes. Some people come away from the classes with
more Danish competence than others, partly because they make more of
an effort to use Danish outside class as a way of practising. But even those
who only manage to obtain little Danish competence from attending
classes are viewed differently than those foreigners who are perceived as
not really trying. This group includes both those foreigners who reject the
offer of Danish classes, and those who drop out of class after a while.
According to Giles and Coupland, we evaluate behaviour directed
towards us in the light of the motives we assume gave rise to it. Studies using communication accommodation theory have shown that speech maintenance or non-convergence was viewed more favourably when attributed to external situational pressure, but less favourably when attributed to speaker’s lack of effort, i.e. an internal motive (Giles and Coupland, 1991:76-77). This psychological mechanism would explain why attitudes are much more positive towards learners of Danish even if they have not succeeded in actually learning it (attributed to situational pressure, e.g. not enough time for lessons), than to those foreigners who choose not to learn at all (attributed to speaker’s lack of effort). I will return to the topic of foreigners learning Danish in chapter 9.

5.3.4 Switching, mixing and borrowing
Speakers at Lundbeck do not restrict themselves to using one language at a time. In the IT support department the spoken style was Danish with frequent codeswitches to English, typically, but not exclusively, in the form of technical terms. One informant describes it like this (with switches to English underlined):

> i IT-verdenen er det bare sådan en blanding altså der er ikke dansk og engelsk det er bare sådan en blanding altså E-trust og create en bruger jeg har createt en bruger og jeg ved ikke hvad så vi blander engelsk og dansk på en måde altså at vi vi ved hvad vi taler om ... hvis man ikke kan sige det på dansk så siger man det på engelsk og vi kan alle sammen de udtryk der in the IT world it is just a mix you know there is no Danish and English it is just a mix you know E-trust and create a user I have created a user and I don’t know what else so we mix English and Danish in a way so that we know what we are talking about ... if there is something you cannot say in Danish then you say it in English and we all know these expressions

(Mariam, Danish IT employee)

Mariam explains that this is the way it is in the IT world in general, and that she started using this style while studying at the IT university. Codeswitching is frequent in the IT community of practice at Lundbeck and appears to be linked with the larger IT community of practice. Codeswitching is also a part of the language practices in other parts of Lundbeck, but where it is the unmarked choice for interactions in the IT
department\textsuperscript{29}, it is clearly a marked choice in other departments. I return to this topic in section 5.4.1.

Codeswitching also occurs in written texts, e.g. job advertisements, emails and texts on the intranet. One common form of switching in emails is to keep the greeting at the end of the email in Danish, even if the rest of the email is in English as in the following examples:

\begin{verbatim}
Hi Andreas
... Could you send me a date for this?
Med venlig hilsen
Mikkel Svendsen, Dyrlæge, Afdelingsleder
Kind regards
Mikkel Svendsen, Veterinarian, Head of Department
\end{verbatim}

From this brief overview of codeswitching practices at Lundbeck it is evident that codeswitching occurs in both oral and written communication, as marked and unmarked codeswitching, and also that it is used differently in different departments. Section 5.4.1 examines norms for codeswitching, while a closer examination of language practices in different departments is the topic of section 5.5.

\subsection*{5.3.5 Technical jargon, abbreviations and acronyms}

Another characteristic of the language at Lundbeck is the tendency to use technical jargon, e.g. medical, IT and marketing jargon. Particularly some of the project meetings in the research department were impossible to follow for an outsider. A PowerPoint slide from one of these meetings illustrates this tendency:

\begin{verbatim}
Effect of injected AI00985 in PCP or MK881 induced hyperactivity & potentiating effect icv injected AI00985 on NNDA induced convulsions (0,7 TSA & 0.2 T)\textsuperscript{30}
\end{verbatim}

As in this example the use of technical jargon often involves abbreviations and acronyms. Another example is taken from the subject line of an email in the IT support department:

\textsuperscript{29} I return to the question of markedness and Myers-Scotton’s theory (1993a) in chapter 6.
\textsuperscript{30} In all data excerpts names and numbers pertaining to research have been replaced with pseudonyms in order to anonymise the data and keep the matters discussed confidential.
Abbreviations and acronyms are also common in spoken language. On one of the first days of fieldwork, I observed a department meeting in the communication department and noted in my field journal:

Der bruges mange forkortelser, fx SUKU, VP-niveau, RD, HR, SEAL, FC-strategiseminarer.
A lot of abbreviations are used, e.g. SUKU, VP level, RD, HR, SEAL, FC strategy seminars.

The use of initials to name individuals is another common practice. All employees have an email address made up by their initials, or another combination of the first one or two letters in each of their names. In this way, my Lundbeck email address was DOL@lundbeck.com. As the initials are unique for each employee they are used to identify employees in a number of situations, e.g. filling out forms and using the internal mail system. But they are also used in speaking, sometimes to identify someone more precisely than “John Smith” and at other times as a nickname. In one example from my observation in the IT support department Carlos makes a phone call and begins the call with “Hej MEKO, det er CIF/Hi MEKO, CIF here”. Welch et al. (2005) make a distinction between ‘everyday spoken/written language’, ‘company speak’ and ‘technical/professional/industry language’. While the example from the research department belongs to the last category, the rest are examples of ‘company speak’ which (to borrow Welch et al.’s definition) includes acronyms, special terms and terminology specific to the company which evolves over time.

5.3.6 Playing with words
One further feature of language use at Lundbeck is the use of English for humorous purposes, typically by making deliberate mistakes. Crystal (1998) defines what he calls the ludic function of language as a way of breaking the rules:
We play with language when we manipulate it as a source of enjoyment, either for ourselves or for the benefit of others. I mean ‘manipulate’ literally: we take some linguistic feature – such as a word, a phrase, a sentence, a part of a word, a group of sounds, a series of letters – and make it do things it does not normally do. We are, in effect, bending and breaking the rules of the language. And if anyone were to ask why we do it, the answer is simply: for fun. (Crystal, 1998:1)

My informants use the fact that they have several languages at their disposal to create a humorous effect\(^{31}\). Sometimes people use English with an exaggerated Danish accent, typically for humorous effect between Danes. In one example from the IT support department, Charlotte takes a call in English, transfers the call to Kasper and then says with an exaggerated Danish accent: “It is for you, Kasper”. A number of times informants used English in a humorous way in their interactions with me. Everyone I came into contact with knew that I was working on a project which had to do with English as a corporate language. For a lot of the informants, this seemed to imply that I wanted them to speak English or that it was better for my project if I found that they were speaking English. Consequently, my presence occasionally made people conscious of their language choices. Often this took the form of them switching into English with an exaggerated accent and with a smile saying things like

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Hej eller skal jeg sige} & \quad \text{Hello?} \\
\text{Hi or should I say} & \quad \text{hello?} \\
\end{align*}\]

(Karsten, Danish service employee)

where ‘hello’ is said with an exaggerated English pronunciation.

Other examples of humorous use of English include deliberately wrong translations from Danish into English, e.g. a literal word-by-word translation of idioms or phrases. In one example an informant comments about a piece of technical equipment that “Den er grædefærdig, it is

\(^{31}\) This type of language play was also found in a study of the use of English in the computer gaming subculture (Lønsmann, 2004; 2009), and Jørgensen (2008) contains several examples of language play across languages by Turkish-Danish children.
crying finish” where “crying finish” is the literal translation of “grædefærdig”. In Danish “grædefærdig” means “on the verge of tears”, but it can also be an exaggerated way of saying that something is broken, “færdig” in Danish. In another example, an informants speaks to me in Danish jokingly about how I probably have a hidden agenda with my observations. He then uses the word “backthought” as a literal translation of the Danish word “bagtanke” for hidden agenda and switches into English as he asks an English-speaking colleague if she knows what this is. He says that it is one of the words he has created and lists other examples. It is obvious from the conversation that this type of joke has been made before among this group of colleagues. In addition to their humorous effect, these instances of language play document the language competence of the speakers (and addressees), since as Crystal notes “a piece of language play is effective only if we first recognize the rules of the language for what they are, and can sense when they are being broken” (1998:3).

5.4 Norms for language use

With or without a language policy, norms for language use emerge. During my fieldwork I encountered norms for the appropriateness of codeswitching, norms for which standard non-native English speakers should orient to and, most saliently, norms for language choice. The next three sections discuss these norms.

5.4.1 The monolingual norm

In this section I am concerned with norms for codeswitching within a sentence. The distinction here between intrasentential and intersentential codeswitches (Myers-Scotton, 1993b) is relevant because different norms have evolved for these different types of codeswitching.

Danish speakers at Lundbeck frequently codeswitch to English. Interestingly, the same speakers were found to express a negative attitude to intrasentential codeswitching. This discrepancy between an overtly expressed attitude and observed language practices becomes very clear in
these excerpt from my field notes where I am observing Else in her office (underlined words are codeswitches):

Kollega Ruben kommer ind og præsenterer sig for mig. Else: “Når du engang har tid, vil jeg gerne pick your brains... dear”: Senere Else: “som baserer sig i ... what my dear?” Colleague Ruben enters and introduces himself to me. Else: “When you have the time, I would like to pick your brains... dear”. Later Else: “which is based in... what my dear?”

Later that same day, I note:

Else viser mig en mail med det, hun kalder “Lundbeck Lingo” og siger derefter: “Det er værre, når folk taler det, det bryder jeg mig meget lidt om, men det er en anden side af sagen” – på trods af at hun lige har kodeskiftet 10-20 gange i den forløbne time. 😒 ... Som jeg forstår hende, er “Lundbeck Lingo”, når folk blander dansk og engelsk.
Else shows me an email containing what she calls “Lundbeck Lingo” and then says: “It is worse when people speak it, I do not like that very much, but that is another matter” – despite the fact that she has just codeswitched 10-20 times in the last hour 😒 ... As I understand her, “Lundbeck Lingo” is when people mix Danish and English. (Else, Danish communication employee)

What Else calls Lundbeck Lingo, mixing Danish and English, other informants refer to as ‘Danglish’. I take the fact that this practice has been named as further evidence that it is common in the company.

That the negative attitude to codeswitching has evolved into a shared norm can be seen from examples from the focus group interviews. In the following example from the interview with the group of secretaries and administrators, one of the participants brings up the subject of Danglish, which is followed by this exchange:

1 BIRGIT: for eksempel så får man jo også en
2 syndig blanding der mange gange [ik]
3 LAURA: [ja ja]
4 BIRGIT: øh når man sidder og taler med <the IT department> så bliver det sådan en sjov
5 blanding [ikke også]
6 LAURA: [ja]
7 SIGNE: [jo (chuckles)]

1 BIRGIT: for instance you get a
2 sinful mix a lot of the time [right]
3 LAURA: [yeah yeah]
Birgit says that when talking to the IT department you get “a sinful mix” of Danish and English, later she also calls it “a funny mix”. Stine gives an example where a Dane switches from English to Danish because of a lack of vocabulary, and explains that this is common practice in her department (“we bruger det også sådan lidt socialt/ we also use it kind of socially”). Like Birgit, she comments on this use of codeswitching...
negatively. First in line 6 with “weird” and again in lines 14-16 when she says “that was kind of” and after a pause continues: “strange things”. When Birgit tells her anecdote, and again when Stine tells hers, the other participants show that they share the assessment of codeswitching as strange and dispreferred with frequent backchanneling, both by agreeing explicitly (“mm”, “yes” and “yeah yeah”) and by chuckling.

One further example from later in the same focus group interview supports the claim of the existence of a norm which says that codeswitching is inappropriate:

When Kirsten here uses “per default”, Laura takes this to be a codeswitch to English, although “per default” is also used in Danish. Kirsten pronounces it with stress on the first syllable of ‘default’ and thus not in a very English way. Laura nevertheless picks up on it and interrupts Kirsten with a repetition of the phrase. This causes Kirsten to apologise, and the rest of the group starts laughing. Following this Kirsten explains that she only codeswitches because she is used to “speaking IT”, i.e. because she belongs to a community of practice where codeswitches to English are acceptable. Both the fact that Laura picks up on what she perceives to be a codeswitch to English, and the fact that Kirsten apologises suggest the existence of a norm that has been broken, and this is thus one example where breaking a norm serves to make it explicit (as discussed in section 4.3). The fact that Kirsten feels the need to explain her use of an English phrase (with her connection to the IT community of practice) further supports the notion that a norm has been broken. This exchange takes
place after the discussion in the focus group interview about ‘Danglish’ (discussed above), and the participants can therefore be said to be ‘primed’ to react to codeswitches. From an interactionist perspective, however, it is interesting that they during the focus group interview have established firmly that codeswitches to English are not acceptable.

Informants also comment on their own codeswitches in the ethnographic interviews, e.g. by pauses, false starts or sounds of hesitation before the codeswitch or by translation or metalinguistic comments after the switch, for instance in the following example:

... den funktion vi sidder i det er jo øh ingeniør og Engineering and Technical Operations som den hedder på godt dansk altså ingeniør drift og vedligehold
... the division we’re in that’s er engineer and Engineering and Technical Operations as it’s called in proper Danish that is engineering operations and maintenance
(Janus, Danish health and safety employee)

Janus marks the codeswitch to English by hesitation (“øh”), metalinguistic comment (“som det hedder på godt dansk”) and a translation (“altså ingeniør drift og vedligehold”), all of which indicates that he considers switching to English a marked choice, a breach of a norm.

Despite their own and others’ frequent codeswitches, it appears that the informants at Lundbeck adhere to what could be called a monolingual norm, i.e. a norm that states that codeswitching is dispreferred or at least marked behaviour. Jørgensen describes what he calls a ‘multiple monolingualism norm’ (multiple allowing for the event that people have more than one language at their command). The norm is defined as the belief that

Persons who command more than one language will at any given time use one and only one language, and they will use each of their languages in a way that does not in principle differ from the way monolinguals use the same language. (Jørgensen, 2008:136)

---

32 The IT support department is an exception here. Danish with codeswitches to English is both a frequently observed language practice here, and the norm expressed in interactions with me.
I understand “using their languages in the same way as monolinguals use their language” as ‘no codeswitching’. Orienting to this norm in my presence indicates awareness of the existence of this norm in surrounding society (which also Jørgensen (2008) argues for), and orientation to me as an outgroup member or perhaps even someone who investigates if they speak properly. During my fieldwork, informants several times joked that when I was around they had to be careful not to swear or tell dirty jokes. They also frequently made comments to the effect that they should be speaking English, as if they thought I expected them to use more English. This type of behaviour suggests that informants saw me as someone who monitored that they speak correctly or that they abide by the norms. The above examples suggest that the same could be the case with codeswitching norms, where the informants see me as someone monitoring their codeswitching or, in other words, their adherence to the monolingual norm.

5.4.2 Native-speaker or lingua franca standard?

Another aspect of the norms for language use at Lundbeck is related to the use of English in a community where the majority are non-native speakers of English. Do these non-native speakers orient to a native-speaker standard, and which one? Or perhaps to what could be termed a lingua franca standard? As discussed in chapter 2, it has been suggested that English as a lingua franca (ELF) is developing as a variety in its own right on a par with the New Englishes of former British colonies and thus could provide a new standard for speakers to orient to (Jenkins, 2007; Seidlhofer, 2001). Contrary to this view Preisler (1995; 2008) argues that native-speaker norms are important in lingua franca interactions. Even if no native speakers are present, the non-native speakers still orient to a language norm, most often the norm that was used when the speaker was taught English as a foreign language in school.

As mentioned in section 5.3.3 on speakers at Lundbeck, English proficiency ranges from very rudimentary skills to near-native-speaker fluency (and indeed to native-speaker fluency in the case of the minority
of native speakers). Some informants are well aware of their own and other speakers’ limited proficiency:

In the first example, the fact that deviations in spelling and pronunciation are recognised and remarked on reveals that Stine does orient to a native speaker standard. At the same time she reveals that another norm is also in place, an acceptance of deviations from the standard. It is also clear that she assumes that the other participants in the focus group interview from which this excerpt is taken share this norm, when she rhetorically asks: “no one laughs if the pronunciation is a bit off right”. In the second example, Martin also talks about this norm when he says that “a large degree of forgiveness” exists in relation to non-native speakers. He also very clearly orients to a native-speaker standard when he talks about the “risk” of becoming used to accepting errors. These quotes reveal two
things about the norms for the use of English at Lundbeck: 1) speakers at Lundbeck do orient to native-speaker standards (that is what is aimed for) and 2) at Lundbeck a norm has developed which could be termed a lingua franca norm. According to this norm it is acceptable to use a kind of English which does not live up to the target of the native-speaker standard.

The lingua franca norm also means that more proficient non-native speakers accommodate to less proficient speakers. An informant explains how he adjusts his language so that people in the Middle East can understand him:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{det var kortere sætninger og det var klarere sætninger og det var måske en lidt spøjed udtale men altså hellere det og de så forstår det frem for at de ikke forstår det der og du kommer nogle fine engelske accenter der ik it was shorter sentences and clearer sentences and perhaps a somewhat funny pronunciation but rather that and that they then understand it instead of them not understanding it and you using some fancy English accents right}
\end{align*}
\]

(Hans, Danish marketing employee)

The existence of this type of accommodation by proficient non-native speakers supports the findings of ELF researchers such as Ehrenreich (2009) and Firth (2009) (see also chapter 2) who find that the focus among ELF speakers is on getting meaning across rather than on correctness. The question is, however, whether this focus is present because we are in a setting where English is used as a lingua franca or because we are in a corporate setting where the business at hand is more important than linguistic correctness. The latter explanation seems at least as probable as the first.

Also native speakers follow the lingua franca norm when they communicate with non-native speakers. One native speaker relates how she has changed the way she communicates:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{when I started here I spoke I guess as I normally had done [in my home country] and wrote as I normally had done and I real- people weren't getting me they weren't understanding so now I think more about what I'm saying so if there's a shorter more simplified word I will kind of use that I don't actually think a lot of people appreciate that you've tailored therefore your own language to try and make understanding easier }
\end{align*}
\]

(Kate, international research employee)
Kate also mentions speaking too fast and certain ways of phrasing things as problematic in relation to non-native speakers and therefore something which she is trying to “tailor”. This way of accommodating to non-native speakers is very close to what Mollin suggests as characteristics of ELF as the result of lingua franca communication strategies: “shorter utterances, a smaller range of vocabulary generally, or the avoidance of … fixed expressions and idioms which the interlocutor is unlikely to be familiar with” (Mollin, 2006:51).

The question of which native-speaker standard employees orient to was not one of my original research interests. The topic kept coming up, however, in ethnographic interviews, in the focus group interviews and in the meetings I held with employees while setting up fieldwork. It also takes up a considerable part of the suggestions for a language policy from employees mentioned in section 5.2. This topic is only relevant for some informants, however. In the focus group interview with the administrators and secretaries who function as language experts in their departments, it was discussed at length. The topic also came up in interviews with employees from IT and the communication and human resource management departments, while it was not mentioned by service assistants and lab technicians. Obviously a certain level of English proficiency is needed for the topic to become relevant, but for those employees with this proficiency it was relevant, for instance in the question of which reference works to consult. There seems to be a degree of consensus that the corporate language is British English. Some informants are very sure of this, others feel that it should be so, while others again are more doubtful that it is or would be a good idea, mentioning for instance the difficulty in selecting one variety of English over another when the company employs a range of native English speakers. That British English is the obvious choice for many probably is connected to the fact that British English is the prevalent standard in the Danish educational system.

In summary, my data show that while speakers at Lundbeck clearly do orient to a native-speaker standard, a lingua franca norm has developed. This norm can be described as a way of using English which focusses on
getting the meaning across more than on native-speaker-like perfection in grammar, pronunciation and vocabulary. Lesznyák’s suggestion of making a distinction between model and target seems useful here (2004:247) (see section 2.1.2 for an elaboration). So, while the model is British English, the target is something like ‘an English which will get the meaning across’. Although I have viewed this norm in a lingua franca light, I would argue that the focus on getting meaning across in this setting arguably has less to do with the fact that English is used as a lingua franca and more with the fact that we are in a business situation where getting the job done is more important than keeping to a native-speaker standard.

5.4.3 Norms for language choice

As mentioned above, Danish is the default spoken language at Lundbeck, i.e. it is the language most frequently used for oral communication. But it is not the only language used. Most employees use both Danish and English at work (and sometimes other languages). There is one very general rule governing language choice, which is repeated over and over in my material:

```
du taler engelsk til dem der ikke kan forstå dansk
you speak English to those who do not understand Danish
  (Julie, Danish research employee)
```

This statement in fact includes two rules or norms: you speak Danish when you can – but you speak English to those who do not understand Danish (and not some other language). In the interviews informants show that they have adopted this norm:

```
alså sådan en uskreven regel er at hvis der er en der ikke kan
dansk der er med til et møde så snakker man kun engelsk
a kind of unwritten rule is that if there is one person in a
meeting who doesn’t know Danish then you only speak English
  (Bodil, Danish service employee)
```

```
[engelsk] bruger vi jo i virkeligheden kun når vi taler med
udlændinge eller skriver til og med udlændinge
we really only use [English] when we talk to foreigners or write
to and with foreigners
  (Bent, Danish health and safety employee)
```
In these examples the most important factor in language choice is the perceived language competence of the addressee. And the choice is Danish, unless the addressee is perceived as not understanding Danish (or as not understanding enough Danish). In the case of a larger audience with mixed language competences, the choice is less clear, however. In most cases the general norm still applies, so that if there is just one English-speaking person in the audience, the language is English. The norm applies to written language as well, so that if there is a non-Danish-speaking person among the recipients of an email, the email will be in English.

The perceived competence of the direct addressee is not sufficient, however, to explain language choice in all situations. What for instance of situations where two Danes speak English to each other at lunch? Or when a Dane prepares slides in English for a meeting with all Danish participants? The norm must be more elaborate than just ‘Danish as default’. In order to understand this, it is necessary to elaborate on the concept of an addressee. In his theory on style as audience design, Bell (1984) divides audience into addressee (known, ratified and addressed), auditors, who are present but not directly addressed (i.e. known and ratified), overhearers (known) and eavesdroppers (whose presence is unknown). Speakers at Lundbeck most often make language choices based on the (perceived) competence of the direct addressee, but also often based on the competence of the auditors, e.g. the people sitting at the same table in the canteen. I have found no examples of language choice based on the competence of overhearers and eavesdroppers, although the distinction between auditors and overhearers can be difficult to establish from observation only.

Just as in the case of changing addressees, the norm is also to change language when the auditors change as Lajla does in this excerpt from my field notes:

I met Lajla and William [who does not speak Danish] in the canteen where they were having coffee with a guy from [another department]. We spoke English, but when Lajla spoke directly to me, she changed to Danish as it became clear that the other two were talking about something else.

Lajla switches to Danish when it becomes clear that the other two participants are no longer listening and therefore can no longer be regarded as auditors.

In order to fully account for the norms for language choice, e.g. the choice of English in emails between Danes or slides used in meetings with all-Danish participants, I have found it necessary to expand on Bell’s model to include what I term ‘expected addressees’. Expected addressees are future audiences. The inclusion of this category enables us to understand why English is chosen in a number of contexts with a purely Danish audience. The norm is to use English also if future addressees do not understand Danish. For instance, if a speaker expects to use a set of slides again at a later stage, he knows that the audience at this later stage might include non-Danish speakers, therefore the slides are created in English from the beginning. Similarly, the norm is to write emails in English if it is likely that the email later will need to be forwarded to English-speaking colleagues. This is also the case when the choice is between German and English as in the following example from my observation of a German scientist:

[Andreas] viser mig en e-mailkæde: den starter på dansk, efter at Andreas har gjort opmærksom på, at han ikke forstår det hele, skifter den til engelsk (inkl. “Andreas sorry about the danish”), nu er den seneste mail imidlertid på dansk, hvilket giver Andreas nogle problemer. … Andreas siger, at han skriver på engelsk til den tyske forsker, der var her tidligere, fordi det kan være, mailen senere skal forwardes til andre.

[Andreas] shows me a chain of emails: it starts in Danish, after Andreas has pointed out that he does not understand all of it, it changes to English (including “Andreas sorry about the danish”), however, the latest email is in Danish, which is causing Andreas some problems. … Andreas says that he writes in English to the German scientist who stopped by earlier, because it might be necessary to forward the email to others later on.

(From my field notes)

This example is evidence of the ‘direct addressee-norm’ as well as the ‘expected addressee-norm’. When one of the senders in the chain writes
“Andreas sorry about the danish”, it is a way of acknowledging that a norm has been broken: the language should have been English, since one of the recipients does not understand (enough) Danish. And Andreas’ decision to write to a fellow German in English (ostensibly breaking the norm of not using English unless you have to) is explained as adherence to the norm which takes expected addressees into consideration.

In this section I have shown that two norms are very influential in language choice at Lundbeck: a Danish-as-default norm and a competence norm. The norm is for speakers to orient to the perceived competence of addressees when deciding which language to use. In addition to the direct addressee, speakers orient to auditors (in oral communication) and expected addressees (in written communication).

Formality and language choice
Several informants distinguish between what I call formal and informal situations when they discuss norms for language choice:

hvis man for eksempel sidder ovre til frokosten jamen så kan man jo ikke forlange hele bordet skal sidde og snakke engelsk altså eller i hvert fald man kan ikke forlange at man skal sidde og snakke engelsk hele tiden altså
for instance if you are at lunch well you can’t very well ask the whole table to speak English you know or at least you can’t ask them to speak English all the time you know
(Jesper, Danish research employee)

når vi sidder og småkagler hvad der er sket i weekenden så er det selvfølgelig på dansk men hvis du har møder bare der er en med så foregår det på engelsk
when we chit-chat about what has happened over the weekend it is of course in Danish but if you are in a meeting as soon as there is one [non-Danish speaker] there then it is in English
(Hans, Danish marketing employee)

Both Jesper and Hans are native speakers of Danish and work in international environments with close colleagues with very limited Danish skills. And while the norm is to switch when a non-Danish speaker is present in meetings, it is different at lunch and when chit-chatting about what happened over the weekend. In those cases it is not necessary to switch to English.

The non-Danish speakers have noticed this difference as well:
when the lunch starts I mean you know the barriers go up in some ways because they do switch and it's interesting I notice that just like when meetings end sometimes they'll switch to Danish right away for a few minutes ... the second the meeting is over and the next words that come out of the mouth it's Danish (William, international marketing employee)

that's their lunch break they should be able to have that kind of relaxed kind of environment ... there's no rule that it's always in English so sometimes it is but it doesn't bother me if I want it to be in English I strike up a conversation (Julia, international marketing employee)

As Julia says there is no rule that it is always English at lunch, sometimes it is, sometimes it is not. I am not trying to argue that there is a qualitative difference between formal and informal situations, rather it would seem that the competence norm is relaxed in certain situations so that it does not apply as strictly in informal situations, such as lunch and the beginning and end of meetings as it does in the meetings themselves. Speakers feel that they can flout the norm more in situations that are not strictly work-related.

5.5 Case studies of three departments

While the chapter until now has focussed on common norms and practices, the case studies in this section present three Lundbeck departments and focus on the differences in language competence, language policy and language use.

The division into production, research and marketing discussed in section 5.1.1 is also evident in the fact that employees know very little about what employees in other parts of the organisation are doing. Peter from marketing for instance says about the science people:

for me it's the whatever the lab rats ... I have absolutely no idea what they're doing and you don't have a lot of contact with them (Peter, international marketing employee)

Many employees experience Lundbeck as a very segregated company, where the primary social contact is with colleagues from their own
department. This means that local norms and policies evolve at department level.

5.5.1 The service department: the English-have-nots

The 100 employees in the service department include the service assistants, the internal mail workers, the staff manning the reception, the guards manning the gates, and ‘the grey men’ - named after their grey uniforms - who function as janitors around the compound with work tasks ranging from groundskeeping and warehouse work to washing the cars of top management. Most of the employees in the service department left school early and have had little education since. A minority is tradesmen, and some of the guards have a military background. The majority is Danish with a small minority of immigrants from e.g. Germany, Greece, the Philippines, Russia and Gambia. The size and organisation of the service department means that it is very much a segregated department, where the employees work in small groups without much contact with the rest of the department.

The norm internally in the department is to send out all information in Danish. The department offers class-based English courses, which take place after working hours. Only a few take the courses, however. While many of the employees in the service department are motivated to learn English, they are afraid that the English classes are too difficult for them. Most of them have never learnt any English before, and they think that the lessons in business English offered by the department will be beyond their capabilities. According to the head of department, the employees are tested and divided into classes that match their proficiency. It seems, though, that some employees have experienced that classes were too difficult, and as this experience is related to colleagues, the fear that the classes are too hard to follow becomes a barrier preventing the employees from making use of this opportunity to learn. Others are simply not motivated to learn English. Some are nearing retirement and are not interested in learning anything new. Others feel that English skills are not necessary for the kind of job they do, typically cleaning.

The service assistants clean the buildings in the Lundbeck compound in teams of five or six. They begin work at 4.30 a.m., which means that
they work alone the larger part of their working day, since the office and laboraty staff whose offices they clean comes in between 8 and 9. The service assistants are almost all women, and most of them are native speakers of Danish, though some have immigrant background and are native speakers of other languages. The English proficiency among the service assistants is very limited. As they are middle-aged or older and left school early, they have had little opportunity to learn English (which was introduced as a school subject in Denmark after they left school).

The service assistants use almost exclusively Danish at work. English is only very rarely used for speaking, and then not without some anxiety, as Berta experienced when a non-Danish visitor asked her for directions: ”jeg var ved at gå i sort hvordan er det nu det er ik altså/I was ready to black out what was it called again you know”. In contrast, receptive English skills are required on a daily basis. Signs and posters are in English, department names are in English, and computer programs are in English. To some extent the service assistants ignore this use of English, but as the example with department names in section 5.3.1 shows, it can also be a source of frustration. One place where English is very salient for the service assistants is on the computer. Each team has its own computer, and is required to check their email and the department news every morning. Although all department emails are in Danish, other emails may be in English, and all computer programs are in English. What then do the service assistants with very limited English skills do? Either they simply do not use the computer, or they delete emails in English without reading them. Or if they meet a message they do not understand, they simply turn off the computer.

It is interesting that the same group of service assistants who react in this way when faced with English in fact are very motivated to learn how to use a computer. They all participate in computer courses through their union, and they stress that this is very interesting – and that it is in Danish. At work English is a barrier, they say, because it is too much to learn to use the computer and to do it in English.
5.5.2 The health and safety department: a very Danish environment

As the name indicates the main tasks in the department pertain to the health and safety of Lundbeck employees. The department is a corporate function, meaning that it services the entire corporation, not just the Danish headquarters. One important task for the employees in the department is to write instructions on the use of chemical substances, others include servicing the safety organisation, producing reports on health, safety and environment within Lundbeck, organising the annual flu shots and handling applications to authorities regarding chemical substances. The department employs twelve people. Most, but not all of the employees, have degrees in science, engineering and language (the department coordinator).

Despite being a corporate function, the health and safety department is one of the more Danish departments. All employees are native speakers of Danish. They all know some English, but at very varying levels. The department coordinator has a degree in English language and consequently functions as the department language expert. Most of the other employees rate their own English level as fluent, but three judge their English skills to be intermediate and one employee says that her English skills are very low. In the ethnographic interview she talks about this issue at length, and it is clear that she does have some English skills, but they are mostly receptive. She feels that her English skills often are inadequate.

The department does not have a language policy, but many of the texts they produce are regulated by Danish health and safety law which requires information to be in a language that employees understand. In the department this is interpreted as Danish. In connection with hiring a new employee, the head of department stresses that Danish is required, otherwise it is too much trouble. English is not mentioned as a requirement. The general norm for language choice (Danish is default, 33 Danish companies with more than five employees are required to have a safety organisation with safety representatives in each department. These representatives work with the employer’s representative to ensure a healthy and safe work environment. At Lundbeck being a safety representative would typically take up 10% of the working time.
English is only used with people who do not speak Danish) also applies in the health and safety department.

The employees all use both Danish and English at work, but other languages are also in play. The employees all speak Danish with each other, both informally and in meetings. Orally, English is only used for phone calls with non-Danish speakers, typically employees from Lundbeck subsidiaries. In writing, English is used by members of the chemical team to search books and internet databases for information on new chemical substances. German and occasionally other languages are also used for this purpose. Instructions on the use of chemical substances are written in Danish for the most part, but around 25% are in English. The monthly reports on health, safety and environment written by the department coordinator are in English. Emails are in either Danish or English and in department meetings, although the language spoken is always Danish, the slides are sometimes in English. And as is the case in all departments, computer programs and signs are in English.

5.5.3 The marketing department: learning Danish – or not

This particular marketing department specialises in the marketing of one of Lundbeck’s products. The department is organised into brand managers, who support the subsidiaries and help them strategise, and medical marketing managers, who are responsible for the contact to doctors and scientists. A congress manager, three secretaries and the head of department make up a total of 11 employees. Among the tasks in the department is the production of marketing materials and arranging and participating in meetings and conferences. Most employees have frequent travel activity as well as a lot of meeting activity internally at Lundbeck. The employees all have graduate degrees, most with a medical or marketing background.

The department is international in several ways: the employees have frequent contact with subsidiaries and other international partners, they travel a lot, and a variety of nationalities is represented among the employees, including Danish, Swedish, American, Austrian and German. The diverse backgrounds of the employees are reflected in the diversity of language proficiency in the department. While all employees have good
English skills, Danish proficiency varies. Seven are native speakers of Danish, one of Swedish. The three international employees have been offered unlimited Danish lessons with a private tutor. Two are learning Danish and have after a year attained enough proficiency to use Danish for approximately half of their communication at work. One has decided not to learn Danish and has no Danish skills. The department has no language policy, but all the marketing materials produced in the department are in English.

Despite the international character of the department, the default language is Danish, and the competence norm applies here as it does to the rest of Lundbeck. Department meetings are routinely in English, but if only Danes are present, the language changes to Danish. At lunch time, however, Danish is also used in the presence of non-Danish speakers. While the employees use mostly Danish and English, Swedish and German are also used. German is used between native speakers both for speaking and in emails. They also use Danish and English with each other, however. In interactions between a Swede and a Dane, the Swede speaks Swedish and the Dane Danish. In interactions where both a Swede and learners of Danish are involved, the language is English, however. Although Danes understand Swedish, learners of Danish most often do not. Employees frequently codeswitch to English when they are speaking Danish. The English items are typically marketing terms, but codeswitching is also present in casual conversations. Most employees seem to orient to this norm where codeswitching to English is unmarked.

The fact that two employees are learning Danish and thus are difficult to categorise as speakers influences the language use in the department. Both are eager to learn Danish and make a conscious effort to use Danish in as many situations as possible. At the same time, they are very aware that their limited Danish skills can be a disadvantage in communicative situations and therefore choose English for certain types of interactions. The presence of two learners means that language choice is not always straightforward. If the norm is to choose a language on the basis of the competence of the addressee, learners present a problem because they are borderline cases where people do not know which language to choose.
The result is that language choice with learners varies from one situation to the next.

Even in an international environment like the marketing department, learning Danish makes a big difference. The international employees in the marketing department experience a basic willingness to accommodate to them and switch to English when they first arrive in Denmark, perhaps since they cannot be expected to understand any Danish at this point. Attitudes seem to influence language choice, though, as this willingness to accommodate diminishes over time. The international employees also experience that Danes are more willing to switch to English if the international colleague is making an effort to learn Danish. While it can be argued that internationals with no Danish skills have a greater need for people to accommodate, Danes are more willing to accommodate if the international colleague is accommodating to them by learning Danish. Furthermore, learning Danish is important on a personal level. Peter, who has learnt Danish, says that “learning Danish really opens you in your world in here” and that “people can get much more less distanced as soon you talk Danish”. But while Peter has experienced this huge difference socially since he started using Danish, his colleague William who has chosen not to learn Danish has not experienced this change and talks in his interview about problems with lack of integration and missing out on social events.

5.6 Conclusion

What does it mean to have English as a corporate language? The ethnographic analysis in this chapter reveals that this is not easy to summarise in a single sentence or even in a single paragraph. At Lundbeck both the decision to introduce English as a corporate language and the lack of any accompanying language policy are closely linked with company history and culture. The lack of a language policy has been shown to lead to a diversity of expectations of language use, and sometimes to disappointments when practices do not live up to expectations, particularly for non-Danish employees who had expected English to be used more.
Danish has been shown to be the default spoken language, while English primarily is used with addressees who do not know Danish. English is therefore used more often in writing, for instance in emails which are frequently directed at a larger audience more likely to include non-Danish speakers. Approaching language use at Lundbeck from an ethnographic point of view means that the full range of communicative events has been considered, revealing that some events are more noticeable than others, with particularly written and receptive events taking place ‘under the radar’. This means that language choice often is not consciously considered for these events.

Speaker competence at Lundbeck ranges from employees who are native speakers of Danish, and who have very limited English skills, over non-Danish speakers with good English skills to speakers who are fluent in several languages. It emerges from the analysis that language choice at Lundbeck is not just a question of Danish or English. In addition to these two languages, a number of other languages, styles and jargons are also part of the linguistic resources.

It has also been shown that a number of norms for language use have evolved. It is clear that despite codeswitching being a frequent practice in almost all departments, most speakers orient to a monolingual norm which sees codeswitching as marked behaviour. Furthermore, while non-native English speakers do orient to a native-speaker standard, the norm is in practice to accept non-standard uses. Most conspicuously, the norm for language choice centres on the competence of the addressee. Also important, however, is the competence of auditors and expected addressees.

The three case studies show that the linguistic diversity of the workforce combined with strong segregation between different parts of the organisation lead to the emergence of local norms and practices in addition to the company-wide norms. Again speakers’ language competence is important: the differences in language use between different departments are closely linked with the different language competences of the employees. In brief: an international company in Denmark is an extremely diverse environment with regard to language competence and language use. And while ‘English as a corporate
language’ turns out to be a difficult concept to capture, some tendencies are clear: Danish is the default spoken language, and English is used primarily with non-Danish speakers.
6 Language choice: theory and methods

In this chapter I present some key findings of previous research into codeswitching and language choice. Some findings are in the form of elaborate models or theories, others point to single influential factors. Some models and theories are specifically about language choice, others are wider in scope but include language choice. In the following I discuss these theories and findings with a view to their explanatory potential for my material. First, however, I would like to define further some of the central terms I use.

6.1 Definition of terms

6.1.1 Language choice and codeswitching

Terms abound for the selection of one linguistic variety over another. When the linguistic varieties in question are separate languages, codeswitching, code choice, language choice and language alternation are some of the most frequently used. In the following I use the terms language choice and codeswitching. Of these two I understand language choice as the most encompassing term, with codeswitching included in its meaning. I see this study as a study of language choice, not just of codeswitching. I am interested not only in language choice within an interaction, where the language changes during that interaction, but also in the language choice made at the beginning of an interaction. These language choices are an important part of the language practices in a setting such as Lundbeck, where English is the corporate language, but Danish the first language of the overwhelming majority of the speakers. Codeswitching patterns in individual interactions are not less interesting, and the analysis of these also form part of my study, but as this brief section hopefully clarifies, codeswitching is only part of my object of study. Language choice then applies to choices made at all levels of speech or writing, i.e. any communicative event, sentence or word.

Following Myers-Scotton, I define codeswitching as “the term used to identify alternations of linguistic varieties within the same conversation” (1993b:1). I also make use of the terms ‘matrix language’ and ‘embedded
language’ as introduced by Myers-Scotton (1993a), of which the matrix language is the language governing the syntax of the sentence. Finally, I have found it useful to distinguish between two types of codeswitching: intersentential, involving switches between sentences, and intrasentential, involving switches within a sentence.

### 6.1.2 Codeswitching vs. borrowing

The distinction between codeswitching and borrowing is frequently discussed in studies of codeswitching. Distinguishing between the two is far from easy, however, in that there is not one simple criterion to use. Myers-Scotton (1993a) argues that the degree of phonological, morphological and syntactic integration cannot be used to differentiate borrowing and codeswitching. Instead she suggests measuring the frequency with which a borrowed/codeswitched form occurs in relation to the frequency of the indigenous form for the same concept. Borrowed forms will show a high relative frequency, since there is no indigenous form in direct competition, while codeswitched forms will show a low relative frequency (1993a:207). Poplack, Sankoff and Millar (1988) define codeswitches as longer than one word. Any use of single words from the embedded language is analysed as a loanword, but the authors distinguish established loanwords from what they call ‘nonce borrowings’. Their definition of ‘nonce borrowings’ appears then to closely resemble what I would term one-word codeswitches. As such, the discussion in Poplack et al. of the difficulty of deciding when a lexical item becomes an established loan also bears on the discussion of codeswitches vs. loanwords:

We can of course distinguish between those that occur only once in our corpus (‘nonce borrowings’) and those used by many speakers (widespread loans), but a priori we cannot take for granted that this purely operational distinction correlates either with the degree of linguistic assimilation of the word or with its history of attestation as a loanword in the language. (1988:50)
This difficulty of distinguishing loanwords from codeswitches begs the question if it is even necessary to do so. If they are similar in so many ways, why then analyse them separately? In answer to this question, Myers-Scotton concludes that while the processes involved in producing the two are much the same, they differ with regard to how they are stored in the mental lexicon. Borrowed forms are stored in the mental lexicon of both the matrix and the embedded languages, but codeswitched forms only in the lexicon of the embedded language. This means that borrowed forms are more easily accessed (1993a:205). Both Gumperz (1982) and Poplack, Sankoff and Millar (1988) follow the same line of thought when they conclude that the speaker alternates between two systems when codeswitching, but only one grammatical system is used when borrowing.

This reasoning does not help us as analysts to distinguish the two, however. Instead, I would argue that some cases are quite easily decided based on etymological origin and widespread use in the speech community. In these cases, inclusion in dictionaries can be used to determine the status of a word as an established loanword. In other, harder to determine, cases, we can look to Auer (1998) who discusses the concept of distinct codes in codeswitching. Auer makes a convincing point when he argues that what counts as a code in codeswitching must be the participants’ notion of code, not the linguists’. His argument is not directly related to the distinction between borrowing and codeswitching, but rather to that of code-mixing vs. codeswitching, but may be applied usefully here. Auer’s conclusion is that the only way to show that participants see two codes as distinct is to show that switching between them is employed in a meaningful way. Following this line of reasoning, determining what is a codeswitch and what is a loanword is a matter of interpretation, using both linguistic and extra-linguistic criteria. It is a matter of showing that the participants orient to the switch as a codeswitch and not as a loanword.

6.2 Codeswitching: a question of competence?

Until the publication of Blom and Gumperz’ 1972 study of codeswitching in Hemnesberget, codeswitching had not been studied in any great detail.
Furthermore, before Blom and Gumperz codeswitching had not been seen as meaningful. Instead codeswitches were seen as lapses of language ability, memory, effort or attention (Woolard, 2005). Early studies of language contact tended to see codeswitching as interference, i.e. as motivated by a bilingual speaker’s lack of competence in one of his languages. Uriel Weinreich, in his classic study Languages in Contact, clearly endorses the view of (intrasentential) codeswitching as defective when he says that “The ideal bilingual switches from one language to the other according to appropriate changes in the speech situation (interlocutors, topics, etc.), but not in an unchanged speech situation, and certainly not within a single sentence” (1953:73). In Blom and Gumperz, codeswitching is instead seen as skilled performance and, even more importantly, as meaningful behaviour. Challenging the earlier view of codeswitching as defective, researchers in the 1970s and 1980s sought to show that codeswitching was not due to lack of language competence. In her study of codeswitching among Puerto Rican Spanish-English bilinguals in the United States, Poplack (1980) clearly has this earlier position in mind when she aims to demonstrate that 1) codeswitching is the norm in stable bilingual communities, and 2) “satisfaction of this norm requires considerably more linguistic competence in two languages than has heretofore been noted” (1980:588). Poplack finds that codeswitches provoked by lack of lexical or syntactic availability is only a weak factor in speakers’ own perception of their behaviour. She concludes that there is “strong evidence that code-switching is a verbal skill requiring a large degree of linguistic competence in more than one language, rather than a defect arising from insufficient knowledge of one or the other” (1980:615). Gumperz also concludes that competence or lack thereof cannot be one of the main reasons for codeswitching:

Code switching does not necessarily indicate imperfect knowledge of the grammatical systems in question. Only in a relatively few passages is code alternation motivated by speakers’ inability to find words to express what they want to say in one or the other code. … Considerations of intelligibility, lucidity or ease of expression,
important as they are in some instances, can therefore not be the main determining reasons. (1982:64-65)

Poplack and Gumperz are concerned with codeswitching in bilingual settings, however, and their findings cannot automatically be carried over into lingua franca settings. I hypothesise that linguistic competence plays a bigger role in language choice in lingua franca settings than in bilingual settings. It is plausible that in a lingua franca setting codeswitching in many instances is in fact motivated by the speakers’ inability to find words in one of the codes, and that ease of expression is an important factor influencing language choice. I do not of course support Weinreich and his contemporaries in their contention that the ideal bilingual speaker does not codeswitch, and that codeswitching is in some way defective behaviour. On the contrary, I agree with Poplack that codeswitching requires a large degree of linguistic competence. At the same time, however, it is possible that some codeswitches in lingua franca interactions are motivated by a lack of linguistic competence. While bilingual speakers may also have differing abilities in their languages, in a lingua franca setting most speakers are per definition non-native speakers and as such their linguistic abilities in the lingua franca may vary considerably. For this reason I include linguistic competence as a possible factor influencing language choice in this study.

6.3 Codeswitching and the ethnography of communication

While Dell Hymes’ (1974) SPEAKING taxonomy is not specifically a theory about language choice, its inventory of the components of communicative events can be seen as a list of possible factors influencing language choice (I discuss the SPEAKING taxonomy in more detail in section 5.3.1). Hymes did not consider this taxonomy an end in itself, but saw it rather as part of the progress towards an explanatory theory, “an initial heuristic schema ... quite preliminary - if English and its grammarians permitted, one might call it ‘toward toward a theory’” (1974:43-44). Here I use the components Hymes outlines, e.g. participants,
setting and genre, as starting points in an analysis of factors influencing language choice.

Another influential text in the tradition of the ethnography of communication is John Gumperz’ *Discourse Strategies* (1982), which deals more specifically with language choice. Gumperz here outlines his ‘interpretive approach’ to the study of conversation, and elaborates on the distinction between situational and metaphorical codeswitching originally introduced in Blom and Gumperz (1972). According to Gumperz, situational codeswitching is when the language changes with the setting, activity or speaker. Only one code is employed at a time, and there is a one-to-one relationship between language and social context. Situational codeswitching is what we find in diglossic communities (Ferguson, 1972). Metaphorical or conversational codeswitching is when items from two different grammatical systems or subsystems form part of the same speech act. The relationship between language and social context here is more complex. Gumperz sees all codeswitching as a way of signalling contextual information, i.e. as contextualisation cues. In situational switching where the use of a certain code is associated with a certain activity, the code comes to signify this activity, so that the use of the code alone can signal the enactment of the activity without any other clear contextual cues (1982:98). In conversational codeswitching the juxtaposition of two codes signals something more subtle, namely metaphorical information about how speakers intend their words to be understood (1982:61). I will return to Gumperz and the theory of codeswitching as contextualisation cues in section 7.3.

Auer (1984) is very critical of the distinction between situational and metaphorical switching. Auer finds that Gumperz’ definition of ‘situation’ is too confined, and he argues instead for a more dynamic view of the social situation as accomplished by the participants through interaction. He further argues that situational and metaphorical codeswitching should be seen as ends of a continuum and not as two distinct categories (a point Gumperz agrees with in his comment to Auer’s article (Gumperz, 1984)).

Gumperz also discusses the distinction between a ‘they code’ and a ‘we code’ in bilingual communities. The ‘we code’ is traditionally the low prestige, ethnically specific, minority language which is associated with
in-group and informal activities, while the ‘they code’ is the high prestige majority language which is associated with the more formal, stiffer and less personal outgroup relations (1982:66). Auer also has issues with the ‘we code’/‘they code’ labels, claiming that the meaning of the two languages juxtaposed in codeswitching is instead an empirical question. In this respect, I am in line with Auer when he argues for a stronger focus on what is accomplished by participants through interaction. I also find it problematic to assume a priori that the languages at play in multilingual situations can be classed as ‘we code’ and ‘they code’. I agree with Auer that the meaning of the two languages needs to be studied locally. In a lingua franca situation it is particularly problematic to assign the languages in use status as either ‘we code’ or ‘they code’. Here, the ethnically specific language used for informal activities, e.g. Danish, can at the same time be the majority language, while the lingua franca used for outgroup relations does not necessarily carry the high prestige traditionally associated with the ‘they code’. This makes it even more important to examine the meanings associated with the languages locally.

6.4 Codeswitching and community norms

Later research into codeswitching has focussed on community norms as central in language choice. One influential contribution is Carol Myers-Scotton’s work on a ‘markedness model’. Myers-Scotton takes Blom and Gumperz as her starting point when she criticises the lack of clarity in the distinction between metaphorical and situational codeswitching:

characterizing switching as either situational or metaphorical serves no useful purpose. First, their differences are not clear. Second (and perhaps even more important), their similarities are not explored (one would want to argue that codes in metaphorical switches depend for their social significance on whatever that significance is when they occur in a situational switch). Further, B[loom] and G[umperz] do not make it clear whether they propose that all switches may be classified as either situational or metaphorical. (1983:121).
Instead Myers-Scotton (1993b) suggests the ‘markedness model’, a theoretical model explaining the social motivations behind codeswitching. This model builds on Gumperz’ theory that speakers use linguistic choices, including codeswitching, to convey intentional meaning of a socio-pragmatic nature. As Gumperz puts it, code choices are discourse strategies (1982). The markedness model attempts to explain all codeswitching, both marked and unmarked, and furthermore it attempts to explain what linguistic variation accomplishes interactionally. Myers-Scotton explains ‘unmarked’ and ‘marked’ choices as belonging to different ends of a continuum:

‘Unmarked’ is used to mean that the choice of a particular linguistic variety is expected as the medium for a talk exchange, given the norms of the society regarding the salience of specific situational factors present (e.g. the speaker and addressee, the topic, the setting). ‘Marked’ choices are at the other end of a continuum; they are not usual, and in some sense they are dis-identifications with what is expected. (1993b:151, emphasis in original)

Myers-Scotton also introduces the concept ‘rights and obligations set’. An RO set is a construct derived from situational factors, standing for the attitudes and expectations of participants towards each other. Through use in particular situations, a code comes to index an RO set.

In the markedness model, all language choices are seen as speaker motivated. Speakers make linguistic choices because they consider the consequences. Interspeaker variation results from different speakers weighing costs and rewards differently. Myers-Scotton proposes the existence of an innate cognitive faculty, ‘the markedness metric’, which enables speakers to assess language choices as more or less unmarked or marked. While the cognitive faculty is universal, the knowledge of what is marked and unmarked is community-specific. Learning the norms of the community is necessary for speakers to interpret messages as marked or unmarked. Importantly, however, while norms determine interpretations of choices, they do not make choices, speakers do. In contrast with earlier theories which tried to list the situational factors influencing code choice
(e.g. Hymes, 1974), Myers-Scotton argues that since the salience of situational factors varies across communities and across interactions, situational factors can only have the limited role of signposts of markedness.

Myers-Scotton discusses a type of codeswitching she calls unmarked codeswitching, which is codeswitching as the unmarked choice for the whole interaction. Here it is not each switch which has indexicality, but the overall pattern of switching. This type of unmarked codeswitching has received attention from a number of other researchers. Auer (1998) terms it code-mixing and suggests a continuum stretching from code-alternation (his term for codeswitching and insertion) to code-mixing. Where code-alternation is interactionally meaningful, code-mixing is not, according to Auer.

For my purposes, the concept of markedness does have some value as an analytical tool. While Myers-Scotton specifically talks about bilingual communities and speakers when outlining her theory, the distinction between marked and unmarked codeswitching is also helpful when attempting to explain language choice in lingua franca settings. I do not find it sufficient, however, to analyse my data in terms of the markedness of language choices. Many of my examples are fairly straightforwardly analysed as unmarked codeswitching. Even if the question of why a codeswitch happens could be answered with “because it is the unmarked choice”, I do not think this is explanation enough.

In a later reworking of the markedness model, Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai reframe the model as a rational choice model. Rational choice models seek to explain how actors make choices, and this linguistic adaptation seeks to explain how speakers choose one linguistic variety over another. The rational choice model claims that social factors do not determine language choice: “speakers’ choices are driven by rationality rather than derived directly from social group membership, ethnographic milieu, or sequential structure” (Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai, 2001:17). Social and situational factors still play a part, but only so far as they determine the available choices, i.e. the linguistic repertoire. Actual language choices are rationally based and are the outcome of a cost-benefit analysis, which includes subjective motivations and objective
opportunities. In other words, speakers make the choice they do in order to gain maximum benefits.

The advantage of using this model to explain language choice is that it includes both situational factors, markedness and values and norms. My main objection to the model is that it does not take interaction into account. Instead language choice is an outcome of a process in the speaker’s head. And as with Myers-Scotton’s original model, it operates at too abstract a level, which makes it difficult to disagree with. Furthermore, I am interested in finding out what beliefs, norms and situational factors influence language choices in what way. Therefore I now turn to theories focusing on one particular factor: the audience.

6.5 Accommodation and addressees

The theories discussed in this section all have a rather broad perspective in that they focus on communication and style, rather than language choice specifically. The theories of Giles and Coupland (1991) and of Bell (1984) are, however, very useful in an analysis of language choice in a lingua franca situation, as they provide plausible explanations for why speakers vary their speech. The theories in this section have a relational perspective, that is they explain linguistic choices in terms of the relationship between speaker and listener (where Myers-Scotton focuses on speaker intentions). But before discussing these two theories, I would like to begin with an earlier model explaining stylistic choices, namely Labov’s work in variationist sociolinguistics. While Labov’s work belongs to a different, “non-relational”, paradigm, it still seeks to explain some of the same variation that the later models look at in relational terms. Labov’s study also introduces degree of formality as an important dimension in a speaker’s linguistic choices, a concept not unimportant in a business setting.

Labov discovered that informants’ language style varied according to the degree of formality of the situation. He explained this variation as a result of differences in the amount of attention paid to speech, arguing that the more formal the situation, the more speakers are aware of how they speak. Labov used sociolinguistic interviews to elicit speech data
from informants. And while most of the speech in a sociolinguistic interview belongs to the category of ‘careful’ speech, Labov and his associates introduced topics such as ‘kid’s games’ and the ‘danger of death’ question in order to elicit examples of ‘casual’ speech (Labov, 1966; 2001). Their basic finding was that informants converge to a prestige form in careful speech and to the vernacular when the speech is less careful. As mentioned above, this perspective on language variation is non-relational. Coupland criticises the ‘attention to speech’ principle for implying a ‘talking heads’ perspective on language, in that it explains stylistic shifts psycholinguistically (2007:54).

As opposed to Labov, Giles and Coupland’s communication accommodation theory is within the relational paradigm. Communication accommodation theory (Giles, 1973; Giles and Coupland, 1991) is a social psychological theory concerned with the social interaction between and within groups. The theory foregrounds the motivations for communicative variation and identifies two main clusters of motives: seeking social attractiveness and seeking communicative efficiency (Coupland, 2007). The two main strategies speakers can use to achieve their goals are ‘convergence’ and ‘divergence’. Convergence is a strategy where individuals adapt their communicative behaviour to others, e.g. by changing their speech rate or pronunciation. Convergence is used in response to an (often subconscious) need for social integration or identification, and the goal is to gain social acceptance and create solidarity in a group. The greater the need for social acceptance, the more a speaker converges. This theory is based on the idea of ‘similarity attraction’: when one person becomes more like another, there is a greater likelihood that the other will feel more positively towards that person or like him more (Giles and Coupland, 1991:72-3).

Divergence is a strategy used to accentuate differences between oneself and others. It can be used to reduce intimacy and create distance, also in terms of intergroup relations:

Divergence can ... be a tactic of intergroup distinctiveness employed by people in search of a positive social identity. ... By diverging and emphasizing one’s own social (and sometimes idiosyncratic)
communicative style, members of an ingroup may accentuate differences between themselves and outgroup members along a salient and valued dimension of their group identity. (Giles and Coupland, 1991:80)

Divergence is thus used to emphasise the particular about one’s own ingroup, e.g. the particular language or style of the group, and can in this way contribute to creating a positive group identity.

Where communication accommodation theory has its origins in social psychology, Bell has a variationist sociolinguistic background. Bell’s theory of style as audience design (1984) deals with intraspeaker variation in general (see also section 5.4.3), but includes considerations of bilingual code choices. The central tenet of audience design is that people respond primarily to other people, i.e. speakers design their style for their audience. Bell draws heavily on communication accommodation theory in his model, but adds important theoretical distinctions. According to Bell, intraspeaker variation, i.e. variation in style, derives from the variation between speakers. That is, speakers draw on their experience of interspeaker variation in their speech community for their own stylistic range. In Bell’s model, speakers accommodate primarily to addressees, secondarily to auditors and overhearers. Where addressees are known, ratified and addressed members of the audience, auditors are just known and ratified, and overhearers only known. Generally, the effect of an auditor is less than that of the addressee, and the effect of an overhearer less than that of an auditor (1984:175). Ladegaard (1995) provides evidence, however, that auditors can influence the interaction as much as the direct addressee. In his study, speakers in a classroom shift between standard Danish and a local dialect, and Ladegaard concludes that the auditors in this situation are in fact implicitly addressed as much as the addressee is, and therefore can influence the interaction as much. Bell himself also accords greater priority to auditors and overhearers when the choice is between different languages and not just between different styles:
The sharper the linguistic differences between codes, the larger the issue of intelligibility looms, the stronger are the pressures to accommodate to the audience, and hence the greater the influence of peripheral members on the speaker. Use of a language which is unintelligible to any interlocutor defines that person out of the audience. It is the ultimate in dissociative behaviour, designating the uncomprehending hearer an unratified eavesdropper, a nonmember, even a nonperson. (1984:176)

That the influence of auditors and overhearers is much greater in situations of language choice is confirmed by Gal (1979) who shows that the presence of monolingual auditors determines language choice.

Bell acknowledges that other factors than audience influence style shift, e.g. topic and setting. Bell hypothesises, however, that variation according to topic and setting presupposes variation according to addressee. Speakers associate topics and settings with classes of persons and shift style when talking about those topics or in those settings as if talking to the addressees they associate with them (1984:181). This means that e.g. talk about education will cause a speaker to shift to a style appropriate to talking to a teacher. With regard to language choice in bilingual settings, Bell argues, however, that “[n]onpersonal factors such as topic and setting which influence style shift fade to insignificance”, because a bilingual does not have the luxury of switching according to topic or setting if there are members of the audience who do not understand the other language (1984:180).

Audience design, as discussed above, is responsive in nature. Another type of style shifting is ‘initiative’ shifting. Where Bell compares ‘responsive’ shifts to situational codeswitching (cf. Blom and Gumperz, 1972), he likens ‘initiative’ shifts to metaphorical switching or to “injecting the flavour of one setting onto another, alien context” (1984:182). Initiative style shifts are when a change of style changes the situation or redefines the relationship between speaker and addressee. This ability to use style to redefine situations is contingent on the regular association of certain styles with certain situations. Bell sees initiative style shifting as the marked form which is derived from responsive, unmarked style shifting,
(and draws here on Myers-Scotton’s early work on marked and unmarked codeswitching).

Despite the differences between a speaker-oriented paradigm and a relational one, the approaches discussed above do share important similarities. When Myers-Scotton writes of speakers weighing costs and rewards before making choices, it seems that among those costs and rewards might easily be social approval or communicative efficiency, goals which communication accommodation theory lists as the motivation behind language choices. Furthermore, in what Myers-Scotton (1993b) calls ‘the virtuosity maxim’ – which directs speakers to codeswitch in order to include participants who do not understand the unmarked choice of code – there are clear parallels to Bell’s audience design model and to communication accommodation theory, since language choice in this case must be said to be audience-oriented and a case of convergence. Also, codeswitching as a marked choice is when a speaker makes a choice in order to change the addressee’s view of him or their relationship. The motivation behind marked choices is “to negotiate a change in the expected social distance holding between participants, either increasing or decreasing it” (Myers-Scotton, 1993b:132). This definition again seems to agree with the basic tenets of communication accommodation theory and audience design, namely that the audience is a significant factor in language choice.

Working within an interactionist paradigm, the two latter theories (Giles and Coupland and Bell) do hold more promise as useful tools for my analysis. And more recent articles from two of the above-mentioned authors show that thinking about style has taken a turn in the new millennium, namely towards an even more interaction- and identity-oriented perspective.

6.6 Language choice in the new millennium: communicative goals, style and identity

In a later reworking of his own framework, Bell (2001) emphasises the dynamic nature of linguistic choices. In this later edition of audience design, Bell wants the framework to be able to account for the fact that
we are continually making creative, dynamic choices on the linguistic representation of our identities, particularly in relation to those others we are interacting with or who are salient to us. (2001:165)

This use of style to represent identity is what Bell originally termed referee design or initiative shifting. But where initiative shifting in the 1984 paper was an add-on to audience design, in this modification of the original framework Bell argues that initiative shifting should be thought of as an ever-present part of individuals’ language use: “We are always positioning ourselves in relation to our own ingroup and other groups, and our interlocutors.” Hence, audience design and initiative shifting should be thought of as complementary and co-existent dimensions of style, “which operate simultaneously in all speech events” (2001:165).

Furthermore, Bell emphasises the dynamic nature of contexts as in part created by language use. In some situations, Bell says, “language may be virtually the sole determinant of context” (2001:164).

Also Coupland (2001b) offers a new take on style and the ‘addressee effect’. In line with Bell’s dynamic and interactional focus, Coupland argues that we should consider style as a situational achievement, and as the fulfilment of communicative purposes in relation to those social situations. He draws on communication science where three core dimensions of communicative purposes are often identified: instrumental, relational and identity goals. The last two goals in particular are important in Coupland’s suggestion that we see style as persona management. Where communication accommodation theory proposes that stylistic choices have an effect on the listener’s perceptions of the speaker, Coupland here suggests that the speaker in his linguistic choices is oriented to his own self-evaluations. Seeing style as identity work means that the distinctions between situational and metaphorical codeswitching, unmarked and marked codeswitching and responsive and initiative style-shifting become blurred, since all shifts can be explained by

---

34 See also Tracy and Coupland (1990) on communicative goals.
style as identity work. From a self-identity perspective, even shifts that are unmarked, responsive or situationally conditioned are creative and open to speakers’ choices. Speakers here just opt to stay within normative bounds. All style shifting is then, to follow Coupland’s line of thought, metaphorical and creative.

Coupland also suggests that we rethink the ‘addressee’ effect as it was proposed in accommodation theory and in audience design. For communication accommodation theory, Coupland suggests a shift from recognizing ‘accommodated styles’ to recognising speakers as ‘being accommodative’. Hence, the use of a convergence strategy to achieve social approval could also be thought of as “projecting a version of our self-identity which is somehow ‘consistent with’ an interlocutor’s” (2001b:201). Similarly, audience design does not necessarily mean reducing dissimilarities between interlocutors’ speech, the design could be to offer a complementary persona. Coupland concludes that addressee-related style-shifts are better explained as strategies in the arena of persona management, an interpretation which is, says Coupland, entirely consistent with findings previously represented as audience effects. As I understand it, what Coupland argues is that if speakers converge to their listeners, they do so because they wish to project an accommodating persona, i.e. to be seen by others as being accommodating. Is that really so different from communication accommodation theory where people accommodate to achieve social approval? As Coupland himself says, the shift in emphasis is a subtle one. And I would say, in both cases the audience is a powerful factor.

Both Bell’s focus on interaction and Coupland’s focus on communicative purposes, including identity goals, are integrated into the analysis in chapter 7.

6.7 Microanalysis

The microanalysis in chapter 7 is grounded in the tradition of interactional sociolinguistics pioneered by John Gumperz. In Discourse Strategies, Gumperz calls for “a sociolinguistic theory which accounts for the communicative functions of linguistic variability and for its relation to
speakers’ goals without reference to untestable functionalist assumptions about conformity or nonconformance to closed systems of norms” (1982:29). Furthermore, Gumperz states, “empirical methods must be found to determine the extent to which underlying knowledge is shared” (1982:30). Gumperz’ theory focusses on interaction as an ongoing collaborative process between speaker and listener, and with the focus on interaction comes a focus on ethnographic data collection. The data used within this paradigm includes participant observation, audio and video recordings of interactions and playing recordings for participants and asking them to comment. In the analysis of these data

[t]he analyst’s task is to make an in depth study of selected instances of verbal interaction, observe whether or not actors understand each other, elicit participants’ interpretation of what goes on, and then (a) deduce the social assumptions that speakers must have made in order to act as they do, and (b) determine empirically how linguistic signs communicate in the interpretation process. (1982:35-36)

Rampton further specifies the purpose of what he calls interactional sociolinguistic micro-discourse analysis as the production of:

detailed and fairly comprehensive analyses of key episodes, drawing on a range of frameworks to describe both small- and large-scale phenomena and processes (e.g. pronunciation, grammar, genres, interaction structures, institutions, social networks) and … given coherence by the theoretical view of communication as an ‘on-line’, moment-to-moment process. (2006:24)

Rampton describes his method of microanalysis, a method I have also used in the following, as an ‘immersion process’:

Once potentially relevant transcripts had been selected, I would go over them in more transcriptional detail, and then try to ‘inhabit’ each of them, putting my sense of a developing argument to one side, taking instead a slow, close look at the moment-by-moment unfolding of each episode, bringing in different concepts from
linguistics and discourse analysis in provisional ways, exploring whether they could help illuminate what was going on. For this immersion process, I tried to work with a rule that I would never put pen to paper about a conceptual link between one fragment and another, or incorporate an extract into a prose commentary or argument, until I had spent at least one hour on it. (2006:396)

Rampton reports that although he sometimes struggled to fill up the time, mostly he spent several hours on each transcript and ended up with much clearer ideas about which aspects of the interaction he could make plausible claims about and which he could not.

With a data material as big as mine (37,5 hours of recordings from the research department) my initial focus was on finding key examples for analysis. For this purpose, I listened through all the recordings and identified key episodes. These episodes were then transcribed and subsequently analysed following Rampton’s description in the above quote. The different concepts from linguistics and discourse analysis brought into the analysis were of course not completely random, but influenced by my research interests. Since I was interested in language choice, I had this angle in mind when doing my analyses and drawing in concepts. Specifically, I have drawn on the theories on language choice and codeswitching discussed in this chapter. As described above, Gumperz’ analyses rely heavily on participant feedback on recordings. I have also used this method in my focus group interviews, but it has played only a minor role in my analytic process.
7 Language choice analysis

In this chapter I focus on answering the questions asked for the second study: What are the factors influencing language choice in a specific situation? Does the formality/informality of the situation play a role? How important is language competence? Situational factors are not the only factors influencing language choice, however, and should be seen in conjunction with norms for language choice, which were covered in the previous analysis, and language ideologies, which will be covered in the next. The chapter begins with an ethnographic case study of the department where the data for this analysis was collected.

7.1 The research department

In the research department employees are either research scientists (with PhDs) or laboratory technicians. While the research scientists, or ‘academics’ as they are called, plan experiments, write reports and participate in project meetings with scientists from other departments, the technicians carry out the experiments in the labs with rats or mice and document the results. The technicians in the department all have a Danish background, while the academics have Danish, British, German and French backgrounds. One of the international academics is also the head of department. In addition to these two groups, the employees include two Danish master thesis students and one Danish secretary.

With international academics among the staff, English is used frequently in the research department. Danish is still the default spoken language, however, and is used frequently among the Danes. Emails with the whole department as recipients are mostly in English, except for those with a more social content which tend to be in Danish. The international employees were offered Danish classes upon arrival, but the offers varied. One employee was offered a one-week intensive course, another took lessons for three months, three hours three times a week. Of the three one now speaks some Danish, while the other two know only very little. The academics consider themselves fluent in English, while the technicians all describe themselves as almost fluent. However, despite good speaking abilities, they frequently have problems understanding native speakers.
especially, as well as very technical language. They also experience difficulties when writing English.

The linguistic divide between academics and technicians is not simply due to the different educational levels of research scientists and laboratory technicians. While the technicians are firmly rooted in the Danish language and culture, the academics, including the Danish academic, are part of the international community of practice of scientific research, where English is the common language. One academic describes it in this way:

> in research the language is English ... in research it is more international to start with because you publish in English and ... you’re always being told if you for example do a PhD somewhere that you are supposed to switch labs afterwards and you are also actually supposed to switch countries so people are much more open towards actually living abroad and living for only short periods of time in different countries at different labs

(Andreas, international research employee)

Part of being a research scientist at Lundbeck is to write articles for international publication and to participate in international conferences. In addition, all the academics have been educated in an international environment. While the technicians work alongside the academics, they are not full members of the research community of practice. They do not go to conferences, read articles or write papers. Still, the practices of the community influence their everyday working lives and their language choices, and as such they can be described as marginal members of the international research community of practice.

The employees frequently codeswitch between Danish and English, and it is these codeswitches which are the focus of the analysis. The primary data for the analysis are 37½ hours of self-recordings by three informants chosen to reflect the diversity in the department, in terms of nationalities, linguistic resources and job types. Kate is a British research scientist, and a native speaker of English. She took Danish classes when she arrived at Lundbeck about a year before the data collection took place, but her Danish proficiency remains very low. Andreas is a German research scientist. While German is his mother tongue, he has good English proficiency and some Danish proficiency. Lisa is a Danish lab
technician. She is a native speaker of Danish with some English proficiency. The choice of these three informants ensured that I would get recordings of a wide range of interactions with a wide range of participants, both in and outside the department. Table 2 shows the 12 employees in the research department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Head of department, research scientist</td>
<td>British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andreas</td>
<td>Research scientist</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Research scientist</td>
<td>Danish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Research scientist</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Lab technician</td>
<td>Danish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Lab technician</td>
<td>Danish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iben</td>
<td>Lab technician</td>
<td>Danish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone</td>
<td>Lab technician</td>
<td>Danish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussi</td>
<td>Lab technician</td>
<td>Danish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Master’s student</td>
<td>Danish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasmus</td>
<td>Master’s student</td>
<td>Danish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stine</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Danish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Employees in the research department

In addition to these twelve informants, a number of other informants are also present in some of the recordings, most frequently in recordings of meetings outside the department.

7.2 Situational factors influencing language choice

As described in the ethnographic study in chapter 5, the norms for language choice are focussed on the language competence of the addressee(s). In the present microanalytic study of situational factors influencing language choice, language competence is also central. In section 7.2.1 I discuss how language competence is linked with language choice in this lingua franca setting. The analysis in the ethnography
chapter also showed that norms for language choice were applied differently in formal and informal situations. In section 7.2.2 the microanalysis reveals that a continuum from formal to informal is not sufficient to capture the complexity of the factors influencing language choice. Understanding language choice requires that we pay attention to the topic and genre of the interaction as well as participants’ goals. In section 7.2.3 I discuss how competence, genre and goal in combination influence language choice.

7.2.1 Competence relations

While competence is perhaps not a situational factor in the strictest sense, the competence relations between participants certainly are, since competence relations vary according to the composition of participants and are thus very much a product of the situation. By competence relations I mean the relationship between the speaker’s perceived competence and the perceived competence of all audience members. In this section, competence relations are shown to influence language choice on a number of linguistic levels, from one speaker’s choice of different languages in interactions with different addressees to one-word codeswitches due to a lack of vocabulary.

As fundamental as the language competence of addressees is to the process of language choice, the speaker’s own competence is even more fundamental. As Gardner-Chloros notes: “you can only exercise a choice to the extent that you speak both varieties sufficiently to have an alternative” (1991:179). In theory the influence of competence relations is straightforward: if speaker A speaks Danish and English, and speaker B English, but no Danish, the language choice will be English. In reality, the relation is almost never that straightforward. As described in the ethnography chapter, in a lingua franca setting such as Lundbeck, the linguistic resources of participants are very diverse. It is not just a question of whether your interlocutor speaks Danish or English. The question is, rather, whether she speaks Danish or English well enough for the purpose of the current interaction, and whether she feels comfortable
enough using Danish or English for this interaction. It is important to remember that we are talking about *perceived* language competence, since the speaker has no way of ascertaining the actual competence of the addressee. This is also the case with the speaker’s own competence. It is not hard to imagine that a speaker’s perception of her own competence may differ from her actual competence. For instance, if a speaker feels that her English competence is not good enough for the interaction at hand, she will choose to use Danish based on this perception, even if her English competence in objective terms would suffice.

The usefulness of the theoretical construct ‘competence relations’ is explicated in the analysis of the following two examples where Andreas, the German research scientist with some Danish skills and good English skills, initiates informal conversations with two Danish colleagues:

**Ex1**

1. ANDREAS: hej Sussi går det bedre
2. SUSSI: ja ja
3. ANDREAS: ja
4. SUSSI: det er simpelthen noget det er en frygtelig uge
5. LISA: xxx
6. SUSSI: det er jamen jeg ved jeg har været syg og øh syge børn og
7. ANDREAS: ja
8. SUSSI: ja
9. ANDREAS: men hvad med børn
10. SUSSI: ah ja Tristan kastede op i nat men han er i vuggestue og han var okay i morges så jeg håber bare
11. LISA: [de ikke ringer]
12. ANDREAS: [okay]

1. ANDREAS: hi Sussi are you doing better
2. SUSSI: yeah yeah
3. ANDREAS: yes
4. SUSSI: it is just it is a terrible week
5. LISA: xxx
6. SUSSI: it is I don’t know I have been ill and er sick children and

---

35 As touched upon in chapter 5, in addition to the language competence of the speaker and the immediate audience, the competence of the expected, or potential future, addressees is also important for some types of interaction, e.g. emails.
ANDREAS: yeah
SUSSI: yeah
ANDREAS: but what about children
SUSSI: oh well Tristan threw up last night but he is
at day-care today and he was okay this morning
so I just hope
LISA: [they won’t call]
ANDREAS: [okay]

Ex2
   (Andreas walks down the hallway)
   LIS: hi
   ANDREAS: hi Lis
   (more walking and chairs being pulled out)
   ANDREAS: had a good weekend (.)
   LIS: oh (.) yeah
   ANDREAS: not really
   LIS: I have a cold so
   ANDREAS: you too everybody [is ill]
   LIS: [chuckles]

In both examples his interlocutors are Danish, but where Andreas chooses Danish with Sussi, he chooses English with Lis. Ex2 takes place shortly after ex1. The topic is similar (how was your weekend, illness), but the (type of) participant has changed, and with that, I hypothesise, Andreas’ assessment of the language competence of his interlocutor, and hence the competence relations. Sussi is a lab technician, but Lis is a fellow research scientist (from another department). This pattern is reproduced in Andreas’ other interactions: he chooses Danish with lab technicians and English with research scientists. As described in section 7.1, while all the research scientists in his department consider themselves fluent in English, the lab technicians typically describe themselves as almost fluent and outline a number of problems in relation to the use of English.

In his ethnographic interview, Andreas says that he tries to use only Danish in interactions with lab technicians as a way of practising his Danish. If him wanting to practice his Danish was the only reason for this language choice, one would think that he would choose to practice his Danish with Dames - and not just lab technicians. The fact that the lab technicians are thought to prefer Danish due to their somewhat limited English competence probably also plays a part here. English competence is not the only factor which divides technicians and research scientists,
however. As described in 7.1, the research scientists are part of the international community of practice of scientific research, where English is necessary for the sharing of knowledge both within the company and in the wider community (cf. also Madsen, 2009). The lab technicians, on the other hand, although they work with international research scientists, are at best marginal members of this international community, but can more accurately be described as members of the Lundbeck lab technician community of practice. These different community of practice memberships may also influence language choice.

Audience roles

The question of competence relations becomes even more complex when more than two participants are present. In his theory on audience design, Bell (1984) differentiates between direct addressee(s) and auditors. While direct addressees are known, ratified and addressed members of the audience, auditors are just known and ratified. Generally, the effect of an auditor on linguistic choices is less than that of the direct addressee (1984:175). When the choice is between different languages and not just between different styles, however, Bell argues that because intelligibility becomes more important, auditors have a greater influence on the language choice. The speaker would not only be concerned with choosing a language the addressee understands, but one which all audience members understand. This theory is supported by a study by Gal (1979) which shows that the presence of monolingual auditors determines language choice in otherwise bilingual interactions. This would mean in my case that English is the only possible choice in the presence of non-Danish-speakers. The norm at Lundbeck is to use English whenever a non-Danish-speaker is present, but the language practices are far more complex. In order to understand these complex practices, Bell’s original hypothesis, that the direct addressee influences language choice more than auditors do, is helpful.

The following example is from a department meeting. Most of the participants are native speakers of Danish or have a high level of

---

36 See also section 6.5 for a discussion of audience design.
competence in Danish, but Kate and Jean do not. The language has been English for most of the meeting, but with some codeswatches to Danish. Towards the end of the meeting, the department Christmas party is on the agenda. Kate, the head of department, is suggesting an international Christmas party with dishes and drinks from the different countries represented in the department. When the excerpt begins Kate is suggesting that the employees group together according to nationality and choose a national drink to bring.

In order to understand the switch to Danish in line 5, we need to look at who the addressees are. Heidi changes the topic by referring to a previous
Christmas party, and to a specific kind of alcohol they had at this party. Since both Kate and Jean are relative newcomers to the department, they were not present for this previous party, and Heidi is therefore not addressing them directly when she asks “kan du huske/do you remember” (where ‘du’ is the second person singular pronoun in Danish). They are still part of the audience, but as auditors they do not influence the language choice as much as the direct addressees, in this case all fellow Danish-speakers.

The differentiation between direct addressees and auditors can also explain the choice of Danish in other interactions where non-Danish-speakers are part of the audience. For instance, the non-Danish-speaking informants pointed out that the small talk taking place after meetings conducted in English would typically be in Danish. My data shows that what happens is that the participants break into smaller groups as they leave the meeting. The small talk does not then have all participants as direct addressees, even though they are all still present. This means that for instance Danish-speakers choose Danish if their direct addressees are all fellow Danish-speakers. Thus, when some participants switch from English to Danish the instant the meeting ends, it is not primarily because of a change in topic or in the formality of the situation, but rather because of a change in audience roles.

**Codeswitching due to limited proficiency**

The influence of competence relations is not just seen in cases of different language choices with different interlocutors, but also in codeswitching in the course of an interaction with no change in participants. In some interactions involving participants with low or some Danish competence, the conversation begins in Danish and then switches to English when the learner’s proficiency is exhausted. The conversation is then finished in English. In the following example the switch happens already after the initial greeting. Julie, the Danish research scientist, is walking first past and then into Kate’s office. Kate is the British head of department.

```plaintext
Ex4
1 JULIE: godmorgen
```
In Kate’s recordings, all her interactions are in English, except for four examples where she is greeted in Danish and responds in Danish. (And then there is the case of the “nej/no” in line 10 here which sounds like an exaggerated Danish “nej”, but could arguably be a dialectal version of “no”). In the ethnographic interview Kate describes her Danish competence as two on a scale going from one to nine, and her colleagues describe her as a non-Danish-speaker. It is highly likely then that her Danish competence is less than sufficient for a conversation in Danish. The interesting question here then is perhaps not so much “why the switch to English?” as “why do they begin in Danish in the first place?”. I will elaborate on this in the section below on greetings.

In a similar example, it is the learner, Andreas, who first chooses Danish, and then switches to English:

Ex5

1 (phone rings)
2 ANDREAS: det er Andreas (.) hej Karl (4.0) ja måske
3 (chuckles) nej engelsk er bedre (4.0) yeah I
4 thought so I just thought maybe
5 roughly (6.0) okay

2 ANDREAS: Andreas speaking (.) hi Karl (4.0) yes maybe
3 (chuckles) no English is better (4.0)
It sounds as if Karl brings up the question of language choice for the interaction immediately after the initial greetings, and Andreas then chooses English. They finish the phone call in English. Based on data from his ethnographic interview, my interpretation is that Andreas’ language choices here are competence-related, both his initial choice of Danish, which displays an ability and a willingness to use and practice his Danish, and his subsequent choice of English, which is a result of a lack of competence in Danish. I understand “nej engelsk er bedre/no English is better” as him stating that it will be easier for them to have this conversation in English.

These examples lend force to the hypothesis of the presence of a ‘Danish is default’ norm as presented in the ethnographic analysis. These and similar examples show the insistence of either learners or their interlocutors on using Danish as far as possible, and also, I believe, a willingness on the part of the Danish-speakers to help their colleagues learn Danish by interacting with them in that language. As the last example showed, the Danish-speakers also display a willingness to accommodate to the learner when this is required.

**Codeswitching used for clarification**

One further type of codeswitching influenced by competence is the use of intersentential codeswitching as clarification. The direction of the switch can be from Danish to English or from English to Danish (and in one case from English to German), and can be of a length from one to several clauses. In the following example Andreas, the previously mentioned German research scientist with some Danish skills, is in the Danish secretary Stine’s office discussing how to register holidays and time off correctly. Andreas started the conversation in Danish, and after this excerpt they continue in Danish.

Ex25

1 STINE: øhm du skal ikke tage dig af det der ikke mødt
2 ikke mødt
3 ANDREAS: hvad er det
4 STINE: det er fordi du er ikke på øh tidsregistrering
5 ANDREAS: ja
6 STINE: du ved laboranter og og andre uundværlige
ANDREAS: ja
STINE: personer de øhm (.) skal stemple hvornår de er kommet og gået
ANDREAS: ja men hvorfor står der ikke mødt
STINE: det er fordi øh
ANDREAS: jeg har ikke (chuckles)
STINE: nej men det skal du ikke tage dig af
just forget it
ANDREAS: okay (.). okay det betyder ingenting
STINE: nej det betyder ingenting det der betyder noget
for dig det er fravær ik
ANDREAS: ja

STINE: er you don’t need to pay attention to the not present not present
ANDREAS: what is it
STINE: it’s because you don’t have to register hours
ANDREAS: yes
STINE: you know lab techs and other indispensable personnel they er (.) have to clock in when they come and go
ANDREAS: yes but why does it say not present
STINE: that’s because er
ANDREAS: I didn’t (chuckles)
STINE: no but you don’t have to worry about that just forget it
ANDREAS: okay (.). okay it doesn’t mean anything
STINE: no it doesn’t mean anything what does mean something to you that’s absences right
ANDREAS: yes

From the beginning of the excerpt, Stine is explaining to Andreas that “ikke mødt/not present” is not applicable to him (presumably they are looking at a document on the computer). She is trying to explain that this is only relevant for employees who register how many hours a week they work (“laboranter og andre uundværlige/lab techs and and other indispensable personnel”), as opposed to research scientists who do not. Andreas clearly does not understand as evidenced by his questions in lines 3 and 10. When in line 12 he seems to want to explain that he has not been “not present”, Stine’s patience seems to wear thin, and she gives up trying to explain and instead reiterates her point from line 1 that this is not something Andreas should worry about. She then switches to English and adds the more forceful and less polite “just forget it”. The switch here serves to clarify her point, but it also adds emphasis to her statement.
Codeswitching due to a lack of vocabulary

One further type of codeswitching is influenced, or in this case rather determined, by a lack of language competence. Single-word intrasentential codeswitches often seem to be motivated by a lack of vocabulary. These switches are typically from English to Danish, but also occur from Danish to English (even by Danes). Where the language choices in the previous examples were influenced by the competence relations, i.e. the competence of all participants, this type of codeswitching is to a lesser degree related to the language competence of the addressee. Speakers codeswitch because they do not know the word they need in the language they are speaking. In this next example, Kate, the British head of department, and Iben, a Danish lab technician just back from maternity leave, are in a meeting discussing Iben’s future work assignments. Kate has very limited Danish skills. The meeting is conducted in English, but before this excerpt Iben has several times searched for the English words and once before codeswitched to Danish.

Ex6

1  IBEN:     so it would be nice to also maybe start up
2  [something new]
3  KATE:     [okay]
4  IBEN:     and and follow the process
5  KATE:     yeah
6  IBEN:     because as soon as it is standard and then you
7  know other people can run it too but it's
8  (1.0)it's nice also to [have tried]
9  KATE:     [okay]
10 IBEN:     to (.) to have the er (2.0) foregående (1.0) er
11     (1.0) erm (1.0) oh I don't know the English
12     word
13  KATE:     I don't know that as a Danish word (laughs)
14
15  IBEN:     erm (.)(sighs) when you begin the work
16     it's like you don't know which is the right way
17     to do
18  KATE:     er
19  IBEN:     and you just try to to find [another]
20  KATE:     [yeah] just like
21  IBEN:     trial and error you are trying things that xxx
22  KATE:     [yes]
23  IBEN:     so you are kind of learning from your own
24  IBEN:     yeah [exactly] that
25  KATE:     [okay]
That the switch to Danish “foregående/preliminary”\(^\text{37}\) in line 10 is caused by a lack of vocabulary seems clear from the hesitation and pauses preceding the switch as well as the meta comment “oh I don’t know the English word” following it. It is interesting that Iben switches to Danish even though it is unlikely that Kate will understand her. Perhaps Iben hopes that Kate will understand the Danish word from the context (as had happened when Iben used the Danish word “barsel/maternity leave” in the same interaction). The subsequent line makes it clear that she does not, however. The use of the Danish word itself could also be a way of indicating that she is searching for a word (as opposed to just not knowing what to say). This would explain the use of Danish with someone who cannot be expected to understand it.

Some one-word codeswitches from English to Danish which are also to some extent motivated by a lack of vocabulary are nevertheless not competence-related. Instead, I argue, they are a special type of loanwords. The following example is again from the department meeting where the annual Christmas party is discussed. Here the participants are debating what food to bring.

It has just been suggested that each nationality bring a course for the meal.

Ex7

\begin{verbatim}
  1 KATE: I’m happy doing any course I just didn’t want
  2 the Brits to get stuck doing all the main
  3 [course]
  4 JEAN: [or the French] because that is probably the
  5 one with the most
  6 MICHAEL: xxx
  7 KATE: is it (.) the main
  8 MICHAEL: xxx
  9 JEAN: yeah
 10 JULIE: so you’re when you are saying main course you
 11 are thinking on: a julefrokost in
 12 KATE: yeah
 13 JULIE: [okay so we just have to pick a]
 14 ANDREAS: [I mean is it is it difficult] to make
\end{verbatim}

\(^\text{37}\) While the direct translation for ‘foregående’ is more along the lines of ‘preceding’ or ‘previous’, from Iben’s explanations it seems as though she is referring to the work that comes before the actual experiment, finding out how to do it.
When Julie says “julefrokost/Christmas lunch” in line 11, she is using the term to refer to the Danish tradition of having lots of smaller dishes making up a meal or in this case a main course (similar to a ‘smorgasbord’, except ‘julefrokost’ is specifically a Christmas tradition). Since there is no English equivalent, she uses the Danish word, and successfully: Kate’s “yeah” in line 12 indicates that she understands the term. Even so, Julie explains in lines 18-22 exactly what is meant by “a normal julefrokost”: that there will be different dishes. Andreas’ use of “flæskesteg/roast pork” in line 15 is another example of the same. Although “roast pork” would be an adequate literal translation, the Danish “flæskesteg” carries different connotations, in this context those of a traditional Danish julefrokost dish. Since the participants live and work in a Danish cultural context, it is not surprising that they need to refer to Danish culture, and that the English vocabulary might not be adequate to do so. The question is whether “julefrokost” and “flæskesteg” really are examples of codeswitching, or whether they are a type of loanwords. Myers-Scotton (1993a:169) suggests that borrowings should be divided into cultural forms and core forms. The core forms are items for which the matrix language always has viable equivalents. They can thus be considered redundant and with a status equivalent to codeswitched forms. Cultural forms represent objects or concepts new to the matrix language culture, and should as such be considered borrowings and not codeswitches. While “julefrokost” and “flæskesteg” clearly are not established loanwords in either British or American English, I would argue that they can be seen as cultural forms or loanwords when English is used as a lingua franca in a Danish context.

In other examples of cultural loanwords in my data, the culture that participants refer to is not the Danish culture, but the Lundbeck culture.
The following example is from another department meeting, Kate is moving on to the next item on the agenda when one of the lab technicians brings up a question:

Ex8

1 KATE: er small kind of management stuff the first erm
2 as you know Sussi is leaving us oh sorry are
3 you done
4 HEIDI: erm I was gonna ask a question I realised er a
5 few weeks ago I had an accident down in the:
6 (... stofudlevering where I spilled er (...) I
7 lost my er (...) compound
8 KATE: yeah
9 HEIDI: and I think that what happened was that er when
10 er we have this what do you say code on now
11 MICHAEL: barcode
12 HEIDI: barcode yeah (...) when er in the washing when
13 this barcode's coming off it's kind of sticky
14 now
15 KATE: okay

In line 6 Heidi switches to the Danish “stofudlevering/substance dispensary”. The switch is marked by hesitation (the prolonged vowel in “the”) and a pause as if she is searching for the word in English first. She is referring to a room where the lab technicians go to pick up the chemical substances they need for their laboratory work. Given that this is an area where only lab technicians work, most signs and posters in the room are in Danish, and it is entirely conceivable that the room name does not have an established English equivalent. A few lines further on in line 10 when Heidi again needs a word (“barcode”) she employs a different strategy and asks “what do you say”, prompting Michael to supply the word “barcode”. The use of a different strategy here suggests that “stofudlevering” simply does not have an English equivalent, but is part of the local cultural style. Kate’s “yeah” in line 8 indicates that she has understood the term and thus supports the theory that it is a loanword.

Competence and the lingua franca setting

While the above sections deal with language choice on a number of different linguistic levels, what ties them together is the fact that language competence is a major factor influencing language choice in each of the
examples. As discussed in the theoretical preliminaries, language competence may very well play a different role in language choice in a lingua franca setting than in a bilingual setting. Where Gumperz concludes that “[c]onsiderations of intelligibility, lucidity or ease of expression, important as they are in some instances, can therefore not be the main determining reasons [for codeswitching among bilinguals]” (1982:64-65), the above analysis shows that at Lundbeck, a Danish company where English is used as a corporate language, intelligibility and ease of expression are among the main determining reasons for both codeswitching and language choices more generally.

What the above analysis also reveals is that language competence in this context is a complex matter. Language choice is influenced not only by the speaker’s competence in the available languages, but rather by the relation between the speaker and the addressees’ perceived language competence. And while the competence factor most of the time drives participants to choose the language which ensures the highest degree of comprehensibility for the present conversation, in some cases participants may choose a language with a more long-term goal in mind, namely that of becoming competent in a new language. As discussed in the ethnographic analysis and in relation to example 5 above, some learners of Danish choose Danish for an interaction because they wish to increase their language competence, even though the conversation would flow more easily in English.

Another facet of the competence factor not touched upon so far is the fact that a majority of the speakers at Lundbeck share a mother tongue, namely Danish. The shared competence means that it is possible for Danish speakers to use this as a resource when their English competence fails. We see this in a number of examples where participants switch to Danish in order to ask for help from fellow Danish speakers when searching for an English word. In this example, Stine and Poul are both native speakers of Danish, while Kate is British with very limited Danish skills.

Ex9

1  STINE:  I've been with my (.). eldest son we had a troll
When Stine introduces the new topic “troll party”, presumably referring to a birthday party with a troll theme, Stine seems to be uncertain about the word “troll”, so she asks Kate in line 4 if she understands the word. When Kate replies in the negative, Stine turns to Poul for help with “hvad hedder det/what is that called”. At least he understands it as such when he immediately confirms that her choice of the word “troll” is correct. Kate then clarifies that she had just not heard of a troll party before and that was why she did not immediately understand.

This next example shows that this resource is not only used by native speakers of Danish, but that Danish competence is an important interactional resource for all Danish speakers. This excerpt is from a meeting between Lone, Maja and Stine, who are all Danes, and Andreas, the German research scientist. They are planning a social event for the division. During the meeting they switch back and forth between Danish and English, and while many of the switches do not seem to be competence-related, the switch in line 8 here is.

Ex10

1. LONE: have you told Andreas what we talked about last time
2. MAJA: different er things people could join boating and fishing and
3. STINE: I think maybe I mentioned it but you can mention it again (.)
4. MAJA: that we talked about it should be some kind of er (.) hvad kalder man det charterferie
5. STINE: ja
6. MAJA: tema
7. ANDREAS: charter
8. MAJA: ja
Here the other Danes do not provide the English term Maja needs, instead Andreas indicates with his “ja/yes” in line 14 that he understands the Danish term. (In line 12 the intonation indicates that he is asking for confirmation that he has understood or perhaps heard correctly). These examples show how shared competence in one language allows speakers to use codeswitching to overcome a lack of vocabulary in another language. Klimpfinger (2009) lists ‘appealing for assistance’ as one function of codeswitching. In her examples speakers also codeswitch to ask for a word (e.g. “was heisst xxx/what is xxx called”). She concludes that asking for words is in some situations the most effective way of achieving the communicative goal and that such switches occur more frequently in what she calls ‘goal-oriented talk’ in the professional domain. I would argue that all talk is goal-oriented. The goals differ, however, from one context to another.

In summary, competence is shown to be a very influential factor in language choice at Lundbeck. The norms developed for language choice revolve around the competence of addressees, but also the speaker’s own competence is shown to be relevant to language choice. Traditional studies of codeswitching (e.g. Auer, 1998; Gumperz, 1982; Poplack, 1980) argue against the view that codeswitching occurs for reasons of limited proficiency, but these studies took place in bilingual settings. Roberts (2008) also mentions competence as an explanation for codeswitching. In the institutional setting of the international university “proficiency again can be seen as one explanation for code-switching as participants negotiate a central or peripheral participation depending on their linguistic resources” (Roberts, 2008:11). The institutional setting of an
international workplace has a number of similarities with the international university, e.g. a minority of foreign nationals and great diversity in the linguistic backgrounds of the employees. And in both settings, competence appears to be an influential factor in language choice.

7.2.2 Topic, genre and goal

While it is clear from the above analysis that competence is an important factor in language choice, competence relations alone cannot account for all language choices and codeswitches in my material. In some interactions, speakers codeswitch even though the participants - and therefore the competence relations - do not change, for instance during a meeting.38 The data show that these codeswitches typically coincide with a change in topic. Not all topic changes are equally important in relation to language choice, however. It is typically when a change in topic coincides with a change in the genre of the interaction that participants codeswitch. According to Hymes’ SPEAKING model, genres are categories which can be identified by a set of formal characteristics or markers. All genres have these markers, even what is sometimes described as casual speech (1974:61-62). Genres in my material include business presentation, administrative talk and lunchtime small talk. In some instances, however, topic and genre are not enough to capture what goes on. In these cases the language choices are linked to participants’ goals. Under the heading ‘purpose’, Hymes differentiates between outcomes and goals (1974:56). Where outcomes are conventionally recognised and expected, and thus seem to function at a community level, goals are more individual and related to participants’ motives. For my purposes here, goal, in the sense of participants’ motives, is the useful analytical term.

As pointed out by Tracy and Coupland (1990) and Coupland (2001b), participants in an interaction usually have multiple goals. One type of goal is the task or instrumental goal. Tracy and Coupland also define this as “the purpose of the interaction” (1990:5). Another type of goal is

---

38 And the codeswitching in these examples cannot be accounted for solely in terms of limited proficiency as in examples 4 and 5 above.
identity goals, i.e. concerns with presenting oneself. A third type of goal is relational goals, i.e. concerns with the relationship between participants. In my data all three types of goals are relevant to language choice as we shall see in the following.

**Lunchtime small talk vs. technicians’ business talk**

In these next two examples, Lisa, a Danish lab technician, is in the canteen having lunch with the rest of the department. Kate, the British head of department, Julie, a Danish research scientist, and Lone, a Danish lab tech, are seated near Lisa. After a short pause, Lisa initiates this conversation (in which Lone does not take part):

**Ex11**

1. LISA: was it planned from the beginning that you were
2. JULIE: going to the (.) to this concert
3. LISA: no it was last Sunday she said there was still
4. JULIE: tickets
5. LISA: o:h (.) who did you went with
6. JULIE: I er yeah one of my friends Sanne
7. LISA: okay
8. JULIE: was it all women
9. KATE: (laughs)
10. LISA: no: but it was er (1.0) it was adult

After this excerpt Julie, Kate, Lone and Lisa continue to talk about concerts in English. At the same time, colleagues from the department are carrying out a conversation in Danish in the background. Approximately five minutes later, after another pause in the conversation during which people eat, Lisa again initiates a conversation:

**Ex12**

1. LISA: kører du <type et> træning
2. LONE: øh det gør Iben
3. LISA: ah

1. LISA: are you running <type one> training
2. LONE: er Iben is
3. LISA: oh
After this exchange Lone and Lisa continue in Danish on the same topic (lab work) for a couple of minutes as Lone explains about a change in lab procedures. During this time other conversations can be heard in the background in English. The different language choices in these two examples are striking. In ex11, Lisa chooses English to address Julie, a fellow Dane, but in ex12 she chooses Danish to address Lone. In both cases Kate, their non-Danish-speaking colleague, is also present. It is interesting to note that the typical association of English with business and Danish with informal small talk is inverted here, as Lisa chooses English for a conversation about a concert and Danish for a conversation about lab work. How can we explain the choice of English in the one case and Danish in the other? The setting is the same, as are the potential participants. In both cases Lisa starts the conversation after a pause in which people concentrate on eating. The direct addressee is different, Julie in ex11 and Lone in ex12, but both are fellow Danish speakers – with whom Lisa customarily speaks Danish. This is the only example where Lisa addresses Julie in English.39 My hypothesis is that Lisa chooses English in ex11 in order to include Kate – to give her the opportunity of contributing. And in line 9 Kate does exactly this when she asks about the audience at the concert. Why not include Kate in ex12, too? What has changed is the topic: Lisa is asking Lone about her work in the laboratory, and Danish is the unmarked choice among the two Danish lab technicians. But the genre of the interaction has also changed: from lunchtime small talk to technicians’ business talk. And where lunchtime small talk implies inclusion of as many colleagues as possible, technicians’ business talk concerns only the technicians. Hence, from the point of view of the lab technicians there is no need to include Kate in this conversation.

---

39 As this example shows, English is used in interactions among Danes. Examples are infrequent, however, and most often seem to be motivated by a wish to give non-Danish-speaking auditors the option of contributing.
Small talk, research discussion and recorder talk

The next two examples are from the beginning and end of a meeting between five research scientists from different departments. When the excerpt begins, Andreas, the German research scientist, meets Stefan, a research scientist from another department, on his way to the meeting. Stefan is Danish, as are the other three participants in the meeting.

Ex13

1 ANDREAS: hey
2 STEFAN: hey
3  (2.0)
4 STEFAN: er det på første eller hvor er det vi skal være
5 henne
6 ANDREAS: jo
7 STEFAN: jeg var ikke engang klar over at der var et
8 mødelokale deroppe også
9 (.)
10 ANDREAS: første sal (.) hundrede tooghalvfems det er
11 godt jeg møder dig fordi jeg har aldrig været
12 før i første sal
13 STEFAN: okay jamen jeg er heller ikke helt klar over
14 hvor øh hvor det er henne om det er noget
15 ude i hampen eller hvad
16  (2.0)
17 ANDREAS: nå spiller du om vinteren
18 STEFAN: ja indimellem
19 ANDREAS: okay
20  (walking on stairs)
21 STEFAN: det kniber lidt med at få folk i øjeblikket det
22 bliver en fem seks mennesker hver gang det er
23 for lidt
24 ANDREAS: jeg tror det er (. ) meget for tidligt
25 STEFAN: (laughs=) meget for tidligt (=laughs) ja
26 det er meget muligt
27 ANDREAS: (laughs) (. ) ja
28  (3.0)
29 STEFAN: xxx
30 ANDREAS: her her [xxx]
31 STEFAN: [xxx] xxx det ser ud som om der har
32 været nogen
33 ANDREAS: (laughs)
34  (3.0)
35 STEFAN: han har da booke det stort mødelokale xxx
36 ANDREAS: (chuckles)
37 KURT: hej
38 STEFAN: hej er det så dig [xxx]

40 The English paraphrase for this very long example is provided in Appendix 6.
ANDREAS:    [goddag goddag]
KURT:     nej det er ikke mig det er Tina xxx
(8.0)
ANDREAS:  var din søn bedre har din søn det bedre
KURT:    nå det er dig der har wireless
ANDREAS:  Åh ja ja det skal jeg sige jeg bliver opdateret
nej øh recorded i dag hvis det er i orden med
jer det er samme som Kate har haft i sidste uge
KURT:    okay ja jo han har det bedre nu så xxx
ANDREAS:  jeg har tænkt på: jeg vil gerne sende dig en
lille Calvin og Hobbes øh comic kender du øhm
Steen og Stoffer hedder de på [dansk]
KURT:                           [ja] okay ja
ANDREAS:  men jeg kunne ikke finde det hvor han har
chicken pox og så kommer de til en øh barnlæge
og Calvin siger chicken pox mum what is this
guy a veterinarian (laughs)
KURT:    ha ha okay ja
ANDREAS:  (laughs)
(2.0)
ANDREAS:  hey
(3.0)
TINA:     jeg ved ikke om der kommer flere
ANDREAS:  [Mads]
TINA:     [xxx]
ANDREAS:  Mads ja
TINA:     okay
ANDREAS:  jeg bare så ham i kantinen
(15.0)
ANDREAS:  I spoke to er Linda before and you know they
had the ferret
TINA:     mm
ANDREAS:  er tested with er <name of chemical compound>
TINA:     yeah
ANDREAS:  right erm and <name of chemical compound>  (2.0)
and she said that in two groups she had a huge
effect but she doesn't know (laughs=) yet which
group (=laughs) that were so er she promised me
to get back to me

If we look at this interaction in terms of the topics discussed, and the
genres invoked in each part, it is possible to see a pattern in the language
choices. The interaction in ex13 can be divided into six parts:

1) In the first part in lines 1-16, Andreas and Mads meet and discuss
where the meeting is held. They do this in Danish.

2) In the next part in lines 17-28, they talk about participation in an
unnamed sports activity. In the ethnographic interview Andreas
talks about his participation in the Lundbeck soccer team, so this is
probably the activity that they are discussing here. This topic is also in Danish.

3) In lines 29-41 when they arrive at their destination, they greet Kurt and talk about the meeting room, still in Danish.

4) In line 42 Andreas enquires about the health of Kurt’s son which leads him to the telling of the Calvin and Hobbes joke. Intertwined in this conversation, Kurt enquires about the recording device. During both of these topics they speak Danish with frequent codeswitches to English. This part ends in line 58.

5) In the next part in lines 59-67, Tina arrives, and they talk about Mads who has not yet arrived. The language is now Danish with no codeswitches to English.

6) Then in line 68 after a pause of 15 seconds, Andreas introduces the topic of Linda’s ferret test. From line 68 onwards all participants speak English.

For the next 55 minutes the participants discuss their research, and they do so in English (with one aside in Danish approximately 30 minutes into the meeting). At a glance it would seem that Danish is associated with informal topics, while English is associated with formal, business-related topics. But what of the fourth part of the interaction where Kurt enquires about the recording device, and Andreas tells the Calvin and Hobbes joke? The switches in Andreas’ turns seem to be either competence-related or quoting. But why does Kurt switch to English in line 43 (“wireless“)? It seems like an odd word to use about the recording device (which is not wireless), and it is noticeable in that it is the first switch to English in the interaction. Data from the end of the meeting suggests, however, that talk about the recorder is associated with the use of English, which might explain the codeswitch here. I will return to the data from the end of the meeting below.

In line 68 Andreas begins a new topic, the first introduction of what could be called the research discussion genre. This is also the first introduction of English as the sole language of the interaction. While there has been a change in participants in the meantime (Tina has arrived), this has not changed the competence relations significantly, since she is a native speaker of Danish like Stefan and Kurt. And while there is a change
in topic, this time – unlike in between the previous parts - the genre of the interaction also changes: from pre-meeting small talk to research discussion. The choice of English as the medium for this genre has at least two explanations: first, among members of the international research community of practice, English is the language associated with research. And second, competence plays a part in this language choice. If Andreas had not been present, the four native speakers of Danish would in all likelihood have conducted the meeting in Danish, regardless of their community of practice membership. It takes the presence of a non-native Danish speaker to change the language to English.

Furthermore, the participants’ goals can be seen to influence the language choices here, as there is a power component involved as well. Andreas perceives his own Danish competence to be sufficient to accomplish the relational goal of socialising (and the choice to use Danish for this purpose perhaps even furthers this goal, because his convergence (in the sense of communication accommodation theory (Giles and Coupland, 1991)) to the other participants may make them feel more positively towards him). When the genre changes to research discussion, Andreas’ goal also changes, probably in the direction of furthering his own research interests or furthering the research agenda of this team, i.e. the focus shifts to an instrumental goal (Tracy and Coupland, 1990). It is entirely feasible that Andreas prefers English in this situation because he feels that he would be at a disadvantage in relation to the native speakers if the research discussion was conducted in Danish. When the goal changes, it becomes more important to him to be able to express himself clearly and to get his points across, since much more is at stake.

Another, rather long, example from the end of the same meeting further highlights the complex relationship between topic, genre, goal and language competence. After approximately 55 minutes, the meeting draws to an end and with that a series of shifts in topic, genre and goal occurs:

**Ex14**

1. TINA:  so what should we er reassemble in er two
2. months or so

---

41 The English paraphrase for this even longer example is provided in Appendix 7.
STEFAN: two months
TINA: that
STEFAN: two weeks (chuckles)
TINA: have these things been tested in two months do you think is that [realistic]
STEFAN: [xxx]
ANDREAS: if the in vivo binding and the CK is coming then yes
TINA: yeah
KURT: we should follow up on the meetings we have we [can]
TINA: [yeah]
KURT: we can do that now we have initiated [so I]
TINA: [yeah]
KURT: say we could just
STEFAN: yeah
TINA: so in a couple of months
KURT: Mads is coming next time of course that is maybe too close xxx
TINA: ja
STEFAN: xxx
TINA: jeg indkalder et eller andet efter jul [and there we of course in]
KURT: [xxx hjernen]
MADS: [xxx general are discussing the safety screen plan]
KURT: xxx is of course an effort that {the in vivo binding}
TINA: [mumbles=] ja (=mumbles)
(.
MADS: this compound here is really like
TINA: but ja bare for at være sikker på at vi har alle data og
KURT: ja ja ja nå men altså selvfølgelig skal vi følge op det også intensivt her [altså]
{phone rings})
TINA: ja det synes jeg
MADS: hvad var det det firma også
med de der tre gamle pensionerede
ANDREAS: (chuckles)
MADS: mænd (. som sø lavede sådan en [skuffefritidsinternetfirma]
ANDREAS: [(laughs)]
MADS: [og havde en masse stoffer]
TINA: [ligesom Sprunken eller hvad]
MADS: nej det var nogle amerikancere hvad fanden var [det de hed]
TINA: [(chuckles)]
MADS: de stoffer vi havde inde til licens og overvejede at købe og sådan noget og det var selvfølgelig mod Alzheimer (laughs)
(Taughter)
ANDREAS: personal interest (laughs)
MADS: it was like (.) totally ridiculous

(2.0)

KURT: xxx

(STEFAN: de skyndte sig og xxx

ANDREAS: ja get to safety

KURT: ligesom Per i dag med hans

STEFAN: ja

MADS: ja tak

(2.0)

STEFAN: nå han havde heller ikke set xxx vel

MADS: nej han kunne vist godt snart bruge noget

STEFAN: xxx

ANDREAS: okay (2.0) hej

MADS: ja men øh

(STEFAN: so how many days are you being recorded

MADS: three days

ANDREAS: yes

STEFAN: what's the purpose

MADS: who is it for

ANDREAS: it sorry

MADS: is it for all er English

ANDREAS: no it's er it's a PhD thesis that external

PhD and er it's Dorte which who can hear now my

explanation (laughs=) well lets see if I get it

right (=laughs) no but basically it's about the

er use of language at Lundbeck

STEFAN: okay

(3.0)

ANDREAS: er and she is following: different departments

where some of them are purely Danish

STEFAN: yeah

ANDREAS: and some of them have maybe one or two

foreigners and then us because we have

the highest percentage of foreigners

MADS: okay

ANDREAS: and er to (.) yeah analyse the use of language

because the corporate language is English but

it's a Danish company

STEFAN: yeah

ANDREAS: and

MADS: try to identify the true corporate

STEFAN: (chuckles)

ANDREAS: exactly lang- Danglish

MADS: (chuckles) Danglish (pronounced=)Danglish

(=pronounced with an exaggerated American

accent)

(4.0)

MADS: (yawn)

STEFAN: see you Mads

ANDREAS: vi ses Mads

(8.0)
Again the interaction can be divided into parts according to topic and genre. When the excerpt begins, the participants have just concluded the discussion of the last research topic in English.

1) In lines 1-38 the participants make arrangements for the next meeting. During this part of the interaction there is a gradual change from English to Danish.

2) Between lines 38 and 39 about a minute of small talk in Danish has been left out. From line 39 the small talk continues as the participants tell anecdotes about the previous CEO. The small talk is in Danish, but with a few switches to English near the end.

3) In lines 70-102 Mads, Stefan and Andreas leave the meeting room. While walking they discuss my recordings. They do this in English.

4) In lines 103-106 Andreas and Stefan say goodbye to Mads, Andreas in Danish and Stefan in English.

5) From line 107 Andreas and Stefan appear to be discussing some kind of unexpected mess they pass. They do so in English with one codeswitch to Danish (“julefrokost”).

While the language choices in some of these parts are what we would expect, others are not. The choice of English to conclude the meeting, and the use of Danish with a few codeswitches to English for small talk is consistent with the examples from the beginning of the meeting. Moreover, it is clear from both the ethnographic data and the recordings that Danish with codeswitches to English is the unmarked choice on many occasions in the research department. During the interaction in lines 1-38, the participants switch from English, which they have been using for the past hour, to Danish. In line 1 Tina opens a discussion on when the next meeting should take place. Stefan’s comments in lines 3 and 5 seem to be intended as a joke, while Andreas answers Tina’s question seriously in
lines 9-10. In line 12 Kurt enters the discussion. In line 24 Tina switches to Danish with a statement which seems intended to conclude the discussion. Here, the switch to Danish seems intended to signal a change in genre, from research discussion to administrative talk. Kurt’s choice of English for the following turn indicates, as much as the content of his statement, that he does not consider the research discussion closed. Tina’s reply is a non-committal, mumbled “ja/yes”, followed by a pause. Mads’ remark in line 32 seems unrelated to this discussion and is perhaps directed at someone else. In line 33 Tina begins in English with “but”, but self-interrupts and switches to Danish. While the content of her turn seems to support the arguments put forward by Kurt, at the same time her language choice sends a message: ‘this discussion is over’. And Kurt seems to accept this in line 35 when he says “ja ja ja ja nå men altså selvfølgelig skal vi følge op/yeah yeah yeah yeah but of course we need to follow up”. His choice of words and tone of voice both indicate that he considers his point made and the discussion closed, as does his choice of Danish. The conflict is resolved, and Tina finishes in Danish in line 38.

The codeswitching in the discussion between Tina and Kurt draws on the association of English with research topics and Danish with non-research topics, and perhaps also of Danish with administrative matters. The language choices for the last three topics are more puzzling. Having already switched from English to Danish when the research discussion ended, and having carried out a couple of minutes of small talk in Danish, it is noticeable that Stefan chooses English to address Andreas on their way out, particularly because these two spoke Danish to each other on their way to the meeting. But the topic here is different, they are talking about the recordings. One explanation is that the participants are focussed on the fact that they are being recorded, and that this influences their language choices. But why would the presence of the recorder make them choose English? This is not the only example where participants use English when they talk about the recordings. Sometimes the speaker sprinkles English words and phrases in his Danish, as Kurt did in ex13, and sometimes the speaker switches to English completely. In the ethnography chapter, I describe how people would use English with me jokingly or in an exaggerated manner, because they seemed to think that I
wanted them to speak English or that it was better for my project if they did. The same motivations may be involved here. It is also possible that the relatively prestigious position of English in Danish society in general and in the business community in particular makes them choose English when they are more aware of their language choices. This would then mean that not just the topic changes when Stefan asks about the recorder, but also his goal for the interaction. When talk turns to the recorder, his goal is not just socialising anymore, but also to represent himself in as flattering a manner as possible, and this is done by choosing a prestigious language variety. Language choice is thus linked with a change in goal from relational to identity goal, or perhaps more accurately, with a change in focus from one type to the other, if we follow Tracy and Coupland in their insistence that participants always have multiple goals (see pp. 180-1). Furthermore, what we see here is an example of the use of language style as persona management, as Coupland discusses in his article on ‘the relational self’ (2001b). Coupland suggests that the speaker in his linguistic choices is oriented to his own self-evaluations. Stefan’s choice of English for recorder talk allows him to draw on the prestige related with English in the business community in his persona management.

In lines 103-106 Stefan and Andreas say goodbye to Mads. Stefan does this in English, but Andreas switches to Danish. After a prolonged silence, Andreas switches back to English, however, when he remarks on something they pass as they walk back to their own building. It is difficult to see a connection between the topic here and the choice of English. My hypothesis is that their language choice is still conditioned by the talk about the recordings. Andreas’ choice to say goodbye in Danish, however, deserves more attention.

The special case of greetings
When I went through my data material, it struck me that greetings (under which I include both openings and closings) seemed to be a somewhat special case. In many cases, the language chosen for greetings seemed marked and hard to explain. In ex4, discussed earlier, Julie greets Kate, who in all other interactions is treated as a non-Danish speaker, in Danish, and then switches to English for the rest of the conversation. And in ex14,
discussed above, Andreas switches to Danish when he says goodbye to Mads, although they are in the middle of a conversation in English. Stefan, who is Danish, says goodbye to Mads in English.

The choice of Danish for these greetings is marked, and cannot be satisfactorily explained solely by competence relations. Genre cannot explain these codeswitches either, even if greetings are analysed as a genre in its own right, and that is not how I understand Hymes. What does seem to influence the language choices and codeswitches are the goals of the participants, particularly goals related to persona management and identity construction. If the choice of Danish in the above examples is seen as a strategy used to either index a Danish identity or signal belonging to the Danish-speaking community at Lundbeck, the language choices make more sense. When Julie greets Kate in Danish, although she knows that the rest of the conversation will have to be carried out in English, she shows that she accepts Kate as someone who is (becoming) a part of the Danish-speaking community at Lundbeck. In the ethnographic analysis I showed that foreigners at Lundbeck are categorised according to their willingness to learn Danish rather than according to their actual competence. The real divide is between those foreigners who make an effort to learn Danish and those who do not. Julie’s choice of Danish here shows that she places Kate in the first category, even though her Danish competence is very limited. And when Andreas switches to Danish to say goodbye to Mads, he is insisting on his own belonging to this Danish-speaking community as well. Stefan, as a Dane, does not need to insist on this, hence his choice of English here.

In addition to the recordings which are the primary data for this chapter, I also collected emails from five informants in the research department over a period of three days. The special case of greetings also revealed itself here. In Julie’s emails (the Danish research scientist), the closings, when she used one at all, were invariably in Danish (in some emails she just signed her name or nothing at all). Two emails with an English subject, but no text, are signed “Hilsner Julie” as is an email in English which ends with “Hope this is okay and will help the planning.
Three Danish emails are signed either “Hilsner Julie” or “På forhånd tak Julie”. The same pattern, although not as consistently, is noticeable in the Danish master’s student Rasmus’ emails. Two out of three emails in English are signed “Venlig hilsen Rasmus”. This use of Danish for greetings in English conversations and emails suggests that greetings are somehow special in relation to codeswitching. Heller (1988) also finds codeswitching in what she calls ‘opening and closing routines’. She concludes that these codeswitching routines symbolise speakers’ claims to the right to participate in situations defined by the use of the other language, without them claiming the corresponding identity. She finds for instance that anglophone employees in a company in Quebec codeswitch to French to legitimate their presence in a francophone environment, but without claiming a francophone identity. Heller makes the point that it is not identity that matters, but the rights and obligations that constitute that identity. Following this analysis the use of Danish greetings by and to internationals at Lundbeck is not so much about the internationals aspiring to or being ascribed a Danish identity as it is about them wanting and being given the same rights and obligations as their Danish colleagues.

The use of Danish greetings in English emails written by Danes cannot be explained in quite this way for obvious reasons. Instead the codeswitching in these examples could function as a way of emphasising Danish identity in an international context. The use of English in these emails constructs the sender as part of the international research community of practice. The insertion of a Danish greeting allows the sender at the same time to construct herself as a member of the Danish majority group at Lundbeck. Codeswitching for the greeting does not threaten intelligibility and is as such one of the few possible places for this kind of identity construction.

While this analysis of codeswitched greetings is rather tentative, it remains clear that greetings are a special case in relation to codeswitching, and that this topic could be a fruitful area for further study of the relationship between codeswitching and identity.

42 “Hilsner” can be translated with “regards” and “venlig hilsen” with “best regards”.
From formality to genre and goal

The above analyses reveal that there is no straightforward relationship between formality and language choice or between topic and language choice. Giles and Coupland (1991:13) discuss the fundamental functions underlying perceptions of social situations, e.g. formal-informal, task-oriented-non-task-oriented. Söderlundh (2010) differentiates between institutional and non-institutional interactions. But the above data shows that such binary divisions may not be adequate to explain the relation between formality and language choice. In this institutional lingua franca setting, there is no one-to-one relationship between e.g. task-oriented/non-task-oriented situations and language choice. First of all, the linguistic repertoire in the research department is comprised of more varieties than just Danish and English. German is also used, as is a mixed code where Danish is mixed with codeswitches to English. Secondly, the interactional categories are more complex than formal - informal or task-oriented-non-task-oriented. What I term administrative talk falls outside such a binary division. Setting up the next meeting as in ex14 is not non-institutional, but it is different from the preceding research discussions. Söderlundh calls these interactions ‘procedure-related talk’ and describes them as institutional interactions focussed on the process (2010:57). Including this third category does make the analytical framework stronger, and in Söderlundh’s case this is a meaningful way of categorising the interactions. The problem is, however, that in my data the language choices cannot be explained by a correlation with institutional – non-institutional interactions, even when including this third category of procedure-related talk. Danish is used for some institutional interactions, e.g. technicians’ business, and English for other institutional interactions, e.g. when scientists discuss research. And English, Danish, German and a mixed code are all used in informal interactions.

In relation to topic, the analysis reveals that while some language choices can be correlated with the topic of the interaction, others cannot. Relating language choice to the genre of the interaction rather than the topic, however, has more explanatory potential. In other instances, we need to look at the goal of the interaction in order to understand participants’ language choices. In the ethnographic data, informants
pointed to the formality of situations as a factor influencing language choice. The microanalysis shows that the influencing factors are better conceptualised as genre and goal.

7.2.3 Situational factors: competence, genre and goal

As the above analyses show, language competence (in all its complexity), genre and the changing goals of the interaction all influence language choice. In fact, as far as situational factors go, competence in combination with genre and goal appears to be what influences language choice. One further example will illustrate this. In departmental and divisional meetings in the research department, the participants include lab technicians, research scientists, heads of department, students and secretaries. And among these participants linguistic repertoires vary greatly. Most lab technicians have good English skills, but still experience comprehension as well as production problems when communicating in English. The research scientists usually do not have any problems communicating in English, but some of them do not have enough Danish skills to communicate in Danish. The question is then: whose competence should be catered to? In the following example the scene is a divisional meeting, i.e. a meeting with the academics and technicians from two departments. When the excerpt begins, Lisa and Julie are talking about some pain medication Lisa is taking after a traffic accident.

Ex15

1 JULIE: hvis det er meget stærke smerter så er det en
2 god ide at tage dem sammen med et par panodiler
3 LISA: er det det
4 JULIE: så virker de på mange bedre
5 LISA: ja
6 JULIE: og det er altså xxx (noise from chairs being
7 moved around) [lægen
8 RASMUS: [okay I'll just er]
9 LISA: [okay xxx]
10 RASMUS: [briefly turn to the agenda]
11 JULIE: [xxx]
12 RASMUS: [for this divisional meeting] and er Poul has
13 asked for twenty five minutes so he'll be
14 allowed to do that
15 (laughter)
16 RASMUS: he will tell about er the division vi- er
17 mission and vision then will come general news
18 {about persons} and highlights from the activity then Erna will tell us a bit about the seminar for the technicians a brief update er Michael will move on to the Christmas party what are we expected to do and then er Michelle will present (.) erm the meeting format how we are going to have future and if times allow it er then we will have a tip of the day but otherwise it will be gløgg und (chuckles)

29 LISA: und (laughs)
30 (Laughter)
31 LONE: gløgg und xxx (laughs)
32 RASMUS: [okay så er det vist Pouls tur]
33 JULIE: [det var lige en til Andreas (laughs)]
34 POUL: ja tak øh allerførst øh det er fint at {et team} tager initiativ med gløgg øhm så tak for det øh en anden ting er også: Erna og xxx som I måske vil opdage har været med i pauserummet og udsmykket det meget fint så tak skal I have (people clapping and moving chairs)
36 MICHAEL: det skal vi fejre (laughter)
37 HEIDI: ja med gløgg og æbleskiver:
38 POUL: de her unge mennesker (referring to a photo on a slide) [øhm] JULIE: [neij]
40 POUL: som I kan huske fra vores seminarium i august måned så var der et et ønske om at vi ligesom definerede hvad er vores mission og vision øh her i divisionen og det tager selvfølgelig udgangspunkt i at Lundbeck ønsker at være (. ) world leader inden for psykiatri og neurologi og det er de der unge mennesker i fuld gang med at repetere så det det er Lundbecks overordnede vision og den skal man den skal man kunne hvis man bliver spurgt

1 JULIE: if the pain is very strong it is a good idea to take them with some Paracetamol
2 LISA: is it
3 JULIE: it works better that way for a lot of people
4 LISA: yes
5 JULIE: and that is xxx (noise from chairs being moved around) [the doctor

The laughter and comments in lines 28-33 are caused by Rasmus’ use of the German “und” rather than the English “and”. Lisa and Lone both repeat the word and laugh, clearly labelling it as a mistake, while Julie’s comment refers to Andreas’ German nationality.
There is much going on in this excerpt in relation to language choice and codeswitching, but here I want to focus on Rasmus’ choice of English...
in relation to Poul’s choice of Danish for his presentation. When Rasmus begins in English in line 8, he signals with words as well as with language choice that the meeting has started, and the genre has changed to divisional business talk. Since English is the only language everyone present has some competence in, this is the unmarked choice for the meeting. Why then does Poul choose to do his presentation in Danish? Poul is the divisional director, and his presentation is on Lundbeck’s mission and vision, and how important it is that all employees know what the mission and vision are. His choice of Danish can be explained if we consider the goal of his presentation as well as the competence relations. He chooses Danish because he is addressing himself primarily to the technicians. It is more important that the technicians understand everything than to include the non-Danish speaking research scientists who presumably know the mission and vision more intimately as it is more directly related to their work.

This interpretation is supported by data from other parts of my corpus. In another recording one of the research scientists is questioning her lab technician on the mission and vision, emphasising how important it is that she knows how her work relates to the bigger picture at Lundbeck. This episode supports the hypothesis that Poul’s goal with his presentation is to make the technicians aware of Lundbeck’s mission and vision. Also, in her ethnographic interview Kate explains that Poul is actually planning to change the language of the divisional meetings to Danish:

the technicians usually have the feedback that they have a general understanding of the gist of the meetings but they may not have understood say the subtleties of all points and that’s where like obviously for them having the subtleties would be better in Danish er to understand so I know kind of Poul as my divisional director is keen kind of from next year onwards to try and make his big divisional meetings actually back in Danish

In other words, the research scientists know that the lab technicians do not understand the details if meetings are held in English. This understanding explains why it is acceptable for Poul to use Danish here. And the fact that he is planning to change the language for divisional meetings to Danish shows that when necessary he is willing to exclude the research scientists in favour of the lab technicians, making this a plausible explanation for his
language choice here. This example shows how several situational factors in combination influence language choice. The genre along with the presenter’s goal determine who the direct addressees for this presentation are, and this in combination with the competence relations is what influences the language choice here.

7.3 Language choice influencing the situation: codeswitching as a contextualisation cue

During my analysis, it became evident that while situational factors such as language competence, genre and goal influence language choice, language choices also influence the situation. And given that language choices have the potential to change the situation, it is feasible that this potential again influences language choices, resulting in a circular process of cause-and-effect. Consequently, ‘how does the situation influence language choice?’ should not be the only question asked. ‘How do language choices influence the situation?’ is an equally important question to ask and answer. In order to fully understand language choice in the research department – and through this language choice in general – we need to look at not only situational factors, but also at what participants do with their language choices. I would argue that most language choices are influenced both by situational factors and by the potential of the language choice to change the situation. In some instances the situational factors are primary and in others the contextualisation potential is.

In Discourse Strategies (1982) Gumperz pioneers the theory of codeswitching as a contextualisation cue. According to Gumperz, people define interaction in terms of familiar frames or schemas (in the sense of Goffman, 1974). Gumperz refers to these schemas as activity types. Listeners use constellations of surface features of linguistic form to understand this channeling of interpretation. It is these features of linguistic form which Gumperz refers to as contextualisation cues: “a contextualization cue is any feature of linguistic form that contributes to the signalling of contextual presupposition” (1982:131). Examples of contextualisation cues are codeswitching, style switching, prosodic phenomena, lexical choice and openings and closings.
Auer has developed Gumperz’ theory into a framework for analysing codeswitching (or code alternation in Auer’s terms). He identifies three characteristics of contextualisation cues:

1) They have no referential meaning. Rather the meaning is implicit, and the signalling value of a contextualisation cue depends on the participants’ tacit awareness of their meaning. Furthermore, contextualisation cues are related to interpretation through a process of inferencing, and this process depends on the context. This means that the same cue may have different meanings in different contexts.

2) Codeswitching as a contextualisation cue derives its meaning either through contrast, i.e. the codeswitch itself, or through the inherent (conventionalised) meaning potential of the varieties.

3) Contextualisation cues bundle together, that is they co-occur. For the analyst, this means that other cues supporting the local interpretation can function as evidence for the meaning of the codeswitch (1995:123-4).

Auer’s main contribution to Gumperz’ theory is to stress the importance of sequential analysis. Since inferencing depends on the context, it is necessary to analyse this context in order to interpret the meaning of a codeswitch. Furthermore, Auer makes a distinction between discourse-related and participant-related codeswitching. Participant-related codeswitching functions as a cue to speakers’ preference for or competence in one or the other language variety. Discourse-related switching contextualises aspects of the situation, such as a shift in topic or participant constellation, and as such it contributes to the organisation of the discourse. This type of switching occurs in contexts where speakers show a preference for using one language at a time. In such contexts “through its departure from [the] established language-of-interaction, codeswitching signals ‘otherness’ of the upcoming contextual frame and thereby achieves a change of ‘footing’” (1999:312). The exact interpretation of this otherness depends on the situational and must be filled in in each case. In other words, there is no simple association of the language varieties with a we/they code as in the case of diglossia.

In the remainder of section 7.3, I discuss how codeswitching in the research department is used as a contextualisation cue. In section 7.3.1, I
discuss how codeswitching functions to direct the attention of participants. In section 7.3.2, I investigate how codeswitching frames aside conversations during meetings as unimportant for some participants. In section 7.3.3, I show how codeswitching can function as an inclusion or exclusion mechanism. Finally, section 7.3.4 sums up the preceding sections.

7.3.1 Directing the attention of participants

One way codeswitching can be used as a contextualisation cue is to direct the attention of audiences. In the research department, the association of English with official business for the whole department means that a codeswitch to English can be used to signal the beginning of a meeting, typically in the form of a transition from pre-meeting small talk to the first item on the agenda. Similarly, a codeswitch to Danish can signal that a transition from meeting to post-meeting small talk is taking place. In ex15 above (pp. 195-7) the participants in a divisional meeting are talking in small groups before the meeting begins. In lines 8 and 10 Rasmus signals that the meeting is about to start when he says “I’ll just er briefly turn to the agenda...”. The small talk subsides, and he introduces the agenda for the meeting. Here the use of English is not the only cue that the meeting has begun (he also speaks louder for instance), but the codeswitch is one strategy by which Rasmus gets the attention of the other participants. It could also be argued that the codeswitch embodies two strategies, as Rasmus seems to draw both on the conventionalised meaning potential associated with English (i.e. the language for agenda items) and the effect of the switch itself (which signals that there is a change in the situation) (Auer, 1995:123-4).

Codeswitching is also used during meetings to indicate how relevant individual presentations are to the participants. In both department and divisional meetings in the research department, the use of Danish for certain presentations typically indicates that the presentation is more relevant for lab technicians than for academics. Poul’s choice of Danish in lines 34 and 44 in ex15 suggests that both his thanks for the Christmas decorations and the presentation of the Lundbeck vision are directed primarily at the technicians. This explanation seems plausible if we also
consider that the Erna he thanks is a lab technician, and that later in the presentation on the Lundbeck vision he addresses himself directly to the lab technicians. In both cases, Poul’s choice of Danish functions as a cue to the technicians to pay attention (and by implication as a cue to the academics that their full attention is not required).

The next example, from a divisional management meeting, shows how a switch to Danish can indicate that the meeting proper is over. Kate is a British head of department, Stine is the Danish secretary, Poul is the Danish divisional director, and Nikolaj is a Danish head of department.

Kate’s “I have to run” in line 1 can be seen as an attempt to close the meeting, but Stine immediately objects, and the meeting continues. It is
not clear whether she considers the topic of the posters closed in line 17, but when Poul switches to Danish in line 18, it is clear that the meeting is over regardless. This is the cue for the others to leave, and Kate does so immediately. In this management context only English is used in meetings, and the use of Danish therefore effectively signals to the participants that the meeting is over, even if this is not stated explicitly.

7.3.2 Out-of-frame activity

In meetings conducted primarily in English, aside conversations between two or more participants are frequently in Danish\(^{44}\). The switch to Danish in these situations frames the aside as an aside, and sends a signal to the other participants that this is a ‘private’ conversation, one which is not relevant for all. In the following example from a department meeting, I was present as a participant observer. The participants are discussing whether the lab technicians should have laptops and what programs should be included.

Ex17

1 MICHAEL: there are Word and Excel on xxx
2 JEAN: okay but how easy it is to transfer (.)(I don’t know)
3 MICHAEL: mm (...) pas\(^{45}\) maybe xxx
4 JEAN: pas xxx [a PC and just]
5 MICHAEL: [we need]
6 JEAN: put it in and that's it
7 MICHAEL: Minesweeper as well
8 JEAN: sorry
9 MICHAEL: [Minesweeper]
10 JEAN: [Minesweeper]
11 (chuckles)
12 MICHAEL: det skal du ikke notere
13 HEIDI: (laughs)
14 LISA: (laughs)

---

\(^{44}\) Aside conversations in English also occur, both in meetings which take place in English and in meetings which take place in Danish. In the latter case, the purpose often is to clarify something said in Danish.

\(^{45}\) Michael’s use of “pas” here (which is repeated by Jean in line 5) is perhaps best translated with “I don’t know”. The literal translation is “pass” as in a game of cards.
In lines 6 and 8 Michael makes a joke about adding Minesweeper, a game, to the other programs on the new laptops. After the others respond with chuckles, he turns to me in line 13 and says in Danish “det skal du ikke notere/don’t write that down”. His switch to Danish here signals that this comment is an aside, different from the Minesweeper joke, even if it is said in the same humorous tone. The codeswitch is not the only cue here, Michael’s turn towards me and the use of ‘du’ (the second person singular pronoun) also signal that what he is saying is an aside. His joke about my note taking can be analysed as an out-of-frame activity (Goffman, 1974). Where the Minesweeper joke was still part of the talk about laptops, comments about my note-taking activity is not. Michael breaks the department meeting frame to make this comment, and his language choice signals this break.

Another example of out-of-frame activity signalled by a switch to Danish is in ex3, which was discussed on p. 168 in relation to audience roles. Heidi’s switch to Danish in line 5 to discuss the forest drink signals that “this is not business even though we are in the middle of a meeting”. When Kate re-enters the conversation in English in line 17, I see this as her move to get the conversation back on track and back into the department meeting frame. She succeeds, and the conversation, which continues in English, does move back to determining the menu for the Christmas party.

7.3.3 Inclusion and exclusion

One way discourse-related codeswitching functions as a contextualisation cue is to give clues as to the participant constellation. This function is especially salient in settings where language choice is between two distinct codes instead of between two dialects or styles. If not all participants have some competence in both languages, codeswitching/language choice here has the potential to include or exclude. In my data the language competence of participants varies greatly, especially with regard to Danish competence. While all the employees in the research department have English competence enough to work in that language, the same is not the case with Danish. This means
that switching to English can function as an inclusion mechanism, while switching to Danish can function as an exclusion mechanism.

In this first example of inclusion the scene is a divisional meeting. Poul is the divisional director, he is Danish. Kate is head of one of the departments. She is British and has only very limited Danish skills. When this excerpt begins, the meeting has been in progress for approximately 45 minutes, and most of the presentations have been in Danish.

Ex18

POUL: the process is now that there will be I don’t know if it already has been called or a meeting will be called with the lab techs in the middle of December where you will be informed exactly what is up for debate about xxx because some of it requires that we think carefully about how we (.). should conduct ourselves I can say that (.). Kate all the feedback will be xxxx in xxx so you also have a chance to be independent

KATE: (laughs)

POUL: er some of it I think that you can discuss in your own academics group

KATE: (laughs)

POUL: processen nu er at øh at der bliver det ved jeg ikke om der er øh der bliver indkaldt til et møde med laboranterne i midten af december hvor I får præcis hvad er til yderligere diskussion omkring xxx fordi noget af det kræver det at vi tænker os lidt om med hensyn til hvordan skal vi (.). begå os ik jeg kan godt sige at (.). Kate all the feedback will be xxxx in xxx so you also have a chance to {be independent}

KATE: (laughs)

POUL: erm noget af det synes jeg dem det kan man tage direkte i sin egen akademikergruppe
her. This is an example of an aside where the switch is from Danish to English. In addition to the codeswitch, the use of “Kate” also functions to signal that this aside is not relevant for the others. When Poul switches back to Danish in line 12, Kate is again excluded from the interaction. At least two other international scientists are present at the meeting, but either their Danish skills are perceived to be better than Kate’s, or it is not deemed as necessary for them to understand the above exchange (arguably since they are not heads of department).

Switching to English to signal the inclusion of colleagues in an interaction also takes place in informal contexts where there is no business to complete, i.e. where the goal is different. This next example is from the break room where most of the department as well as colleagues from other departments are gathered for coffee. Lisa and Michael are Danish lab technicians, Kate is the British head of department, and Sara is a Danish master’s student.

Ex19

1 MICHAEL: det er lidt ligesom i Bodyshop der der er ikke
2 noget af det der er der er testet på dyr
3 LISA: nej
4 MICHAEL: bortset fra alt sammen
5 LISA: alle er
6 MICHAEL: bortset fra alt sammen er testet på dyr
7 LISA: ja
8 MICHAEL: det kan godt være produktet ikke er men alle
9 komponenterne i er
10 LISA: ja ja
11 MICHAEL: og hvis det er mere end syv år siden så må du
12 godt skrive på dit produkt at det ikke er
13 testet på dyr
14 LISA: ja det er sådan noget mærkeligt noget jamen det
15 er rigtigt
16 MICHAEL: så:
17 (.).
18 LISA: men jeg går uden om de der byty- butylparabener
19 (.)
20 SARA: but don't you eat chewing gum
21 LISA: no
22 SARA: (laughs)
23 LISA: I know it's in that too
24 SARA: yeah
25 LISA: and in Colgate Total
26 KATE: what is
When Sara joins the conversation in line 20, she does so in English and succeeds in changing the language of the interaction to English – at least for a couple of minutes. It is difficult from this example to say what motivates Sara to choose English when she joins a conversation with two fellow Danes, but her switch *does* have the effect of including Kate as a possible participant. And as Kate’s comment in line 26 shows, she takes advantage of this opportunity and joins the conversation. However, while part of her motivation may be a wish to include Kate, another possibility is that Sara chooses English to assert her identity as an academic (since English is more associated with academics than lab technicians). Sara has worked in the department for some time as a student and has shared an office with the lab technicians, but now she has just received her degree. Her age is closer to the lab technicians’, but the work she does is closer to that of the academics. This borderline position may cause her to choose English as a way of associating herself more closely with the academic group, and as a way of emphasising her academic identity.

Where inclusion is accomplished through a switch to English, exclusion is signalled through switching to Danish. This excerpt is from a department meeting. One of the technicians has brought up a problem with the barcodes on the bottles in the lab. When the barcodes come off

---

46 The beginning of this interaction is presented in ex8 on p. 176.
in the washing, the glue remains and makes the bottles stick to the technicians’ gloves, causing the bottles to get knocked over. Bolette, Michael and Lone are Danish lab technicians. Julie is a Danish, Andreas a German and Jean a French research scientist. After the end of this excerpt, the meeting continues in English.

Ex20

1  JEAN:     yeah but why then the barcode should be:
2            [taken away]
3  ANDREAS:  [it comes it comes off] automatically in the
4            washing [except the glue]
5  JULIE:     [but not the:]
6  ANDREAS:  the glue is staying on the bottle
7  BOLETTE:  kan den ikke sidde i bunden så
8  LONE:     then you can’t see er when you
9  MICHAEL:  den er også for lang
10  BOLETTE:  er den for lang
11            (.)
12  MICHAEL:  but (.) if you don’t wear gloves
13            (laughter)
14  LONE:     and a month later {we} lost a finger or two

7  BOLETTE:  can’t it be on the bottom then
8  LONE:     then you can’t see er when you
9  MICHAEL:  also it is too long
10  BOLETTE:  is it too long

In line 7 Bolette enters the conversation. Until this point the interaction has been in English, but she chooses Danish: “kan den ikke sidde i bunden så/can’t it be on the bottom then”. It is possible that Bolette chooses Danish because she feels that her English competence is not sufficient for her to make this argument - and because she feels that she can choose Danish, since the language policy for department meetings allows for the use of Danish. At the same time, the switch to Danish effectively excludes Kate and Jean from the discussion since they have very limited Danish skills, and the use of Danish could therefore be a way of signalling that this is a matter primarily for technicians (since they are the ones working with the bottles and the barcodes). Lone’s switch back to English in line 8 would then be a way of insisting on including the academics, and Michael’s use of Danish (“den er også for lang/also it is too long”) in line 9 a way of insisting on keeping this a matter for the technicians. His choice
of Danish could also be triggered by Bolette’s use of Danish, and this is probably the more likely explanation, since he switches back into English in line 12, allowing Kate to re-enter the conversation as she does after the end of the excerpt. His suggestion in line 12 is clearly not to be taken seriously, which we can see both from the general laughter and Lone’s response in line 14. This change in genre to ‘telling a joke’ likely also influences Michael in his decision to use a more inclusive language.

All the examples of inclusion in this chapter involve switches from Danish to English to include non-Danish-speakers. And the examples of exclusion are switches to Danish which exclude them. In this particular department the language repertoires of the employees make this pattern prevalent. In other departments at Lundbeck, however, other patterns prevail. Not only the non-Danish-speaking research scientists are excluded from interactions through language choice, in other situations Danes with little or no English skills are excluded. This is the case for instance in departments where signs and wall posters are exclusively in English, even though not all employees understand English.

Interestingly, I also have an example where a participant excludes herself from interactions, indicating that sometimes other concerns are more important than ensuring the inclusion of everyone present. The language policy for the department meetings is stated in the email invite and determined by Kate, the non-Danish-speaking head of department. During my fieldwork she changed the policy to read:

Language: Ideally English, but half English/half Danish acceptable for e.g. technician presentations.

A presentation in half English/half Danish would typically mean that the spoken part would be in Danish with slides in English. In her ethnographic interview, Kate discusses this decision in relation to the extra pressure her presence as a non-Danish-speaking head of department puts on the lab technicians:

suddenly because I have been recruited if they want to communicate with me or if they have any concerns it does add an extra barrier I think that they have to overcome and my perception is that they I mean they’ve been great they’ve been
really willing to overcome and we've done various compromises so in my department meetings where I want obviously the technicians to be able to speak out and to be involved I'd rather they said something and if they'd rather say that in Danish to at least kind of do that.

In other words, she would rather have the technicians present in Danish, although this means that she herself will not understand their presentations, than have them be so uncomfortable presenting in English that they may refrain from participating. In the terms of communication accommodation theory (Giles and Coupland, 1991), Kate’s decision about language policy is a kind of convergence to the Danish-speaking lab technicians. She cannot converge by speaking Danish, so she does it by allowing them to do so, thereby effectively excluding herself and the other non-Danish-speakers from the interaction. In the theory, convergence is used in response to a need for social integration and approval, and the greater the need for social acceptance, the more a speaker converges. Kate’s position in the department as the relatively new head of department explains her strategy to converge to her employees in order to gain social approval. Her awareness that her presence puts extra linguistic pressure on the lab technicians further explains her choice to converge to such a degree that she excludes herself.

7.3.4 Codeswitching as a contextualisation cue: local meanings
In an analysis of codeswitching in a similar setting, namely in an English-language programme in a Norwegian university, Ljosland (2008) finds that one of the functions of codeswitching is to signal or even effect a change in the situation. She finds that Norwegian is linked with informal interactions and English with formal, such that for instance a switch to English signals the beginning of a lecture. In another example, a switch from Norwegian to English during group work signals a transition from joking around to beginning the task. Although Ljosland links language varieties with formality, she also notes that the association of Norwegian with informal, joking interaction and English with formal, task-oriented interaction is not consistent. The reverse pattern is also found, as well as examples where the codeswitching cannot be linked to a change in the
situation. In other words, there is no simple one-to-one relationship between activity type and language variety in Ljosland’s material.

My analyses show that codeswitching and language choice in the research department function as contextualisation cues in several different ways. English is used to signal the beginning of a meeting, and Danish the end. A switch to Danish can also be a cue that the interaction is an aside, i.e. not relevant to all participants, or that it is an out-of-frame activity. Danish can also be used to direct participants’ attention, for instance as a cue that a particular presentation is aimed at one group rather than another. These analyses show that there is no straightforward functional distribution of the language varieties; it is not simply a case of English for business and Danish for informal interactions. The direction of the switch is important, however, for its potential as a contextualisation cue. My findings here are in concurrence with Auer who says that in a typical bilingual community “the correlation between language and activity is not strong enough to make code-alternation predictable, but the direction of switching is nevertheless important for reconstructing its conversational meaning” (1995:123). Auer continues that it is necessary to look at the sequential patterning of language choice in order to uncover this meaning. My microanalyses reveal that while the language varieties in the research department are not related to activity type in any straightforward manner, they do have local conversational meanings. Instead of looking for a general meaning, such as English=formal interactions/Danish=informal interactions, we need to look at the local, situated meanings of the varieties, and in order to do so, we need to look at the local context, i.e. both the situational factors and the sequential unfolding of the situation.

7.4 Codeswitching or language mixing?

In the previous examples, the participants switch between Danish and English. But these are not the only codes available to the employees in the research department, German for instance is also available to some people, to most as a foreign language and to one person as his mother tongue. In a few examples one further choice is available, a Danish/English mixed code.
One episode in particular stands out. Andreas is in the canteen for a lunch meeting, planning a social event for the two departments in the division. Also participating is Stine, the Danish department secretary, Lone, a Danish lab technician, and Maja, a Danish lab technician from the other department. The meeting lasts approximately 40 minutes. Andreas walks to the canteen with Stine and on the way they speak Danish with one joke involving the use of German. The meeting begins in Danish, but after 20 minutes a codeswitch changes this. The participants are discussing ideas for the event, and Stine is talking about the possibility that the participants make their own meal from scratch. At this point Andreas switches to English (line 14):

Ex21

1 STINE: og så kommer der sådan en kok eller hvad det er
2 og så hjælper ik og så skal man selv stå og
3 stege det her dyret over bål og man skal det
4 hele er udenfor i den fri natur og man skal
5 lave maden
6 ANDREAS: så det har I haft
7 STINE: [nej nej nej] vi har
8 LONE: [vi har talt om det]
9 ANDREAS: a:h nå
10 MAJA: sidst det ikke blev til noget
11 STINE: det blev da det ikke blev til noget
12 ANDREAS: okay
13 STINE: så xxx om at få sådan en mand
14 ANDREAS: I thought that you that's what you did last
15 time
16 STINE: no no
17 LONE: somebody else tried it before
18 STINE: somebody else another division [tried it]
19 ANDREAS: [okay]
20 STINE: and everybody came back and they were
21 completely (.) thrilled about it they thought
22 it was the best food they'd ever had and it was
23 a really really good team building experience to
24 erm
25 ANDREAS: I think it could be really fun if we have to if
26 [you have to make your]
27 MAJA: [to make a kind of luxury dinner]
28 ANDREAS: er take care of your food yourself instead of
29 you know sit there and then somebody gives it
30 to you
31 MAJA: but the point was that it was supposed to be
32 something luxury xxx realise
33 ANDREAS: okay
Andreas’ switch to English in line 14 is what I would call codeswitching for clarification as he attempts to clear up a misunderstanding. It is interesting, however, how this switch seems to trigger a switch to a mixed code, since during the remaining 15 minutes of
the meeting the participants switch back and forth between Danish and English. Some of these codeswitches are clearly competence related, e.g. ex10 discussed above, but most of them cannot be explained by competence, or by a change in genre or goal. Nor do they function as contextualisation cues. Instead of analysing these codeswitches as such, the last 15 minutes of the meeting are better analysed as the use of a mixed code. Myers-Scotton (1993b) refers to such cases as unmarked codeswitching, where codeswitching is the unmarked choice for the whole interaction. Auer (1998) terms it code-mixing and Auer (1999) language mixing, but the definition is the same: it is when the juxtaposition of two languages is meaningful not in a local, but only in a global sense. It is when the alternating use itself is the language-of-interaction. In a newer study Konstantinou uses the term ‘bilingual medium’, which she defines as the use of “two grammatically different languages without orienting to the alternate use of them as deviant or repairable conduct” (2008:66). A similar kind of language use was discussed in relation to the IT support department in section 5.3.4.

This next example occurs 30 minutes into the meeting when the participants are discussing possible locations. It shows how the participants switch between Danish and English without orienting to the switches as either meaningful or deviant.

Ex22

1 MAJA: and where was this one var det Rørvig
2 STINE: xxx fra Rørvig
3 MAJA: ja
4 STINE: [direkte til vandet]
5 LONE: [er du også til strand]
6 STINE: ja
7 LONE: skal vi så ikke skrive de to ned
8 ANDREAS: jo der er masser
9 LONE: der er masser okay
10 (8 second pause, background noise)
11 ANDREAS: but I mean this for example is like the same
12 homepage and there will be a homepage to visit
13 where you know
14 STINE: what if we all go in and have a look at these
15 ANDREAS: yeah for example and then there's
16 Lærerforeningen their homepage
17 (3.0)
18 STINE: this is Lærerforeningen this is Copenhagen
In my data from the research department the use of language mixing of this kind is infrequent, unlike in Konstantinou’s bilingual Greek/Swedish family setting where the bilingual medium is frequently employed. The fact that language mixing only occurs in a few instances can be explained by the fact that it requires a specific set of competence relations, which is only rarely present in this lingua franca setting. For participants to be able to employ language mixing as the language-of-interaction, they all need to be competent in the two languages. However, even in interactions where this criterion is fulfilled, language mixing as the language-of-interaction is not very frequent. This limited use of language mixing supports my conclusion that employees at Lundbeck are aware of the presence of a
monolingual norm (see section 5.4.1) i.e. a norm that sees codeswitching as dispreferred or at least marked behaviour.

7.5 Conclusion

At the beginning of this chapter I asked: What are the factors that influence language choice in a specific situation? My analyses in 7.2 revealed that three situational factors in combination influence language choice, most prominently the competence relations, but also the changing genres of the interaction and participants’ goals. While genre and goal are likely to influence language choice just as much in bilingual settings, competence plays a particularly significant role in this lingua franca setting because of the great variety in the participants’ linguistic repertoires. Previous research has also found competence to be a factor in codeswitching and language choice. Saville-Troike (1982) lists ‘lexical need’ (similar to my ‘lack of vocabulary’) and ‘intensification/elimination of ambiguity’ (similar to my ‘clarification’) as two functions of codeswitching, while Gumperz (1982) includes ‘message qualification’ (again similar to my ‘clarification’) on his list. Auer’s (1999) participant-related codeswitching functions as cue to speakers’ preference for or competence in one or the other language variety. Gardner-Chloros comes closest to my conception of competence relations as the operative factor when she lists “the speaker’s linguistic competence” and “the speakers’ perceptions of each other (including their respective competence)” (1991:179) as two of the main factors determining the frequency and type of codeswitching. In combination, these two factors seem to cover the same ground as competence relations.

Competence and the specifics of the lingua franca setting are also important in relation to the discussion of the influence of the audience on language choice. While the influence of the direct addressee is undisputed, the influence of more peripheral audience members is debatable. In the theory of audience design (Bell, 1984), auditors and overhearers influence language choice only secondarily. But according to Bell, these peripheral audience members will influence the language choice much more when intelligibility is at stake. In the markedness
model framework (1993b), Myers-Scotton includes the ‘virtuosity maxim’ which directs speakers to codeswitch in order to include participants who do not understand the unmarked choice of code. Consequently, we would expect speakers to choose a language which all those present can understand. Several of the examples discussed in this chapter show, however, that often this is not the case. It seems then that although intelligibility is very much an issue in this lingua franca situation, peripheral audience members remain peripheral and their influence on language choice limited.

In 7.3 I discussed how codeswitching functions as a contextualisation cue. In some situations participants codeswitch because they can use the codeswitch to signal a change in the situation, or even effect a change through codeswitching. In this connection it became obvious that there is no straightforward relationship between language variety and function. Where in diglossic communities the H and L varieties have a strict functional distribution, the relationship between language variety and activity type is more subtle in the research department at Lundbeck. While there is a tendency for English to be associated with official business in situations where all employees in the department are present, and for Danish to be associated with informal interactions, the analyses reveal that we need to look at the local meanings in order to understand the language choices.

The analyses also showed how language choice functions as an exclusion mechanism. While researchers of bilingual settings have also found this function (e.g. Saville-Troike (1982) who finds that one function of codeswitching is the exclusion of other people within hearing), the potential of language choice to exclude participants is particularly strong in a lingua franca situation. The reason is again the great variety in participants’ linguistic repertoires, and the fact that the two main varieties in my case are not mutually comprehensible (as would be the case with two varieties of the same language). Furthermore, the particular circumstances surrounding a Danish company with English as a corporate language mean that this potential is even bigger than in other lingua franca situations. Firstly, although English is the lingua franca, the vast majority of employees share a mother tongue, Danish, and are inclined to
switch to Danish as soon as possible. Secondly, because this particular lingua franca setting is a workplace, and because the employees here rarely stay in the same job all their lives, new participants are continuously arriving on the scene. This means that even though most employees in time attain some level of competence in the majority language Danish, new international employees with no Danish skills will also always be part of the audience, and will always be excluded when their Danish colleagues use their mother tongue.

In the theoretical preliminaries to this chapter, I discussed a number of models seeking to explain language choice. In this concluding section, I will revisit these models and their explanatory potential seen in the light of my data and analyses. Within one paradigm, Myers-Scotton’s markedness model and its later version the rational choice model (Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai, 2001) seek to explain language choice in terms of speaker's intentions. While community norms are an important backdrop for language choice in this model, the choice itself, particularly in the later version of the model, rests within the speaker. According to Myers-Scotton, language choices are rationally based and are the outcome of a cost-benefit analysis. Briefly put, speakers make the choice they do in order to gain maximum benefits. As already touched upon in the theoretical preliminaries, these models are too abstract to have much explanatory potential for my purposes. Even if I go along with Myers-Scotton and agree that speakers make language choices based on a cost-benefit analysis, I need a framework which can help explain what these costs and benefits are. Another problem with these models is the view of language choice as something which takes place within individual speakers and not something which is negotiated in interaction. In order to capture this interactional aspect, we need to look to a different paradigm.

Bell’s audience design belongs to such a relational paradigm. In this paradigm language choice is seen as determined in interaction between speaker and audience. Basically, speakers use language choices to negotiate their own position relative to their audience. Bell’s theory is useful in explaining a lot of my data, especially in explaining situations where language choice varies with a change in participants. Furthermore, I find Bell’s distinction between direct addressee and peripheral audience
members a particularly useful categorisation for explaining how competence relations influence language choice in situations where speakers codeswitch although participants do not change, e.g. when Danish participants switch to English for agenda items, but revert to Danish once the meeting finishes because their non-Danish-speaking colleagues are no longer the direct addressees.

Giles and Coupland’s communication accommodation theory also belongs to the relational paradigm. In early versions of the theory (e.g. Giles, 1973), focus was on social approval/distance as the main motivations behind linguistic accommodation. In an institutional setting such as the research department at Lundbeck, other motivations are also important in relation to language choice. In many situations instrumental goals, such as the need for intelligibility to handle the business at hand, clearly influence language choice as much as or more than relational goals. Furthermore, the potential of language choices to function as identity markers also plays a part in participants’ language choices. Later versions of communication accommodation theory (e.g. Giles and Coupland, 1991) do include other motivations, e.g. accommodation motivated by instrumental goals (1991:74) and convergence and divergence as identification strategies (1991:80). This recognition of a complex set of motivations for language choice, including social approval, instrumental goals and identity goals, is particularly useful in relation to my data.

While communication accommodation theory and audience design do have a lot of explanatory potential, they do not satisfactorily explain all instances of codeswitching in my material. Some instances of intrasentential codeswitching, what I have termed lack of vocabulary, cannot be explained by these theories, since the relational aspect in these language choices is not very strong. In these cases, competence is the operative factor, or rather a lack of competence. Since neither communication accommodation theory nor audience design were initially discussed with language choice in a lingua franca setting in mind, it is not surprising that they do not cover these instances. Furthermore, while the relational paradigm has some interesting contributions towards an explanation of language choice in a lingua franca setting, the models
within this paradigm fail to satisfactorily account for the potential of language choices as contextualisation cues.

It appears then that neither the ‘speaker’s intention’ paradigm nor the relational paradigm is sufficient. Instead goals, or communicative purposes, appear to have the most explanatory potential. Tracy and Coupland (1990) and Coupland (2007) discuss the three core dimensions of communicative purposes: instrumental, relational and identity goals (similar to the set of motivations discussed in communication accommodation theory). Most of the language choices in my material can be linked with one or more of these communicative goals. In addition, however, competence is an important factor in all my examples, and the reason for this is the great variety in linguistic repertoires which is the key characteristic of a lingua franca setting.

Coupland also manages to link communicative purposes with the potential of language to influence or even determine the social situation. His point is that while language is influenced by the situation, language also always influences the situation:

> language needs to be seen as a determinant of social situation just as much as conditioned by it ... it follows that we have to consider style as situational achievement, and as the fulfilment of communicative purposes (whether consciously or non-consciously represented) in relation to those social situations. (Coupland, 2007:189)

While Coupland discusses style specifically, this point can easily be extended to language choice as well, especially with regard to the way in which codeswitching has been shown to function as a contextualisation cue.

In conclusion: language choice is influenced by the situational factors competence relations, genre and goal. At the same time language choices influence the social situation. Seeing language choices as the fulfilment of multiple communicative purposes gives us a framework for explaining language choice which allows us to include both these aspects and which
recognises that language choices are interactionally accomplished rather than residing in the speaker’s head.

8 Language ideologies: theory and methods

My focus in the third analysis is on language ideologies, especially in relation to the choice of Danish vs. English. In the analysis I draw on theories and methods from the language ideologies framework. In the following I present a brief overview of the language ideologies research tradition, and the different definitions of language ideology prevalent in the field (section 8.1). I then discuss the link between language ideologies and language use in section 8.2 before moving on to my working definition of language ideologies for this study (section 8.3). In 8.4 I discuss some prevalent language ideologies, and in 8.5 I turn to methods for analysing language ideologies.

8.1 Language ideologies: traditions and definitions

Language ideologies emerged as a separate field of study within linguistic anthropology in the last decades of the 20th century. Both linguistic anthropology and studies of language ideologies are concerned with the nexus of language and culture. The language ideologies tradition investigates this nexus “by introducing another level of cultural structuring in language: the language-ideological, indexical metalinguistic level” (Blommaert, 2006:518). Silverstein (1979) is one of the earliest works in the tradition of language ideologies research per se. But even before this, early work in the ethnography of communication was concerned with what we now term language ideologies, e.g. Hymes who suggests that a community’s own theory of linguistic repertoire and speech should be considered as part of a serious ethnographic account (1974:31). Language ideologies have been the subject of numerous studies and several anthologies in the last few decades (e.g. Blommaert and Verschueren, 1998; Gal, 1979; Gal and Irvine, 1995; Jaffe, 1999; Jaworski et al., 2004; Schieffelin et al., 1998; Seargeant, 2009; Spitulnik, 1998; Woolard, 1989). Most of these studies are within anthropological linguistics, but see

Within the field of language ideologies, definitions of the term vary, as do the definitions of the broader concept of ideology. Woolard introduces a number of themes which recur in discussions of ideology:

- ideology as mental phenomena, beliefs or ideas
- ideology as a reflection of the experiences of a particular social position
- ideology as ideas and discourse in the service of acquiring power
- ideology as distortion, illusion or rationalisation (1998:6-7).

Blommaert identifies two strands of ideology:

- an anthropological approach which investigates beliefs or worldview with a focus on unspoken assumptions. This strand has a neutral definition of ideology and is represented by e.g. Boas and Whorf.
- an approach where ideology is tied to interests of particular social groups and processes of power and dominance. This approach was introduced by Marx and Engels, and is later promulgated by Bourdieu (Blommaert, 2006:510). Fairclough (2001) and other proponents of critical discourse analysis can be placed here as well.

In both these categorisations we see a divide between neutral and more negative, critical conceptions of ideology (or in Woolard’s case more of a continuum).

Definitions of language ideology also vary widely as researchers focus on different aspects in their definitions. In the abovementioned article, Silverstein defines linguistic ideologies as “any sets of beliefs about language articulated by the users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use” (1979:193). Silverstein here focusses on the explicit expression of language ideology as articulated rationalisations. Blommaert and Verschueren (1998:191) take a different view when they define ideology as a common frame of reference
constituted by shared implicit assumptions. And Jaworski and Coupland share this emphasis on the implicit:

The central point [about language ideologies] is that language is necessarily used against background sets of assumptions - about what is ‘correct’, ‘normal’, ‘appropriate’, ‘well-formed’, ‘worth saying’, ‘permissible’, and so on, ... these evaluative and prescriptive assumptions are ideological. That is to say they are part of specific socio-cultural frames, with particular histories, tied in to particular power struggles and patterns of dominance. (2004:36-37)

In this definition, language ideologies are also background sets of assumptions, but it is stressed that they are evaluative and prescriptive, i.e. it is suggested that language ideologies have the potential to influence language use. Furthermore, they are culturally and historically situated and tied to power and dominance.

Focussing on linguistic differentiation, Gal and Irvine define the ideological aspects of that as “the ideas with which participants frame their understanding of linguistic varieties and the differences among them, and map those understandings onto people, events, and activities that are significant to them”. They continue: “we call these conceptual organizations ideologies because they are suffused with the political and moral issues pervading the particular sociolinguistic field, and because they are subject to the interests of their bearers’ social position” (1995:970, emphasis in the original). Language ideologies are here conceptualised as a framework with which to understand linguistic variation. Furthermore, it is again emphasised that language ideologies are socially situated.

Kroskrity also stresses the fact that language ideologies are context-bound when he defines them as “beliefs, or feelings, about languages as used in their social world” (2004:498). He argues that because language ideologies are grounded in social experience, which differs from one person to the next, they are most profitably viewed as multiple rather than

---

47 Kroskrity views this difference in focus on explicit and implicit language ideologies as a tension between emphasising speakers’ awareness as a form of agency and emphasising the embeddedness of language ideologies in sociocultural systems (2004:497).
homogeneous. This view of language ideologies is in opposition to earlier schools of sociolinguistics, e.g. variationist studies in which the speech community was defined by shared evaluations and attitudes towards linguistic varieties. In these earlier studies, language ideologies were thus conceptualised as shared throughout the speech community. The new theoretical focus on multiplicity assumes that different ideologies exist within a speech community and that different ideologies construct alternate realities, or in less sweeping terms: they construct differing views arising from different social positions (Gal, 1998:320). One advantage of adopting a view of language ideologies as multiple is that it allows for a focus on potential conflicts and contradictions.

Kroskrity furthermore proposes that language ideologies should be viewed as constructed in the interest of specific groups, rather than individuals. Related to this argument, Seargeant suggests that whereas attitudes are individualised dispositions, recurrent expressions of attitudes within a community can be seen as evidence of the more structured belief systems constituting ideologies (2009:125). In other words, where attitudes are by definition individual, ideologies are shared. The central point here is that they are not shared by the whole speech community, but shared among members of groups within the speech community. Taking this approach means that language ideologies are both multiple and shared. That they are multiple means that an individual can have multiple, potentially conflicting, language ideologies, but also that multiple language ideologies exist within a speech community. That they are shared does not mean that all members of the speech community share all language ideologies, but that some individuals share one language ideology which reflects the interests of this group, and that members of another group, which may include some of the same individuals, share another language ideology.

One final aspect of language ideologies is the role of power. In their discussions of different definitions of ideology, both Blommaert and Woolard define power as inextricably linked with the more critical versions of ideology. According to Woolard, one view of ideology is that it is used to acquire power (1995:6-7). According to Blommaert, ideology is tied to processes of power and dominance (2006:510). Also Jaworski and
Coupland (above) define ideology as tied to power struggles. According to Seargeant, power determines ideologies, but ideologies also create power relations:

In so far as ideologies are classifications of the world according to a specific system of values shared by a community, they reproduce hierarchies within society and thus are, in the final instance, determined by and productive of power relations. (2009:27)

Gal (1998) provides a more detailed account of the role of power in language ideologies. According to Gal, ideologies provide representations of the social world. And the power of ideologies resides not only in this ability to constitute social groups, but also in the ability to valorise one group and its practices over others, and to formulate certain forms of discourse and disable other forms. If we take the one-nation-one-language ideology and Denmark as an example, this language ideology constitutes two groups within Danish society: Danish speakers vs. non-Danish speakers. It also valorises the Danish speakers and the practice of speaking Danish over other groups and practices with its insistence on Danish as the only natural language in Denmark. Furthermore, according to Gal, some ideologies have the potential to gain assent even from those whose social identities and practices they do not valorise (1998:321). Ideologies, then, become dominant, not just because they are held by dominant groups, but because even the dominated shared them. Continuing the above example, this would mean that immigrants in Denmark who do not master the Danish language would also espouse the one-nation-one-language ideology even though it does not reflect the interests of this group.

To sum up, definitions of ideology range from neutral to critical. Language ideologies have been defined variously as explicit beliefs and as implicit assumptions about language and language use. Furthermore, language ideologies are seen as part of specific socio-cultural contexts, and as grounded in social experience. This leads to the conclusion that they are

---

48 Which I will return to in section 8.4.
most profitably viewed as multiple as they reflect the interests of different social groups. Hence, they are potentially conflicting. Where attitudes belong to individuals, language ideologies are shared among groups of people. In more critical approaches, power is inextricably linked with ideologies, which are both determined by and productive of power relations.

8.2 The performative aspect of language ideologies

According to the above definitions, ideologies reproduce hierarchies, they constitute social groups, they formulate discourses and they valorise social identities and practices. In this section I will further explore the relationship between ideologies and social practice, including linguistic practice. In a recent empirical work on language ideologies, Seargeant defines ideology as “any entrenched system of beliefs which structures social behavior” (2009:40) and language ideologies as “the structured and consequential ways in which we think about language” (ibid., p. 26). The emphasis in these definitions is on the relationship between ideology and behaviour, more specifically Seargeant argues that ideology structures social behaviour. Eagleton calls this “the performative aspect of ideology under its constative guise: ideology creates and acts in a social world while it masquerades as a description of that world” (1991:19 in Woolard, 1998:11). Woolard also recognises this potential of language ideologies in the introduction to the anthology Language Ideologies (Schieffelin et al., 1998) when she defines the aim of the volume as “not just to analyze and critique the social roots of linguistic ideologies but to analyze their efficacy, the way they transform the material reality they comment on” (Woolard, 1998:11).

Jaworski et al. explicate the way in which what they call metalanguage influences the social world:

Metalanguage can work at an ideological level, and influence people’s actions and priorities in a wide range of ways, some clearly visible and others much less so. When we approach language use as discourse and social practice, we naturally view language as a form of social action. But it is in the interplay between usage and social
evaluation that much of the social “work” of language – including pressures towards social integration and division, and the policing of social boundaries generally – is done. That is one of the reasons why metalanguage matters to sociolinguistics. (2004:3)

And this is why I include a study of language ideologies in this project, because language ideologies influence participants’ social world and social practice. I am not interested in the language ideologies at Lundbeck merely for their own sake. Rather I am interested in the language ideologies present in the discourse of my informants because of the assumed relationship between language ideologies and social practice, including linguistic practice.

The relationship between language ideologies and language use was dealt with already by Silverstein (1979). According to him, one long-running language ideology is what he calls the referential ideology of language; “the widespread belief in denotation as the main function of language” (Blommaert, 2006:511). Within this view language is seen as a bounded, context-less artefact with one clear function: denotation. Silverstein argues that the referential language ideology can cause certain forms of language structure to change towards a more denotationally transparent system. When people believe denotation to be the main function of language, they will use language accordingly (Blommaert, 2006:516).

Gal and Irvine are also concerned with the relationship between language ideologies and language use (1995; see also Irvine and Gal, 2000). From their point of view ideologies “locate, interpret, and rationalize sociolinguistic complexity, identifying linguistic varieties with ‘typical’ persons and activities and accounting for the differentiations between them” (1995:972). According to Gal and Irvine, this happens through three semiotic processes: iconicity, recursiveness and erasure. Iconicity is a process through which linguistic practices that index social groups become iconic, i.e. a linguistic feature is thought to display the inherent nature of a social group. Gal and Irvine give an example from a Hungarian village where most families are categorised as either craftsmen or farmers. The two categories of families have different speech styles which are thought
to display their respective natures, e.g. the farmers’ plainness in speech is thought to show their controlled and restrained manner, whereas the elaborate and ornamented speech style of the craftsmen is believed to be a display of the same inherent character traits. Recursiveness is the projection of an opposition which is salient at one level onto another level, e.g. when the opposition farmer/craftsman is recursively projected onto individuals and situations when a farmer styleshifts between farmer style and craftsman style in a conversation with craftsmen.\footnote{This is similar to Bell’s theory that intraspeaker variation (styleshift) is derived from interspeaker variation (1984).} The third process is erasure: when persons, activities or sociolinguistic phenomena inconsistent with the ideological schema are unnoticed or explained away, e.g. when the farmer/craftsman division erases the differences in wealth within each group (Gal and Irvine, 1995:973).

In conclusion, the performative aspect of language ideologies is a complex issue. As with definitions of language ideologies, researchers come at the topic from different angles. It is, however, widely recognised that language ideologies have an impact on the social world.

### 8.3 My definition of language ideologies

Having reviewed the literature on language ideologies, I will now outline my working definition of language ideologies, and how I apply the framework in this thesis. In my definition

- language ideologies can be found both in explicitly stated beliefs and in underlying implicit assumptions
- language ideologies are situated in specific socio-cultural contexts
- language ideologies are grounded in social experience and are subject to the interests of their bearer’s social position
- multiple, potentially conflicting, language ideologies co-exist in a speech community
- language ideologies are shared by groups of individuals rather than by all members of the speech community
language ideologies are both determined by power relations and contribute to creating them
language ideologies are performative in their ability to influence social and linguistic practices; as they e.g. constitute social groups, formulate and disable discourses and valorise social identities and practices.

These points should make it clear that my approach is critical rather than the neutral. Finally, I will add a quote by Seargeant which neatly summarises my position:

With respect to language, therefore, to speak of ideologies is to say that there exist socio-political (that is, historically specific) conceptions of what constitutes language and of how it functions as part of social existence. These conceptions can be both implicit and explicit, but in either case they constitute a shared (though continuously disputed) belief system that influences the way in which we interact with language. (2009:28)

8.4 Some prevalent language ideologies

Seeing language ideologies as historically and culturally situated means that it is necessary to investigate them in relation to the context in which they appear. For this reason I want to mention briefly three of the most widespread and influential language ideologies in the broad context of contemporary Western (European) society. While they are by no means the only such widespread language ideologies, I will restrict myself to mentioning these three, as they are the ones most likely to have some bearing on my data.

The one-nation-one-language ideology dates from 18th century German Romanticism and is associated with Herder and his characterisation of language as the genius of a people (Woolard, 1998:16). As the name indicates, in this ideology linguistic boundaries are thought to coincide with national (and ethnic) boundaries. In 19th century Europe the equation of one language with one culture had great political significance, as a linguistically united community (= a nation), when tied to a territory,
could claim to deserve statehood (Gal and Irvine, 1995:968). Today, this particular language ideology is still widespread and influential, particularly in relation to minority languages and multilingualism. Equating one language with one nation means that multilingualism and codeswitching are marked, or even stigmatised, behaviour.

Another prevalent language ideology is the ‘standard language’ ideology. According to Milroy, the chief characteristic of the standard language ideology is “the belief that there is one and only one correct spoken form of the language, modelled on a single correct written form” (1999:174). Furthermore, “the standard ideology holds that far from being a morally neutral fact of social life, language change equates with language decay, and variation with ‘bad’ or ‘inadequate’ language” (ibid., p. 175). In this way the standard language ideology valorises the standard language while devaluing nonstandard forms, e.g. dialects (Kroskrity, 2004:502). In some definitions of the standard language ideology, the political and hegemonic nature is even more heavily emphasised. Lippi-Green describes the standard language ideology as “a bias toward an abstracted, idealized, homogenous spoken language which is imposed and maintained by dominant bloc institutions and which names as its model the written language, but which is drawn primarily from the speech of the upper, middle class” (1997:64).

A third widespread language ideology is the ‘English as the language of globalisation’ ideology. Haberland (2009) discusses this ideology in terms of a hegemonic discourse which presents English as the only relevant international language. It is hegemonic because not only do speakers of other languages choose English in a large number of situations, they “consider this choice natural with respect to the existing linguistic world order” (2009:25).

8.5 Methods for analysing language ideologies

As discussed in chapter 3 on methodology, focus group interviews are very useful in “examining participants’ shared understandings of everyday life, and the everyday use of language and culture of particular groups” (Litosseliti, 2003:18). Furthermore, what distinguishes focus
group interviews from individual interviews and other kinds of group interviews is the emphasis on interaction and the use of interaction as data. According to my working definition of language ideologies as outlined in section 8.3, language ideologies are shared, rather than individual, and they can be found both in explicitly stated beliefs and in underlying implicit assumptions. Focus group data is thus particularly well suited for an analysis of these shared language ideologies; both in the way that they are articulated explicitly in the interaction, and in the way that underlying assumptions are revealed through the interaction. The five focus group interviews are thus the primary data for the language ideologies analysis, which has also been informed by the ethnographic data and analysis in chapter 5.

8.5.1 Two levels: explicit talk and implicit assumptions

In her introductory chapter to *Language Ideologies*, Woolard distinguishes between three sittings of language ideology:

- in linguistic practice itself
- in metapragmatic/metalinguistic discourse, i.e. in explicit talk about language
- and in implicit metapragmatics, defined as “the unsaid, the unexpressed assumptions that implicitly frame a text” (Woolard, 1998:9)\(^\text{50}\).

Previous empirical studies of language ideologies have focussed on one or more of these sittings. Laihonen analyses language ideologies as they are discursively constructed in interaction, i.e. he focusses on Woolard’s second sitting, which he defines as “explicit metalinguistic discourse or talk about language” (2008:669). In his study of ideologies of English in Japan, Sargeant also focusses on the second sitting of language ideologies in his analysis of interviews: “The object of analysis here is the expressed attitudes of the participants toward English, and also the manner of the articulation for this in terms of the associations, juxtapositions and explicit conceptualizations that are made” (2009:41). He also attends to the third

\(^{50}\) Woolard compares this third sitting to Gumperz’ contextualisation cues (Woolard, 1998:9).
siting when he looks for premises upon which arguments are based and connections between concepts which need not be expressed explicitly because they are already assumed: “it is ideas that are treated as self-evident, and which are not accorded special justification, which can be gathered inductively and assembled to suggest the outline of how English is being collectively conceptualized within Japan” (ibid., p. 42). Blommaert and Verschueren (1998) focus solely on the third siting; implicit metapragmatics. When investigating widely shared ideologies, it is crucial, according to Blommaert and Verschueren, to attach more weight to the implicit frame of reference, the supposedly common world of beliefs in which the texts are anchored than to the explicit statements. The basic assumption is that authors cannot express what they want to communicate in a fully explicit way. Therefore their texts leave implicit most of the assumptions they expect readers to share with them, and a careful analysis of those implicit assumptions will reveal a common frame of reference or ideology. Hence isolated examples are never sufficient as evidence, coherence – either manifested as recurrence or systematic absence – is necessary in forming conclusions (1998:191). In an analysis of interaction, this means that it can be fruitful to focus on what is not said, i.e. the underlying beliefs which participants assume to be shared.

Kroskrity makes an interesting suggestion with regard to the different sitings of language ideologies. He proposes a correlation between a high level of discursive consciousness and active contestation of ideologies on the one hand, and between a low level of discursive consciousness and highly naturalised, definitively dominant ideologies on the other (2004:505). If this theory holds, we would expect analyses of explicit talk to reveal the more contested language ideologies, and analyses of implicit assumptions to reveal the naturalised, hegemonic language ideologies.

I have chosen to concentrate on the second and third of Woolard’s sitings in my analysis of the focus group interviews, leaving me with two levels of analysis, one that I call metalinguistic discourse, i.e. the explicit talk about language use, and another level that (following Blommaert and
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51 Blommaert and Verschueren talk about texts and authors because their data material is newspaper articles.
Verschueren) I call implicit metapragmatics, where I focus on the implicit assumptions. To the extent that I draw on my ethnographic data, the scope of this level can be expanded to encompass “the implicit understandings and unspoken assumptions embedded and reproduced in the structure of institutions and their everyday practices” (Gal, 1998:319). In this definition, language ideologies can be extrapolated not only from the assumptions framing a text, but also from assumptions embedded in social structures and practice.

8.5.2 Discourse analysis

The way to approach an analysis of language ideologies has already been touched upon in the above. Here I will outline my analytical procedures further. I have transcribed all five focus group interviews and listened to them repeatedly to identify key sequences. In my further analysis I have drawn on both discourse analysis (Gilbert and Mulkay, 1984) and interactional sociolinguistics (Gumperz, 1982). In addition to these classics, I draw on the approaches outlined by Seargeant and Blommaert and Verschueren above. I also follow Jenkins’ (2007) advice to pay attention both to what is said and how it is said. Jenkins works with two levels of analysis: overtly articulated beliefs and the manner in which they are expressed. This second level thus functions as a means of accessing latent attitudes, or what I call implicit assumptions. Jenkins focusses here on stylistic choices, e.g. repetition, use of metaphor, collocation, repetition and lexical choices (i.e. use of positive vs. negative words and phrases). Furthermore, she analyses participants’ use of prosodic features, such as pauses, laughter, stress, and pitch movement and the way these prosodic features are used as contextualisation cues.

I am interested in the symbolic values of Danish and English, and in investigating this aspect of language ideologies I draw on Seargeant’s approach used in his study of ideas of English in Japan. Seargeant sees the symbolic value of a language as part of the ideology about that language. The analysis of such symbolic values can take two forms: an investigation of the way in which it results in specific strategies of regulation for the language, which is what Seargeant mostly focusses on, and an investigation of how “the ideologies of the language influence the way
that it is spoken and thus result in the metapragmatics of a contextually specific sociolect or variety” (2009:31). This second line of investigation is what I carry out in the following analysis. In his analysis Seargeant focusses on conceptualisations of the language which have become normalised and taken for granted. He looks for premises upon which arguments are based and recurring connections between concepts which need not be expressed explicitly because they are already assumed. Seargeant is interested in how a particular language accrues specific cultural meaning within a society, especially as it is found in discourses about the language or its symbolic citation. Drawing on Peircean semiotics and referring to Silverstein (1979), Seargeant differentiates between indexical and symbolic use of the language. Seargeant concludes that the concept of the language has symbolic value, and its use is indexical of the beliefs constituting the value of this symbol (2009:30). Furthermore, the symbolic value is tied to a specific context, and interpretation of the value must begin with an understanding of the context. The ethnographic analysis in chapter 5 serves that purpose for this study.
9 Language ideologies analysis

My aim in this chapter is to investigate the language ideologies constructed and employed by participants in their discussions of languages and language use at Lundbeck. My research questions for this third study are: What discourses about Danish, English and language choice are constructed? What are the symbolic values attached to Danish and English respectively? My focus in the analysis has been the beliefs and language ideologies which emerge from the data and only secondarily their connection to the widespread language ideologies mentioned in section 8.4.

In the analysis I have found it useful to view language ideologies as comprised of sets of beliefs about language. Consequently, I have structured this chapter so that related beliefs are treated under one headline corresponding to the overarching language ideology. In section 9.1 the headline is ‘Danish because we are in Denmark’. I discuss here a set of beliefs related to the pre-eminence of the local language, and the relation between these beliefs and the widespread one-nation-one-language ideology. In section 9.2 I discuss sets of beliefs revolving around the idea that the mother tongue is the ‘natural’ language. These beliefs are connected to those discussed in 9.1 in that they are also linked to the one-nation-one-language ideology. The mother-tongue-is-natural ideology explains among other things why Danes are against the use of English among themselves, and the analysis leads to a consideration of the connection between this ideology and so-called ‘domain loss’, a concept discussed in chapter 2. In section 9.3 I discuss beliefs connected to the language-hierarchy ideology, in this case a hierarchy among different kinds of English and among different English users. This part of the analysis is then related to the ‘English as a lingua franca’ ideology found in the literature. The set of beliefs discussed in section 9.4 revolve around the idea of English as the international language, particularly the belief that the degree of internationalisation at Lundbeck can be measured through the use of English. In section 9.5 I discuss a set of beliefs about language learning as a resource for social mobility. Interestingly, this ideology is found particularly frequently among people with little or no
foreign language skills. The analyses in sections 9.4 and 9.5 also provide insights about the symbolic values attached to Danish and English at Lundbeck. In section 9.6 I conclude on the previous analyses, while the final section 9.7 is dedicated to a discussion of the link between language ideologies and language use.

9.1 ‘Danish because we are in Denmark’

In the ethnographic analysis in chapter 5 I found that ‘Danish is default’ was one of the strongest linguistic norms at Lundbeck. Not surprisingly, some of the beliefs about language expressed by informants in the focus group interviews echo this norm. They frequently stress that Danish is the natural language in Denmark, and it is remarkable how often this is used as an argument for the use of Danish the way it is here: “vi jo trods alt danskere det er en dansk virksomhed/after all we are Danes it is a Danish company” (Thea, Danish service employee). Danish is the natural choice, it is what should be used because we are in a Danish company, because we are Danes and because we are in Denmark. In one of the interviews the informants discuss the choice of English over Danish for the company website and how this is perceived as arrogant by Danes. This discussion exemplifies this ideology nicely, as it shows how Danish is the natural choice and the choice of English requires justification. Failing to provide such justification may lead people to regard the choice of English as the arrogance of more proficient English speakers.

The Danish-because-we-are-in-Denmark ideology is most clearly seen in the discussions about foreigners learning Danish. The dominant belief here is that foreigners should learn Danish if they intend to live in
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52 The meaning of the Danish particle ‘jo’ is difficult to capture in English. In the literature ‘jo’ is referred to as a ‘modal particle’ (Christensen, 2006) or a ‘dialogic particle’ (Mortensen, 2010). According to Mortensen, such dialogic particles “manage the expression of justificatory support in interaction because they orchestrate points of view in the discourse and evaluate them against each other” (2010:95). ‘Jo’ has no direct translation equivalent in English, but Mortensen (citing Hansen and Heltoft, 2011) explains the meaning of ‘jo’ in this way: “jo carries an abstract polyphonic instruction which can be formalised as I hold a specific point of view (p) and you do not hold non-p, and will therefore not contradict me” (2010:96). In other words, in dialogue ‘jo’ is often used to express an expectation of consensus, as is indeed the case in the above example.
Denmark. Not surprisingly, the Danes with the least foreign language skills have the strongest feelings about foreigners learning Danish. In some cases they express this belief almost aggressively. In the interview with the service assistants, I mention that I have talked to one foreigner who does not want to learn Danish because he has been informed that he can get by with English at Lundbeck. The service assistants are not pleased with this attitude:

1  URSULA:   det er dumt
2  MARTHA:   ja
3  THEA:     [så kunne han blive hjemme]
4  GITTE:    [jeg synes ikke det er godt]

1  URSULA:   that’s stupid
2  MARTHA:   yes
3  THEA:     [he should stay at home]
4  GITTE:    [I don’t think it’s a good thing]

For the service assistants as a group with very limited English skills, ‘Danish because we are in Denmark’ is clearly an ideology which furthers their interests. They do not have the option of switching to English, and they believe they do not have the capability of learning English either. (As discussed in section 5.5.1, they think that the English courses offered by Lundbeck are too difficult for them.) The Danish-because-we-are-in-Denmark ideology moves focus from their lack of language skills to the foreigners’. And it goes even further: following the logic of this ideology, the service assistants do not lack language skills, on the contrary they possess the language skills appropriate to the setting, Danish that is.

A small minority of the Danish informants contest the Danish-because-we-are-in-Denmark ideology. Contradicting the other members in their focus groups, they claim to find it strange that Danish is chosen for large meetings which have foreigners in the audience or to not even think about it when they receive an email in English. These statements typically come from employees who work in an international environment or who have a large degree of international contact. Coincidentally these employees are also the more proficient and confident English speakers. It seems then that those Danes most at ease with the use of English in the workplace are also more accepting of the use of a foreign language.
Most Danes with good English skills share this ideology, however. But where the English-have-nots emphasise communication and intelligibility as the prime reasons why it is important that foreigners learn Danish, more proficient English speakers emphasise social integration, saying that not knowing Danish means that you are sidelined socially. Furthermore, the belief is that social integration depends on the foreigners’ willingness to learn Danish, not necessarily their actual achieved competence (this distinction was touched upon in chapter 5.3.3). In other words, the attitude of foreigners to learning Danish is very important. Being interested in learning and using Danish is regarded positively and is seen as a willingness to integrate into Danish society. Foreigners who explicitly express an interest in learning Danish are thought to be easier to talk to as they signal that they want to get to know the Danes. Choosing not to learn Danish, on the other hand, is viewed very negatively, so much so that it is clear that much more is at stake than just intelligibility. Sofie talks about a co-worker who has not displayed much interest in learning Danish, forcing her to communicate with him in English. This leads to the following exchange:

1. LISA: he has chosen to come here himself
2. I’m sorry that’s my opinion if you [choose to]
3. SOFIE: [yeah yeah]
4. LISA: move to another country then you have to
5. then it’s not just the company that you choose
6. but you also choose the country’s er
7. well you choose [all of it]
8. LISA: [ellers så må man sgu tage hjem igen]
9. LISBETH: [mm]
10. SOFIE: [både inden for og uden for arbejdspladsen]
11. LISA: [ja]
12. SOFIE: [så må man integrere sig [øh]
13. LISA: [vælger at]
14. SOFIE: [ja ja]
15. LISA: flytte til et andet land så skal du altså
16. så er det ikke kun firmaet du vælger
17. men du vælger altså også landets øh
18. jæmén du vælger det [hele]
19. LISBETH: [mm]
20. SOFIE: så må man integrere sig [øh]
21. LISA: [vælger at]
22. SOFIE: [ja ja]
23. LISA: han har selv valgt at komme her altså
24. unds- det er sådan min holdning hvis du
25. [vælger at]
26. SOFIE: [ja ja]
The lab technicians here reach the same conclusion as the service assistants above: foreigners who are not interested in learning Danish are not welcome. They also, however, link the rejection of Danish lessons with integration. The underlying assumption here is that learning Danish or not is about social identity, about wanting to be a part of the group or not. I am going to argue that the Danes perceive foreigners who do not want to learn Danish as rejecting their offer to be a part of Danish society. According to social identity theory (SIT) (Augoustinos and Walker, 1995; Tajfel, 1978), we make sense of the social world by carving it up into social categories or groups. In the terms of SIT, groups we are members of are ingroups, other groups are outgroups. Groups stand in power or status relations to each other, and these relations are determined through comparisons between groups, in SIT called social comparisons. The theory is that subjects strive to enhance their social identity, and that this is done through social comparisons. If we can compare our ingroup favourably to relevant outgroups, the ingroup becomes positively valorised, and through our identification with this group, our positive social identity is enhanced. If an individual cannot compare the ingroup favourably to other groups, he or she can resort to a number of strategies, e.g. seeking to leave the original group for a more positively valued group or trying to change the status of the group. This theory can explain the animosity towards foreigners who do not want to learn Danish, i.e. who are perceived as not wanting to be a part of the ‘Danish group’. In the terms of SIT, foreigners who choose not to learn Danish are a threat to the Danes’ positive social identity since these foreigners do not value the Danish-speaking outgroup highly enough to want to join it. Instead they prefer the somewhat problematic status of a non-Danish-speaking immigrant. It is this perceived threat to their positive social identity which makes the Danes reject the foreigners in turn, which is what they do when they say that the foreigners who do not want to learn Danish should go home. And this perceived threat is one reason why many Danes so vocally espouse the Danish-because-we-are-in-Denmark ideology.
Interestingly, the international employees at Lundbeck, the scientists and marketing people who have been recruited from around the world, also express the belief that you should try to learn the language of the country you live in. And they are clearly aware of the salience of this ideology at Lundbeck. One international employee labels it “the well you’ve been here for so many years you should be speaking Danish”, suggesting by the use of the definite article that this is a well-known ideology at Lundbeck - or perhaps in Danish society at large. The addition of the definite article also reveals that when she says this, she expects the other participants in the focus group to be familiar with the ideology. And they are familiar with it, it is even shared among the majority of this group. Those foreigners who have learnt Danish are aware that putting in an effort towards learning and using Danish is important in relation to their Danish colleagues. One international employee reports that in their linguistically mixed research department, the non-Danish scientists started to make a point of using Danish in meetings and for presentations and that this resulted in an improved working environment. And in the focus group interview with the international employees, the majority of the informants share the belief that it is the attitude towards learning Danish rather than the actual achieved competence that matters:

if I came into Denmark and said I had no interest in learning Danish then that shuts the door whereas if you come in and you say I’m very interested in Danish and you put in an effort then they’re very much more sort of friendly and open and willing to help with that ... how you sort of present to the Danes from that perspective is very important

(Michelle, international research employee)

The international group believes that learning Danish is a key factor in keeping foreign experts in Denmark in the long term. Foreigners who choose not to learn Danish often leave Lundbeck after a short time period:

I mean certainly there's other reasons why people are leaving but I think that is a factor either during your day to day work environment or when you think long term career potential and I know that Lundbeck has sort of been a bit frustrated by being able to recruit people and then being able to retain the knowledge and not lose those people and I do think the language is an issue

(Michelle, international research employee)
While the majority of the international informants agree with Michelle about the importance of learning Danish for integration reasons, Julia represents a vocal minority. She has chosen not to learn Danish although she has worked at Lundbeck headquarters in Denmark for six years. At one point in the interview she firmly states that she has not found the lack of Danish skills an integration issue, neither in the company nor outside. Her contestation here of the belief that Danish is necessary for social integration clearly justifies her choice not to learn Danish. Julia is a good example of conflicted ideologies within an individual, however. At another point in the interview, she says:

> would it have been better if I'd have learnt the language of course do I feel stupid that after six years am I not slightly embarrassed yes of course I am I would love to have learnt it but I mean it's just I it's not it's not been an issue

(Julia, international marketing employee)

On the one hand, Julia makes a point of saying that it has not been an issue. On the other hand, she says that she feels stupid and embarrassed that she has not learnt Danish. These statements indicate that Julia does share the Danish-because-we-are-in-Denmark ideology, and this last example shows just how dominant this ideology is, as even those who do not benefit from it share it to some degree.

These beliefs about Danish as the natural language in Denmark are reminiscent of the pervasive one-nation-one-language ideology discussed in section 8.4, in which linguistic boundaries are thought to coincide with national and ethnic boundaries. In fact, the one-nation-one-language ideology appears at several levels in my material. It is not only used as an explicit argument in relation to foreigners learning Danish, but is also present at a subconscious level in the labelling of people and places. Foreigners in general are frequently categorised as ‘English’ or ‘from England’. In all of these examples it is clear from the context that what is meant is the group of foreigners, not just those of British nationality. One example of this is when a non-British native speaker of English says: “there was a bunch of us in the department that were English”, including
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53 In Danish the nominal “englændere” (literally “Englishmen”) is often used, in the translation to the English “English” this close association to nationality is lost.
in this description herself as well as a German colleague. In other examples the use of ‘English’ is corrected to ‘English-speaking’, making the intended meaning clear: "du risikerer at der er kommet at der er en englænder med eller en engelsktalende person med/there is a chance that an English person has joined or an English speaking person has joined". While this type of labelling attests to the fact that Danish speakers vs. English speakers is a very salient categorisation at Lundbeck, (with ‘engelsktalende/English speakers’ commonly used to describe foreigners at Lundbeck), it also shows that people have difficulty disassociating language and nationality. Seen in conjunction with the other expressions of the one-nation-one-language ideology, these categorisations, even if they are slips of the tongue, indicate the prevalence of this ideology which makes it seem natural that if someone speaks English, they must be from England.

Even though the reality in a globalised world does not match this ideology, it is still used by various groups among my informants to argue their case and disguise their concerns, be they lack of English skills or feelings of rejection by international colleagues. And perhaps it is shared by so many, both Danes and foreigners, precisely because a world divided into linguistically homogeneous nation states is no longer the reality (if it ever was). Perhaps social identity concerns are not the only issue here. A more general concern is what I would term feelings of dislocation and insecurity in a transitional era of increasing globalisation. The employees at Lundbeck feel strongly that they are in a transitional phase with regard to globalisation. As discussed in the ethnographic analysis in chapter 5, the consensus is that the company is on its way to becoming an international company with all the changes that entails with regard to language use, company culture and organisation. In this light, the insistence on the one-nation-one-language ideology becomes a way of maintaining and strengthening the Danish national identity, both on a company level and on a personal level. In this way a language ideology can be used as way of constructing stability and maintaining clear borders in a changing world.
9.2 ‘The mother tongue is natural’

One language ideology that all my informants can agree on is the ideology which holds that the mother tongue is the natural language. At Lundbeck this ideology is often used to argue for the use of Danish, or as an argument against the use of English among Danes. Although I did not ask directly about this in the focus group interviews, the special status of the mother tongue was brought up frequently in discussions about language choice. My informants believe that people are more comfortable when they speak their mother tongue, which means both that they are likely to speak more in their mother tongue and that they are able to express themselves better. Implicit in this belief is also that asking someone to switch to a language other than their mother tongue is asking a lot. This belief is not restricted to Danes and Danish, but extends explicitly to other nationalities and mother tongues as well. Towards the end of one interview the informants remark that I must have heard other languages besides Danish and English during my fieldwork since “franskmandene snakker fransk sammen ik og svenskerne snakker svensk sammen tyskerne snakker tysk/the French speak French to each other right and the Swedes speak Swedish to each other the Germans speak German”. And in another interview an informant labels Brits and Americans “the natural English speakers” - which I take to mean that mother tongue speakers are the ‘natural’ English speakers in comparison with second or foreign language users.

Furthermore, the perceived existence of a natural link between a language and its mother tongue speakers is also behind the belief that speaking a foreign language can be distancing. This distance is expressed in one of two ways: either in the way that speaking a foreign language means putting on a façade which makes it easier to assume the role of teacher or presenter, or in the way that speaking a foreign language makes it harder to express yourself, both in terms of meaning and in terms of identity. As Line, a Danish IT employee, explains:

man helst vil fremstå som den man er og den man er er man jo ikke hvis ikke man kan udtrykke sig ordentligt … og derfor så kan det der engelske sprog jo være en barriere
you want to appear as who you are and you can’t be who you are if you can’t express yourself properly … and that’s why the English language can be a barrier.

Personal identity is linked with language, and speaking a foreign language makes it impossible to express that identity, to “be who you are”.

The belief in the mother tongue as the natural medium is also present as a background assumption when the participants explain their language choices to me and to each other. A German research scientist explains that she has been communicating with a group of German colleagues via email in English and that this had been a topic of discussion (within the group or outside it is not clear from her explanation). She then carefully explains that she chose English because she knew that the emails would have to be forwarded later to other people. By choosing English in the first place, she would be saved the trouble of translating later on. The fact that she feels the need to explain her choice to use another language than their common mother tongue, and her allusion to a previous discussion of the topic implies that she is operating on the underlying assumption that the mother tongue is the natural choice.

A related belief says that humour and irony are inextricably linked with the mother tongue, thus making it impossible to joke in a foreign language even if you have a high level of proficiency:

for me humour is defined through language … for example when you go to lunch and then it's a lot about like one-liners you know fast responses funny funny comments and stuff and I think those you can actually only do in your own language … I could (even) see the play on word now in Danish I would never be able to do that because you can only do it when you're native

(Andreas, international research employee)

So although Andreas now has a high level of Danish proficiency, enough so that he can understand the play on words in Danish, he still believes that he would never be able to make a play on words in Danish himself since that is only possible for native speakers of Danish. In another interview, two IT employees agree that not even understanding Danish humour is possible for non-native speakers. They talk about the particular Danish ‘culture of irony’ which is built into the Danish language, and which people will miss out on, even if they understand Danish, because it
is necessary to be a native speaker to understand the sense of humour. When informants in these examples construct an essential link between sense of humour and the mother tongue, they also link the mother tongue with national culture and identity, e.g. the Danish culture of irony. The mother-tongue-is-natural ideology thus appears to be related to the above-mentioned one-nation-one-language ideology, but is also an instance of what Blommaert and Verschueren (1998:192) dub ‘feature clustering’. They find that descent, history, culture, religion and language are treated as a feature cluster, and that such clusters identify natural discontinuities in the form of nations or peoples. One feature is essentially linked with the others, so that for instance a specific language can predict a specific history and culture. In this case it means that the use of the Danish language predicts a specific Danish culture of irony.

These different aspects of a language ideology which puts the mother tongue in a unique position as the only natural language for a speaker are behind the oft-mentioned belief that the use of English among Danes is unnatural. In the focus group interviews I asked the participants questions about language choice, e.g. when they would use Danish, and when they would use English. While discussing these questions, participants frequently stressed that English is not used in contexts where only Danes are present. Furthermore, the question of there being a language choice in these situations was refuted, as even the idea of using English among Danes was rejected as foolish. My informants describe the idea of speaking English among Danes as strange, artificial, or absolutely ridiculous. They say that there is no reason to do that whatsoever, and that the language used with Danes must be Danish. Some of the less confident English-speakers even feel uncomfortable speaking English in groups with a majority of Danes, although foreigners are part of the group, and the use of English thus justified.

There is one very interesting exception to the ideological opposition to English among Danes, however. Some types of written communication are exempted, in particular the PowerPoint slides used in combination with oral presentations. This type of communicative event is quite common at Lundbeck, both internally in the company and in meetings with external business partners. Along with certain types of emails, this
type of communication is routinely done in English even when the audience share the presenter’s or writer’s mother tongue. This practice is as such in stark contrast to all other communicative events, including the concurrent oral presentations, as evidenced by this excerpt from the discussion among the IT employees:

1  KASPER: jeg tror at jeg ville føle mig tåbelig ved at
2      stå og holde en præsentation eller et møde på
3      engelsk hvis alle var dansktalende
4  LINE: ja ja
5  KASPER: hvorfor skulle man dog det
6  LINE: nej det kunne jeg heller aldrig finde på men
7      mine slides omme bagved ville være på
8      engelsk

1  KASPER: I think I would feel foolish giving a
2      presentation or having a meeting in English
3      if all participants were Danish speakers
4  LINE: yeah yeah
5  KASPER: why would I do that
6  LINE: no I would never do that either but my
7      slides behind me would be in
8      English

Although the informants agree that this is the norm at Lundbeck, they all still feel the need to justify this use of English among Danes, for instance in this example taken from the lab technicians’ focus group interview:

1  LISBETH: jeg synes funktionsmøder ik der er slides og
2      [sådan noget der er slides på engelsk]
3  SOFIE: [det er meget på engelsk ik]
4  ANNA: ja fordi de måske også bruger det til
5      <det amerikanske datterselskab> eller de kan
6      præsentere [det til]
7  LISBETH: [ja ja]
8  ANNA: [USA også]
9  LISBETH: [ja]

1  LISBETH: I think divisional meetings right slides and
2      [such slides are in English]
3  SOFIE: [that’s in English a lot of the time right]
4  ANNA: yes because they perhaps also use it for
5      <the American subsidiary> or they can
6      present [it to]
7  LISBETH: [yeah yeah]
8  ANNA: [the US too]
9  LISBETH: [yeah]
When Lisbeth and Sofie agree that English is used a lot for slides in divisional meetings, which in Lisbeth’s case have an all Danish audience, Anna jumps in to explain that this is because ‘they’ may want to use the slides for presentations to Americans. And this is exactly the explanation they all give: that in order to be able to reuse the slides (or forward emails) without the extra burden of translating them, they have to be in English in case a later audience includes non-Danish-speakers. In the ethnographic analysis in section 5.4.3, I discussed ‘expected addressees’ as possible influences on language choice, specifically written language choices. The focus group data confirm that future addressees are indeed an important factor in language choice, particularly in the choice to use English for certain types of written communication. The choice of English among Danes is accepted in these situations because it is understood that this is done with a view to potential future addressees who may or may not understand Danish. At least in this business context, the need for efficiency trumps the belief in the naturalness of the mother tongue. But the discussion in the above excerpt is at the same time an example of how strong the mother-tongue-is-natural ideology is, as the informants clearly feel that the use of English among Danes in any context requires a lot of justification.

When a language ideology is so dominant as to be shared by all, who does then benefit from the reiteration of it? The interests of which groups are reflected in the beliefs which make up this ideology? In the case of the mother-tongue-is-natural ideology, it seems that different groups use the ideology to justify their language choices in different situations. Danes use it to argue for the general use of Danish in a company with English as the corporate language and no explicit language policy, and more specifically, e.g. as an explanation of why they would speak Danish in informal situations where non-Danish speakers are present. And native speakers of English use it to argue that it is natural for them to use English rather than Danish, even though they live in Denmark and work in a Danish company.

The dominant status of this language ideology has interesting implications for how it may influence language choice and language shift.
in the long run. In connection with the ‘domain loss’ debate, discussed in chapters 1 and 2, concerns have been put forward that the use of English as a corporate language would lead to increased use of English among Danes at the expense of the Danish language. The (omni)presence of the mother-tongue-is-natural language ideology suggests, however, that this is a very unlikely scenario, even years down the road. The ethnographic and language choice analyses reveal that English is rarely used among Danes without the presence of a non-Danish speaker. And the above language ideologies analysis reveals that a dominant language ideology constructs the use of English among Danes as unnatural. In my opinion, the prevalence of this language ideology makes it unlikely that English, or any other language, will supplant Danish as the natural medium of communication among Danes. I am not talking here about codeswitching or loanwords, both of which are of course already in frequent use particularly among young and younger Danes, but rather about the exclusive use of English. If we assume that there is a connection between language ideologies and language practices, and I do, one way of theorising that connection would be to say that dominant language ideologies have the greatest potential to influence language practices, including language choice. This means that in a speech community where a dominant language ideology brands English among Danes strange and artificial, it is highly unlikely that the use of English among Danes would increase. Following this line of reasoning, this analysis does not indicate that the spread of English as a language for international communication also means the spread of English among Danes.

The exception of English for PowerPoint slides and emails is interesting in this connection, however. I argued above that the hegemony of a language ideology which claims a natural link between a language and its mother tongue speakers will likely work against so-called ‘domain loss’. It follows then that the exceptions, the cases where other concerns are thought to be more important than this natural link, are the cases where English may have a possibility of gaining ground at the expense of Danish. And as I found above, concerns such as time and money heavily influence language choice for at least two types of communicative event, slides and emails. What I am suggesting, then, is that whereas spoken
Danish does not seem likely to lose ground to English, some types of written Danish may. In situations where there is a need to include future audiences in one’s deliberations over language choice, where translations take time, and where time is money, English may gain ground. If so, what we see here may portend a tiny crack in the wall of the Danish language monopoly in Denmark.

9.3 The language hierarchy

While the above analyses focus on language ideologies related to language choice, more specifically Danish vs. English, in this section I discuss beliefs about different kinds of English and different English users. These beliefs are all part of a language ideology which is based on the implicit assumption that language varieties are hierarchically organised. At Lundbeck the informants are concerned with placing different varieties or uses of English into such a hierarchy.

In the interviews the informants talk about native-speaker English as “correct”, “proper” and “good” English, while variation from native-speaker standards in comparison is viewed negatively. In this example Birgit, a Danish health and safety employee, talks about non-native English speakers in the subsidiaries and her feeling that their receptive English skills are somewhat lacking. She suggests that these speakers sometimes mask their inability to understand, especially when they are speaking with someone from the company headquarters:

det er vel så også et spørgsmål om at når det så samtidig er en fra moderselskabet som kommer så vil man for det første helst ikke virke dum og man vil helst heller ikke tabe ansigt og så skal man i al fald lade som om man forstår det.

I guess it also matters that when at the same time it’s someone from headquarters who is visiting then first of all you don’t want to appear stupid and you would also rather not lose face and then you have to at least pretend to understand.

Birgit associates not mastering the standard with appearing stupid and with face loss. Other informants share these beliefs which are particularly noticeable in relation to accent. A British accent is invariably described in positive terms, such as ”en pæn engelsk accent/a pretty English accent”; ”en meget korrekt britisk <accent>/a very correct British <accent>”; ”en
rigtig fin britisk accent/a really nice British accent”. A Danish accent, on the contrary, is to be avoided, it is something proficient English speakers strive to lose. Hence, not only is a British accent correct and really nice, it is also what the Danish English speakers aim for. Stine, a Danish research employee, tells a story about a Danish lab technician who is married to a Brit and therefore speaks “rigtig britisk engelsk/real British English”. Stine continues:

man kan faktisk ikke høre hun er dansk og der er min fornemmelse nogle gange at de andre de tør ikke rigtig sige noget fordi hold da op hun er simpelthen så god

actually you can’t hear that she is Danish and my feeling is that sometimes the others are afraid of saying anything because oh my she is just that good

The fact that you cannot hear that the lab technician is Danish is clearly a positive quality here, even though it is also something which intimidates her Danish colleagues so much that they refrain from speaking English in her presence. A strong Danish accent is also sometimes implicitly associated with a general lack of language proficiency, for instance in the following example where Stine comments on a Danish colleague that he “har en meget kraftig dansk accent men kan en sindssyg masse fremmedord/has a very strong Danish accent but has a very impressive vocabulary”. The use of the word ‘but’ implies an opposition between the two statements, or in other words, it is surprising that someone with a strong accent has a large vocabulary.

My informants also share the belief that their English improves when they are communicating with native speakers. As Laura, a Danish secretary, puts it: “man bliver bedre til engelsk blandt englændere/your English improves among the English”. The reverse is also the case: the Danes believe that their English deteriorates when they communicate with less proficient non-native speakers as they adjust e.g. their pronunciation. Again, the native-speaker standard is positively valued and seen as something to strive for.

The underlying assumption about a hierarchy of English use and users also reveals itself in the way that informants frequently remark upon the English proficiency of different national groups and compare them to each
other. Most salient are the beliefs that everyone in Denmark speaks English, and that Danes are very proficient English speakers:

> engelsk det er det vi alle sammen kan
> English that is what we all know
> (Kirsten, Danish communication employee)

> altså de mennesker der er ansat i Lundbeck kan jo læse engelsk
> der er jo ikke rigtig nogen som ikke kan
> people who work in Lundbeck can read English there really isn’t
> anyone who can’t
> (Line, Danish IT employee)

> in Denmark it's like that that most people speak very well
> English
> (Nicole, international research employee)

> you can perfectly well live in Denmark without speaking a word
> of Danish you would still be able to go to a supermarket or to a
> restaurant and things like that because everybody understands
> you
> (Andreas, international research employee)

These beliefs are shared to a very large degree and only infrequently contested. And as can be seen from the above quotes, not only Danes make these assertions, the international employees do, too. By constructing ‘Danes’ as a homogeneous group, the actual diversity in English competence among Danes (as evidenced in the ethnographic analysis in chapter 5, and for Denmark in general in Preisler, 1999; 2003) is overlooked. The prominence of beliefs which categorise Danes as a group compared to other non-native speakers as very competent English users means that the group of English-have-nots are forgotten, and also that the comprehension and production problems of less proficient English users remain hidden under the surface. Irvine and Gal describe a process they call erasure “in which ideology, in simplifying the sociolinguistic field, renders some persons or activities (or sociolinguistic phenomena) invisible” (2000:38). When all Danes are constructed as proficient English users, the internal variation in the group is disregarded, and Danes with little or no English skills are rendered invisible.

Some informants at least are aware that a minority of the employees at Lundbeck have very little or no English skills and mention this fact in the interviews. This does not, however, keep them from also espousing the
belief that everyone at Lundbeck is a proficient English speaker. Line, for instance, says about informing the IT users at Lundbeck about security updates:

jamen så er jeg ikke sikker på vi fanger alle de danske Valbybrugere hvis vi skriver kun på engelsk ik så derfor skriver vi den på begge to begge sprogene
but I’m not sure that we get the attention of all the Danish users at Valby\textsuperscript{54} if we only write in English therefore we write it in both in both languages

(Line, Danish IT employee)

In the same interview and quoted above on p. 251, Line expresses the belief that everyone at Lundbeck can read English and uses that as an argument for only distributing IT newsletters in English. Other informants make similar seemingly contradictory statements in the focus group interviews. It seems that the belief that all Danes are proficient English speakers applies when informants are speaking in general terms. When they are reminded of or themselves think of specific examples, they are more aware of the variety of English skills in the company and in Denmark at large.

The dominant belief is, however, that Danes are very proficient English speakers, and this case is often made with a comparison to the English skills of other non-native speakers. And in all cases, the Danes compare themselves favourably to English speakers from other countries. From a Lundbeck perspective, the comparison is often with the subsidiaries in general, but particularly the French are often singled out as being less proficient and less enthusiastic English speakers. And it is clear that a comparison is taking place, e.g. in this excerpt:

hvis jeg ringer til en fra Estland jamen så ved jeg jo at jeg mit engelsk er jo fantastisk godt i forhold til ik (laughs)
if I call someone from Estonia well then I know that my English is amazing compared to theirs right (laughs)

(Line, Danish IT employee)

Line obviously expects the other participants to agree with her here, as evidenced by her laughter at the end of the statement as well as her use of

\textsuperscript{54} Valby is the location of the Danish headquarters.
the dialogic particle “jo”, which also in this case is used to express an expectation of consensus in the group.

I discussed the standard-language ideology in section 8.4. This ideology holds that there is one and only one correct form of a language and that variation from this standard form equates bad language. The standard-language ideology is most often discussed in relation to dialect variation, but in this case the variation in question is the use of English by non-native speakers. Although the vast majority at Lundbeck are non-native speakers of English, they still adhere to a variant of the standard-language ideology where they place native varieties of English at the top of a language hierarchy (with British English perhaps a step above even other native varieties although this is only touched upon briefly in my material). Interestingly, the English proficiencies of different non-native users also have their defined positions in this hierarchy with English spoken by Danes taking a high-ranking position. Danes and international employees alike do not hesitate to mention the ‘fact’ that all Danes speak English and that they do so very well. In fact, the Danes rank themselves just below native speakers in the hierarchy, with other non-native speakers of English, typically Southern European or Middle Eastern speakers in my informants’ examples, positioned far below.

Although these beliefs about the supremacy of native-speaker English are not contested, it is notable that they are nevertheless not shared by all. The positive evaluations of native-speaker English are frequent among very proficient speakers, less frequent among less proficient speakers and not mentioned at all by the English-have-nots. Thus it appears that a certain level of English proficiency is required for this topic to come up in discussions. Furthermore, only the more proficient English speakers are concerned with their accent which is not surprising, considering that less proficient speakers may not be able to distinguish accents, much less change them.

In the theoretical preliminaries it was argued that language ideologies reflect the interests of the bearer’s social position. Following this line of thinking, it seems counterintuitive that Danes as non-native speakers should adhere so strongly to a standard-language ideology which valorises native-speaker English and therefore makes it difficult for them
to obtain a positive social identity. Gal suggests that some language ideologies may gain assent even from those whose social identities and practices the ideology does not valorise (1998:321), and the above is a good example of this. Another set of beliefs about the language hierarchy makes perfect sense, however, if we look at how it can reflect the interests of the Danish non-native English speakers. When they place themselves second in the hierarchy, just below the native speakers, it is easy to understand why this belief is so strong. It serves to strengthen the social identity of a group who cannot compare themselves favourably to the group of native speakers. Drawing again on social identity theory (Tajfel, 1978), the prevalence of the belief in Danes as very proficient English speakers can be explained in the following terms: All groups have a need to compare themselves favourably to relevant outgroups in order to gain a positive social identity. When the Danes compare themselves to native speakers, the comparison is not in their favour. In order to find a way to compare their group favourably to another group on this dimension (English proficiency), they simply choose another group for comparison, namely other non-native speakers. And this time, the Danish non-native speakers are able to compare themselves favourably to the outgroup, since they here can be considered more proficient.

The international employees’ support of the Danes-are-very-proficient-English-speakers ideology is more straightforwardly explained, since it clearly reflects the interests of their social position as non-Danish speakers (or non-native Danish speakers). Learning Danish becomes less pressing if in fact all your interlocutors are very proficient English speakers, and it thus makes sense that the international employees so vocally espouse this belief.

The salience of a language hierarchy at Lundbeck with native-speaker English at the top is also interesting in relation to what could be termed the ‘English as a lingua franca’ ideology. I discussed English as a lingua franca in chapter 2 and again in section 5.4.2. In the literature the English-as-a-lingua-franca ideology conceptualises ELF as an equally valuable alternative to native-speaker English and argues against a deficit view where non-native speakers are measured against native-speaker standards, and where deviation from these standards is considered an
error (e.g. House, 2003; Jenkins, 2006; Seidlhofer, 2004). In the ethnographic analysis I found that what I termed a lingua franca norm had developed at Lundbeck according to which it is acceptable to use a kind of English which does not live up to the target of the native-speaker standard. At the same time it was clear from the analysis that speakers at Lundbeck do aim for native-speaker English. From a language ideological point of view, my informants do not share the ELF ideology since it is clear from the interviews that they do measure themselves against native-speaker standards. They talk about native-speaker English as correct and proper English, and when they discuss which standard to adhere to for a corporate language, the only varieties they consider are native English varieties. There is no mention of English as a lingua franca either in those or other terms, except for this one example:

Laura mentions “transatlantic” as the type of English which would result from not choosing a specific native-speaker standard, with the clear implication that that would be bad, and with the expectation that the others share this opinion as evidenced by her use of “jo”.

Laura mentions “transatlantic” as the type of English which would result from not choosing a specific native-speaker standard, with the clear implication that that would be bad, and with the expectation that the others share this opinion as evidenced by her use of “jo”.

Laura mentions “transatlantic” as the type of English which would result from not choosing a specific native-speaker standard, with the clear implication that that would be bad, and with the expectation that the others share this opinion as evidenced by her use of “jo”.
One further indication that the informants adhere to the language-hierarchy ideology is that both Danes and foreigners see the Danes as learners of English, not just as users of English, as the ELF ideology suggests. The Danes want to practise their English and improve their English, and they talk about it in those terms. Stine, a Danish research employee, talks about her accent which used to be “den der enormt brede danske accent/that really broad Danish accent” but which has now almost disappeared because she has practised and used the language more. This clearly implies that she sees herself as a learner of English, someone who is constantly working on improving her skills.

The standard-language ideology thus seems to be uncontested, in the sense that those speakers who are concerned with these issues all subscribe to it. But how then should we interpret the results from the ethnographic analysis which pointed to the existence of a lingua franca norm at Lundbeck where in practice it is accepted to deviate from native-speaker standards? If a detailed study of language use (which is beyond the scope of this thesis) were to show that such deviations do indeed take place and are accepted in the interaction, does this mean that the language practices and language ideologies are in conflict? One possibility is that other concerns simply are more important in these interactions, namely that the need for efficient communication and ‘getting the business done’ supersedes the language ideological impetus. Another possibility is to reconsider the relationship between ideology and practice. In my definition of language ideologies in section 8.3 I stated that I see language ideologies as performative in their ability to influence social and linguistic practices, e.g. in the way that they constitute social groups, formulate and disable discourses and valorise social identities and practices. If language ideologies and practices are at odds, can language ideologies still be said to influence linguistic practices? It is possible to look at this conundrum from another perspective. In the theoretical preliminaries I referred to Woolard (1998:9) who says that language ideologies are present at three levels. In this project I have chosen to focus on two of these levels, explicit talk about language and implicit metapragmatics. This does not mean, however, that I reject the third option, language ideologies in linguistic practice, as a place to look for language ideologies. And if language
ideologies can be expressed in linguistic practice, what we have here is not a conflict between ideology and practice, but between two different language ideologies. One, the standard-language ideology, is expressed in explicit talk and in implicit assumptions and another, the English-as-a-lingua-franca ideology, is expressed in linguistic practice.

9.4 ‘English is the international language’

Where the previous sections dealt with different language ideologies at Lundbeck, either related to language choice or to the status and prestige of different kinds of English and English users, this section focuses on the symbolic value of English. And it is obvious that English symbolises one thing above all others: English is the language of internationalisation. And it is the only language seriously considered for international communication.

One of the underlying language ideological assumptions among my informants is that English is the international language. When asked about language use or language choice at Lundbeck, informants invariably consider only Danish and English. And when it comes to international communication or communication with non-Danish speakers, English is the natural choice. “It must be English”, as one informant says. In contrast to this explicit comment, this language ideology is to a large degree present as an underlying assumption. In one focus group interview I ask the lab technicians when English is used in their departments, and Anna says: “vi bruger det meget hvis vi har nogen problemer med nogen af apparaterne altså de er købt i udlandet/we use it a lot if we have any problems with the equipment it is purchased abroad you see”. It is understood here that English is the language for communication with people from abroad, no matter where they come from. Even when specific nationalities (e.g. French, German) are mentioned, it is assumed that the language choice is English. Other languages are mentioned in relation to international communication in a few rare cases, but then only as a joke. In one interview I ask the informants whether English courses should be mandatory, and as they discuss this, Kasper, a Danish IT employee, says: “jeg begynder først at blive bekymret den dag de siger at nu skal vi til at
I won’t start worrying until the day they tell us that we are all going to have to learn Japanese (chuckles),” clearly hinting that this is so unlikely that there is nothing to worry about. The following example makes it obvious that French is not considered an option for international communication either:

KASPER: hvis jeg svarer på på en mail øhm i de fleste
tilfælde der vil jeg nok svare på det sprog
jeg bliver (.) der bliver skrevet til mig på
medmindre det er på fransk hvorefter jeg så xxx
godt kan finde på at svare på dansk
DORTE: sker det at du får e-mails på fransk
KASPER: (laughs=) ja (=laughs) jeg har også
svaret på dansk nogle gange (laughs)
så kan de lære det (laughs)

In fact, when he is addressed in French, Kasper is provoked enough by the presumption of his French colleagues that he replies in Danish, a language his French colleagues do not understand. We see here both from explicitly expressed beliefs and underlying assumptions that English is considered the only possible choice for international communication.

The association of English with international is also seen in the fact that informants frequently substitute one word with the other. When I ask the informants about “international”, they reply with “English”, for instance when I ask whether the Christmas party was Danish or international, and one informant replies “all speeches were given in English”. In the same way, the amount of English used in the company is regarded as a measure of how international Lundbeck is. I asked the informants in the focus group interviews whether Lundbeck is a Danish or an international company. Invariably, they discuss this in terms of how much English is used. One informant focusses in her reply on the increasing internationalisation within the company, saying that the tendency has
been to have everything international, which meant that “alt hvad der var dansk det var stort set forbudt/everything that was Danish that was largely banned” (Birgit, Danish health and safety employee). Very few informants mention other parameters than language in response to this question, although one informant mentions the flags that go up when visitors from other countries arrive, and another informant says that being represented in forty-seven countries by definition makes Lundbeck international. All other responses focus on language choice, specifically English instead of Danish, as a marker of the degree of internationalisation.

Not only is ‘international’ a salient symbolic value of English at Lundbeck, these and other examples also attest to the presence of a dominant language ideology which constructs English as the international language. This language ideology is shared by all my informants, also the less proficient English speakers. The interesting question is then how and whether such an ideology can be said to reflect the interests of the Danish informants. If we consider the above-mentioned belief in Danes as proficient English users, it makes sense: drawing on an ideology that positions English as the only international language does reflect the interests of a group who regard themselves as competent English users, but much less competent in other foreign languages.

English is not only a symbol of internationalisation, it is also linked with power and prestige. “Altså verden bliver jo regeret fra engelsk sprog/after all the world is ruled by the English language” says Beate, a service assistant. And her colleague Thea captures perfectly the symbolic link between English and quality, power and prestige when she says: “altså det ender måske med at det hele bliver engelsk engelsktalende … det er det de vil være de bedste i verden ik/in the end all of it may be in English English-speaking … that’s what they want to be the best in the world right”. She here links the fact that English is used increasingly in the company with her understanding of Lundbeck’s goal: to be the best in the world55. The underlying assumption here is an association between

55 This understanding accurately reflects the official company vision, described in the 2005 annual report as “at blive en af verdens førende specialistvirksomheder inden for
internationalisation (which as we saw above equals English) and quality and prestige. In contrast with this, Danish comes to signal local and unimportant. This is evident in some of the language practices at Lundbeck, e.g. the language choices on the Valby news channel on the intranet. All employees can post news here, and it is used for a variety of topics. The majority of the news stories are posted in Danish, around 70-80%, with the rest being in English or in both Danish and English. More interesting than the numbers, however, is the way that the news topics align with the language choices. The numerous Danish news items are concerned with a wide range of topics, but most of them non-business related, e.g. news about anniversaries or retirements, a blood drive, lost and found items, after-work social activities such as theatre or handball and the on-going construction on the Valby site. A few are more directly business-related, e.g. advertisements for internal courses, commentaries from management on corporate developments and announcements about the company’s position on the stock market. The relatively few news items in English, however, are exclusively concerned with business, e.g. an advertisement for a course for managers, messages from the IT department, news of organisational changes and a heads-up about an upcoming inspection from authorities. So while Danish is occasionally used for business-related news, it is overwhelmingly associated with social activities and minor practical information. English, on the other hand, is firmly associated with business.

This association between English, internationalisation, business and prestige on the one hand and between Danish, local matters, non-business and lack of prestige on the other is also quite clear in this discussion about the choice of English for the corporate website. Birgit has just argued that this choice is perceived as arrogant by some, when Kirsten, the Danish administrator who is responsible for the website, launches into an explanation of why management has made this choice:

når vi snakker internet sites snakker vi også lidt målgrupper og målgruppen på vores internet sites ... det er investorer og det er behandling af sygdomme i centralnervesystemet/to become a world leading specialist company within treatment of central nervous system disorders".
Choosing Danish means selling 20 shares to Mr Hansen (a prototypical Danish surname), while choosing English means selling shares worth a billion kroner to an American investment fund. Kirsten’s explanation captures the symbolic values of the two languages very succinctly: Danish means small-scale, local and unimportant, while English means large-scale, international, economically important and prestigious.

9.5 Language as a resource for social mobility

9.5.1 ‘English is the future’

Interestingly, also informants with very little or no English skills equate English with economic importance and prestige. One of my focus group interviews is with six service assistants with minimal English skills. They are in their late forties or fifties, some of them near retirement. One could expect these ‘English-have-nots’ to espouse the Danish-because-we-are-in-Denmark ideology as this would seem to serve their interests best, and this ideology is shared among them. However, they also share a strong belief that ‘English is the future’. The service assistants believe that English is necessary in many aspects of life already, not just at work but also in their private lives, for instance when they want to use a computer or when they travel abroad on holidays. They mention several times that

56 Also Preisler finds that the English-have-nots are positive towards English as a ‘window to the world’ even though, as he remarks, the window for them remains closed. Furthermore, Preisler concludes that the English-have-nots have a positive attitude toward
being able to speak English would make life easier, and they agree that not knowing English is a handicap:

1  GITTE:    det ville gøre det lidt lettere hvis man kunne
2            engelsk
3  MONA:     ja selvføllig men jeg synes man skal nok
4            klare sig
5  GITTE:    ja ja
6  MONA:     altså
7  THEA:     ja
8  MONA:     jeg synes man man klarer sig alligevel hvis man
9            skal fordi man kan mere end man tror ik
10         [når man står over for det ik]
11  URSULA:   [men alligevel er det en handicap]
12  DORTE:    [mm]
13  MONA:     ja
14  DORTE:    hvad siger du
15  URSULA:   jeg siger alligevel er det en en handicap
16  GITTE:    ja det synes jeg [også]
17  MONA:     [jo jo] det absolut det er det
18         da
19  GITTE:    det synes jeg bestemt også
20  MONA:     ja

1  GITTE:    knowing English would make it a little
easier
2  MONA:     yes of course but I think you can get
3            by
4  GITTE:    yes yes
5  MONA:     you know
6  THEA:     yes
7  MONA:     I think you can get by anyway if you have to
8            because when you come face-to-face with it
9            [you know more than you think you do right]
10  URSULA:   [but it still is a handicap]
11  DORTE:    [mm]
12  MONA:     yes
13  DORTE:    what was that
14  URSULA:   I said it still is a handicap
15  GITTE:    I said it still is a handicap
16  MONA:     [yeah yeah] absolutely
17  DORTE:    it is
18  GITTE:    I really think so too
19  MONA:     yes

All members of the focus group contribute to the discussion here, and while Mona initially counters with “yes but I think you can get by”,

the general presence of English in Denmark, “though many are upset about their own personal communication problems” (2003:125).
consensus on the topic is constructed during the discussion, and towards the end even Mona agrees that not knowing English “absolutely” is a handicap. And not only is English necessary in their lives now, and the lack of it constructed as a handicap, the service assistants also believe that English in the future will be even more important than what they experience now, both in Denmark and globally:

1 GITTE: der bliver det nok det nationalsproget er
2 [engelsk]
3 THEA: [jamen du altså førhen da]
4 GITTE: står det hele på engelsk på de her rengøringsflasker det skal ikke [undre mig]
5 THEA: [ja ja ja]

1 GITTE: then the national language will probably be
2 [English]
3 THEA: [well you know in the old days]
4 GITTE: everything will be in English on these soap bottles I wouldn’t be [surprised]
5 THEA: [yes yes yes]

1 GITTE: det bliver internationalt sprog
2 må man jo regne med [på et tidspunkt]
3 MONA: [ja det gør det]
4 GITTE: hvor at eller er det [det ved jeg ikke]
5 MONA: [det er en god ting]
6 GITTE: men så så alle skal kunne det

1 GITTE: it will become the international language
2 you have to expect that [at some point]
3 MONA: [yes it will]
4 GITTE: or it is already [I don't know]
5 MONA: [that's a good thing]
6 GITTE: but er then everybody has to know it

This belief in English as omnipresent, necessary and the language of the future lends the language a degree of prestige for these English-have-nots which leads to embarrassment at their lack of English skills. Mona says that she feels stupid not knowing English because it is something which almost everyone knows. And while Bente knows a little English, she does not want to use it if foreigners ask her a question in English because she is afraid that she might say something stupid. This fear of being thought stupid or even picked on due to a lack of English skills is mentioned several times in the discussion. Thea even relates the fact that emails directed at the service assistants almost always are in Danish to the
assumption that management in the service department knows that “vi er for dumme til engelsk/we are too stupid for English”.

English is not only prestigious, it is also linked with social mobility. In this excerpt the service assistants talk about the opportunities English skills would give them:

1 THEA:     og så kunne der måske være at man kunne komme
2            lidt længere end bare rengøring
3 DORTE:    ja
4 THEA:     at man kunne søge noget andet hvis man kunne
5            det engelsk også på computeren ik
6 DORTE:    mm
7 (.)
8 THEA:     og så længe du ikke kan det så må du jo så
9            blive dernede
10 URSULA:   (chuckles)

1 THEA:     then you might be able to go a little further
2            than just cleaning
3 DORTE:    yes
4 THEA:     you could look for something else if you knew
5            English also on the computer right
6 DORTE:    mm
7 (.)
8 THEA:     and as long as you don’t know it you have to
9            stay down there
10 URSULA:   (chuckles)

English skills would allow them to look for a different job, and not just a different job, but a better one, as implied both by Thea saying they could “go further” and by her use of “down there” when she talks about their current work doing cleaning. Thea expects the others to agree with her in this as shown by her use of the dialogic particle “jo”. And as Ursula shows by her chuckling, she does agree.

To sum up, English is seen as the language of the future and as prestigious among informants with few English skills, partly because English is linked with opportunities for social mobility. Consequently, the lack of English skills is negatively valued, and these informants see themselves as stupid or feel embarrassed because of this lack.

9.5.2 ‘If you want to make career you need to be fluent in Danish’
The belief in the domination of English, and hence the necessity for learning it, which is found among the English-have-nots is matched by a
similar belief in the necessity of having Danish skills by those who do not have them. At Lundbeck one group without Danish skills are the foreign experts brought in in research and marketing. Since offers of Danish lessons differ widely between departments, as do people’s motivation for learning a new language, Danish skills among this group vary. Some choose not to learn Danish, others try but never attain much competence, while others again, typically those supported by unlimited individual tutoring, attain a level of Danish competence where they can use it for at least some situations at work. Since all of these employees are either native speakers of or very proficient in English, we could expect them to stress the superior position of English today and downplay the necessity of other foreign languages. Instead, however, I have found among this group a belief linking proficiency in Danish with social mobility, particularly with opportunities for advancement within Lundbeck.

1 MICHELLE: for the job I have right now I don't feel it's critical that I learn Danish but if I want to stay at Lundbeck and have any aspirations to move upwards I know I need Danish
2 NICOLE: yeah completely [fully agree]
3 MICHELLE: [(laughs)]
4 NICOLE: so in the moment you want to make career at Lundbeck you need to be fluent in Danish

Later in the interview Nicole expands on this:

I would say there is a huge pressure <to learn Danish> because not in this way that people are coming and telling you you should learn Danish but the pressure is when you want to make career when you want to know what is going on when you want to be fully integrated in the company not in the society in this company you have to learn you have to speak Danish and you have to understand it like a Dane this is otherwise we have no chance

Unlike the beliefs about English as a world language, the belief in Danish as a resource for social climbing is narrowly confined to Lundbeck. The majority of the informants in this group share the belief that Danish is necessary for career advancement within Lundbeck. One participant, however, does not. In the focus group, Julia is the only one who has chosen not to learn Danish. And she is also the only one who
does not agree that Danish is necessary for advancing your career. She contests this belief by mentioning an example from her part of the organisation where a foreigner with no Danish skills has succeeded in advancing to vice president. And she maintains that her lack of Danish skills has not had any consequences for her career. She does acknowledge, though, that learning Danish is a dimension foreigners can compete on:

> there will be some foreigners that have come over and they have learnt the language very quickly will make a point in a meeting of speaking in Danish but that's just a very kind of foreigner orientated competitive you know I've learnt it you haven't (laughter) 

(Julia, international marketing employee)

Overall, it seems that beliefs about Danish as a resource for career advancement are tied firmly to the individual’s linguistic repertoire. Of the participants in the focus group interview, Andreas has taken Danish lessons and is making an effort to use his Danish with his colleagues. Michelle is trying very hard to learn Danish, partly motivated by being married to a Dane, and Nicole, although she is no longer trying to learn Danish, has acquired some receptive skills. Julia, on the other hand, has no Danish skills and no intention of acquiring any. Her contestation of the belief that Danish skills are important for your career is thus firmly in her interest as she needs to justify her choice faced with differing opinions.

To sum up, the majority of the international informants, namely those informants who have made an effort to learn Danish, see Danish as the key to career advancement at Lundbeck. And all the informants in the interview share the belief that learning Danish is prestigious at Lundbeck, it is for instance a dimension for foreigners to compete on.

9.6 Conclusion

In this chapter I set out to investigate the beliefs and language ideologies about Danish, English and language choice as well as the symbolic values attached to Danish and English at Lundbeck. From the above analyses we can see how language ideologies typically reflect the interests of the individual members of the group espousing them, e.g. when Danes strongly support the Danish-because-we-are-in-Denmark ideology. We
have also seen, however, evidence of dominant language ideologies, where even those individuals whose interests are not served by the ideology support it, for instance in the case of the English-is-the-international-language ideology, which even those with very few English skills support.

One language ideology which appears systematically in my material is the Danish-because-we-are-in-Denmark ideology, which includes beliefs about the necessity of foreigners learning the local language primarily for social integration reasons. In the analysis we saw how this language ideology is connected to the construction of social identity in relation to national identity. Another language ideology so widely shared as to be dominant is the mother-tongue-is-natural language ideology, which includes beliefs about it being unnatural to use any other language than the shared mother tongue with fellow native speakers. The language-hierarchy ideology also has a strong presence in my material, often as an underlying assumption. The beliefs included in this ideology position native-speaker English at the top of a hierarchy with English spoken by Danes in a central position and other types of non-native English at the bottom. This language ideology is in stark contrast with the ‘English as a lingua franca’ ideology. Proponents of the ELF paradigm suggest that non-native speakers of English who use English as a lingua franca do not orient to native-speaker standards. My material shows that as far as language ideologies are expressed in explicit talk about language and in the underlying assumptions, the non-native English speakers at Lundbeck do orient to native-speaker standards. And furthermore, they unequivocally place native-speaker varieties at the top of the hierarchy. The ELF ideology is not present either explicitly or implicitly in my material. If we, however, were to look for language ideologies in the language practices at Lundbeck, it is entirely possible that the ‘English as a lingua franca’ ideology would manifest itself, although this bears further investigation. Finally, ‘English as the international language’ is an ideology which equates English with international and international with English, and which does not leave room for any other language as a serious candidate for international communication.
It is in connection with this last language ideology that the symbolic values attached to English and Danish respectively come into focus. English not only symbolises international, but also business, quality, power and prestige. Danish, in contrast, comes to symbolise small-scale, local and unimportant. This is not the full picture, however. In section 9.6 it is once again confirmed that English is linked with prestige and opportunities, but also, and perhaps surprisingly, that Danish is too. From the perspective of international experts recruited to work in Denmark, Danish is the language of opportunity and thus of a certain prestige. What is also evident from the above analyses is that the symbolic values are not entirely fixed, rather they vary with perspective. Where informants working with top management focus on English as the symbol of large-scale economic benefits for the company, informants further removed from large-scale decisions view English as a tool for personal advancement. And where Danish in some contexts, namely in contrast with English, symbolises local and hence unimportant, in another context it is linked with social mobility and hence prestige.

An important conclusion from the above analyses is the clear evidence of a connection between language ideologies and identity. Language ideologies are seen to be shared by groups, e.g. groups defined by nationality or language proficiency, and they are often constructed and maintained in the interest of these groups. In fact, one important purpose of language ideologies seems to be the construction of boundaries between groups and the attribution of value to these groups. One example of this is the mother-tongue-is-natural ideology which serves to create boundaries between mother-tongue speakers and other speakers of a language. Along the same lines, the language-hierarchy ideology constructs groups such as ‘native speakers of English’, ‘Danish speakers of English’ and ‘French speakers of English’ and valorises them in relation to each other. The same mechanisms are also visible in the other language ideologies prevalent at Lundbeck. The Danish-because-we-are-in-Denmark ideology draws boundaries between Danes and foreigners, and between foreigners who want to learn Danish and those who do not. Furthermore, it constructs interest in learning Danish as a positive characteristic and links it with an interest in social integration. Vice versa,
a lack of interest in learning Danish is viewed negatively and linked with social distancing. At another level, the Danish-because-we-are-in-Denmark and the related one-nation-one-language ideologies serve to reinforce boundaries between nations and nationalities and are thus used to construct stability and maintain clear borders in a global world.

9.7 Language ideologies and language use

After having read and discussed the theoretical literature on language ideologies and carried out the analysis, one further question has appeared in addition to the questions answered above in 9.6. This is a question which has not yet been answered satisfactorily in the literature, namely: how do language ideologies influence language use? Is there a causal link between the two, and if so, how does it work? In the theoretical preliminaries I defined language ideologies as “performative in their ability to influence social and linguistic practices; as they e.g. constitute social groups, formulate and disable discourses and valorise social identities and practices”. The discussion in section 9.6 of the connection between language ideologies and group identity confirms the performative aspect of language ideologies in relation to social practices. But what about language ideologies and linguistic practices? Here the answer is more tentative. It seems that language ideologies can explain at least some language choices. One of these is the decision to have English as a corporate language. The above analyses of language ideologies at Lundbeck make it clear why it has been important for Lundbeck to make this choice. As we saw above, English equals international, and that is an important symbolic value for a company on the verge of going global as Lundbeck was when English was introduced as the corporate language. Secondly, English is linked with quality, power and prestige, and those are obviously also important symbolic values. Thirdly, English is believed to be the future, and there can be no doubt that that is important symbolically. The choice of English as a corporate language thus has, in addition to the practical benefits of adopting a common lingua franca in the company, a significant positive symbolic load. Another example is the prevalence of Danish. The ethnographic and language choice analyses
revealed that Danish has a strong presence at Lundbeck, despite the choice of English as a corporate language. In fact, the overarching norm is to use Danish whenever possible. The language practices which favour Danish seem to be reflections of the dominant Danish-because-we-are-in-Denmark and the mother-tongue-is-natural ideologies. These language ideologies and the related beliefs can help explain the strong presence of Danish despite the international profile of the company, especially the use of Danish in situations where foreigners are present. The dominant status of these language ideologies also shed light on future language choices. From the above analyses it seems unlikely that Danish will lose ground to English anytime soon. As long as beliefs that tie Danish so firmly to Denmark and to Danes are so widespread even in such an international setting, Danish can not be said to be under pressure. This conclusion is also supported by the analysis in section 9.5, which confirms that Danish, despite its associations with small-scale and local, is a prestigious language at Lundbeck, a belief which perhaps surprisingly is most salient among non-native speakers of Danish.

I have also found evidence which does not support the theory of a direct link between language ideologies and language use. The language-hierarchy ideology is not reflected in the language practices at Lundbeck. While speakers place native-speaker standards at the top of the hierarchy and say that they aim at native-speaker English, very few if any of my informants approach native-speaker English in the data material. Furthermore, from the focus group interviews it is clear that divergence from the native-speaker standard is not attended to in interaction. My ethnographic analysis suggests that although speakers at Lundbeck do orient to native-speaker standards, a norm has developed according to which it is acceptable to use a kind of English which does not live up to the native-speaker standard. This means for instance that informants accommodate their use of English to their interlocutors (both to native-speaker and non-native-speaker interlocutors) and that they do not in practice attend to deviations from native-speaker standards.

On a theoretical level the question is, however, whether it makes sense to talk about language ideologies influencing linguistic practices (although that was part of my working definition for this project). The
norm described above which means that it is not treated as deviant to
diverge from native-speaker standards could arguably be treated as an
example of the ‘English as a lingua franca’ ideology expressed in linguistic
practice. Woolard suggests that language ideologies can be found at three
levels: linguistic practice, explicit talk and implicit assumptions (1998:9). If
we accept that language ideologies are also found in linguistic practice,
perhaps it makes more sense to say that language ideologies are expressed
in linguistic practice rather than that language ideologies influence linguistic
practice. Of course the divergence between practice and ideology in the
case of the language-hierarchy ideology also has an alternative
explanation: the discrepancy may be explained as a competence issue.
While speakers may aim for a native-speaker standard, they may not be
able to use it in practice.

Attesting to the benefits of applying a wider range of methodological
tools to the study of language ideologies are the results of a recent
research project at the LANCHART centre at Copenhagen University.
Here Tore Kristiansen and his colleagues have approached language
ideologies through a study of language attitudes, and their research offers
a new and interesting perspective on the relationship between language
ideology and language use (see e.g. Kristiansen, 2001; 2004; 2009). The
LANCHART centre aims to explain the relationship between language
attitudes and language variation and change. Studying language variation
in real time has given this research group the possibility of comparing
attitudes with data on language use and change over a period of 20 years.
With the focus on language attitudes and the use of quantitative methods,
Kristiansen’s research differs from the anthropological linguists’ take on
language ideology which tends to use discourse analysis as the main
method. The starting point for the LANCHART centre is that language
variation and change is driven by ‘social meaning making’, and that “such
social meaning making will always relate, somehow, to ideological
structures that dominate at the macro-level of society and organize
different ways of speaking into hierarchies of ‘good and bad’ language”
(Kristiansen, 2009:187). Speakers can either be aware of these meaning-
making processes or not. When speakers are not aware of the ‘social
meaning making’, it happens subconsciously, Kristiansen says. He draws
the following conclusions from his research: firstly, people operate with
two value systems, conscious and subconscious attitudes. Secondly,
language change is governed by the subconscious attitudes. Thirdly, the
rapid spread of the subconsciously held value system can only be
understood as a media effect (2009:189). For my purposes here, what is
interesting are the conclusions drawn about language ideology and
language change in general, and I therefore do not discuss the findings as
they pertain to the specific Danish dialects.

Kristiansen’s study focusses on language attitudes, but implies an
intimate connection between attitudes and ideology. As I understand it,
Kristiansen conceptualises language ideology as two value systems at two
levels of consciousness, the conscious and the subconscious. He labels
these two value systems ‘covert’ and ‘overt’ language ideology. He asks:

   do people hold one set of overt values when language attitudes are
   consciously ‘performed’, and quite another set of covert values
   when the ‘performance’ is offered subconsciously? (2009:169)

In other words, a language ideology is a set of values which can be
performed as attitudes. This means that consciously and subconsciously
offered language attitudes are expressions of the overt and covert language
ideologies respectively.

How can these very convincing results be related to my findings
above? My study and Kristiansen’s differ significantly in both
methodology and starting point. Where my study is a discourse analytic
study which looks at language ideologies expressed in explicit talk about
language and in the underlying assumptions, Kristiansen’s is a
quantitative study of conscious and subconscious language attitudes.
Furthermore, my analysis is ethnographic in the sense that it takes as
point of departure the language ideologies expressed by the informants,
i.e. I work from the data. In comparison, Kristiansen has from the
beginning narrowed the focus by concentrating exclusively on the
standard-language ideology and by taking as point of departure a
hypothesis about Copenhagen as Denmark’s only linguistic norm centre.
Furthermore, Kristiansen and his colleagues are able to compare the
results of their language attitude study with data on language change in real time, an advantage I do not have. Despite these differences, Kristiansen’s conclusions do have a bearing on my findings at least with regard to my speculation on the link between language ideology and language change. Following Kristiansen’s conclusion that only the subconsciously offered language attitudes have a bearing on language change, it would make sense to distinguish between explicit talk about language and underlying assumptions in the analysis, as these two levels can be said to correspond to the expression of conscious and subconscious language attitudes. It follows then that only the underlying assumptions about language and language use are relevant in explaining language change. I have not, however, found any clear differences between the language ideologies expressed at these two levels.

As to how my research could add to Kristiansen’s findings, the variety of language ideologies present in my limited data set points to a future research agenda of investigating other language ideologies, particularly those pertaining to multilingualism in different guises, e.g. the language use of immigrants or the presence of English in Denmark. Such research could provide a fuller picture of the “ideological structures that dominate at the macro-level of society and organize different ways of speaking into hierarchies of ‘good and bad’ language” (Kristiansen, 2009:187) and also contribute to the theoretical discussion of the link between language ideology and language change.
10 Inclusion and exclusion

At Lundbeck, one reason for introducing English as a corporate language was to include the subsidiaries, and in this way create cohesion in a growing international corporation. Another reason was to include the growing number of international employees working at headquarters. However, as we have seen in the three analyses above, the use of English as a corporate language not only includes, it also excludes. In this chapter the focus is on inclusion and exclusion as a consequence of the different ways in which languages are used and talked about in a company with English as a corporate language. In this discussion I draw on the above three analyses, and this chapter thus aims to synthesise the findings from the previous chapters in the light of inclusion and exclusion.

10.1 Language choices that include

While the introduction of English as a corporate language was motivated by inclusion on a macro level, the choice of English for certain communicative events also functions to include on a micro level. In the language choice analysis we saw how inclusion is one motivation for switching from one language to another. The Danish employees in the research department choose English for certain communicative events in order to include their non-Danish speaking colleagues, e.g. in ex11 on p. 181, where Lisa initiates a conversation about a concert with her Danish colleague in English which gives their non-Danish-speaking colleague Kate the option of joining the conversation, as she soon does. In the focus group interviews I learned that international research scientist Michelle had regular sessions with her Danish lab technician where they would read Danish newspapers and practice Danish. These kinds of practices aimed at helping foreigners learn Danish are also a way of including them. And when Danes greet their non-Danish speaking colleagues in Danish, as discussed in section 7.2.2, it has the effect of symbolically including them in the Danish-speaking community.

At other times, the choice of Danish is motivated by a wish for or a need to include another group of employees, namely the less fluent English speakers. This is done at a language policy level for instance by
making Danish the designated language for meetings with an audience with mixed language proficiencies. One example of this is the biannual information meetings for all headquarters employees. While the slides are in English, the spoken language for these meetings is Danish. Another example is from the research department where it is explicitly stated that lab technicians are allowed to do presentations in Danish in department meetings. The head of department has made this policy in order to include the technicians and to ensure that they contribute to these meetings. At the situational level, participants may switch to Danish during a communicative event if part of the event is particularly important to those employees less proficient in English. One example of this is ex15 (analysed in section 7.2.3) where we saw that the divisional director switched to Danish for a presentation directed at the lab technicians.

In all three examples described here, the wish to include some results in the exclusion of others. In the case of the information meetings, the non-Danish-speaking employees are effectively excluded from participation in the meetings, since the notes on the English-language slides rarely manage to convey the full meaning. In the research department, the choice of Danish for parts of meetings means that the non-Danish-speaking research scientists are excluded from those parts. And in the case of the department meetings where the foreign head of department has chosen to allow Danish, her wish to include the lab technicians actually results in situations where she herself is excluded.

10.2 Language choices that exclude

In the language choice analysis I concluded that the potential of language choice to exclude participants is particularly strong in a lingua franca situation due to the great variety in participants’ linguistic repertoires. At Lundbeck the picture is further complicated because the vast majority of employees share a mother tongue, Danish, and are inclined to switch to Danish as soon as possible. Combined with the fact that new international employees with no Danish skills continually arrive on the scene, this means that the potential for exclusion because of the use of Danish is significant.
While Danish employees frequently converge to their non-Danish speaking colleagues by switching to English, they do not do so in all situations. The results of the ethnographic analysis are clear: Danish is the default spoken language at Lundbeck. And as described in section 7.1 of the language choice analysis, even in the very international research department, Danish is the default spoken language, and is as such used frequently among the Danes, also in the presence of non-Danish speakers. When Danes choose not to converge, but instead diverge or maintain Danish as the language of the conversation, they effectively exclude their non-Danish-speaking colleagues. This occurs all over Lundbeck and in a wide range of communicative events. Foreigners experience being excluded when their Danish colleagues switch to Danish at the lunch table or before meetings start, as William and Kate describe here:

> when the lunch starts I mean you know the barriers go up in some ways because they [the Danes] do switch
> (William, international marketing employee)

> when everyone is filing in [for a meeting] or at coffee breaks it’s a switch straight back from English to Danish so there is still that kind of barrier if you really want to integrate with your colleagues
> (Kate, international research employee)

Both of them describe the use of Danish as a barrier in informal situations\(^{57}\). In addition, a lot of scheduled social activities also take place in Danish:

---

\(^{57}\) While the language choice analysis did not confirm a difference in language choice in formal vs. informal situations, these quotes reveal that the international employees perceive there to be a difference. In chapter 7 I found that the shifts happening e.g. when a meeting ends are related to the change in audience roles and hence competence relations and not to a change in formality. In other words, when a Dane speaks Danish on his way out of the meeting room, it is because his words are directed only at his Danish colleague, and not because the situation has changed to informal. The non-Danish speakers have no way of knowing what is said, however, including whether it is relevant for them or not. This means that they may feel excluded even if they would never have participated in the interaction even if it was in English. Since participants are more likely to break into small groups at lunch and coffee breaks, this explain why the internationals experience these situations as particularly excluding.
they also have a lot of social clubs here like wine clubs and sports clubs and things like that and all these things are just in Danish it’s not in English so they actually exclude people if they don’t speak Danish

(Peter, international marketing employee)

This tendency to exclude international employees through the use of the local or parent company language has also been found in other studies (all reviewed in chapter 2). Marschan-Piekkari et al. (1999b) find that competence in the parent company language, Finnish, bestows power upon the Finnish employees, who fulfil central positions as language nodes while non-Finnish staff feel disconnected from decision-making and critical information exchanges. In Louhiala-Salminen et al.’s (2005) study of a merger, the company language initially was Swedish, and here the Finns felt excluded due to a lack of Swedish skills. In their study of English as a corporate language in Denmark, Tange and Lauring (2009) find that the international employees are excluded by the Danes’ use of Danish. They conclude that because Danes are in the majority and the setting is Denmark, Danish has a certain symbolic power and is frequently used in informal interactions. As a result, the international employees feel excluded and are prevented from participating fully in the social life at work.

In addition to purely social events, the international employees at Lundbeck also find themselves excluded from key communicative events in the company because they are in Danish, for instance information on the intranet about employee stock options and introduction courses for new employees. The choice of Danish for these communicative events means that the employees are barred not just from obtaining crucial information, but also in the case of the introduction courses from the ensuing networking possibilities. Marschan-Piekkari et al. (1999a) also find this problem in their study and conclude that this may damage company performance, as these networking possibilities could enhance informal communication and knowledge transfer across departments. It is interesting, though, that while Marschan-Piekkari et al. find that employees who do not acquire competence in the corporate language are excluded from participating in company-wide activities, in my study it is
the lack of competence in the local and at the same time parent company language which excludes employees.

There is an important difference to be noted between inclusion and exclusion. Where I conclude that language choices often are motivated by a wish to include, I have not found evidence of exclusion as a motivation for language choice. Nevertheless, exclusion is often the result of language choices. Exclusion at the situational level, e.g. codeswitching during a conversation, can often be attributed to the fact that most Danes feel that it is easier to communicate in Danish. In less formal situations, they choose Danish, not because they want to exclude anyone, but because keeping up the conversation in English is too exhausting. As one employee says in relation to speaking English at lunch:

> og så gør man så det engang imellem … så tager Lajla og jeg og siger nu gider vi altså ikke i dag nu vil vi godt være os selv og så går vi alene [til frokost] og så taler vi selvfølgelig kun dansk
> and then sometimes Lajla and I say we can’t be bothered today now we want to be on our own and then we go [to lunch] alone and then of course we only speak Danish
> (Birte, Danish marketing employee)

In this way Danes occasionally choose to exclude foreigners not by speaking Danish, but by not speaking to them at all. In other situations, the choice of Danish is related to limited resources, e.g. for the translation of text on the intranet. The employees may here be aware of the fact that the choice of Danish excludes a group of employees, but have made this choice in order to include as many people as possible with the resources they have at hand.

The non-Danish speakers are not the only ones excluded by language choices. While English frequently is chosen in order to include, it also excludes, namely those employees with few or no English skills. The fact that all signs with department names and locations are in English means that this information is unavailable to the English-have-nots. Another

---

58 Söderlundh (2010) finds, however, that the use of Swedish in university courses which are nominally in English has an exclusionary function, and is used as such by the Swedish students to manage participation in the classroom. Here it seems that language choice in some cases is motivated by the potential for exclusion.
problematic area is the computer where programs and emails in English exclude this group from participating fully in the company daily life. As we saw in the ethnography chapter (section 5.5.1), the reaction often is to ignore information in English, but the feeling of exclusion also leaves these employees frustrated. The use of English technical or business jargon is also a problem for the less proficient English speakers. An employee from the production department told me about a meeting with 70 participants where “goals, visions and sustainability” was discussed. The participants soon ceased to pay attention, however, because they did not understand the jargon. The employee explains:

*Vores mål er på engelsk for det skal jo være smart, men så er de ikke med på bageste række. “Sustainability” – vi måtte alle sammen ind og slå op.*

*Our goals are in English because it has to be hip, but then they don’t get it on the back row. “Sustainability” – we all had to look up that one.*

(From my field notes)

These examples show how difficult it is to make language choices without excluding someone. English is often chosen for mass communication at Lundbeck because it is regarded as a language of inclusion, but the undifferentiated use of English for computer programs, emails and signs excludes employees with few or no English skills, as does the use of English jargon in meetings where even employees with some English skills may have problems understanding.

The presence of a dominating language ideology which constructs Danes as very proficient English users and tends to overlook the actual diversity in English competence plays an important role here. In the language ideologies analysis we saw that the informants operate with a language hierarchy of English users which places Danes just below the native speakers in terms of proficiency. The prominence of this ideology means that the group of English-have-nots are forgotten, and that the comprehension problems of less proficient English users remain hidden under the surface. As with most language ideologies, this ideology is present as an underlying assumption, meaning that it is not reflected upon. In this way a false understanding that everyone speaks English can lead to the exclusion of employees with little or no English skills simply
because people do not think about the consequences of their language choices. If everyone speaks English, the choice of English can hardly have any negative consequences.

10.3 Language ideologies, categorisation and exclusion

This last point shows that not just language choices but also language ideologies, or the way that people talk about language and the underlying assumptions they draw upon, are relevant in connection with a discussion of inclusion and exclusion. In the language ideologies analysis we saw how language ideologies draw boundaries between people and categorise them as belonging to some groups and not to others. The dominance of certain language ideologies thus functions as another way of including and excluding, not only by influencing language choice but through social categorisation. The insistence on the Danish-because-we-are-in-Denmark ideology becomes a way of maintaining and strengthening the Danish national identity, but it also constructs boundaries between Danes and foreigners, and Danish and other languages. The mother-tongue-is-natural ideology divides speakers into mother-tongue and non-mother-tongue speakers, and essentially ties the mother tongue to national culture and identity. In this way the mother-tongue-is-natural ideology excludes non-native speakers of Danish from fully partaking in the Danish culture and identity. The language-hierarchy ideology constructs some English speakers, namely the native speakers, as speaking a more correct and better English than other speakers. Non-native English speakers are excluded from this high status position at the top of the hierarchy and relegated to lower status positions. Finally, the belief which links proficiency in Danish with opportunities for advancement within Lundbeck has the potential to exclude international employees from the group of top management. Not because the belief is necessarily true, but because the mere existence of such a belief may lead these employees to seek other career opportunities because they do not consider advancement at Lundbeck to be a possibility.

The language ideology which promotes English as the only possible international language is also interesting in a discussion of exclusion. It is
clear from the ethnographic analysis that Danish and English are the only languages that count at Lundbeck. When asked about language use or language choice at Lundbeck in the interviews, informants invariably consider only Danish and English. The exclusive focus on these two languages means that other linguistic resources are disregarded. During my ethnographic fieldwork it became evident that other languages are indeed used at Lundbeck, e.g. Swedish, Spanish, German, French and Arabic. Native speakers of German speak German with each other at work, Danes speak Danish to Swedes who speak Swedish to them in return and a native speaker of Arabic may be called upon to use her Arabic skills in communication with the subsidiaries (see the example on p. 114). The ideology which constructs English as the only possible choice for international communication means that the potential of these other languages is overlooked, even though they do in fact contribute in significant ways to the daily communication at Lundbeck. The narrow focus on English and Danish competence also means that the linguistic resources of the employees are not fully explored and put to use. In the case of employees who are native speakers of one of the immigrant languages in Denmark, the focus tends to be on the fact that their Danish is accented rather than on what their proficiency in e.g. Arabic could contribute to the company.

This tendency to see English as the only possible choice for international communication is not narrowly confined to my case or to the corporate world. In a recent study of attitudes to the influence from English in the Nordic countries, Thøgersen (2010) also concludes that English is constructed as the default foreign language for Danes. And in a study of language choice in Swedish university courses where English is the nominal language, Söderlundh (2010) finds that for her informants competence in English and Swedish is what matters, other language skills are not made visible.

10.4 Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the results of the three studies in the light of inclusion and exclusion. I have shown that language practices, including
local language policies and language choice, have the potential to include or exclude participants. Furthermore, both Danish and English can include as well as exclude. Language ideologies also play a part in these processes of inclusion and exclusion, both in the way that they influence language choice and in the way that they categorise and valorise speakers and languages.
11 Conclusions and implications

In this concluding chapter I first present the results of the three analyses (sections 11.1, 11.2 and 11.3). In sections 11.4 and 11.5 I synthesise these results as I provide answers for the research questions presented in chapter 1. In these last two sections of the thesis, I also discuss the applications and implications of my research and suggest possible avenues for future research.

11.1 Ethnographic analysis

The results of the ethnographic analysis reveal first of all the linguistic diversity at Lundbeck. While the great majority of the employees are native speakers of Danish, their foreign language competences vary greatly. The minority of employees who do not have a Danish background come with a great variety of first (and second and foreign) languages, including varying English competence. In addition, their Danish competence varies a lot and depends on, among other things, initial expectations of the linguistic environment, motivation and opportunities for learning Danish at work. Not only competences vary, however, the linguistic practices in individual departments also differ widely. The choice is not only between Danish and English or another national language, the employees switch, mix and borrow, and they use technical jargon, abbreviations and acronyms.

The lack of a language policy at Lundbeck is found to be intimately linked with the corporate culture which stresses a lack of rules, informality and the freedom to do things your own way. While this corporate cultural imperative functions well in other areas (employees appreciate it when they are encouraged to contribute their own suggestions), with regard to language policy, the lack of rules leads to very different expectations of language use among employees. “We have English as a corporate language” is thus taken to mean very different things by different employees. Where one person thinks it means that English is the preferred lingua franca, another takes it to mean that all crucial information will be available in English. And when the first interpretation more accurately corresponds to the reality than the second,
some employees are bound to be disappointed, particularly the non-native speakers of Danish who expected English to be used more.

The ethnographic analysis also brought to light the norms for language use at Lundbeck. The most salient norm, the one that everyone agrees on and readily verbalises, is concerned with language choice and can be phrased as follows: “we speak Danish unless there is a good reason not to”. And a good reason not to usually is that someone in the audience does not speak Danish or does not speak enough Danish. While Danish thus is the default spoken language at Lundbeck, English holds a slightly stronger position in written communication, where some communicative events take place in English because the author takes future addressees into consideration. Furthermore, speakers were shown to orient to a monolingual norm which sees codeswitching as marked behaviour. The question of which English standard, if any, is the norm was shown to be more tricky: while non-native English speakers orient to a native-speaker standard, in practice non-standard uses are accepted.

In the introduction I asked: ‘What does it mean to have English as a corporate language? How much is English used, by whom and in what situations? What do employees and management understand by a ‘corporate language’?’. In reply to these questions, the results of the ethnographic analysis can be summed up as follows: Having English as a corporate language at Lundbeck does not mean that English has taken over from Danish. Danish is still the default language. English is used frequently at Lundbeck. It is used by those employees with competence in English in a wide range of situations, but mainly in communicative events which include non-Danish speakers. Among employees the interpretations of the phrase ‘English as a corporate language’ differ widely. In brief then: in this specific company where English is a corporate language, Danish is in practice the default language, while English is the default lingua franca.

11.2 Language choice analysis
Where the ethnographic analysis provided the bigger picture, in the language choice analysis the microanalytic method and the focus on a
single department allowed me to look at language choice in much more detail. The microanalysis confirmed the results from the ethnographic analysis that competence is a key factor in language choice, and the analytical framework was refined through the use of the theoretical construct ‘competence relations’, which describes the combination of or the relation between the language competences of the interlocutors. In this connection Bell’s theory on audience design is helpful in differentiating between different types of addressees and their significance in relation to language choice.

The ethnographic analysis revealed that the competence norm does not apply as strictly in informal situations as it does in more formal situations, such as meetings. In the microanalysis I looked into the relationship between formality and language choice, and concluded that there is no straightforward relationship between formality and informality, understood as work- vs. non-work-related situations, and language choice. In my data, Danish is used for some work-related interactions, and English for others. And both Danish, English, and a mixed code are used in non-work-related interactions. Rather than a bipartite model, the analysis revealed it to be more fruitful to consider language choices in relation to the genre of the interaction and the goals speakers have. Following Tracy and Coupland (1990) and Coupland (2007), I consider speakers to have multiple goals or communicative purposes of which the three core types are instrumental, relational and identity goals. In conclusion then, genre and goals along with competence relations are the main situational factors influencing language choice.

In the second part of chapter 7 the focus was on language choices as contextualisation cues. I found here that language choices function to direct the attention of participants, e.g. to signal that “this presentation is irrelevant for you” or that “the meeting begins now”. Again, there is no straightforward functional distribution of the language varieties. The direction of the switch is important, however, for its potential as a contextualisation cue. My conclusion is that instead of looking for a general meaning, such as English=formal interactions/Danish=informal interactions, we need to look at the local, situated meanings of the
varieties, and in order to do so, we need to look at the local context, i.e. both the situational factors and the sequential unfolding of the situation.

At the end of chapter 7 I revisited the theories discussed in the preliminaries. The conclusion here was that goals, or communicative purposes, appear to have the most explanatory potential in relation to language choice. Language choice is influenced by situational factors such as competence relations, goal and genre. At the same time language choices influence the social situation because they function as contextualisation cues. Seeing language choices as the fulfilment of multiple communicative purposes gives us a framework for explaining language choice which allows us to include both these aspects and which recognises that language choices are context-bound and interactionally accomplished rather than residing in the speaker’s head.

11.3 Language ideologies analysis

With the language ideologies analysis focus shifted from micro to macro. Instead of close attention to details of language choice, the analysis focussed on the language ideologies shared by the employees at Lundbeck and the symbolic values attached to Danish and English respectively. One of the most prominent discourses constructed about language at Lundbeck revolves around the idea of language and nation as inextricably entwined, crystallised in the belief that “we speak Danish because we are in Denmark”. This ideology has implications for foreigners who are expected to learn Danish as fast as possible, and whose opportunities for social integration are viewed as dependent on them learning Danish. The negative attitude to foreigners who choose not to learn Danish is connected with this ideology. A related language ideology views the mother tongue as the ‘natural’ language, in which speakers can express themselves more freely. This language ideology is behind the norm that renders it unacceptable to use English among Danes. The one exception to this norm is found in the use of English in written materials in which the need to take future addressees into consideration outweighs the language ideological background assumptions. These different variants of the one-nation-one-language ideology are linked with the increasing globalisation
and the ensuing feelings of dislocation and insecurity. I argue that the insistence on language ideologies which promote national boundaries becomes a way of maintaining and strengthening the Danish national identity. In this way my analysis shows how a language ideology can be used to construct stability and maintain clear borders in a changing world.

Different kinds of English and different English users are also topics for language ideological discourses. The language-hierarchy ideology places native-speaker English at the top of the hierarchy, Danes’ English just below and other non-native varieties, typically Middle Eastern, at the bottom. In the theoretical preliminaries I defined language ideologies as performative in their ability to construct boundaries between groups and to attribute value to these groups. Two examples of this are the mother-tongue-is-natural and language-hierarchy ideologies which serve to create boundaries between mother tongue speakers and other speakers of a language and to attribute positive values to native speakers.

With regard to the symbolic value of English and Danish, it is clear from the analysis that English more than anything symbolises ‘international’. English is perceived to be the only candidate for international communication, and the two words have come to be associated to such a degree that ‘English’ is used to mean ‘international’. Through this connection with internationalisation, English is also linked with power and prestige, and in some contexts with business. In contrast, Danish in these contexts, e.g. the company intranet, is associated with local, informal and unimportant. Furthermore, English is linked with opportunities for social mobility, particularly by speakers with very few English skills. Interestingly, Danish is also seen as necessary for social mobility by those who do not master the language. It is also evident, however, that the symbolic values of the languages are not entirely fixed, rather they vary with perspective. Where Danish in some contexts, namely in contrast with English, symbolises local and hence unimportant, in another context it is linked with social mobility and hence prestige.

The final section of the language ideologies analysis discusses the relationship between language ideologies and language use and change. My analysis suggests that the decision to introduce English as a corporate language may have been influenced by the symbolic values attached to
English, particularly as the international language and the language of the future. While the language practices discussed in the ethnographic analysis reflect the Danish-because-we-are-in-Denmark and mother-tongue-is-natural ideologies, it is difficult to determine whether the practices are in fact influenced by the language ideologies, although it seems to be the case. Also, the language-hierarchy ideology is not reflected in the linguistic practices at Lundbeck, as the norm is to accept deviations from the native-speaker standard. In conclusion, while it appears that language ideologies do influence some language choices, the relationship between language ideologies and language use is an area which requires more attention in future research.

11.4 In what situations do Danes use English at work and why? Applications and implications

This section aims to synthesise the results of the three studies into a coherent answer to the above research question. The following three sections outline how these results can be applied in multilingual companies and what the implications are of these results in two areas of study: language choice and language ideologies.

My case study of language use at Lundbeck reveals that Danes use English at work primarily to communicate with non-Danish speakers. In situations where their direct addressees have little or no competence in Danish, Danes choose English, both for oral and written communication. English is also chosen in some situations where the direct addressee does master Danish, but where peripheral audience members or future addressees are taken into consideration, e.g. in meetings and in emails respectively. In addition, Danes use their receptive English skills in a large number of situations: e.g. to read signs, information on the intranet and emails. It is also worth noting here that contrary to the popular belief and frequently reiterated language ideology, not all Danes are proficient English speakers. A minority, typically older and in blue-collar jobs, have little or no English proficiency. This group of Danes does not use English at work, as they tend to ignore information in English when they encounter it.
As to the reasons why Danes use English at work, my analyses have pointed to a number of influences at three different levels. At the societal level, globalisation in general and the transnational migration of experts in particular have influenced the need for other languages than Danish in Danish workplaces. Why the language chosen is English must be attributed both to the de facto status and the ideological positioning of English as the international language. At an institutional level, the reason for introducing English as a corporate language has been shown to be intimately linked with the development of the organisation from a Danish company with few international contacts to a multinational corporation with subsidiaries worldwide. Furthermore, the symbolic value of English as a prestigious and powerful language has likely also played a part in this decision. At the situational level, language choice has been shown to be influenced primarily by the competence relations between participants. Another influential factor in language choice is the genre of the interaction. There is no one-to-one correspondence between genres and specific languages, rather the genre influences language choice because it influences the goals participants have. As an analytical heuristic, these goals can be categorised as instrumental, relational or identity goals. Often, however, language choices are influenced by multiple goals. The potential a switch from one language to another has as a contextualisation cue is also found to be an influence on language choice. Finally, language ideologies based on unspoken assumptions about the unity of nation and language appear to influence language choice as they result in certain norms for language use. According to one such norm, it is inappropriate to use English among Danes, according to another it is expected of foreigners that they learn Danish. Both of these norms thus enforce the use of Danish and can in this way influence language choice at the situational level.

At the outset of this thesis I placed my research within an integrationist-interactionist perspective. In this concluding chapter, it is natural to briefly reflect on how the results of the thesis relate to this perspective. First of all, I have operated under the a priori assumption that both macro and micro factors are important, and the conclusion that factors ranging from societal to situational influence language choice
confirms this assumption. Secondly, I have worked from the premise that discourse and society shape each other, i.e. that while social and cultural phenomena are to some degree socially constructed, existing structures also influence these phenomena. This is borne out in my analyses which show that language choice is influenced primarily by agents’ competence relations and communicative goals, and that norms are constructed locally through interaction. The analyses also reveal, however, the importance of structure in the form of larger societal influences, namely globalisation and trends of transnational migration.

11.4.1 Corporate language policy: raising awareness and centralising language training

Due to the comprehensive nature of the study, my findings are, I would argue, applicable to multilingual companies in general, not just those with English as a corporate language. How can multilingual companies use the above results then?

My study documents the diversity of the multinational corporation. This diversity is evident in the range of job types, educational backgrounds, national backgrounds and linguistic repertoires among the employees. It is this diversity which makes it so difficult for communication departments to come up with a successful language policy, but this diversity also has positive implications for the companies. One implication is the great range of language competences employees have. In addition to Danish and English, a number of employees at Lundbeck have competences in other languages, e.g. Spanish and Arabic, a fact often overlooked by management, but put into good use by the employees. More attention to this positive aspect of the linguistic diversity would surely only benefit a multilingual company.

This study also reveals that in the absence of a clear definition of what it means to have English as a corporate language, employees construct a range of different meanings and expectations. The international employees recruited to work in Denmark tend to understand “we have English as our corporate language” to mean that all crucial information will be in English, and are thus disappointed to discover that this is not the case. The important role of Danish, the local language, is clearly
documented. And while this is probably not a surprising finding to the Danish employees at Lundbeck, it is clear from my results that the role of Danish is either significantly downplayed during the recruitment of international employees or simply not focussed on at all. More focus on linguistic aspects during the recruiting process, including the use of Danish in the company as well as the opportunities for learning it, could prevent disappointed expectations and ensuing communicative difficulties.

The importance of focussing on language in the recruitment phase is one example which shows that awareness of language issues is the key to overcoming them. The language practices of smaller groups in the company is another. In groups or departments where internationals make up a significant proportion, the Danes are more used to and therefore also more willing to use English. But they are also more aware of language issues because a large proportion of internationals makes them more apparent. In such groups, language issues are discussed openly and addressed as the problems that they can be, for instance in the form of a local language policy. This results in language issues actually being less of a problem than in environments with few or a single international employee, where these issues are disregarded or left to the individual, resulting in decreased knowledge-sharing as well as potential marginalisation of the international employee(s). In addition to the sheer number of internationals, the presence of international employees high in the organisational hierarchy also contributes to raising awareness of language issues.

Focussing on raising awareness means that the purpose of a language policy at the corporate level would be to make sure that employees are aware that language choice is an issue. The formulation of specific guidelines about when to use which language would then take place.

---

59 This finding is supported by Söderlundh’s (2010) study of the use of Swedish in a nominally English-language classroom where she finds that a large number of exchange students and a native-English-speaking teacher influence language choices in favour of English. She attributes this to the fact that these two factors make linguistic preferences other than Swedish visible in the classroom.
locally in individual departments where they can be tailored to the specific local needs and resources.

In addition to raising awareness, the corporate level can also contribute to overcoming language issues by centralising language training. At Lundbeck, the responsibility for language training is decentralised, resulting in very varying offers to employees depending on the priorities of the individual departments and divisions. Making language training a corporate priority would ensure that all employees are given the required opportunities for language training, whether it is learning Danish or improving their English. In a multinational corporation like Lundbeck the focus is, naturally, on increasing revenue. And language skills are therefore seen in terms of their potential for generating income – or in other words, language training has to be ‘worth it’ to the company. My study suggests that the potential of language choices to include and exclude is particularly strong in a lingua franca setting such as a multilingual company. The results also indicate that successful social integration in the workplace is closely connected with learning the local language, a finding which is echoed in other studies of organisational communication, e.g. Tange and Lauring (2009) and Welch et al. (2005). Giving priority to language training, especially Danish classes for international experts, would thus provide a better working environment not only for the international employees, but also for their colleagues. And it is feasible that increased opportunities for successful social integration would enable the company to retain international experts, also after the three-year period of partial tax-exemption is over.

11.4.2 Language choice in a lingua franca setting

Where the previous section dealt with the practical applications of my results, this section deals with some of the theoretical implications. Until now, most research on language choice has focussed on bilingual communities, and the research on style, while very relevant to a discussion of language choice, has focussed on style shifting in general, with no particular attention to multilingual settings. The aim in this thesis has been to investigate language choice in a lingua franca setting, i.e. by definition a setting with several languages. The analyses in chapters 5 and
7 reveal that this particular setting is relevant to language choice. Variety in speakers’ linguistic repertoires has been shown to be a key characteristic of this lingua franca setting, and linguistic competence to be the most important influence on language choice. Furthermore, unlike style shifting between different dialects, language choice in a lingua franca setting has consequences for intelligibility.

As shown in the language choice analysis in chapter 7, competence relations is a complex factor, including in its scope the language competences of all interlocutors and the relationship between these competences. One important contribution from my analyses is that not just the people present in the situation influence language choice, expected addressees also play a role. In some communicative events, typically emails or PowerPoint presentations, the language competences of potential future addressees are taken into consideration when the language choice is made. Including expected addressees as a factor can explain for instance why Danes in some cases use English with each other; they do so because they expect non-Danish speakers to be addressees of the same material in the future. This factor can thus explain seemingly illogical language choices and should as such be included in future studies of language choice.

In studies of language choice within the ELF paradigm, it has been argued that English as a lingua franca is a language for communication, not identification (House, 2003) and that the function of codeswitching in ELF interactions is the completion of the unfolding work task (Firth, 2009). This focus on the instrumental function of English as a lingua franca seems too narrow when my results are taken into consideration. My analyses show that speakers make language choices with a variety of goals in mind. English as a lingua franca is indeed often used for instrumental goals, e.g. ensuring maximum intelligibility in order to complete a task, but it is also used with identity goals in mind, e.g. to signal belonging to an international research community of practice, and with relational goals in mind, e.g. to include others in a conversation. The workplace setting naturally also has a bearing on the communicative goals, hence it is not surprising that instrumental or pragmatic goals are particularly important here. This does not change the fact, however, that
English as a lingua franca is used for a variety of communicative goals, including identity-related goals.

11.4.3 Language ideologies and social integration

Previous work on language ideologies in Denmark has focussed on the standard-language ideology and the disappearance of the Danish dialects, the most prominent work here being done at the LANCHART centre (see e.g. Kristiansen 2001; 2004; 2009). In contrast, the focus of the language ideologies study in this thesis is on the meeting between Danish and other languages and between Danes and speakers of other languages. Also, the focus of the LANCHART studies has been the relationship between language attitudes and ideologies and language change. The results of the present thesis suggest that the relationship between language ideologies and social categorisation and social identity would be an equally valid agenda for future research into language ideologies in Denmark.

In chapter 9 we saw that language ideologies with ties to the widespread one-nation-one-language ideology categorise people into Danes and not-Danes, and native speakers of Danish and other speakers of Danish, and in this way construct boundaries between different groups in Danish society. Furthermore, these language ideologies link willingness to and interest in learning Danish with a willingness to integrate into Danish society, and thus by extension categorise immigrants into those who are willing to integrate and those who are not. In the case of this last categorisation, there is a clear positive valorisation of the group of immigrants who are perceived as making an effort to learn Danish and hence to integrate. In contrast, immigrants who are perceived as not making an effort to learn Danish and by extension to integrate are viewed negatively.

With these results as the point of departure, future research into language ideologies in Denmark could very well focus on beliefs about multilingualism, language learning and social integration. One important question is how such language ideological beliefs contribute to the construction and valorisation of groups in Danish society. In the analysis in chapter 9, I suggest that beliefs related to the one-nation-one-language ideology serve to reinforce boundaries between nations and nationalities.
and that language ideologies in this way can be used to construct stability and maintain clear borders in a globalised world. Ideologies about language are thus seen to reflect wider societal concerns. It follows that a study of language ideologies in Denmark with a focus on multilingualism and language learning would shed light on a key concern of many societies in the era of globalisation: the social integration of immigrants and refugees.

11.5 The ‘domain loss’ concept: conclusions and implications

In this section I discuss the conclusions to the second research question which is concerned with the ‘domain loss’ concept as it has been applied in discussions of the use of English in Denmark, particularly as it has been applied in relation to the use of English as a corporate language. The aim in this section is to provide an answer to the question of whether the ‘domain loss’ concept can be applied to situations where English is used as a corporate language in Denmark, and if this is found not to be the case, to discuss how this type of influence from English can be conceptualised. Following this are two sections which outline the methodological and theoretical implications of the conclusions of the first section.

As outlined in chapter 2, ‘domain loss’ is used to mean that Danish is dropped in favour of English, and in several cases ‘domain loss’ is used in connection with the use of English as a corporate language. The underlying assumptions behind these uses of ‘domain loss’ are 1) that the use of English as a corporate language means that Danish is no longer used in these companies and 2) that this entails - if a sufficient number of companies adopt English as a corporate language - that the ‘domain’ will be ‘lost’ and that Danish will no longer be a complete language. In contrast with these assumptions, my study shows that both English and Danish are used, and that both are in fact necessary in order to participate fully in the life of a multinational corporation in Denmark with English as a corporate language. To a lesser extent, other languages are also used, along with technical jargon and company speak. My analyses thus reveal a diverse linguistic landscape, rather than one in which English has
replaced Danish. And in fact, if any language can be said to dominate at Lundbeck, it is Danish.

Also, not only is ‘domain’ a very vague concept, it is clear from my analyses that it is far too general an analytical concept. First of all, the fact that some\(^{60}\) companies choose English as a corporate language does not mean that the corporate world as an area of society discards Danish in favour of English. Secondly, even if we consider those companies with English as a corporate language a ‘domain’ in itself, it is clear that Danish cannot automatically be assumed to be ‘lost’ in these companies. Furthermore, the language use in a company such as Lundbeck is far too complex to be described adequately by the ‘domain’ concept. In fact, even the analytical construct ‘communicative event’ (from Hymes and Gumperz) applied in my ethnographic analysis appears to be too general to fully describe language choice in this setting, as more than one language is often used within the same communicative event, either as codeswitching or in situations where one language is used orally while another is used simultaneously for the written part of the event (e.g. presentations in Danish and slides in English).

11.5.1 Implications for research on English in Denmark: methodology

The main contribution of this thesis is that it provides an in-depth investigation of the use of English in one area of Danish society, namely the use of English as a corporate language. Such a thorough analysis provides the necessary basis for any discussion of the advantages and disadvantages as well as the consequences of the use of English as a corporate language. Furthermore, due to the use of widely applicable theories from sociolinguistics and anthropological linguistics on language choice and language ideologies respectively, the results from this thesis can also be used to shed light on the phenomenon of English in Denmark in general. My findings about the societal, institutional and situational factors influencing language choice are not restricted to language choice in companies, and neither are the findings on language ideologies. And

\(^{60}\)25\% of the members of the Confederation of Danish Industry according to a 2007 survey (Pedersen and Holm, 2007).
although the case study methodology precludes me from drawing any general conclusions from this one case, a case study such as the above does provide one important piece of the puzzle which has recently occupied the minds of a number of sociolinguists: when do non-native speakers in their home countries use English, why do they do so, and what are the consequences, linguistically and socially?

Methodologically, this thesis shows the benefits of employing ethnographic methods to investigate linguistic practices. The choice to study English as a corporate language through an ethnographic case study was based on the premise that in order to understand language use, we need to study it in practice. And because language use is always embedded in a context, we need to study it in that context. The ethnographic fieldwork which informs not just the ethnographic analysis, but all three analyses, has been crucial to an understanding of the language practices at Lundbeck. And the ethnographic methodology which favours a back-and-forth process between data and research questions over hypothesis-testing has likewise proved essential for the groundedness of the results. The premise here has been that until the researcher has acquired some knowledge about the setting, it is impossible to ask the right questions. Furthermore, as we saw in the ethnographic analysis certain communicative events tend to ‘get disappeared’, in the sense that informants make some language choices without being aware of them. This tendency means that the full extent of the use of English cannot be revealed through questionnaire studies or interviews alone. Ethnographic observation is necessary if we want to capture the diversity which is easily overlooked in more quantitatively oriented studies.

Finally, I consider it a significant contribution to the study of English in Denmark that the experiences of the English-have-nots have been studied in detail here. The ethnographic approach has been crucial in locating this group of informants and including them in the research. A narrow focus on areas where English is routinely used would mean that these employees would not be heard, and that the consequences of introducing English as a corporate language for this group of employees would go unnoticed. If we want the full picture of what goes on in a multilingual workplace, we need to include all types of employees in our studies, not
just the seemingly important or interesting ones. And the only way to gain enough knowledge about an organisation to determine who should be included in a study is through ethnographic fieldwork.

Another important methodological contribution from this thesis lies in its eclecticism. Combining ethnographic analysis of language policy and language use with microanalytical studies of language choice and discourse analytical studies of language ideologies has provided unique insights. Viewing language choice, the heart of the matter in this thesis, from these three different perspectives has, I believe, ensured that the combined results are both comprehensive and solidly grounded.

11.5.2 Implications for research on English in Denmark: theory
The discussion in section 11.5 shows that debating the use of English as a corporate language in terms of ‘domain loss’ does not add to the understanding of the phenomenon. Rather than hinging on ‘domain’, language choice is conditioned by societal and institutional as well as situational factors, of which the most important are competence relations and communicative goals. Future discussions of the use of English as a corporate language, and indeed of the use of English in Denmark in general, would benefit from an increased focus on these factors.

Furthermore, I suggest that rather than focussing on the consequences for the Danish language, which does not appear to be under threat, we should focus on the social consequences of the use of English in Denmark. Linguistic diversity is per definition characteristic of situations where English is used as a lingua franca, and in this diversity is the potential for exclusion. English is often used with the intention of including, e.g. when English is introduced as a corporate language in order to create a sense of community in a large international organisation or when English is chosen for a lunch-time conversation between Danes in order to include their non-Danish-speaking colleagues. In reality, however, while the use of English in these and other situations does include some people, it inevitably excludes others, namely those with few or no English skills. Concerns about the use of English in Danish workplaces could therefore more fruitfully focus on the social consequences for the English-have-nots.
As outlined in section 11.4 there are multiple reasons for the use of English in Danish workplaces. At a societal level, the reasons include increasing transnational migration and at an institutional level, the development of organisations from local, Danish companies to multinational corporations. And these factors are important to remember when we discuss the use of English as a corporate language or any other use of English in Denmark. What is happening is not that English is taking over where Danish was used before. What is happening is rather that the number of situations where a foreign language has always been used are increasing, namely the number of situations which require communication with non-Danish speakers. Because multinational corporations recruit internationally, and because in their very nature they require cooperation and communication across national and linguistic borders, the need for foreign languages and linguae francae has increased. In other words, what has changed is not the language, but the context.
12 Summary

This thesis investigates language choice in an international company in Denmark with English as a corporate language. The data for the analyses was collected during five months of ethnographic fieldwork and includes participant observation, ethnographic interviews, recordings of naturally occurring interactions and focus group interviews. The analyses are divided into three studies.

1) The ethnographic study reveals this international company in Denmark to be an extremely diverse environment with regard to language competence and language use. While many Danish employees are proficient English users, a minority has little or no English competence. The international employees are typically proficient English users, but have varying levels of Danish competence. An investigation of norms for language choice reveals that Danish is the default spoken language, while English is used primarily with non-Danish speakers.

2) The microanalytical study of language choice shows that the primary factor influencing language choice in this lingua franca setting is language competence. The term ‘competence relations’ is introduced to emphasise that it is the relation between the language competence of the speaker and all addressees, including future addressees, that influences language choice. Furthermore, language choice is found to be intimately linked with speakers’ communicative goals. The study concludes that seeing language choices as the fulfilment of multiple communicative goals provides a theoretical framework for explaining language choice which also recognises that language choices are interactionally accomplished.

3) In the language ideologies study, English is shown to symbolise international to such a degree that it is constructed as the only candidate for a language for international communication. In addition, English is shown to symbolise quality, power and prestige, while Danish in contrast symbolises local and unimportant. In another context, however, namely from the point of view of those without Danish skills, Danish is a language of opportunity and hence prestige. The analysis also reveals how language ideologies are linked with identity, as it is shown that language ideologies contribute to the construction of boundaries between groups.
such as Danes and foreigners and the attribution of value to these groups. Furthermore, beliefs related to the one-nation-one-language ideology are seen to reinforce boundaries between nations and nationalities and thus to contribute to constructing stability and maintaining clear borders in a globalised world.

The combined results of the three analyses show that language choice is influenced by factors on three levels: societal (in the form of globalisation), institutional (the development of the organisation into a multinational corporation) and situational (competence relations and communicative goals). Furthermore, the language practices in this lingua franca setting have the potential to exclude or include participants. This can happen either on a situational level as a switch in languages may allow potential participants to enter the conversation or prevent them from it, or it can happen ideologically through constructing others as non-native speakers of Danish, which in combination with the mother-tongue-is-natural ideology excludes them from partaking fully in Danish culture and identity.

The conclusions reached in the thesis have practical, theoretical and methodological implications for several fields: 1) For multilingual companies the results point to the importance of raising awareness of language issues and of centralising opportunities for language learning. 2) The thesis contributes to the field of language choice by pointing out the primary factors influencing language choice in a lingua franca setting, i.e. the diversity of speakers’ repertoires and the ensuing importance of competence relations. 3) In relation to the language ideologies paradigm, the thesis attests to the existence of dominant language ideologies linking beliefs about language learning with beliefs about social integration of immigrants. 4) With regard to English in Denmark, the thesis shows the advantages of employing an ethnographic perspective which allows the researcher to capture the complexities of language choice in the setting. The results confirm that ‘domain loss’ is neither an accurate nor an adequate description of the complex linguistic situation in a company with English as a corporate language. There is no ‘loss’ in the sense that Danish is being replaced by English. What has changed is rather that the number of situations which require communication with non-Danish
speakers has increased, and hence the number of situations requiring the use of a lingua franca. The language choice has not changed, the context has.
13 Resume

Afhandlingen undersøger sprogvalg i en international virksomhed i Danmark med engelsk som koncernsprog. Data til brug i analyserne er indsamlet gennem fem måneders feltarbejde og inkluderer deltagerobservation, etnografiske interviews, optagelser af naturligt forekommende interaktion samt fokusgruppeinterviews. Analyserne er inddelt i tre studier.

1) Det etnografiske studie afslører, at denne internationale virksomhed i Danmark er et ekstremt varieret miljø hvad angår sprogkompetencer og sprogbrug. Mens mange danske medarbejdere er kompetente engelskbrugere, har en mindre andel få eller ingen engelskkundskaber. De internationale medarbejdere er typisk kompetente engelskbrugere, men har varierende niveauer af danskkundskaber. En undersøgelse af normer for sprogvalg afslører, at det er normen at anvende dansk i talt sprog så vidt muligt, dvs. at engelsk fortrinsvis anvendes med ikke-dansktalende.

2) Det mikroanalytiske studie af sprogvalg viser, at den primære faktor, der påvirker sprogvalg i dette lingua franca-miljø, er sprogkundskaber. Begrebet ‘competence relations’ (sprogkundskabsrelationer) introduceres for at understrege, at det er forholdet mellem talerens og alle modtageres sprogkundskaber, inklusive fremtidige modtageres sprogkundskaber, der påvirker sprogvalg. Analysen viser også, at sprogvalg er tæt knyttet til sprogbrugernes kommunikative mål. Det konkluderes, at sprogvalg med fordel kan ses som opfyldelsen af kommunikative mål, da dette giver en teoretisk ramme til at forklare sprogvalg, som anerkender, at sprogvalg sker i samspill med mennesker.

3) Studiet af sprogideologier viser, at engelsk symboliserer international i en sådan grad, at det konstrueres som det eneste mulige sprog til international kommunikation. Endvidere vises det, at engelsk symboliserer kvalitet, magt og prestige, mens dansk i sammenligning symboliserer lokal og ubetydelig. I en anden sammenhæng, nemlig set fra medarbejdere uden danskkundskabers perspektiv, er dansk dog mulighedernes sprog og forbindes dermed også med prestige. Analysen afslører også, hvordan sprogideologier hænger sammen med
identitetskonstruktion, idet det fremgår, at sprogideologier bidrager til at konstruere grænser mellem grupper såsom danskere og udlændinge og til værditilskrivningen til disse grupper. Derudover ses det, at forestillinger relateret til ’et land, et sprog’-ideologien forstærker grænserne mellem lande og nationaliteter og således bidrager til at konstruere stabilitet og opretholde klare grænser i en globaliseret verden.

De kombinerede resultater fra de tre analyser viser, at sprogvalg påvirkes af faktorer på tre niveauer: samfundsmæssige (i form af globalisering), institutionelle (organisationens udvikling til en multinational virksomhed) og situationelle faktorer (sprogkundskabsrelationer og kommunikative mål). Endvidere ses det, at de sproglige praksisser i dette lingua franca-miljø potentielt kan ekskludere eller inkludere deltagere. Det kan enten ske på situationsniveau ved at et sprogskift tillader potentielle deltagere at komme med i en samtale eller udelukker dem fra det, eller det kan ske ideologisk ved at konstruere andre som ikke-modersmålstalere af dansk, hvilket i kombination med ’modersmålet er det naturlige sprog’-ideologien ekskluderer dem fra fuld deltagelse i den danske kultur og identitet.

Afhandlingens konklusioner har praktiske, teoretiske og metodologiske implikationer på en række områder: 1) For flersproglige virksomheder peger resultaterne på vigtigheden af at højne opmærksomheden omkring sproglige problemstillinger samt af at centralisere muligheder for sproguddannelse. 2) Afhandlingen bidrager til sprogvalgsforskningen ved at udpege de primære faktorer, der påvirker sprogvalg i et lingua franca-miljø, dvs. diversiteten i sprogbrugernes repertoarer og den heraf følgende vigtighed af sprogkundskabsrelationer. 3) I forhold til sprogideologiforskningen påviser afhandlingen eksistensen af dominante sprogideologier, der sammenkæder forestillinger om sprogtilegning med forestillinger om indvandreres sociale integration. 4) Med hensyn til engelsk i Danmark viser afhandlingen fordelene ved at anvende et etnografisk perspektiv, som tillader forskeren at indfange alle de komplekse aspekter af sprogvalg i miljøet. Resultaterne bekræfter, at ’domænetab’ hverken er en præcis eller tilstrækkelig beskrivelse af den komplekse sproglige situation i en virksomhed med engelsk som
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Appendix 1: Transcription conventions

... irrelevant sequence left out

(.) pause of less than a second

(2.0) longer pause, numbers indicate seconds

[right] overlap

(chuckles) comments made by the researcher

Eng- self-interruption

(laughs=) very (=laughs) text between comments is said while laughing

<the IT department> pseudonyms inserted by the researcher

xxx unintelligible words or passages

{maybe} uncertain words or passages

the: prolonged sound

per default in some examples key passages are underlined

paraphrases line-by-line paraphrases of the Danish part of examples are provided in English in italics immediately after the original
Appendix 2: Information til deltagere

Projektet
Ph.d.-projektet omhandler sprogbrugen i danske virksomheder, der har engelsk som koncernsprog. Jeg er interesseret i at finde ud af, hvilke sprog der bliver brugt i virksomheden, hvordan de ansatte oplever det at arbejde på en international arbejdsplads med engelsk som koncernsprog, og hvilke holdninger der er til brugen af forskellige sprog på arbejdspladsen. For at kunne finde ud af disse ting er det nødvendigt at undersøge, hvordan folk rent faktisk kommunikerer hos Lundbeck.

Hvordan vil dataindsamlingen foregå?

Senere i forløbet vil jeg bede nogle medarbejdere om at bære optageudstyr i 3 dage, så jeg kan få optagelser af eksempler på samtaler. I samme periode vil jeg indsamle en del af disse medarbejderes e-mail-korrespondance. Til slut vil jeg igen gennemføre en række interviews, denne gang i grupper.

Deltagelsen i projektet for den enkelte medarbejder kan således variere fra medvirken i et enkelt interview til også at inkludere optagelser, indsamling af e-mails samt medvirken i gruppeinterview. Interviews og optagelser vil efterfølgende blive transskribet og analyseret. Alle personnavne og andre personlige oplysninger vil blive ændret til pseudonymer for at beskytte de medvirkendes identitet, ligesom alle navne på produkter, firmaer, steder mv. vil blive ændret.

Hvad skal de indsamlede data bruges til?
De indsamlede data skal bruges til forskningsformål, dels udarbejdelsen af en ph.d.-afhandling og dels andre publikationer og præsentationer. Konklusioner fra projektet vil indgå som væsentlige bidrag til optimering af kommunikationspraksisser i virksomheden, og projektet ses som en unik mulighed til at undersøge kommunikationskulturen på dette væsentlige punkt i Lundbeck.

Hvem får adgang til datamaterialet?
Jeg har tavshedspligt til at hemmeligholde alt, hvad jeg i løbet af dataindsamlingen erfarer om forskningsprojekter, produkter, organisation mv. Alle optagelser og alt skriftligt materiale vil blive opbevaret sikkert hos Lundbeck og på Roskilde Universitetscenter. Kun min vejleder og jeg vil have adgang til datamaterialet, og du kan være sikker på, at optagelser ikke vil blive spillet for din chef eller dine kolleger.

Kontaktoplysninger
Jeg vil under dataindsamlingen være tilknyttet Employee Relations. Hvis du har yderligere spørgsmål eller kommentarer i forbindelse med dataindsamlingen, er du velkommen til at kontakte mig:

Dorte Lønsmann, ph.d.-stipendiat
Institut for Kultur og Identitet
Roskilde Universitetscenter
E-mail: xxx@ruc.dk

Samtykkeerklæring
Jeg giver hermed tilladelse til, at optagelser af min mundtlige interaktion på arbejdspladsen, optagelser af interviews såvel som skriftligt materiale indsamlet i forbindelse med ph.d.-projektet ”Brugen af engelsk i danske virksomheder” fra 1. september 2006 til 31. januar 2007 må bruges til forskningsmæssige formål som beskrevet i ovenstående. Jeg har forstået, at min identitet vil blive beskyttet og ikke afsløret uden min tilladelse. Jeg forstår endvidere, at det er frivilligt, om jeg ønsker at medvirke i projektet.

Underskrift ________________________________
Navn ___________________________________

Dato ___________________________________

Baggrundsoplysninger

1. Hvad er din stillingsbetegnelse hos Lundbeck?
   _______________________________________

2. Hvor længe har du haft denne stilling?
   _______________________________________

3. Hvor længe har du været hos Lundbeck?
   _______________________________________

4. Er du kvinde ____ mand ____ (sæt kryds)

5. Hvilket år er du født?
   _______________________________________  

6. Hvad er den højeste uddannelse, du har?
   _______________________________________  

7. Hvilket land er du født i? ________________________________
   Hvis relevant: Hvilket år kom du til Danmark?___________

8. Hvad er dit modersmål? ________________________________

9. Hvilke sprog taler du ud over dit modersmål?
   Flydende _______________________________________
   Nogenlunde _______________________________________
   Lidt _____________________________________________

10. Hvilke sprog bruger du til hverdag?
    På arbejdet ______________________________________
    Hjemme _________________________________________  

[nedenstående udfyldes af feltarbejderen]

11. Pseudonym/kode ______________________________________
Appendix 3: Information for participants

The project
The PhD project is a study of language use in Danish companies with English as corporate language. I am interested in finding out which languages are used in the company and how the employees experience working in an international workplace with English as the corporate language. I am also interested in learning more about the attitudes of employees to the use of different languages in the workplace. In order to learn more about these issues, it is necessary for me to study how people actually communicate at Lundbeck.

How will the data collection be carried out?
The data collection will take place from September 2006 until January 2007. During this period of time I will be present daily at Lundbeck. For the first couple of months I will observe how communication takes place in the individual departments and conduct a number of interviews in order to learn more about the daily life and communication at Lundbeck.

Later in the process I will ask a number of employees to carry recording equipment for a period of 3 days. These recordings will provide me with examples of conversation. During the same period I will collect part of these employees’ email correspondence. At the end of the data collection period I will again conduct a number of interviews, this time in groups.

Each employee’s participation in the project can vary from participation in one interview to also include recordings, collection of emails and participating in a group interview.

Interviews and recordings will then be transcribed and analysed. All names and other personal information will be changed to pseudonyms in order to protect the identity of participants. All names of products, companies, places etc. will also be changed.
What will the data be used for?
The collected data will be used for research purposes, i.e. my PhD thesis as well as articles and presentations. Also, conclusions from the project will contribute significantly to an optimisation of communication practices in the company. The project is viewed as a unique opportunity to investigate the communication culture in this important area at Lundbeck.

Who will have access to the data?
I am obligated not to disclose any confidential information learned during the course of the data collection, including information about research projects, products and organisation. All recordings and all written material will be stored securely at Lundbeck and at Roskilde University. Only my supervisor and I will have access to the data material. Rest assured that recordings will not be played to other staff or managers at Lundbeck.

Contact information
During the data collection I will be placed in Employee Relations. For any further questions and comments in relation to the data collection, please contact:
Dorte Lønsmann, PhD student
Department of Culture and Identity
Roskilde University
Email: xxx@ruc.dk

Consent form
I hereby give permission for recordings of my verbal interaction in the workplace, recordings of interviews as well as written material collected for the PhD project “The use of English in Danish companies” from 1 September 2006 until 31 January 2007 to be used for research purposes as described above. I understand that my identity will be protected and will not be disclosed without my permission. I also understand that participation in the project is voluntary.
Signature ___________________________________
Name _____________________________________
Date ______________________________________

Background information

1. What is your current job title?
   _______________________________________

2. How long have you had this job?
   _______________________________________

3. How long have you been with Lundbeck?
   _______________________________________

4. Are you female ____ male ____ (please mark with an X)

5. Which year were you born?
   _______________________________________

6. What is your highest educational qualification?
   _______________________________________

7. Which country were you born in?
   _______________________________________

If relevant: Which year did you come to Denmark?___________

8. Which language is your mother tongue?
   _______________________________________

9. What other languages do you speak?
   Fluently ___________________________________
   Some _____________________________________
   A little ___________________________________

10. What languages do you use?
    At work _____________________________________
    At home _____________________________________

[the information below is filled out by the fieldworker]

11. Pseudonym/code _______________________________
Appendix 4: Interviewguide for etnografiske interviews

Indledning: Jeg vil gerne lære om hverdagen hos Lundbeck, jeg er interesseret i DINE oplevelser og erfaringer. Jeg vil gerne høre dig fortælle, gerne med mange detaljer og eksempler. Interviewet er fortroligt, dine kolleger og chefer får ikke at vide, hvad du har sagt.

Din arbejdsdag
Fortæl hvordan en typisk arbejdsdag ser ud for dig
Hvor er du?
Hvad laver du?
Hvem kommunikerer du typisk med? Hvor er de?
Ad hvilke kanaler? Hvilke måder er der at kommunikere på?
Hvem snakker du mest med? Hvem har du mest kontakt med?
Beskriv din afdeling
Hvilke arbejdssopgaver er der?
Hvilke medarbejdere er der?
Hvordan er de fysiske rammer?
Hvordan adskiller jeres afdeling sig fra andre afdelinger?

Sprogbrug
Hvilke sprog bruger du til hverdag på Lundbeck?
Hvornår/i hvilke situationer bruger du engelsk/dansk/andre sprog?
Eksempler?
Hvis jeg var med til et afdelingsmøde, hvilke sprog ville jeg høre?
Hvis jeg sad med jer i kantinen, hvilke sprog ville jeg så høre?
Hvis jeg hang ud på gangene her, hvilke sprog ville jeg så høre?
Hvilket sprog vælger du, når du skriver e-mails internt i afdelingen/ti hele virksomheden/til folk i Lundbeck, du ikke kender?
Hvornår taler/skriver du engelsk?
Hvornår er du sidst stødt på engelsk?
Kan du give mig et eksempel på en situation, hvor du har været i tvivl om, hvilket sprog, du skulle bruge?

Hvilke retningslinjer er der for sprogbrug hos Lundbeck?

Hvordan er du blevet opmærksom på, at engelsk er koncernsprog/Hvornår blev engelsk koncernsprog?

Hvilke sproglige værktøjer/hjælpemidler findes der?

Er du blevet tilbudt sprogkurser?

Hvilke oplevelser har du haft som ikke-dansktalende?

Hvor god er du til engelsk?

Er dine engelskkundskaber tilstrækkelige?

Kan du lide at tale/skrive engelsk?

Er der situationer, hvor du føler brugen af engelsk hæmmende? (Kan du fx udtrykke den rette grad af høflighed på engelsk, når du beder nogen om noget?)

Lundbeck

Hvilke sprog bruges hos Lundbeck? Hvornår?

Hvilke grupper synes du, der er hos Lundbeck/ Hvilke typer af medarbejdere er der hos Lundbeck?

Hvilke værdier er vigtige hos Lundbeck, hvordan vil Lundbeck gerne fremstå?

Afrunding: Har du andet at tilføje til det, vi har snakket om?
Appendix 5: Diskussionsguide for fokusgruppeinterviews

Emne 1 Dansk eller international?
Har I været til julefrokost på Lundbeck/i afdelingen? Hvordan afspejlede arrangementet det danske og internationale?
   Mad, aktiviteter, sprog
   Er Lundbeck en dansk eller international virksomhed?
   CITATER (dansk eller international): Hvad mener I?/Hvad har I af kommentarer?
      Er det vigtigt, at udlændinge, der arbejder i Danmark, lærer dansk?
      Hvorfor?
      I hvilke situationer er det vigtigt at kunne dansk?
      Hvilken rolle spiller ens holdning til at lære dansk ift. at blive accepteret på arbejdspladsen og indgå i sociale relationer?

Emne 2 Dansk eller engelsk? (40 min.)
Hvem på Lundbeck bruger mest engelsk?
   Forskning, marketing, IT, ledelsen?
   I hvilke situationer er det vigtigt at kunne engelsk?
   I hvilke situationer bruges der mange engelske ord i det danske?
   Hvornår skifter man pludselig fra dansk til engelsk eller omvendt?
   OPTAGELSE (kodeskift): Hvad sker der her?
   CITATER (formel/uformel): Hvad mener I?
   Hvilke signaler sender man, når man kommunikerer kun på dansk eller kun på engelsk?
   Fx i en mail til alle i bygningen, informationsmøder i kantinen, materiale om sikkerhedsorganisationen.

Emne 3 Engelsk som barriere (1 time 10 min.)
Kan det engelske nogle gange være en barriere?
   For hvem eller i hvilke situationer?
   OPTAGELSE (kodeskift): Kender I de situationer?
Er det vigtigt, hvad man taler om, fx forskning over for innovation?

CITATER (engelsk som barriere): Kender I det?

Emne 4  Engelsk som koncernsprog (1 time 25 min.)

Hvad forstår I ved et koncernsprog?

Hvordan passer den forståelse med den måde, tingene foregår på i praksis her?

Hvad tror I, ledelsens opfattelse af et koncernsprog er? Hvad er deres forventninger?

Hvad er Lundbecks sprogpolitik efter jeres mening?

Hvis I skulle give ét godt råd om Lundbecks sprogpolitik, specielt ift. engelsk som koncernsprog, hvordan ville det så lyde?

I kan tage udgangspunkt i de ting/problemer, vi har snakket om

Hvornår burde man bruge engelsk?

Krav ved ansættelse, sprogkurser (skal man tilbyde/skal man tage imod)
Appendix 6: Paraphrase of ex13

1  ANDREAS:  hey
2  STEFAN:   hey
3  (2.0)
4  STEFAN:   is it on the first floor or where are we
5  supposed to be
6  ANDREAS:  yes
7  STEFAN:   I did not even know there was a
8  meeting room up there too
9  (.)
10  ANDREAS:  first floor (. ) one hundred and ninety two it is
11  a good thing I met you because I have never
12  before been to the first floor
13  STEFAN:  okay but I am not exactly sure either
14  where it is whether it is
15  in the outback or what
16  (2.0)
17  ANDREAS:  so do you play in winter
18  STEFAN:   yes sometimes
19  ANDREAS:  okay
20  (walking on stairs)
21  STEFAN:  it is difficult to get people to join at the
22  moment it is just five or six people every
23  time that’s too few
24  ANDREAS:  I think it is (. ) a lot too early
25  STEFAN:  (laughs=) a lot too early (=laughs) yes
26  that may very well be the case
27  ANDREAS:  (laughs) (. ) yes
28  (3.0)
29  STEFAN:  xxx
30  ANDREAS:  here in here [xxx]
31  STEFAN:    [xxx] xxx it looks like someone
32  was here
33  ANDREAS:  (laughs)
34  (3.0)
35  STEFAN:  he sure booked a large enough room
36  ANDREAS:  (chuckles)
37  KURT:     hi
38  STEFAN:   hi did you [xxx]
39  ANDREAS:  [hello hello]
40  KURT:     no that wasn’t me that was Tina xxx
41  (8.0)
42  ANDREAS:  was your son is your son better
43  KURT:     oh are you the one with wireless
44  ANDREAS:  oh yes yes I have to say that I’m being updated
45  no er recorded today if that is okay with
46  you it is the same thing Kate had last week
47  KURT:     okay yes yes he’s better now so xxx
48  ANDREAS:  i’ve been thinking I wanted to send you a
49  little Calvin and Hobbes comic do you know
KURT: [yes] okay yes
ANDREAS: but I couldn’t find the one where he has chicken pox and then they go see a paediatrician and Calvin says chicken pox mum what is this guy a veterinarian (laughs)
KURT: ha ha okay yeah
ANDREAS: (laughs)
(2.0)
ANDREAS: hey
TINA: I don’t know if more people are arriving
ANDREAS: [Mads]
TINA: [xxx]
ANDREAS: Mads yes	
TINA: okay
ANDREAS: I just saw him in the canteen
(15.0)
ANDREAS: I spoke to er Linda before and you know they had the ferret
TINA: mm
ANDREAS: er tested with <name of chemical compound>
TINA: yeah
ANDREAS: right erm and <name of chemical compound> (2.0) and she said that in two groups she had a huge effect but she doesn't know (laughs=) yet which group (=laughs) that were so er she promised me to get back to me
Appendix 7: Paraphrase of ex14

1  TINA: so what should we er reassemble in er two
2  months or so
3  STEFAN: two months
4  TINA: that
5  STEFAN: two weeks (chuckles)
6  TINA: have these things been tested in two months do
7  you think is that [realistic]
8  STEFAN: [xxx]
9  ANDREAS: if the in vivo binding and the CK is coming
10  then yes
11  TINA: yeah
12  KURT: we should follow up on the meetings we have we
13  [can]
14  TINA: [yeah]
15  KURT: we can do that now we have initiated [so I]
16  TINA: [yeah]
17  KURT: say we could just
18  STEFAN: yeah
19  TINA: so in a couple of months
20  KURT: Mads is coming next time of course that is
21  maybe too close xxx
22  TINA: yeah
23  STEFAN: xxx
24  TINA: I’ll set up something after Christmas
25  KURT: and there we of [course in]
26  MADS: [xxx the brain]
27  KURT: general are discussing the safety screen plan
28  xxx is of course an effort that {the in vivo
29  binding}
30  TINA: (mumbles=) yeah (=mumbles)
31  (.)
32  MADS: this compound here is really like
33  TINA: but yeah just to be sure that we have
34  all the data and
35  KURT: yeah yeah yeah yeah well but of course we need
36  to follow up on this intensively [of course]
37  [phone rings)]
38  TINA: yes I think so
39  ...
40  MADS: there is also that what was the company
41  with the three old retired
42  ANDREAS: (chuckles)
43  MADS: men (.) who made this internet
44  [shell company run in their spare time]
45  ANDREAS: [(laughs)]
46  MADS: [and had a lot of drugs]
47  TINA: [like Sprunken or what]
48  MADS: no they were American what were
TINA: (chuckles)
MADS: the drugs we had in for licensing and thought about buying and so on and that was of course against Alzheimer's (laughs)
(Laughter)
ANDREAS: personal interest (laughs)
MADS: it was like (.) totally ridiculous
(2.0)
KURT: xxx
(Laughter)
STEFAN: they hurried xxx
ANDREAS: yeah get to safety
KURT: like Per today with his
STEFAN: yes
MADS: yes please
(2.0)
STEFAN: well he hadn’t seen xxx
MADS: no I think he could use something soon
STEFAN: xxx
ANDREAS: okay (2.0)bye
MADS: yes but er
(people leaving the meeting room)
STEFAN: so how many days are you being recorded
MADS: three days
ANDREAS: yes
STEFAN: what's the purpose
MADS: who is it for
ANDREAS: it sorry
MADS: is it for all er English (.)
ANDREAS: no it's er it's a PhD thesis that external
PhD and er it's Dorte which who can hear now my explanation (laughs=) well let’s see if I get
it right (=laughs) no but basically it's about
the er use of language at Lundbeck
STEFAN: okay
(3.0)
ANDREAS: er and she is following different departments
where some of them are purely Danish
STEFAN: yeah
ANDREAS: and some of them have maybe one or two
foreigners and then us because we have
the highest percentage of foreigners
MADS: okay
ANDREAS: and er to (.) yeah analyse the use of language
because the corporate language is English but
it's a Danish company
STEFAN: yeah
ANDREAS: and
MADS: try to identify the true corporate
STEFAN: (chuckles)
ANDREAS: exactly lang- Danglish
MADS: (chuckles) Danglish (pronounced=)Danglish
(=pronounced with an exaggerated American
accent)

102 (4.0)
103 MADS: (yawn)
104 STEFAN: see you Mads
105 ANDREAS: see you Mads
106 (8.0)
107 ANDREAS: wow (2.0) what happened
108 STEFAN: somebody tried to
109 ANDREAS: everywhere
110 STEFAN: I think it’s the wind that goes in and then
111 ANDREAS: (chuckles) I mean if this was [after the er]
112 STEFAN: [or or otherwise]
113 it was some really drunk
114 ANDREAS: [(laughs=) after Christmas party (=laughs)]
115 STEFAN: [yeah]