University administrators as forced language policy agents. An institutional ethnography of parallel language strategy and practices at the University of Copenhagen

(Maarja Siiner)

Published in: *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 2016,
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2016.1204058>

Nation states increasingly assign the responsibility for meeting the global competitiveness agenda to the universities themselves [Cirius, 2009, *Mobilitetsstatistik for de videregående uddannelser 2007/08* [Mobility statistics for higher education 2007/08]]. In Denmark, universities that have introduced English as an instrument to facilitate internationalisation are called post-national(-ising) [Mortensen & Haberland, 2012, *English: The new Latin of academia? Danish universities as a case. International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 216, 175– 197]. The present article questions this assumption by outlining results from an institutional ethnographic study of internationalisation at the University of Copenhagen, where national agendas like the preservation of the Danish workplace culture and developing and protecting the status of Danish are very much present. In line with authors who have analysed internationalisation at Danish universities as an uneven and differentiated process due to the counter discourse of immigration prevailing on the Danish labour market [Valentin, 2012, *Caught between internationalization and immigration. Learning and Teaching*, 5(3), 56–74; Mosneaga & Agergaard, 2012, *Agents of internationalisation? Danish universities' practices for attracting international students. Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 10(4), 519–538], my study reveals that internationalisation at a national university in Denmark is a contested field where the conflicting language regimes [Cardinal & Sonntag, 2015, *State traditions and language regimes: Conceptualizing language policy choices. In L. Cardinal & S. Sonntag (Eds.), State traditions and language regimes* (pp. 3–28). McGill-Queen's University Press] of internationalisation (favouring English) and immigration (favouring Danish) clash, complicating the linguistic organisation at UCPH [Tange, 2012, *Organising language at the international university: Three principles of linguistic organization. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 33(3), 287–300]. While using English was regarded as the primary means of solving internationalisation-related challenges by the Danish staff, for the foreign staff, English obscured rather than facilitated their understanding of the Danish workplace culture and university administration, which was their primary internationalisation-related concern.

Introduction

Increased mobility among students and faculty, as well as the increasingly global knowledge market, has forced universities in non-Anglophone Europe to adopt language policies that, on the one hand, introduce English as language of instruction and university administration, but on the other hand also try to safeguard the role of the national languages in the national higher education institutions. The situation is similar at the University of Copenhagen (hereafter UCPH), which in 2008 introduced the parallel language strategy (the strategy was introduced for the first time in the Nordic Declaration of Language Policy, 2006) to ease the international recruitment of students and academic staff (Strategy, 2016, p. 31; Destination, 2012, p. 35) combined with a need to secure the position of the Danish language as a fully functioning academic language. Denmark has, in contrast to Sweden, no separate Language Act where the status of the national language is stratified, but the most recent language policy report from 2008 recommended universities to pass language strategies with the aim of securing the status of Danish vis-à-vis English and thus safeguarding the continuous development of Danish for Specific Purposes and of Danish terminology (Sprog til tiden, 2008, p. 133). This aspect of universities' language planning has been studied under the heading of domain loss (Preisler, 2009), while other studies of the parallel language strategies claim that the focus should be on language-in-education planning (Liddicoat, 2013) or how the choice of language for education in the classroom affects the quality of higher education (Holmen, in press; Kling, 2015).

In order to better understand the language planning activities carried out at universities, a distinction should be made between the main language policy activities: language acquisition, corpus planning and status planning activities (Spolsky, 2004). Universities' language policies can include all three activities: choice of language of instruction, development of the national language as academic language and the choice of corporate or administrative language(s) for in-house communication. For the sake of clarity, however, an analysis of universities' language policies should ideally focus on just one of the activities.

The aim of the present paper is to focus on the consequences of the choice of the administrative language for inner communication at UCPH. As I will clarify below, there are some important differences between internationalising multinational companies and internationalising national universities that also influence how the choice of a corporate language affects the organisation. These differences mean that in higher education (hereafter HE), internationalisation as an uneven process that advantages some and disadvantages others is harder to achieve than in multinational companies (Tange, 2012). In order to fully understand the language status planning at universities, it is important to offer a broader analysis of internationalisation as a differentiated process and how it affects a national university as a workplace where national and international discourses, promoted by two conflicting language regimes (Cardinal & Sonntag, 2015) of internationalisation and integration, meet.

For this purpose, I carried out an institutional ethnographic study (Smith, 1974, 2005) of language ideologies and practices at the department at the Faculty of Humanities with the biggest proportion of foreign employees: the Department of Cross-Cultural and Regional Studies (hereafter the Department). The Department was founded in 2004, when many small regional studies and language subjects merged into one large department to avoid closure. The secondary aim of my research was to shed more light on the phenomenon of internationalisation, which is targeted in UCPHs development strategies (Destination, 2012; Strategy, 2016) as a well-defined phenomenon (measured mainly by the number of foreign students and researchers present at UCPH); however, there is a clear lack of knowledge about how internationalisation affects the language behaviour of those involved: the Danish and foreign staff working together. Besides mapping the language attitudes and practices in English and Danish, I also gave staff the opportunity to define what internationalisation is about in the personal encounters of their everyday work-related practices. I will start out by explaining the choice of the method for my study and my research questions and will proceed to main findings thereafter.

Theoretical and methodological basis of the study

There are different ways of studying internationalisation and language management in higher education. In Denmark, the majority of these studies focus on the language political activity of language acquisition or on how teaching/learning in English in the international classroom affects academic achievement (Dimova, Hultgren, & Jensen, 2015; Kling, 2015). Others focus on the language ideological aspects of internationalisation (Holmen, 2012; Phillipson, 2015) and a few of them study internationalisation as an organisational challenge (Tange, 2012). My aim was to continue along the latter path – to study language ideologies and practices outside the classroom: How has the introduction of English as the official language of communication at a workplace affected work at universities. My approach is bottom-up and covers two main questions: firstly, what experiences do foreign staff have of working in a Danish national institution, and secondly, how institutional practices are affected by the increasing presence of foreign staff. My study is inspired by the sociological-ethnographic method called institutional ethnography (hereafter IE) (Smith, 2005), which analyses knowledge as socially constructed and shaped by the world of experience (Smith, 1974, 2005). IE has its roots in feminist sociology and is a critique of theory-driven sociology, which tends to find what is already conceptualised, that is, studying a phenomenon through a certain lens (Smith, 1987). Since all sociological research is interpretative, the researcher has to be aware of his or her own positionality in explaining what has triggered the interest in the subject: the researcher's personal experiences are also shaped by certain institutions.

Studying internationalisation from a foreign researcher's standpoint relates to my own experiences as a foreign researcher at UCPH, but I needed to know more of the experiences of other foreign researchers and of the Danish staff: What are the institutional processes or the ruling relations that coordinate their everyday work at this specific university and institute (Smith, 2006, p. 6)? Similar to Bourdieu's habitus (1991) and Giddens' agency in his structuration theory (Giddens, 1984), IE's core tenet is an assumption that knowledge is

socially organised and that what is known is dependent on a particular subject's position in institutional practices, the so-called standpoint (Rankin, 2015, p. 527). Your agency or possibility to change the structure depends on what you know (about the organisation), which in turn depends on your position in the organisation. IE aims specifically at studying how the socially organised powers influence our lives and consciousness and how we contribute to or challenge this organisation through our actions (Widerberg, 2008). The structure becomes especially visible in cases where individuals who are not shaped by these structures, like foreign employees, enter into the organisation and start questioning the existing practices.

IE, like any ethnographic study, begins with a puzzle. I was puzzled by the frequent and uncontested use of the term internationalisation in several language policy texts drafted in Denmark and at UCPH, all following the same rationale: increasing internationalisation leads to a need to adopt a language policy in HE. In 2008, UCPH developed the parallel language use strategy (using both Danish and English in parallel) as UCPH's official language policy (Destination, 2012, p. 12), referring to internationalisation as the primary reason for why UCPH needs a language strategy to increase the use of English: foreign employees should be able to access the information they need to function at their new workplace. In this way, they would feel "welcomed". However, none of the documents defined what the process of internationalisation might imply, other than leading to increased numbers of foreign students and staff. Will the translation into English of what is deemed to be relevant information be sufficient to make foreign staff feel welcome at UCPH? How do new foreign colleagues affect the work environment for the Danish staff and vice versa? IE observes how changes in work environment alter the working conditions of people who share a common location in an institutional regime but have different positions in it. The aim of IE is not to understand the whole institution or its individual employees, but to shed light on how their work is shaped by ruling relations. IE studies "observable" discourses (in policy texts, guidelines, working documents and the employees'

own encounters of their work) and activities, that is, how the university employees are the knowledgeable practitioners/knowers (Smith, 2005, p. 9) of internationalisation. Since IE studies power relations and governance, it is also an appropriate approach for an analysis of the policy-making process. The drafting and dissemination of policy texts forms part of this process, and IE studies policy texts as relatively stable reference points for actors. Texts can be distributed and made widely accessible and play a standardising and mediating role (DeVault & McCoy, 2006). Similar to Giddens' structuration theory, texts institutionalize habits or traditions that become a rule – the ruling relations. "The rules and resources drawn upon in the production and reproduction of social practices are at the same time the means of system reproduction" (Giddens, 1984, p. 19). Using texts in ethnographic analysis makes it possible to study how coordination takes place across contexts and locations. With reference to Barthes, Smith adds that the act of reading makes the text (Widerberg, 2004); however, one cannot follow a text that is not made readable (e.g. in translated form). In contrast to discourse studies, IE thus studies how people make reference to texts in their encounters of actions carried out in an institutional context. According to Smith (1990), the ontological basis of IE is that all knowledge is constructed in relations – in employee's relations to texts, their jobs and each other.

My ethnographic study, which was carried out during the spring term 2015, included semi-structured interviews with the "knowers" of internationalisation: six foreign employees, four in permanent positions (a vice head of department, two associate professors and a lecturer) and two in temporary positions (a PhD student and a postdoc), and five Danish employees (all in permanent academic positions: the head of department, the deputy head of studies, an associate professor, an HR consultant and a representative for the International Staff Mobility office, a unit under the central administration). These interviews were supplied with observations of written communication (common e-mails, information sheets, news mails and department newspapers) and oral communication (the obligatory department meetings, which take place every second week). I also used my knowledge

from several years personal experiences from working at a Danish university and analyses of policy texts that in one or other way address or define internationalisation in HE (Destination, 2012; Reform of international recruitment, 2014; Regeringen, 2006; Report on Use of English, 2013; Strategy, 2016; University Act, 2015, memos on language strategies from two departments). The academic staff members who participated in my study represent the following areas of study: Chinese (1), Korean Studies (1), Arabic Studies (5), Indology (1) and Russian (1). Although they all signed the consent form allowing them to be cited in the publication, I have chosen to conceal their identities. To detect any discrepancies and/or concordances of internationalisation-related language ideologies and practices, I was guided by two research questions:

(a) Which language practices and attitudes emerged from the employees' personal encounters of everyday practices and how were these related to their standpoint in the organisation?

(b) Which ruling relations coordinated these, that is, what coordinating texts did the employees refer to?

Internationalisation at universities and the two conflicting language regimes

IE research usually begins by interviewing informants about their work experience. I decided to interview both foreign and Danish employees to avoid taking sides (McCoy, 2006, pp. 109–110). In IE the interviews are also used to map how the coordinating texts are activated through references made to them (Smith, 2005, p. 119). In some cases, however, it makes more sense to do the opposite, that is, to start from above – with an analysis of the texts. This is the case when studying how texts make actions possible in highly politicised areas, like for example climate change (Kalveland, 2015). Taking the political focus on internationalisation in HE, it needs to be clarified why it is important to look behind its promising rhetoric. In the following I will outline how Danish universities constitute sites where two contradicting language regimes of internationalisation, an agenda

set from above, and integration, a socio-political reaction to demographic changes gradually grown from below, meet. Situated in the Copenhagen area, UCPH receives a higher than average share of the incoming international students and researchers (OECD, 2009), increasing its competitiveness on the global education market. As expressed by the rector, UCPHs ambition is to become one of the top universities in the world, a new Berkeley (University Post, 4 February 2015). At the same time UCPH remains a Danish HE institution situated in the public sector where Danish labour market regulations rule.

Internationalisation agenda – set from above

Increasing the number of foreign researchers and students is not a need that has grown gradually from the inside out, but is, rather, imposed to universities from above. The increased marketisation of the field of knowledge production is caused by the fact that universities are (partly) run as corporate entities operating within the highly competitive international education market, where they compete for (international) student tuition revenue and research grants from the same international and national pools, and where they strive to maximize their ranking on the common ranking systems, such as the Times Higher Education Supplement (Kamola, 2013; Khoo, 2011; Meyer & Schofer, 2009). Besides having to respond to the pressure from the global education market (Mosneaga & Agergaard, 2012, p. 527; Marginson & Wende, 2009), Danish universities are also target of the Danish government's globalisation strategy. All of a sudden, Danish universities have to become smoothly operating businesses attracting talented foreign students, scientists and a highly qualified workforce, whose contribution can make Denmark competitive on the global HE market.

The fact that globalisation is seen as profitable for the Danish economy has been partly responsible for driving the Danish government's explicit globalisation agenda since the mid-2000s (Cirius, 2007; Regeringen, 2006), and attracting talented foreign students as a means of enhancing human capital (Robertson & Keeling, 2008) forms an important part of this (Cirius, 2007). Internationalisation in HE is, in other words, embedded in a neo-liberal

discourse of global competitiveness (Robertson & Keeling, 2008) and has been supported by the gradual shift from being government-owned to being self-owned (Mosneaga & Agergaard, 2012). In this discourse English is presented as a good for which there is a global demand and which has an instrumental value on the global education market (Phillipson, 2015). I agree with Phillipson that presenting English as a neutral or even democratic resource that makes knowledge and education freely accessible is naïve, since it favours some (English-haves or native speakers) and creates a barrier for others (English-have-nots). At the same time the mission of Nordic universities is – in contrast to many universities in the world – to ease social mobility and thus decrease rather than increase the societal inequality.

Globalisation and internationalisation studies have themselves become an academic growth industry (Rosenberg, 2000), as research funding in higher education shifted its priorities from area studies to projects with a more global and international focus (Mirsepassi, Basu, & Weaver, 2003), leading to the closure of languages and area studies, as happened at UCPH in the beginning of 2016. In sociolinguistics, a similar term, “superdiversity” (as related to mobility, complexity and superdiversity in the present-day language situation, Blommaert, 2013), is embraced by European research funding bodies, who are concerned about the new migration and the management of linguistic diversity in Europe. Superdiversity is regarded by its critics as a romantic illusion of equality and tolerance towards migrants’ languages (in e.g. European nation states), claiming that western societies are experiencing increasing diversity. In fact, western societies can rather be characterised by their quest for homogenisation and standardisation of languages (Hinrichs, 2015). The context from where the majority of non-Western migrants originate is in fact considerably more diverse linguistically than the places they migrate to and where, in contrast, they experience homogenisation (Pavlenko, 2014).

Integration – reaction on changes gradually growing from below

This homogenisation applies not only to language, but also to concepts and theories.

Kamola (2013) argues that the political economy of higher education favours knowledge produced in English by the American style research institutes that occupy the top 100 places on the THES list. But there are also differences between conceptual universes in different languages (Airey, 2011; Phillipson, 2015), which is why increasing use of English colours the knowledge about the world mediated through it, including our knowledge of what counts as global or international (Kamola, 2013, p. 48). Hultgren defines globalisation in HE in terms of the tension between the national and international needs (Hultgren, 2013, p. 15); others claim that the globalising universities are post-national – detached from the national context for bureaucratic reasons (Bull, 2004; Mortensen & Haberland, 2012). And yet, more studies are needed to know what the process is about, for whom, and in what specific historical and geographical context it takes place, to have internationalisation as the object, rather than the lens through which the current changes in HE are studied (Koenig-Archibugi, 2003).

Compared to Germany or France, Denmark has a relatively recent history of immigration and had already introduced a ban on labour market-oriented immigration from non-EU countries in 1973. However, the country has been less successful in increasing immigrant employment than has, for example, Sweden, whose immigration history is also recent (OECD, 2007). Denmark has continued to amend asylum and family reunification policies and pass other restrictions (e.g. with respect to access to social benefits), which have also resulted in a marked decline in total immigration in recent decades. This has also affected the area of HE. Although all self-financing students are welcome to Denmark, students from less developed countries have clearly more difficulties in keeping up with the Northern European educational standards or in finding jobs in Denmark that match their educational backgrounds (Valentin, 2012). In the socially, politically and discursively constructed field of the labour and education market, the empowerment of education of the non-Western students gets lost in the moment they enter the labour market, where they find themselves competing for low-skilled and low-wage jobs alongside less educated locals or foreigners (Pan,

2011). Studying internationalisation in the context of European nation states, it is important to include the tension that exists between the promising and facilitating internationalisation policies and the restrictive immigration policies that in turn influence language organisation in HE (Tange, 2012).

Given the challenges of demographic ageing and the current favourable economic situation, Denmark is trying to attract more labour immigrants. Special tax incentives have been introduced for highly qualified immigrants, and a job-card scheme was established to facilitate recruitment of people with professional qualifications that are in short supply in Denmark. In 2014, the Danish parliament agreed on a reform of international recruitment. The reform targets a particular group of international knowledge workers in the global knowledge market, namely highly trained specialists and researchers, mainly working in research institutes in industry, but this legislation also affects university staff. The reform aims to make it easier to recruit international researchers, offering favourable conditions for obtaining residence permits (faster processing of permit and waiver of cancellation of residence) and taxation (flat rate researcher tax scheme). These reforms mark a critical juncture (Sonntag & Cardinal, 2015, p. 5) in the existing immigration regime in Denmark, which has seen a tightening of immigration (reduced introductory allowance and tighter rules on family reunification). The most interesting aspect of the reform, which, incidentally, is in fact not unique to the EU context, is, however, that it underlines the importance of ensuring that international knowledge employees working in Denmark do so under Danish conditions, thus maintaining the special Danish workplace culture.

A reform of international recruitment must also ensure that the work in Denmark is carried out in accordance with the Danish agreements. Companies must comply with the rules governing the Danish labour market (...); the state will also exercise increased control over complying with this requirement (Beskæftigelsesministeriet, 2014, p. 1).

Internationalisation and universities' language policies

Universities are increasingly being made responsible for pursuing internationalisation strategies. This in turn means that they have come to act as mediators of sometimes conflicting policies that otherwise should have been dealt with at the national level. Internationalisation in Danish HE has been hit by language regimes that have been fostered by the developments in the immigration area since the 1980s (OECD, 2007). Mortensen and Haberland (2012) call the internationalising of Danish universities post-national, where English is adopted for mainly bureaucratic and instrumental reasons as a facilitator of international recruitment of students and researchers. I claim that this term blurs the understanding of language choice at universities as national knowledge institutions which have to preserve:

Core knowledge about society and as cultural institutions which have to exchange knowledge and competencies with the society around them and encourage employees to participate in the public debate. (University Act, 2015, § 2. 3.)

Implicit in this task is also an expectation that universities will develop and preserve the Danish language functionality as the language of science and HE. This idea has its roots in the Humboldtian type of university (Bull, 2004). The Humboldtian University marked a gradual transition from Latin schools to national universities. One of the central tasks of universities as national institutions was also to contribute to the strengthening of the position and corpus of national languages. Language ideological debates about the need to protect the national language began to appear in Denmark, in the wake of globalisation discourse, seemingly uncritically embracing an increased use of English (Siiner, 2010). In fact, HE is the first area ever where a need for a language policy (specifying the status of the national language) has been discussed. In the last language policy report (Sprog til tiden, 2008) the committee recommended universities to develop language policies to guarantee that the Danish language does not lose its position as a society-supporting language of science:

(-) the Committee has gone through all language policy areas and has identified only one [higher education and research] where the Committee could conclude that there is a need for language legislation. Several members of the Committee, including the chairman, have thus suggested amending the Universities Act to secure the further development of the Danish scientific language and terminology and to bring language policy in line with the government's official policy on language. (Sprog til tiden, 2008, p. 128)

This has not happened due to the lack of political will to regulate language use and status (Sprog til tiden, 2008). Instead, several universities adopted explicit language policies, and UCPH formulated theirs in 2008 as the principle of parallel language use (Harder, 2008). Parallel language use acknowledges the position of English in academia, but was also meant to secure an equal position for Danish, since it refers to a situation where two languages are used side by side, without one language being subordinate to or marginalised by the other. The parallel language strategy was a compromise that could ensure continuous attention on Danish as an equal working language of science without having to adopt a proper language policy for upholding the Danish language's status (Hultgren, 2013, p. 14), as there is a lack political will to use the resources on securing the status of Danish (Sprog til tiden, 2008, p. 129). The new Danish University Act from 2015 does not either dictate the language of instruction or explicitly state the universities' role in preserving and developing the Danish language as the language of science. The idea of not passing a language act at the state level was also intended to make language management flexible – so that problems could be solved locally, for example, on the institutional or departmental level (Siiner, 2010).

The lack of a central body for language policy and implementation also means that different agents and agendas compete in the area, as demonstrated by the two evaluation reports on the use of English (EVA, 2010) or Danish (Language Council, 2012) respectively at Danish universities which were published after 2008. The latter concluded that universities needed additional resources to ensure that teachers and students can continue to

use and develop Danish, especially in a situation where an increasing number of BA programmes are offered in English (Language Council, 2012, pp. 11–12). Furthermore, many reports warned against ad hoc solutions and recommended clear guidelines for language use (Gregersen, Hultgren, & Thøgersen, 2014; Thøgersen, 2010). The conclusions and recommendations can be divided into two camps according to the discourse used: either the internationalisation discourse or the integration/nationalisation discourse. The latest language political report, drafted at UCPH with the aim of mapping language needs and challenges, related to language use at the university, with a special focus on administrative staff (Report on use of English, 2013). The report is based on interviews with employees from different faculties and documents considerable differences between faculties' and employees' positions (administrative or academic, temporary or permanent) as regards challenges faced (Report on use of English, 2013, p. 7). Addressing these differences, the report suggests that UCPHs language policy should be targeted at purposeful parallel language use (måltrettet parallelsproglighed), where the choice of language depends on the situation.

As the focus of the report signals, many of the challenges related to a lack of central coordination in language use, which has led to a situation where administration has had to solve these problems (translating information, choice of language) without having the necessary English competences (Report on use of English, 2013, p. 14). The administration's lack of English competences is thus regarded as the most burning problem, and the report's recommendations also allocate the majority of additional resources to English courses for administrative staff and to providing assistance in translating information into English (Report on use of English, 2013, Bilag 1). In the next subchapter I will analyse my ethnographic data to see how this solution corresponds to the problems experienced on the ground.

Zooming in on the site of engagement – the department of cross-cultural and regional studies

The Department of Cross-Cultural and Regional Studies was founded in 2004 when five departments at the Faculty of Humanities were merged into one. In 2015 it offered 28 study programmes that aim to develop and maintain expertise in the culture, languages and societies of regions that lie outside Western Europe and North America (like Indology, Arabic, China Studies, Tibetology, Korean Studies, etc.). In order to maintain the necessary expertise in different regions and their languages, the department has always had to hire staff from abroad and has thus a bigger proportion of foreign staff compared to other departments in the Faculty of Humanities. In 2015, foreign staff made up about 40% of the department's approx. 200 employees. The department has in other words experienced internationalisation from below:

Excerpt 1

There have always been people employed with different backgrounds, which is understandable, because when we work with Asia and the Middle East, Eastern Europe, the Arctic etc. we need people with these different backgrounds (-). Almost every second employee has a non-Danish background (-), they're all trying to acquire Danish within two years, so much that they can use it in teaching, but where it gets difficult is in administrative tasks or participating in administrative functions, because as soon as you use legal language, things get much more complicated (-). I found out that a lot of mistakes were made because [foreign] teachers do not know the curriculum (studieordning) well enough. So now I have told the Dean that during the job interviews, we have to test their knowledge of course curricula, ask them to answer three quick questions, or otherwise take a course in understanding a curriculum (-). they should learn to understand the rules. And follow our traditions. We [Danes] have taken this knowledge for granted. And when we only had one foreigner for every 20 Danes, they did not cause much of a problem, did they? (Head of Department)

Analysing actions through standpoints

The head of department both embraces internationalisation (many foreigners present) as necessary, but also points to the main challenges – that foreigners do not know and follow the Danish rules. Although he underlines that studieordninger should be translated into English, he agrees that legal concepts and phenomena bound in the local culture need explanation and time to get used to. In fact, there are so many different rules and routines that regulate the everyday work at a Danish university that Danes themselves forget to explain why these routines are important. One example is the department's obligatory meetings, the aim of which is not only to inform everybody of what is going on in the department, but also to encourage staff to enter into dialogue, which is why they are conducted in two languages, Danish and English.

Excerpt 2

The (-) obligatory meetings that we have (-), where the administration and the study board and people are...the presentations visually are in Danish, but the language that is used throughout the meeting is English.. And it's obligatory, so everyone is there, and it's always full. I think they made it obligatory because at first when it was arranged, nobody turned up. And some of them are pretty sort of like...last week we came back and it was like "well that was a useful one hour". It's like...it's a lot of...it's interesting, but if you're from the Middle Eastern studies and you get a lot about the Polish or the Chinese or...it's interesting to know, but I don't need to know all about the administrative stuff around that (postdoc)

This forum is intended especially for foreigners as the place where they can get acquainted with the Danish way of doing things. My observations and interviews revealed that foreign employees were not aware of this invitation to dialogue and perceived the meeting rather as one-way communication and usually found it irrelevant for them, often also because the administrative topics remained vague for them in both Danish and English. They seldom asked questions if things remained unclear. Danes on the other

hand interpreted their silence as a sign of comprehension. Difficulties in understanding the Danish workplace culture, even if it's in English, could also be observed in the case of the annual performance and development review meetings between the manager and the employee. Danes perceive these as a place where one can discuss one's work and the workplace situation; however, it is not perceived as such by the employees:

Excerpt 3

We will have to have a language we can communicate in [at performance and development reviews], right? (-) we only run these in English if it is a foreigner. We rarely speak Danish [with them at performance and development reviews], so...(-) this is mainly about... you can see it on their faces when they come in that they have been doing a lot of thinking "what is this about?" so I use a large part of it to defuse the concerns, since the aim of it is to see whether you are in balance and feel that you can manage your work and are ok, and get done the things you should, right? (-) It's more about trust, not so much about English or Danish. But it is a matter of confidence to one's boss. So that you dare to speak up if you have a problem and trust that this will not be used against you. (Head of department)

As is specified in the latest UCPH language report (Report on the use of English, 2013), performance and development reviews are also the forum where the manager can evaluate whether the employee's language competences are sufficient for their work and where the employee can negotiate to get a language course. But as Excerpt 3 shows, the issue of language competence is sacrificed in favour of the content. Although the head of department mentions in Excerpt 1 that Danish is the main key to inclusion in the workplace, this is far from straightforward.

Excerpt 4

We have two cultures. We have the Danish structure that prevails at the university and that determines everything. And the conversations outside the classroom are in Danish, excluding foreigners who do not know how the system works, so other people decide over them. And as a

foreigner you are not in a position where you can influence things. (-) This is where we find the friction (-) we are several foreigners here who come from different systems, and when we point at things and say: Why is it so? Can this be done differently? It is impossible because: we do it this way and it's the Danish way of doing it. Then I think you should stay in Denmark and not try to internationalize. I think there is a paradox in that we have to internationalize, but people do not bother to change, and you cannot just ask people to do it because they say "no, I will not," Even as the deputy head I cannot say to people "Yes, you have to." (-) So you have this horizontal hierarchy. (Deputy head of department)

Even within the space of the Danish language there are discourses that construct "who can say what about what", also influencing a foreigner's possibilities to change the structure from within. Although an increasing number of foreigners constitutes an institutional challenge, there is a core structure that the university management culture and workplace culture are a part of which is not meant to be changed. The presence of foreigners who question these rules also increases the Danes' awareness of these rules that have previously been implicit for them. Particular historical settings foster an epistemic structure or culture that creates the conditions to make certain thoughts or truths possible. Foucault (1977) outlined how disciplinary power affecting cultural practice is implicit in authoritative knowledge claims, often presented as common sense: "This is the only way to do it because we have always done it like this." For Foucault, powerful social forces aligned to particular knowledge claims ultimately shape thought and control behavioural outcomes.

Parallel language use strategy – a story of a text that got lost

There are many studies in language policy on why language regulations do not work (i.e. do not change language behaviour in a desired direction). Critics have pointed to the problem that language regulators are not aware of what the real problems and challenges of language users are and thus do not target these challenges in their policies (Hornberger & Johnson, 2011). IE makes it possible to analyse whether or how policy texts are incorporated into people's actions or how they affect the coordination of people's work (Smith, 2006). A

text becomes relevant to IE when it is referred to and studied through how the interviewee “reads” or relates him or herself to the text – this becomes the act of reading (or more correctly interpreting). As the Head of Department mentioned (Excerpt 1), non-Danish-speaking appointees to permanent positions with teaching obligations are expected to conduct teaching in both Danish and English or to acquire proficiency in Danish sufficient to teach and to interact with colleagues and students within a reasonable period of time (max. 2 years). This advocates parallel language use with the focus on Danish as the means of getting into the structure and was explicitly stated in the advertisements for the job positions (Associate Professor) that the two foreign interviewees in this study had applied for.

Excerpt 5

It was written in the ad, in the advertisement, that the selected person should have had to learn Danish within two years. (-) so I noticed that and told them “Ok, I’m ready to come, I would love to come, I’m ready to learn the language no problem, it’s something that I would love to do, but if for any reason I would not be able to for example to teach in Danish within two years, then what happens?” And I was told that that would not be a big issue. (Associate professor 1)

In other words, the associate professor makes a reference to the requirement in the job ad as a text he has perceived as a ruling for his language behaviour – he is ready to learn Danish. During the interview, however, he finds out that this requirement is not decisive for the job, and this is supported by the infrastructure. He later realised that the Department rather values his qualifications as an internationally successful researcher and that it is not the Danish that will make him successful in his job:

Excerpt 6

I don’t think that [learning Danish within two years] is gonna happen. I mean my aim at the moment is...well firstly, the contract says a lot of things and one of the things that they stressed to me when I arrived: “Look, do a good job teaching, number one, and number two: do research. Produce some publications. Your book. Your articles. You know how valuable

they are? One point or two points on our scale.” So, when I arrived here I was very worried about, you know, are they gonna keep me in my job, so I started a lot of projects, and as you know, when you start a lot of projects it takes time to finish them, so at the moment I’m writing two books, I published a number of articles last year and I’ve got things to write coming up. So I got a lot of things plus I’m organizing a conference for May, and I got various other activities, so at the moment I’m trying to finish off these research projects and give myself more time so I can study more Danish. (Associate professor 1)

All foreigners interviewed were positive about learning Danish, partly due to their research fields being related to language and culture, but also because they wanted to be included and socialised in the Danish culture. Many experienced, however, different infrastructural constraints that hindered learning Danish. One clear difference was one’s position either as a temporary or a permanent staff member. The university does not expect foreign researchers in temporary positions (like PhDs and postdocs) to learn Danish. On the other hand, all municipalities offer Danish language courses for free to all foreigners who settle in the municipality. This may be a problem if one lives in Sweden – one postdoc had settled in Southern Sweden, only an hour’s train trip away, as she could not afford to live in Copenhagen and because her husband got a job in Malmö on the Swedish side of the Øresund. She thus never received any information about Danish courses. Danish courses organised in municipalities are furthermore an option for citizens from the EU (which they have to use within 3 years), rather than an obligation (contrary to the text in job advertisements, which state it as a must). The PhD who had first heard about the option from her municipality interpreted the absence of information about Danish courses as a lack of interest on the university’s part for her to learn Danish AND as a lack of interest in her (or at least that the university did not really expect her to want to get involved in her workplace).

Excerpt 7

[Whether] they expect me to learn Danish? No. But they have offered these courses for free.

Q: Here, at the university?

A: No. They have offered them to me in 'Allerød Kommune', which is the place where I'm living (-) so maybe they [the university] have forgotten that I am here.

Q: Why do you think so?

A: No because of these things, I don't know if I am supposed to learn Danish or if they... haven't realized that I am here and have to learn Danish, I don't know... (PhD)

Since there is no central body at the university that coordinates Danish instruction or informs new employees about different options, it is coincidental which courses the foreigners hear about. Sometimes these courses take place at an inconvenient time or in a place far away.

Excerpt 8

I decided...I wanted to learn it [Danish] immediately when I came, which was one of the first things that I felt, but...so I registered immediately for the course, but the first course that I was offered was not here, but at the Panum Institute, so it was not that convenient for me time-wise, so I didn't have the time to go. (-) It was in the afternoon, but still I would have had to leave here quite early according to my time schedule, and it's still half an hour by metro and then walking or by bus, so it wasn't that convenient so I couldn't attend. And I was asked why I didn't show up, so I told the truth, I mean, I would love to do that, but I cannot. (Associate professor 2)

Later on this associate professor learned from a colleague about a course in the next building to where he works and where he could easier participate in the course there.

What sort of courses you are offered and whether they are offered as an obligation or an option therefore depends on your position as a temporary or permanent employee. The infrastructural constraints and "relaxed" attitudes furthermore devalue the text/obligation to learn Danish (e.g. of the job advertisement). Those who do learn it feel they need to be appreciated for doing so:

Excerpt 9

I have of course tried [to start speaking in Danish to my students] and (-) well normally I have to

repeat a couple of times (-). They don't expect me to say anything in Danish, so I think if you are not expecting to be talked to in your language, you do not grasp it. So this is one thing, the other is my bad pronunciation. (-) There are only a few people in administration I've tried several times to speak Danish to, so they wait for me and expect me to address them in Danish and I have noticed that they understand me better because they pay attention to what I say. So this is very much rewarding. (Associate Professor 1)

What came out of several interviews was that the office personnel often are the ones who have to solve language-related problems – by helping foreigners with administrative tasks they are incapable of sorting out, speaking Danish to them or translating, if necessary. These tasks that are not part of their job description, but they do them anyway because nobody else does (or has the time) or because they are the ones in most regular contact with the foreign employees. Such decentralisation in language management issues may make language management more flexible, since small problems can be solved locally (Siiner, 2012), but if these tasks are too complicated or time-consuming for the administrative staff and are not completed, this indicates an infrastructural deficiency in language management, where the “front line workers” have to solve the problems nobody else wants because they cannot delegate it further (Siiner, 2012).

Excerpt 10

We have this parallel language use policy, but in reality it is not parallel at all, causing an extra working load for Danish employees who have to do the administrative work for their foreign colleagues. This could be a good reason for Danes to support their foreign colleagues in learning Danish...and the reason that should make foreigners learn Danish, so their Danish colleagues can be free of this burden. (Head of studies)

In including textual references into an analysis of actions, IE operates with an intertextual hierarchy – that is, how texts coordinate texts (Smith, 2006, p. 79). But the intertextual hierarchy might not be the same for everyone and depends on a person's position in the organisation. Furthermore, working in a national university, where work is regulated in

other institutions in the Danish public sector, foreign researchers are caught between the two discourses of internationalisation (publish in English, use of English is facilitated) and integration (learn Danish). As long as their value is based on their academic production, fluent academic English remains their primary concern. As discussed above, one's position in the organisation, in terms of rank as well as in terms of being a permanent or a temporary employee, influences one's access to necessary (language) resources and knowledge (about for example workplace culture or administrative tasks). Although facilitation of English has become the ruling relations in language behaviour, English is not enough to fulfil all one's tasks at the university.

Excerpt 11

S: Yeah [the course should] officially be in Danish. The syllabus that I've made is in English though. But the studieordning [curriculum] is of course in Danish. (-) The only issue is about the grading of the papers, because they are allowed to write it in Danish. (-) I actually still don't know how to grade, so I need to have, before the end of the course, I need to have some instruction in that. I know it's a twelve point system or something like that...but I need to have more instruction. But you need to be...Nobody comes to you and explains it to you; you really have to ask...(Postdoc)

By far the biggest concern is that foreign staff lacks access to the central texts that coordinate the administrative aspects of teaching and academic work (and which are in Danish), but which they nevertheless have to follow. This also constitutes a significant cost for the administrative staff, who have to translate texts for the foreign staff or help them.

Discussion

The present article offered an ethnographic and bottom-up view on the parallel language strategy as lived and experienced by the "practitioners" or "knowers" of the internationalisation process that the strategy addresses. The different employees' actions depended first of all on their standpoint in the organisation, either as a foreigner or a Dane, in a permanent or temporary

position. The latter parameter determined employees' access to Danish courses, opportunities for socialisation and thus also access to the coordinating texts. The analysis of ruling relations and coordinating texts revealed that within one language organisation, a Danish national HE institution, different ways of organising language use took place. UCPH attempt for status planning, the official parallel language use policy, became, without any language managers (clearly defined agents responsible for implementation of this policy), the text that got lost in infrastructural constraints and attitudes facilitating the increased use of English. Could using English be a solution? In a nation state like Denmark, the state regime that has influenced the development of national institutions is based on the immigration language regime of adoption or assimilation (Sonntag & Cardinal, 2015). Foreign employees have to adapt to the Danish workplace culture and rules, while internationalisation, facilitating the use of English, disconnects and estranges from the Danish system. This discrepancy or infrastructural deficiency (Siiner, 2012), has led to a situation where those with least authority and access to necessary training or resources, the Danish administrative personnel, are left with the task of solving the language-related problems.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Professor Anne Holmen and Associate Professor Tine Roesen for their comments on the earlier versions of the article and Student Assistant Feline Busborg Jensen for her assistance with transcribing the interviews and Pete Westbrook for his comments. The research was, from planning to data storage, conducted according to the Danish Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (Ministry of Higher Education and Research, 2014). All participants signed an informed consent form prior to them being interviewed.

References

- Airey, J. (2011). The relationship between teaching language and student learning in Swedish university physics. In B. Preisler, I. Klitgård, & A. Fabricius (Eds.), *Language and learning in the international university* (pp. 3–18). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Beskæftigelsesministeriet. (2014). The reform of international recruitment. Retrieved from <http://bm.dk/da/Beskaeftigelsesomraadet/Flere%20i%20arbejde/Udlaendinges%20arbejde%20i%20Danmark/Reform-af-international-rekruttering.aspx>
- Blommaert, J. (2013). *Ethnography, superdiversity, and linguistic landscapes: Chronicles of complexity*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bull, T. (2004). Dagens og gårdagens akademiske lingua franca. Eit historisk tilbakeblikk og eit globalt utsyn [The academic lingua franca of today and yesterday. A historical retrospect and a global perspective]. In A. Simonsen (Ed.), *Språk i kunnskapssamfunnet. Engelsk — elitenes nye latin?* [Language in the knowledge society. English — the new Latin of the elites?] (pp. 35–45). Oslo: Gyldendal Akademisk.
- Cardinal, L., & Sonntag, S. (2015). State traditions and language regimes: Conceptualizing language policy choices. In L. Cardinal & S. Sonntag (Eds.), *State traditions and language regimes* (pp. 3–28). Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Cirius. (2007). *National strategi for markedsføring af Danmark som uddannelsesland*. Copenhagen: Cirius.
- Danish Language Council. (2012). *Dansk sprogs status* [The status of the Danish language]. Retrieved from <http://www.dsn.dk>
- Danmarks Evalueringsinstitut. (2010). *Engelsksproget undervisning på danske kandidatuddannelser* [English as medium of instruction in Danish MA studies]. Retrieved from <http://www.eva.dk>
- Destination. (2012). *Strategy for the University of Copenhagen*. Retrieved from <http://www.e-pages.dk/ku/236/fullpdf/full4c864d1d9db9e.pdf>
- DeVault, M. L., & McCoy, L. (2006). Institutional ethnography: Using interviews to investigate ruling relations. In D. Smith (Ed.), *Institutional ethnography as practice*. Lanham, MD: Altamira Press.
- Dimova, S., Hultgren, A. K., & Jensen, C. (Eds.). (2015). *English-medium instruction in European higher education: English in Europe, Volym 3 Volym 4 av Language and Social Life*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Abnormal: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1974–1975*. New York: Picador.
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gregersen, F., Hultgren, A. K., & Thøgersen, J. (Eds.). (2014). *English in Nordic universities: Ideologies and practices*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Harder, P. (2008). Hvad er parallelsproglighed? ['What is parallel language use?']. Retrieved from http://cip.ku.dk/om_parallelsproglighed/oversigtsartikler_om_parallelsproglighed/hvad_er_parallelsproglighed/

Hinrichs, L. (2015). Review of Jan Blommaert ethnography, superdiversity and linguistic landscapes: Chronicles of complexity. *Multilingual matters. Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 19(2), 260–265.

Holmen, A. (2012). Efterord. Parallelsproglighed og flersprogethed på nordiske universiteter. *Nordand*, 2, 161–169.

Holmen, A. (in press). Transforming a university language policy from within: The interplay between institutional, local and individual drivers of change. In M. Siiner, F. Hult, & T. Kupisch (Eds.), *Bridging language acquisition and language policy*. Springer Language Policy Book Series.

Hornberger, N., & Johnson, D. C. (2011). The Ethnography of language policy. In T. Mccarty (Ed.), *Ethnography and language policy* (pp. 273–289). New York: Routledge.

Hultgren, A. K. (2013). *Parallelsproglighed på danske universiteter: en statusrapport 2013* ['Parallellingualism at Danish universities: A status report 2013']. Copenhagen: Centre for Internationalisation and Parallel Language Use.

Kalveland, J. (2015). Wrong remedy for change. An institutional ethnography of Nicaraguan civil society workers' perceptions of REDD+ (MA thesis). Department of Sociology and Human Geography, University of Oslo.

Kamola, I. (2013). Why global? Diagnosing the globalization literature within the political economy of higher education. *International Political Sociology*, 7, 41–58.

Khoo, S.-M. (2011). Ethical globalisation or privileged internationalisation? *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 9(3–4), 337–53.

Kling, J. (2015). You try with a little humor and just get on with it. In S. Dimova, K. Hultgren, & C.

Jensen (Eds.), *English medium instruction in European higher education* (pp. 201–211). Boston: De Gruyter.

Koenig-Archibugi, M. (2003). Introduction: Globalization and the challenge to governance. In D. Held & M. Koenig-Archibugi (Eds.), *Taming globalization: Frontiers of governance* (pp. 1–17). Cambridge: Blackwell.

Liddicoat, A. J. (2013). *Language-in-education policies. The discursive construction of intercultural relations*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Marginson, S., & Wende, M. (2009). The new global landscape of nations and institutions. In *Higher education to 2030 Volume 2: Globalisation*, ed. Centre for educational research and innovation, OECD, 17/62 (pp. 17–62). Paris: OECD.

McCoy, L. (2006). Keeping the institution in view. In D. Smith (Ed.), *Institutional ethnography as practice* (pp. 109–126). Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.

Meyer, J.W., & Schofer, E. (2009). The university in Europe and the world: Twentieth century expansion. In G. Kræmmer & G. S. Drori (Eds.), *World society: The writing of John W. Meyer* (pp. 355–372). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mirsepasi, A., Basu, A., & Weaver, F. (2003). Introduction: Knowledge, power, culture. In A. Mirsepasi, A. Basu & Frederick Weaver (Eds.), *Localizing knowledge in a globalizing world* (pp. 1–22). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Mortensen, J., & Haberland, H. (2012). English: The new Latin of academia? Danish universities as a case. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 216, 175–197.

Mosneaga, A., & Agergaard, J. (2012). Agents of internationalisation? Danish universities' practices for attracting international students. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 10(4), 519–538.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2007). *Jobs for immigrants. Labour market integration in Australia, Denmark, Germany and Sweden*. Paris: Author.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2009). *OECD territorial reviews: Copenhagen, Denmark*. Paris: Author.

Pan, D. (2011). Student visas, undocumented labour, and the boundaries of legality: Chinese migration and English as a foreign language education in the republic of Ireland. *Social Anthropology*, 19(3), 268–287.

Pavlenko, A. (2014). Superdiversity and why it isn't. Presentation held at the conference: *Slogonizations in Language Education Discourse*, Humboldt Universität zu Berlin, Germany, May 8–10, 2014.

Phillipson, R. (2015). English as threat or opportunity in European higher education. In S. Dimova, K. Hultgren, & C. Jensen (Eds.), *English medium instruction in European higher education* (pp. 19–42). Boston, Berlin: De Gruyter.

Preisler, B. (2009). Complementary languages. The national language and English as working languages in European universities. In P. Harder (Ed.), *English in Denmark. Language policy, internationalisation and university teaching. Angles on the English-speaking world* (pp. 10–28). Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press.

Rankin, J. M. (2015). The rhetoric of patient and family centered care: An institutional ethnography into what actually happens. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 71(3), 526–534.

Regeringen. (2006). *Fremgang, fornyelse og tryghed: Strategi for Danmark i den globale økonomi [Progress, innovation and security. A strategy for Denmark in the new economy]*. Denmark: Danish Government.

Report on the use of English in administration. (2013). To the management and dean. University of Copenhagen. Retrieved from <http://www.ku.dk>

Robertson, S., & Keeling, R. (2008). Stirring the lions: Strategy and tactics in global higher education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 6(3), 221–240. doi:10.1080/14767720802343316

Rosenberg, J. (2000). *The follies of globalization theory*. London: Verso.

Siiner, M. (2010). Hangovers of globalization: A case study of laissez-faire language policy in Denmark. *Language Problems & Language Planning*, 34(1), 43–62.

Siiner, M. (2012). *Towards a more flexible language policy: An analysis of language policy design in Denmark and Estonia (PhD Thesis)*. Tartu University Press.

Smith, D. (1974). Women's perspective as a radical critique of sociology. *Sociological Inquiry*, 44, 7–13.

Smith, D. (1990). *The conceptual practices of power: A feminist sociology of knowledge*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Smith, D. (2005). *Institutional ethnography. A sociology for people*. Lanham: AltaMira Press.

Smith, D. (2006). Introduction. In D. Smith (Ed.), *Institutional ethnography as practice* (pp. 1–11). Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.

Smith, D. E. (1987). *The everyday world as problematic: A feminist sociology*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Sonntag, S., & Cardinal, L. (2015). Introduction: State traditions and language regimes:

Conceptualizing language policy choices. In L. Cardinal & S. Sonntag (Eds.), *State traditions and language regimes* (pp. 3–28). Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.

Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sprog til tiden. (2008). *Language report*. Copenhagen: Ministry of Culture.

Strategy. (2016). University of Copenhagen. Retrieved from <http://research.ku.dk/strategy/>

Tange, H. (2012). Organising language at the international university: Three principles of linguistic organization. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 33(3), 287–300.

Thogersen, J. (2010). 'Parallelsproglighed' i teori og praksis ['Parallellingualism in theory and practice'].

Nyt fra Sprognævnet ['News from the Language Council'], 4, 1–5.

University Act. (2015). Ministry of education and research, LBK nr 261 as of 18/03/2015. Retrieved from <https://www.retsinformation.dk/forms/r0710.aspx?id=168797>

Valentin, K. (2012). Caught between internationalization and immigration. *Learning and Teaching*, 5 (3), 56–74.

Widerberg, K. (2004). Institutional ethnography – towards a productive sociology; an interview with Dorothy E. Smith. *Sociologisk tidsskrift*, 12(2), 179–184.

Widerberg, K. (2008). Dorothy E. Smith. In R. Stones (Ed.), *Key sociological thinkers* (pp. 311–323). London: Palgrave Macmillan.