Kristin Rygg* and Stine Hulleberg Johansen

When the Norwegian 'politeness marker' *vennligst* becomes impolite

Abstract: This corpus-based study contributes to the ongoing discussion on conventional politeness markers, such as *please*, by being the first to examine how the corresponding Norwegian lexical item *vennligst* 'please' is used. The study investigates the use of *vennligst* in data from two Norwegian corpora in standard situations, where the relationship between the interlocutors is clear, and non-standard situations, where the relationship between the interlocutors is less clear. The results show that although Norwegian dictionaries describe the pragmatic function of *vennligst* as being that of a polite request, most instances were found in standard situations where *vennligst* indicates a ritual frame that goes unmarked. The results also show that in non-standard situations, *vennligst* is not only used as a politeness device but more often strengthens the requestive force into a command. Therefore, we caution against using *vennligst* in non-standard situations due to the likelihood of being interpreted as impolite. Depending on the situation type, the various interpretations may explain why some Norwegians interpret *vennligst* as polite, whereas others deem it impolite. By illustrating how *vennligst* may be interpreted differently, we hope to draw attention to the situational influences on such markers and the dangers of relying on their conventional meanings.

Keywords: corpus-based; Norwegian; politeness marker; request marker; RFIE

1 Introduction

Norwegian–English dictionaries translate the Norwegian lexeme *vennligst* into the English lexeme 'please' (ordnett.no). *Vennligst* is the superlative form of the adjective *vennlig* 'friendly' related to the noun *venn* 'friend'. According to the same dictionaries, the pragmatic function of *vennligst* is that of a polite request. Our interest in the term started with a text message from a journalist at a local radio

---
*Corresponding author: Kristin Rygg, Dept of Intercultural and Professional Communication, Norwegian School of Economics, Bergen, Norway, E-mail: kristin.rygg@nhh.no
Stine Hulleberg Johansen, Department of Literature, Area Studies and European Languages, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway, E-mail: s.h.johansen@ilos.uio.no

station to one of the authors. The journalist was not familiar to the recipient. It read as follows (the names and numbers are fictional):

Example (1) *Hei Kari. Vennligst ring meg på 01234567. Hilsen Per Ruud i* Radio N
             'Hi Kari (first name). Please call me on 01234567. Regards, [greetings] Per
             Ruud (full name) in Radio N'

In the English translation, this may look like a perfectly polite request, especially if we consider that in Norwegian, the use of 'hi' with the first name (Rygg 2017, 2021) coupled with downtoning hedges (Johansen 2020) is acceptable in requests to strangers. The recipient of the SMS, however, interpreted *vennligst* as a supercilious command; 'be so kind (as to call me)'. To get an idea about whether this was only this author's subjective interpretation or if other Norwegians would do the same, we posted example (1) in a discussion forum on Facebook[1] for people with a particular interest in Norwegian language use. This time the SMS had the additional question: "How do you perceive the word *vennligst*? Polite or impolite? Friendly or unfriendly?". Among the 126 respondents (which is quite a high response rate in 24 h for this forum), 30 % saw *vennligst* as a "standard, formal, correct, matter-of-factly, sober, friendly, polite" request. However, nearly double (56 %) interpreted it as a "dominating, rude, unfriendly, demanding, cold, blunt, strict, arrogant" command with comments such as: "I perceive the expression as arrogant, impolite, and absolutely intolerable". Their aggressive tone bewildered those who had never thought of it as anything other than a politeness formula. One of them wrote: "To me, it is only a polite request. How can I communicate if it is perceived as unfriendly and impolite? I am genuinely shocked". This illustrates that even among fellow Norwegians, the use of this 'politeness marker' is not straightforward and, thus, in need of research.

Whereas the corresponding English term *please* has been thoroughly studied from the perspectives of its social and linguistic context (House 1989; Kádár and House 2020; Murphy and De Felice 2019; Sato 2008; Wichmann 2004), this study is the first to investigate *vennligst*. The study aims to understand how *vennligst* in example (1) may be perceived so differently. To address this aim, the study investigates the use of *vennligst* in standard and non-standard situations in data from two Norwegian corpora of written text. In standard situations, the roles and relationships between the interlocutors are clear, whereas in non-standard situations, the roles and relationships are less clear. The sample of data from the two corpora includes traditional edited written data in the form of book extracts (both translated into

---

[1] The Facebook group Språkspalta has 43,800 members. In the course of one month, there are about 120 posts with an average of 40 comments on each post (based on the number of posts and comments in September 2022).

Norwegian and Norwegian originals) and newspaper articles, as well as less edited data in the form of posts on online forums and text on homepages. In the absence of a comprehensive framework for analysing markers in both standard and non-standard situations, the study draws on the recently proposed ritual frame analysis model (Kádár and House 2019, 2020) for the analysis of *vennligst* in standard situations. To account for the uses of *vennligst* in non-standard situations, an inductive process led to the application of the term "politeness marker" in cases where *vennligst* seems to signal deference or a bid for cooperative behaviour and the term "request marker" when *vennligst* appears to strengthen the requestive force. By investigating *vennligst* across situations in corpus data, we aim to understand whether its use is governed by obligations in a ritualistic situation, a wish to strengthen the requestive force, or a need for politeness.

2 Theory

Conventional lexical forms of politeness, such as *please* have received much attention in linguistic politeness research. Watts (2003: 183) calls *please* "[t]he most obvious example of a politeness marker in English", where politeness markers may be defined as expressions that "show deference to the addressee and bid for cooperative behaviour" (House and Kasper 1981: 166). Later research has found that no linguistic expressions are inherently polite (Culpeper 2011; Eelen 2001; Mills 2009; Watts 2003). In fact, House (1989) was one of the first to question the term "politeness marker" because typical ones such as *please* are often used where there is minimal need for politeness. The situations she refers to are further detailed below.

Whereas politeness attends to the hearer's face wants, the speech act request (Searle 1969) is, by definition, a face-threatening act as it attends to the speaker's needs and impinges on the hearer's freedom (Brown and Levinson 1987). In reality, the level of imposition varies a great deal depending on interpersonal and situational variables. House (1989) claims that in "standard situations" where the speaker has a social right to utter the request, the hearer is perceived as having a social obligation to comply with it, and the posing of the request is not associated with social or communicative difficulty, the imposition is weak and, consequently, politeness less of an issue. These claims have later been confirmed by studies based on conversation analytic approaches (Heinemann 2006; Lindström 2005; Taleghani-Nikazm 2006, 2011). In "non-standard situations" where rights and obligations are less clear, on the other hand, there is more need to decrease the illocutionary (directive) force of the request by various linguistic means associated with politeness.

The adverb *please* frequently accompanies requests. In fact, according to Fraser (1996: 174), when *please* occurs before an imperative structure (e.g., *please wait*), "it signals that the speaker intends the utterance to be taken as a request, and only a request", making *please* a request marker that carries the illocutionary force of a request alone. Watts (2003: 183) calls *please* the most obvious example of a politeness marker in English. In line with this, Wichmann (2004: 1521) finds that the omission of *please* in some contexts "makes a request less courteous rather than less like a request, so its function must be, at least to some extent, to convey interpersonal, 'attitudinal' meaning". However, Sato (2008: 1250) argues that *please* comes "with a varying degree of politeness and directive force". By comparing American and New Zealand English texts, she finds that when *please* appears in a sentence initial position (e.g., *please wait a moment*), the speaker strongly asserts compliance, resulting in the directive acts of either a demand or a plea. In a sentence final position (e.g., *wait a moment, please*), however, when the request is transactional or formulaic, and the recipient is subject to comply, *please* carries limited politeness effect. This formulaic quality of *please* is what Watts (2003: 20) terms "politic", i.e., behaviour "which the participants construct as being appropriate to the ongoing social interaction" and therefore goes unmarked. Contrary to what one might expect, House (1989) finds that the lexeme *please* seldom accompanies non-standard situations because of the requestive force carried by the word itself, making the request explicit. Instead, in non-standard situations where the right to utter a request is unclear, House finds it much more common to use other linguistic means to mitigate the face threat, such as hedges and supportive moves. On the other hand, *please* occurs almost normatively in standard situations, something that Kádár and House (2019, 2020, 2021) relate to ritual behaviour. When *qing* in Chinese, or *please* in English appear in standard situations, it is interpreted as an RFIE (ritual frame indicating expression) (Kádár and House 2020) or a marker of a standard situation (Kádár and House 2021). "Ritual frame" is understood as the participants' awareness of the rights and obligations that a particular standard situation holds. When for instance, *please* is used by a judge in a courtroom, it is not necessarily used to intensify or mitigate the request but rather to remind the audience about the ritual frame associated with the institution (Kádár and House 2020). The more conventional the meaning of a particular RFIE becomes, the less directly related to individualistic politeness (Kádár and House 2021). This idea that *please*, especially in British English, is often primarily part of a conventional requesting routine rather than a mitigator of a face threat has also been advocated by others (Murphy and De Felice. 2019; Terkourafi 2015; Wichmann 2004). For instance, Wichmann (2004: 1532) states that: "The indirect *please*-requests tend to be towards the more transparent and conventionalised end of the scale, where the imposition is socially licensed (such as a court hearing) or where the imposition is

low (such as passing the salt), or where it is of benefit to the hearer". From an American-English perspective, however, Murphy and De Felice (2019) argue that *please* is interpreted less as a routine and more as a marker of upward (an order) or downward (a plea) relational power differences.

In Norwegian, according to Fretheim (2005: 158), "conventionalised indirectness in the performance of requests exists, but too much linguistic embroidery for the sake of mitigating requests is normally counter-productive". No Norwegian word or phrase can be said to correspond directly to the English term *please* (Johansson 2007). Fretheim (2005) mentions the verb *vær* (imperative form of 'to be') combined with the adjectives *snill* 'kind' and *vennlig* 'friendly' as expressions that come closest in corresponding to *please*: ***Vær så snill** å ikke døm Oliver så hardt* 'be so nice as to not judge Oliver so severely', or ***Vær vennlig** å ikke bruke den slags språk her* 'be kind as to not use that sort of language here'. A search for *please* in the English Norwegian Parallel Corpus (Johansen and Rygg forthcoming) gave 92 instances, of which four were translated into *vennligst*, and most of the remaining instances were translated into *vær så snill* or 'Ø' (no marker). This coincides with Andersen (2022), who uses four spoken corpora to examine Norwegian correspondences of *please* and finds that *vennligst* is rare compared to *vær så snill*. However, more often, a word corresponding to *please* is not required in Norwegian. Thus, a typical construction when asking for permission is an interrogative containing the auxiliary verb *kan/kunne* 'can/could' + infinite/past particle (*Kan/Kunne jeg få en kaffi takk*? 'can/could I get a coffee, thank you?') (Fretheim 2005), often with a negation (*kan ikke jeg få en kaffi?* 'can't I get a coffee?') (Urbanik and Svennevig 2019). Not having a routinised politeness marker corresponding to *please* can have various effects on translations into English. Johansson (2007: 32) finds that *please* is underused in translations from Norwegian to English. From a similar Swedish context, Aijmer (2009) uncovers that *please* is frequently added to English translations where the source text had no such marker.

To the best of our knowledge, no prior Norwegian studies focus on the lexeme *vennligst*. In form, it may be the one that most resembles *please* as it is a sentence-adverbial consisting of one lexeme followed by an imperative verb. Initially, we hypothesised that the researchers' lack of interest might be because it is less common than the expressions mentioned by Fretheim (2005) above. However, if we compare occurrences in the two corpora used in our study (The Corpus for Bokmål Lexicography [LBK]) (Fjeld et al. 2020) and the Norwegian Web Corpus (HaBiT) (HaBiT 2015), we see that overall, *vennligst* is more frequent than *vær vennlig* and approximately as frequent as *vær så snill*, but used extensively more in one corpus than in the other (Table 1).

The corpora, presented in more detail in Section 5, are not primarily chosen to be compared with each other but collectively provide us with a rich source of data to examine the use of *vennligst* across the broadest possible range of texts.

Table 1: The occurrence of three Norwegian phrases corresponding to 'please' in LBK and HaBiT.

	Vær så snill ['be so nice'] 'please' per million words	*Vær vennlig* ['be kind'] 'please' per million words	*Vennligst* ['kindest'] 'please' per million words
LBK corpus	15.59	0.32	3.46
HaBiT corpus	4.42	0.47	10.55

Methodologically, we investigate *vennligst* in standard and non-standard situations to find which factors inform its interpretation as a request maker, a politeness marker, or a ritual frame indicating expression (RFIE), which again may provide answers to why some Norwegians interpreted example (1) in the introduction as polite whereas others did not.

3 Analytical framework

To analyse the use of *vennligst* in standard situations, elements from the ritual frame analysis model (Kádár and House 2019, 2020) were applied to corpus data. The model enables the comparison of standard situations in which a particular RFIE is deployed. The concept of *ritual* frame may be understood as a set of standard situations, i.e., situations where the speaker has the social right to utter a request, and the hearer has an obligation to comply, and where expectations and perceptions of social roles are more or less taken for granted (Kádár and House 2021). Central to the model is the concept of ritual frame indicating expressions (RFIEs). These expressions make the interactants aware of a certain type of standard situation or a broader ritual frame.

The model involves a two-level procedure: the first level is to identify one or more RFIEs, collect examples in corpora and identify categories or types of standard situations in which these RFIEs are used. The second level involves explaining which factors condition the convention or ritual. This procedure is referred to as *bottom-up* in the sense that the starting point is not a particular type of ritual, which pre-determines the pragmatic context, but rather an RFIE, which makes it possible to start from the level of the expression and move upwards towards the situation (Kádár and House 2019: 4). This view of bottom-up stands in contrast to the general corpus-pragmatic view on bottom-up studies, where the term is typically reserved for studies in which a pragmatic function is the starting point, and forms realising this function are retrieved from a corpus (O'Keeffe 2018), thus the other way around.

Because of their focus on RFIEs, Kádár and House (2019) limit their search to standard situations. In the present study, we also look at non-standard situations. Thus, our study, in many ways, resembles more traditional corpus-based form-to-

function studies, where a form is the starting point, and its pragmatic functions are investigated in the corpus (Aijmer 2018). Non-standard situations may be understood as situations where social roles are unclear to the participants. The degree of imposition of the request may be perceived as high, as is the perceived degree of difficulty in realising it. Non-standard situations are not restricted to informal situations where participants are of equal social status. Such situations may be classified as standard if the rights and obligations of the participants or the particular context are clear to the interlocutors. Non-standard situations, on the other hand, involve a lack of clarity of social roles and unclear expectations. In such situations, a marker may express varying degrees of politeness or directive force (Sato 2008). Without an established analytical framework for non-standard situations, our categories were not predetermined but arrived at inductively through the analysis. We first used the categories "command" when the requester seemed to expect compliance and "plea" when he did not. However, a plea is usually associated with a strong requestive force, and not all the tokens we had labelled a plea had such force. Thus, finally, we decided on the terms "request marker" when the requester seems to expect compliance and "politeness marker" when he does not but instead shows deference or asks for cooperation in line with House and Kasper's (1981) definition of politeness markers. However, using these labels is not without difficulties, something we address further in Section 7.

4 Methodological approach

A random sample of 500 instances of *vennligst* was extracted from two corpora of written Bokmål Norwegian.[2] 250 random instances were collected from each corpus using the "show in random order" function in the search interfaces. Following the procedure of Kádár and House (2019), invalid instances, e.g., *vennligst* used an adverb as illustrated in example 2, were replaced by valid examples to create a sample universe with an equal number of instances from both corpora.

Example (2)

I stedet dytter han barnet	***vennligst***	*mulig ned på benken ved siden av mannen*
Instead he pushes the child	**in the kindest**	Possible way down on the bench next to the man

(SK01SeAd02.6670 no. 15)

---

2 For the Bokmål/Nynorsk distinction, see https://www.sprakradet.no/Vi-og-vart/Om-oss/English-and-other-languages/English/norwegian-bokmal-vs.-nynorsk.

Clear errors or instances where it was impossible to say something about *vennligst* due to limited context were also replaced, as in example (3). As were cases of "unidiomatic Norwegian", e.g., instances of translationese as in example (4), where *vennligst* has been chosen as a viable translation of the item please into Norwegian, but with the result of creating unconventional Norwegian. In some cases, particularly in online texts, it was clear that the use of *vennligst* was the result of a, most likely automatic, translation from English, as in example (5).

Example (3)

[…] en vakker jente kom til ham, og de giftet seg.	*Vennligst*	*Lailiaoyibang hjort hjort jente brødre*
[…] a beautiful girl came to him, and they got married.	**Please**	Lailiaoyibang deer deer girl brothers

(no.swewe.net no. 63)

Example (4)

Dette er vanvittig. Når ambassaden min får rede på …	*Vennligst*	*sa hun og løftet den ene hånden*
This is crazy. When my embassy finds out …	**Please**	She said and raised one hand

(SK01StOl01.4757 no. 52)

Example (5)

Please hjelp meg save Sierra:	*Vennligst*	*hjelp meg redde henne […]*
Please help me save Sierra	**Please**	Help me save her […]

(Leesysinfo.com no. 49)

For each invalid instance, the next valid one on the list was chosen from the randomly extracted instances. In total, 77 invalid instances of *vennligst* were replaced by valid ones.

All 500 instances were manually sifted through and analysed according to the type of situation, type of interaction and situational characteristics. First, the situations were classified as either standard or non-standard. Second, the situations were described according to the type of interaction, i.e., dyadic, multiparty and public (Kádár and House 2019: 9). Dyadic are interactions in private with no overhearers. Multiparty are interactions between two participants with overhearers or dyadic interactions which are a part of a network with other dyads. Public are interactions which are designed to be accessible to unratified participants. It is important to note that in dyadic and multiparty relationships, there is evidence of personal involvement on the requester's part, whereas, in public interactions, there is none. Thus, in

multiparty interactions, those instances where the speaker is talking to himself but simultaneously seems to imagine an audience "out there" are included.

Third, the situations were described according to situational characteristics. Kádár and House (2020) identify four standard situations, three of which we also found helpful to our data analysis.[3] The first is linked to the interactional category called "public" above and is labelled public display. Public display means public signs and reminders of people's rights and obligations. Whereas public displays target an unratified audience, two other categories represent interactional scenes between people, one where the power relation between the interlocutors is important, institutional with *power-salience*, and the other where it is not, institutional without power-salience. Institutional with power-salience are situations where people know who and where they are and are aware of their rights and obligations. It is not perceived as difficult to make a request, and the likelihood of compliance is high. Institutional without power-salience are situations in which the participants are in an institutional setting, but power relations are not pragmatically significant to their interaction. By "institutional" they mean "scenes in which conventions and/or ritual behaviour very often become relevant" (Kádár and House 2020: 149). Murphy and De Felice (2019) call this a ritual situation as opposed to a non-ritual one. In our data, a request with power-salience is easiest to detect when the requester is superior in status, such as a judge to his audience, a teacher to his pupils, a bus driver to his passengers, a parent to a child, or a superior to a subordinate. These are all scenes with conventions about who is entitled to utter a request to whom. However, even when the requester is lower or equal in status, the formality of the situation (e.g., a wedding ceremony, a formal letter, condolences, service encounter), where language tends to have a formulaic quality driven by communal rights and obligations, may sanction a request.

The classification of the data into categories was performed manually by the authors themselves, a procedure which is not without its risks as "manual coding might be compromised for a variety of reasons, both systematic (e.g., due to ambiguity of the coding scheme […]) and random (e.g., due to coder fatigue […])" (Larsson et al. 2020: 238). The sample was divided into two sets, and each coder analysed one set. As a means of validation, each coder checked the other coder's classification. Cases which were challenging to categorise or where there was disagreement between the coders were discussed, and more context from the corpora was consulted to reach an agreement.

---

3 The fourth standard situation identified by Kádár and House (2020), "service encounters", encompasses contexts in which a service is provided, e.g., in a restaurant or in a shop. Such contexts were absent in the Norwegian sample.

5 Data

The data was collected from two existing corpora of edited and less edited written Norwegian Bokmål. Initially, we wanted to collect data from spoken corpora as well; however, the three spoken corpora consulted[4] yielded only one instance of *vennligst* and were therefore not included in the study.[5] Although traditionally, pragmatics has been concerned with unconstrained spoken interaction, and written language, particularly processed (published) language, has been regarded as derivative and secondary with little degree of interaction (Jucker 2018: 11), it is now generally acknowledged that different research questions require data from different sources, different types of data, or a combination of types (Flöck and Geluykens 2015; Schauer and Adolphs 2006). We wanted to fully grasp how *vennligst* is used and chose to utilise both more traditional edited written data as well as less edited, more spoken-like computer-mediated data.

The edited written data was collected from The Corpus for Bokmål Lexicography (LBK) (Fjeld et al. 2020), and the less edited online language data was collected from The HaBiT Norwegian Web Corpus (HaBiT) (HaBiT 2015). The LBK corpus consists of 27,000 text extracts from various genres, both published and unpublished texts such as novels, newspapers, and brochures, amounting to about 100 million words.[6] The corpus was compiled between 2008 and 2013, and the compilation was based on a study by Norsk Mediebarometer from 2003 of the types of texts and the amount of text from each type an "average Norwegian reader" reads (Fjeld et al. 2020). LBK contains both Norwegian original texts as well as translations into Norwegian, mainly from English. Our random sample from the corpus consists of 51.0 % fictional texts, 19.7 % non-fictional texts, 13.5 % TV subtitles, 14.1 % unpublished texts such as advertisements, letters, brochures, etc. and 1.4 % newspapers and periodicals.

The HaBiT corpus belongs to the Web-as-Corpus (WaC) paradigm and is the first of its kind for Norwegian. It was completed in 2017 and was compiled using a software tool designed to obtain large amounts of text from the web. The raw data was subsequently filtered and cleaned to fit the corpus profile (Rayson 2015). The HaBiT corpus largely represents computer mediated discourse (CMD), which may be

---

4 Three spoken corpora were consulted, The Norwegian Speech Corpus (NoTa) (Johannessen and Hagen 2008), The BigBrother Corpus (BB) and The Nordic Dialect Corpus (NDC) (Johannessen et al. 2009), which amount to about 2.3 million words and consist of informal conversations between family members, friends, acquaintances and strangers recorded in the period 2001 to 2016.

5 The low number of *vennligst* in spoken corpora does not necessarily imply that *vennligst* is a feature of written discourse. It may also be related to the limited number of requests performed in the spoken corpora. Both NoTa and NDC consist of recorded conversations between two persons in settings where requests for actions are likely to be limited.

6 The total number of *vennligst* in LBK was 345.

explained as "predominantly text-based human-human interaction mediated by networked computers or mobile telephone" (Herring 2007: 1), mainly in the form of asynchronous public communication (e.g., homepages belonging to companies and organisations) where neither the text producer nor the readers are ratified. However, it also contains more private online communication, such as blog posts and comments on online forums. The corpus consists of approx. 1.18 billion words.[7] Our random sample consists of 70.4 % public communication, such as company homepages, organisation homepages, betting pages, etc., 23.7 % private communication, such as blogs, discussion forums, etc. and 6.3 % unidentified sources.

6 Results

Overall, the results indicate that *vennligst* is used in both standard and non-standard situations and that its use follows a relatively clear pattern depending on the type of situation as well as the type of interaction. Table 2 shows the overall distribution of *vennligst* across standard and non-standard situations in the data sample.

The categories in Table 2 are discussed with examples from the corpora in the following sections.

Table 2: The distribution of *vennligst* in LBK and HaBiT.

		LBK	**HaBiT**	**SUM**
Standard	RFIE (public display)	45	226	271
	RFIE (institutional without power-salience)	47	0	47
	RFIE (institutional with power-salience)	78	3	81
Non-standard	Politeness marker	32	11	43
	Request marker	48	10	58
SUM		250	250	500

6.1 Standard situations

Most of the instances of *vennligst* (79.8 %) in the sample are in standard situations. Table 3 shows the distribution of *vennligst* in standard situations across various interpersonal scenarios.

---

7 The total number of *vennligst* in HaBiT was 14,392.

Table 3: The distribution of *vennligst* in standard situations in LBK and HaBiT.

Standard situations	Dyadic		Multiparty		Public		SUM
	LBK	HaBiT	LBK	HaBiT	LBK	HaBiT	
RFIE (public display)	0	0	0	0	45	226	271
RFIE (institutional without power-salience)	35	0	12		0	0	47
RFIE (institutional with power-salience)	56	1	21	2	1	0	81
SUM		92		35		272	399

Forty five of the instances in LBK and 226 in HaBiT were labelled *RFIE (public display)*, where the request functions in an interaction that is designed to be accessible to the public (Kádár and House 2020). Because of the lack of a clearly identifiable addressee, there is little need to mitigate the request. In HaBiT, where *vennligst* is found almost entirely in public display scenarios, we find that it tends to collocate with certain verbs (*kontakt* 'contact' [1870], *besøk* 'visit' [674], *send* 'send' [644], *se* 'see' [616], *merk* 'note' [550], *les* 'read' [357], *bruk* 'use' [318], and *sjekk* 'ensure' [298]).[8] Among these, *kontakt* 'contact', as illustrated in example (6), and *besøk* 'visit', as in example (7), had the highest frequencies in our sample as well. Example (6) is from the website of a local municipality, and example (7) is from a company website.

Example (6)

Ved spørsmål vedrørende dette,	***vennligst***	*kontakt Ås kommunes eiendomsavdeling.*
For questions regarding this,	**Please**	Contact Ås municipality's real estate department.

(togrendabarnehage.no no. 108)

Example (7)

For mer informasjon om sinus hodepine	***vennligst***	*besøk vår nettside.*
For more information on sinus headaches,	**Please**	Visit our website.

(blogworlds.info no. 79)

---

8 The numbers in brackets show the frequencies of some of the most common collocates of *vennligst* within a span of +/− 3 words in the HaBiT corpus as a whole, e.g., of the total 14,392 instances of *vennligst*, 1,870 cooccur with *kontakt* 'contact'.

Public displays are not directed towards anyone in particular, but an RFIE can also be used in requests to specific persons. RFIE (institutional without power-salience) appear in 35 instances in dyadic and 12 instances in multiparty interactions in the LBK corpus. Example (8) is from a *Usenet*, a type of internet forum where individuals can post messages.

Example (8)

Sykkelen ser ikke ut som den er brukt. Med på kjøpet følger to hjelmer og fullt Gore-Tex kjøreutstyr. (ca str 44) Pris CA 39.000, – PS Det er ikke jeg som skal selge den, så	***vennligst***	*ring tlf. 69144343 for info.*
The bike does not look like it has been used. The purchase includes two helmets and complete Gore-Tex driving equipment. (Approx. Size 44) Price CA 39.000, – PS It's not me who is selling it, so	**Please**	Call tel. 69144343 for info.

(UN04USN01.53568 no. 112)

Even though the request is from one person to another ratified individual, and therefore is a message with more of a personal nature than an RFIE public display, the phrase *please call tel. 69144343 for info* may be interpreted as a routinised formula associated with an RFIE (Kádár and House 2019: 644) and, as such, does not carry much directive force.

However, the most common use of *vennligst* in standard situations in LBK is an RFIE with power-salience. There were 56 in dyadic and 21 in multiparty relationships. Power-salience here means that the requester's superior position and/or the situation sanction an order expecting compliance. Examples 9 and 10 are from two non-fiction texts where the speakers take on leadership roles in the situation at hand.

Example (9)

To sivilkledde politimenn, den yngste sto og blafret med noen papirer mens den eldste forklarte rolig: Dette er en arrestordre.	***Vennligst***	*gjør deg klar. Ta med bestikk, rasjoneringskort og alle legitimasjonspapirer.*
Two plainclothes policemen, the youngest stood fluttering with some papers while the eldest calmly explained: This is an arrest warrant.	**Please**	Get ready. Bring cutlery, ration cards and all identification documents.

(SK01IsRu01.2457 no. 194)

Example (10)

Dette er kaptein Noah som på vegne av besetningen ønsker alle velkommen om bord.	***Vennligst***	*fest setebeltene. Det kan bli turbulens.*
This is captain Noah who, on behalf of the crew, welcomes everyone on board.	**Please**	Fasten the seat belts. There may be turbulence.

(SK01KjJa01.11343 no. 172)

Vennligst here has mainly a requestive quality in that it does not mitigate the face-threat but simply acts to get things done. Kádár and House (2020: 155) argue that: "Basically, in the case of a challenge in an institutional frame, a judge may deploy the RFIE please not necessarily to mitigate, but rather to remind the addressee of who and where (s)he is". Thus, it does not only aim to get things done but also to remind the hearers about the institutional frame that they are in.

6.2 Non-standard situations

Vennligst is used in non-standard situations in 20.2 % of the instances investigated. 80 of the 250 instances in the LBK corpus and as few as 21 in the HaBiT corpus were examples of *vennligst* in non-standard situations. Table 4 gives an overview of the use of *vennligst* in non-standard situations across various interpersonal scenarios.

In non-standard situations, the requester has no clear right to utter the request, and the requester may therefore see the necessity to mitigate it. This use of *vennligst* is thus the one that most resembles a politeness marker as it was defined by House and Kasper (1981). Example 11 is from the webpage of a local history association, and they are planning to have a statue made and are asking their members for advice.

Table 4: The distribution of *vennligst* in non-standard situations in LBK and HaBiT.

Non-Standard situations	Dyadic		Multiparty		Public		SUM
	LBK	**HaBiT**	**LBK**	**HaBiT**	**LBK**	**HaBiT**	
Politeness marker (without power-salience)	16	6	4	3	0	0	29
Politeness marker (with power-salience)	8	2	4	0	0	0	14
Request marker (without power-salience)	27	6	19	4	0	0	56
Request marker (with power-salience)	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
SUM	67		35		0		101

Example (11)

Har du en kommentar til dette arbeidet, så	***vennligst***	kom med dem. Vi trenger tips om […]
If you have any comments about this work, then	**Please**	Go ahead. We need tips about […]

(lokhistorie.sola.kommune.no no. 93)

Example (11) is an example of a politeness marker without power-salience, as there is no clear power difference between the requester and the requestee. There were 22 in dyadic and seven in multiparty relationships in the two corpora. The recipient is politely encouraged to suggest tips to the authors. The requestee(s) are not obliged to comply, but the use of *vennligst* seeks to encourage compliance with the request. In part 6.1, we mentioned verbs that tend to collocate with *vennligst* and that the audience, therefore, recognises as routine formulae. The verb 'go ahead' in example (11) is unconventional and informal and is probably not recognised as a routine formula by the readers. We, therefore, interpreted this as non-standard. However, the distinction between a politeness marker and an RFIE is not simple. The following is an example where *vennligst* might be defined as either one.

Example (12)

[…] da en svartkledd mann fra hotellet lavmælt henvender seg og sier at Mr Professor Ngere venter på madam, om hun	***vennligst***	vil følge med til bassenget.
[…] when one of the hotel staff dressed in black courteously addresses her by saying that Mr Professor Ngere is waiting for madam, if she would	**be so kind (as to)**	Follow him to the pool.

(SK01SeAd01 no. 63)

The conversation between the member of the hotel staff and the guest (madam) has the quality of marking downward relational power differences (Murphy and De Felice 2019). However, another interpretation is that of a ritual frame, as the phrase 'if she would be so kind as to' may be recognised as a routinised formulae by both involved. In fact, the mitigatory factor of *vennligst*, although present, may be secondary to its communal ritual use.

Vennligst in example (13), however, is a clearer example of deference. The security man is being questioned by the police and is aware of his inferior position, but really would like to leave.

Example (13)

Vekteren akter ikke å sette seg ned. […]. Kan han	***vennligst***	*få gå nå? De gidder ikke svare han.*
The security man has no intention to sit down. […] [Can] (could) he	**Please**	be allowed to go now? They don't bother to answer him.

(SK01SmKi02 no. 246)

The most common routine formulae in a situation like this in Norwegian would be kan jeg få gå *nå*? 'can I [get to] go now' without please. By adding *vennligst*, the illocutionary force of the request is intensified into a plea. There were 12 instances of politeness markers with power-salience in the LBK corpus and two in the HaBiT corpus.

In non-standard situations where the requester does not have a clear right to utter the request, they might still feel that they do because of negative emotions such as anger or frustration, as illustrated in example (14). These were labelled request markers and most of them were without power-salience. There were 46 instances of request markers without power-salience in the LBK corpus and 10 in the HaBiT corpus. Example 14 is from a webpage where the writer is expressing her annoyance with trying to get through to customer service during the summer holiday.

Example (14)

Det kan umulig være mer enn ett menneske på jobb på kndsrvc i dag.	***Vennligst***	*ta dere sammen. Mvh Kristiane*
There cannot possibly be more than one person at work in customer service today.	**Please**	Pull yourselves together. Kind regards Kristiane

(UN05KC04084.12 no. 97)

The requester is the potential customer but cannot be said to have a higher status than those that she addresses. Thus, there is nothing in the situation that sanctions this command. Here, *vennligst* does not have a mitigating but rather an intensifying effect on the request. Kádár and House (2020) find a similar use of please in standard situations where people have a right to reprimand those who step out of line and behave inappropriately within the ritual frame. A person in a non-standard situation, however, typically expects compliance, no matter if they are entitled to it or not. The requester may be furious as in example (14) or mildly annoyed as in example (15).

Example (15)

Du bør ikke kjøre bil. Jeg er helt fin, freste Daphne.	***Vennligst***	*få henne inn i en drosje, sa Siobhan. Hun har drukket.*
You shouldn't drive. I'm perfectly fine, Daphne snarled.	**Please**	Get her into a taxi, Siobhan said. She's been drinking.

(SK01HiEl01 no. 11)

There is no power-salience between Daphne and Siobhan. It is her drunken state that makes Siobhan believe that she has the right to command, whether Daphne agrees with it or not.

In Table 4, there are only two tokens of a request marker with power-salience. These are incidences where it is the requestee who is superior in status, and the following is one such example.

Example (16)

Vi er glade for at du er så samarbeidsvillig Lonni. Men så kan kanskje dere	***vennligst***	*fortelle meg hva dette dreier seg om.*
We appreciate your cooperation, Lonni. But then you might	**[Please] (be able to)**	Tell me what this is all about.

(SK01NyGe02 no. 5)

Lonni is being interrogated by the police and is in no position to request anything. Still, in his inferior position, he talks as if he expects compliance from the police.

In Table 4, the majority of *vennligst*, regardless of whether it is used as a politeness marker or a request marker, is used in situations with no power-salience, which means that the interlocutors are of equal status. It is not always easy to determine whether *vennligst* is used as a politeness marker with a mitigating effect or a request marker with an intensifying effect.

Example (17)

Olav, når du kommer hjem,	***vennligst***	*sjekk den svarte jakken som jeg hadde på meg til lunsj sist fredag*
Olav, when you get home,	**Please**	Check the black jacket I wore to lunch last Friday

(SA03BrAr02.9243 no. 87)

Example (17) is from the memoirs of the husband of Norway's first female prime minister Gro Harlem Brundtland. Gro asks her husband to check the pockets of her jacket in the search for some important travel documents. In the example, Gro is

likely not requesting something in a professional capacity but instead as a wife speaking to her husband on equal terms. Without the intonation, it is impossible to determine whether *vennligst* indicates a command or a plea from Gro to check her jacket pockets.

7 Discussion

The question we set out to answer in this study was why some Norwegians perceive *vennligst* as polite, whereas others deem it impolite. To answer this question, we investigated the use of *vennligst* across situations. In line with Andersen (2022), our preliminary analysis showed that *vennligst* is used to a minimal extent in spoken Norwegian, and we, therefore, continued our search in two written corpora.

In the HaBiT corpus, which contains mainly online public communication from companies and organisations where neither the text producer nor the readers are ratified, we found that *vennligst* was primarily used in public displays. In these, *vennligst* represents a typical RFIE that carries little directive force and may go unmarked, which is why companies and organisations can use it extensively without offending. In the LBK corpus, which represents a larger variety of texts, both fiction and non-fiction, *vennligst* was also used more in standard than non-standard situations. However, the difference was not as straightforward as in the HABiT corpus. In contrast to the HaBiT corpus, however, *vennligst* was used more to ratified than to unratified individuals. The use of *vennligst* between ratified individuals requires that the reader recognises and accepts the situational, formulaic and relational frames that sanction its use. Like Kádár and House (2020: 145), we found that the distinction between a standard RFIE and a non-standard politeness marker is not straightforward and, therefore, open to interpretations.

In non-standard situations such as the SMS from a journalist in example (1) in the introduction, *vennligst* is less likely to go unmarked than in standard situations. It would then be beneficial if *vennligst* was mostly interpreted as polite, but our analysis of the two corpora found that *vennligst* in non-standard situations was used as a command (request marker) more often than to signal deference. The tokens identified as politeness markers in line with House and Kasper's (1981) definition did not amount to more than 43 (8.6 %) of the 500 tokens. It questions the validity of calling *vennligst* a politeness marker as some Norwegian–English dictionaries do (cf. the Introduction). It would be more correct to call it an RFIE, but that would limit its use to standard situations. In contrast to *please* in English (Sato 2008), *vennligst* is mainly found in sentence-initial position followed by a verb in imperative form. Wichmann (2004: 1525) maintains that a common way to consider the addition of

please to a request is "a further way of softening the force of requests, particularly if they are in the form of imperatives". Our study shows that *vennligst* used as a request marker does not weaken but rather strengthens the request's illocutionary force. Based on our findings, we would caution against using *vennligst* in situations where people's rights and obligations are potentially unclear due to the likelihood of being interpreted as impolite.

To account for the uses of *vennligst* in standard situations, this study applied the recently developed ritual frame analysis model (Kádár and House 2020). The model was initially developed to show that linguistic forms, such as *please* and *vennligst*, typically referred to as politeness markers (Aijmer 2009; Watts 2003), are not used for politeness purposes in most situations. On the contrary, so-called politeness markers are often used as reminders of social rules or rituals rather than indicators of deference and thus function as RFIEs. This was true for most of the uses of *vennligst* (nearly 80 %) in our sample, thus supporting Kádár and House's (2020: 4) claim that such forms are mainly indicative of ritual language.

However, as the analysis in Section 6 shows, *vennligst* may be used for a variety of purposes. To fully account for the versatility of *vennligst*, we had to broaden the scope of our investigation beyond the use of *vennligst* as an RFIE in standard situations and include an account of its use in non-standard situations as well. To describe the uses of *vennligst* in non-standard situations, we had to find a set of suitable descriptive terms. The label "politeness marker" was used when *vennligst* signalled deference or a bid for cooperation. When *vennligst* served to intensify the requestive force into a demand for cooperation, the label "request marker" was used.

The use of these labels has its challenges. Both terms have been used in previous studies and have various and partly overlapping meanings, making them difficult to distinguish. The term "politeness marker", the most extensively used of the two, is typically used for linguistic forms which are commonly associated with conventional politeness; however, such forms, which are strongly linked to conventions, are reconceptualised as RFIEs (Kádár and House 2021), making the distinction between the concepts blurry. Furthermore, what constitutes a standard and a non-standard situation is not always clear-cut, as the effect of the social roles, rights and obligations on the request may be ambiguous. Such challenges may indicate the need for a more fine-grained framework with more precise terms to reduce such ambiguity.

Our study indicates that *vennligst* can only be used with relative certainty of not being interpreted as impolite in public displays to unratifiable individuals. By showing that *vennligst* may be used to indicate politeness, to point to a ritual frame or to strengthen the force of a request, the study also challenges the view of conventional politeness markers as only markers of politeness and hopes to draw attention to the sensitivity of such markers to influence from situational factors. There are, however, a few limitations that should be borne in mind. First, this study is mainly

qualitative, and a quantitative analysis with a larger sample size may allow for a more robust statistical analysis of the results. Secondly, and more importantly, the high number of *vennligst* used as an RFIE may be influenced by the high number of public displays in the HaBiT corpus. Thus, we welcome additional investigations in more balanced corpora.

References

Aijmer, Karin. 2009. Please: A politeness formula viewed in a translation perspective. *Brno Studies in English* 35(2). 63–77.

Aijmer, Karin. 2018. Corpus pragmatics: From form to function. In Andreas H. Jucker, Klaus P. Schneider & Wolfram Bublitz (eds.), *Methods in pragmatics*, 555–586. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Andersen, Gisle. 2022. What governs speakers' choices of borrowed vs. domestic forms of discourse-pragmatic variables? In Elisabeth Peterson, Turo Hiltunen & Joseph Kern (eds.), *Discourse-Pragmatic Variation and Change: Theory, Innovations, Contact*, 251–271. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

BigBrother-korpuset [The BigBrother corpus]. The Text Laboratory, Department of Linguistics and Scandinavian Studies, University of Oslo. Available at: http://www.tekstlab.uio.no/nota/bigbrother/.

Brown, Penelope & Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Culpeper, Jonathan. 2011. Politeness and impoliteness. In Gisle Andersen & Karin Aijmer (eds.), *Pragmatics of society*, 393–438. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Eelen, Gino. 2001. *A critique of politeness theories*. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome Publishing.

Fjeld, Ruth Vatvedt, Anders Nøklestad & Kristin Hagen. 2020. Leksikografisk bokmålskorpus (LBK) – bakgrunn og bruk [The corpus for Bokmål Lexicography (LBK) – background and use]. In Janne Bondi Johannessen & Kristin Hagen (eds.), *Leksikografi og korpus. En hyllest til Ruth Vatvedt Fjeld [Lexicography and corpus. A tribute to Ruth Vatvedt Fjeld]*, vol. 11(1), 47–59. Oslo Studies in Language.

Flöck, Ilka & Ronald Geluykens. 2015. Speech acts in corpus pragmatics: A quantitative contrastive study of directives in spontaneous and elicited discourse. In Jesus Romero-Trillo (ed.), *Yearbook of corpus linguistics and pragmatics 2015: Current approaches to discourse and translation studies*, 7–37. Cham: Springer International.

Fraser, Bruce. 1996. Pragmatic markers. *Pragmatics* 6(2). 167–190.

Fretheim, Torstein. 2005. Politeness in Norway: How can you be polite and sincere? In Leo Hickey & Miranda Stewart (eds.). *Politeness in Europe*, 145–158. Bristol, Blue ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

HaBiT Norwegian Web Corpus 2015. 2015. The text laboratory, department of linguistics and scandinavian studies, university of Oslo. https://www.hf.uio.no/iln/english/about/organization/text-laboratory/projects/habit/habitcorpus.html (accessed 13 May 2021).

Heinemann, Trine. 2006. 'Will you or can't you?': Displaying entitlement in interrogative requests. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38(7). 1081–1104.

Herring, Susan C. 2007. A faceted classification scheme for computer-mediated discourse. *language@internet* 4(1).urn:nbn:de:0009-7-7611

House, Juliane & Gabriele Kasper. 1981. Politeness markers in English and German. In Florian Coulmas (ed.), *Conversational routine. Explorations in standardized communication situations and prepatterned speech*, 157–185. New York: Mouton Publishers.

House, Juliane. 1989. Politeness in English and German: The functions of please and bitte. In Shoshana Blum-Kulka, Juliane House & Gabriele Kasper (eds.), *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*, 96–119. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Johannessen, Janne Bondi & Kristin Hagen. 2008. Om NoTa-korpuset og artiklene i denne boka [About the NoTa corpus and the articles in this book]. In Janne Bondi Johannessen & Kristin Hagen (eds.), *Språk i Oslo. Ny forskning omkring talespråk [Language in Oslo. New research on spoken language]*, 7–14. Oslo: Novus forlag.

Johannessen, Janne Bondi, Joel Priestley & Kristin Hagen, Tor Anders Åfarli & Øystein Alexander Vangsnes. 2009. The Nordic Dialect Corpus – an advanced research tool. In Kristina Jokinen & Eckhard Bick, *Proceedings of the 17th nordic conference of computational linguistics NODALIDA 2009. NEALT proceedings series volume 4*, 73–80. Tartu, Estonia: Northern European Association for language Technology (NEALT).

Johansen, Stine Hulleberg & Kristin Rygg. Forthcoming. The social functions and linguistic patterns of *please* and its Norwegian correspondences. In Anna Čermáková, Hilde Hasselgård, Markéta Malá & Denisa Šebestová (eds.), *Contrastive corpus linguistics: Crossing boundaries*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Johansen, Stine Hulleberg. 2020. A contrastive approach to the types of hedging strategies used in Norwegian and English informal spoken conversations. *Contrastive Pragmatics* 2(1). 81–105.

Johansson, Stig. 2007. *Seeing through multilingual corpora. On the use of corpora in contrastive studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Jucker, Andreas. H. 2018. Data in pragmatic research. In Andreas H. Jucker, Klaus Schneider & Wolfram Bublitz (eds.), *Methods in pragmatics*, 3–36. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Kádár, Dániel Z. & Juliane House. 2019. Ritual frame and 'politeness markers'. *Pragmatics and Society* 10(4). 639–647.

Kádár, Dániel Z. & Juliane House. 2020. Ritual frames: A contrastive pragmatic approach. *Pragmatics* 30(1). 142–168.

Kádár, Dániel Z. & Juliane House. 2021. 'Politeness markers' revisited – a contrastive pragmatic perspective. *Journal of Politeness Research* 17(1). 79–110.

Larsson, Tove, Magali Paquot & Luke Plonsky. 2020. Inter-rater reliability in learner corpus research. Insights from a collaborative study on adverb placement. *International Journal of Learner Corpus Research* 6(2). 237–251.

Lindström, Anna. 2005. Language as social action: A study of how senior citizens request assistance. In Auli Hakulinen & Margret Selting (eds.), *Syntax and lexis in conversation: Studies on the use of linguistic resources in talk-in-interaction*, 209–233. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Mills, Sara. 2009. Impoliteness in a cultural context. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41(5). 1047–1060.

Murphy, Lynne M. & Rachele De Felice. 2019. Routine politeness in American and British English requests: Use and non-use of please. *Journal of Politeness Research* 15(1). 77–100.

O'Keeffe, Anne. 2018. Corpus-based function-to-form approaches. In Andreas H. Jucker, Klaus P. Schneider & Wolfram Bublitz (eds.), *Methods in pragmatics*, 587–618. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Rayson, Paul. 2015. Computational tools and methods for corpus compilation and analysis. In Biber Douglas & Randi Reppen (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of English corpus linguistics (Cambridge handbooks in language and linguistics)*, 32–49. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rygg, Kristin. 2017. The semantic and pragmatic value of Norwegian greetings the last hundred years. *Maal og Minne* 1. 147–174.

Rygg, Kristin. 2021. Openings and closings in workplace emails. How do people navigate without clear standards and clearly prescribed formulae? *Hermes* 61. 7–21.

Sato, Shie. 2008. Use of "please" in American and New Zealand English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 40(7). 1249–1278.

Schauer, Gila A. & Svenja Adolphs. 2006. Expressions of gratitude in corpus and DCT data: Vocabulary, formulaic sequences, and pedagogy. *System* 34(1). 119–134.

Searle, John R. 1969. *Speech acts. An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Taleghani-Nikazm, Carmen. 2006. *Request sequences: The intersection of grammar, interaction and social context*, vol. 19. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Taleghani-Nikazm, Carmen. 2011. Requests and orders. In Gisle Andersen & Karin Aijmer (eds.), *Pragmatics of society*, 393–438. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Terkourafi, Marina. 2015. Conventionalization: A new agenda for politeness research. *Journal of Pragmatics* 86. 11–18.

Urbanik, Pawel & Jan Svennevig. 2019. Managing contingencies in requests: The role of negation in Norwegian interrogative directives. *Journal of Pragmatics* 139. 109–125.

Watts, Richard J. 2003. *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wichmann, Anne. 2004. The intonation of please-requests: A corpus-based study. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36(9). 1521–1549.

Bionotes

Kristin Rygg
Department of Intercultural and Professional Communication, Norwegian School of Economics, Bergen, Norway
kristin.rygg@nhh.no

Kristin Rygg is an Associate Professor at the Norwegian School of Economics, Department of Professional and Intercultural Communication. Her research areas include socio-pragmatics with a special focus on politeness theory and intercultural business communication with a special interest in the East Asian and Scandinavian regions.

Stine Hulleberg Johansen
Department of Literature, Area Studies and European Languages, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway
s.h.johansen@ilos.uio.no

Stine Hulleberg Johansen has a PhD in English linguistics from the Department of Literature, Area Studies and European Languages at the University of Oslo. Her areas of interest are Corpus Linguistics, Pragmatics and Corpus Pragmatics. She is currently employed as a postdoctoral researcher in the MULTIWRITE project funded by the Norwegian Research Council at the University of Oslo.