

**THE SOCIOLINGUISTIC COMPLEXITY
OF INTERNATIONAL HIGHER
EDUCATION IN DENMARK**

**STUDENT PERSPECTIVES ON LANGUAGE
IDEOLOGIES AND SOCIAL INCLUSION**

EDITED BY JANUS MORTENSEN AND DORTE LØNSMANN



**KØBENHAVNERSTUDIER I
TOSPROGETHED**

**STUDIER I PARALLELSPROGLIGHED
KØBENHAVNS UNIVERSITET
HUMANISTISK FAKULTET
2021**

**BIND
C11**

THE SOCIOLINGUISTIC COMPLEXITY OF INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

Student perspectives on language
ideologies and social inclusion

Edited by
Janus Mortensen and Dorte Lønsmann

Københavnstudier i tosprogethed
Studier i parallelsproglighed bind C11
Københavns Universitet
Det Humanistiske Fakultet
København 2021

Copyright 2021: The editors and authors.

The sociolinguistic complexity of international higher education: Student perspectives on language ideologies and social inclusion.

Københavnstudier i tosprogethed
Studier i parallelsproglighed bind C11
ISBN: 978-87-93510-07-4
ISSN: 0901-9731

Københavnstudier i tosprogethed udgives af Københavns Universitets Humanistiske Fakultet.

Redaktion:

Juni Söderberg Arnfast, Center for Dansk som Andet- og Fremmedsprog, Københavns Universitet
Anne Holmen, Center for Internationalisering og Parallelsproglighed, Københavns Universitet
Janus Spindler Møller, Center for Sociolingvistiske Sprogforandringsstudier, Københavns Universitet
Marta Kirilova, Center for Dansk som Andet- og Fremmedsprog, Københavns Universitet
Jakob Steensig, Lingvistik, Aarhus Universitet

Redaktion af dette bind: Anne Holmen

CONTENTS

Introduction: Language and inclusion in an international study programme in Denmark <i>Dorte Lønsmann and Janus Mortensen</i>	1
Charting the language ideological landscape of Danish higher education: Long-term international students' perspectives on Danish and English <i>Simone Møller Krogh</i>	27
The value of learning Danish: Language ideologies at an international study programme in Denmark <i>Karen-Sofie Ahrenfeldt Madsen</i>	61
'It helps me fit in better': A study on language ideologies and notions of inclusion <i>Ida Moth Kej</i>	87
Exploring linguistic biases in an international education context: A qualitative study of KEA students' language ideologies <i>Frida Lundquist Andersen</i>	115
'It turned into a mother tongue': Ideologies of English as a 'native' language among international students in Copenhagen <i>Niels G. van Leeuwen</i>	143

INTRODUCTION: LANGUAGE AND INCLUSION IN AN INTERNATIONAL STUDY PROGRAMME IN DENMARK

Dorte Lønsmann and Janus Mortensen

Today, many study programmes in Danish higher education are billed as 'international', intended to attract transnationally mobile students as well as local students. In such programmes, English is commonly used as the medium of instruction while also functioning as the nominal lingua franca outside formal teaching contexts. Using English rather than the local language as the medium of instruction is arguably not the only way for a study programme to be 'international'. However, in Denmark – as in many other parts of the world – internationalisation and anglicisation have come to be seen as two sides of the same coin, giving English an important role alongside Danish in the sociolinguistic landscape of higher education.

The practice of establishing English-medium study programmes as part of an internationalisation agenda is a relatively new phenomenon in Denmark. At the turn of the century, virtually all higher education programmes were offered in Danish (and Danish only), but this has changed significantly. In 2018, 13% of the BA programmes and 48% of the MA programmes at Danish universities were offered in English. At university colleges and business academies, the number of English-medium programmes amounted to 16% and 24%, respectively (Uddannelses- og Forskningsministeriet [Ministry of Higher Education and Science] 2018a). Similarly, the number of transnationally mobile students has also increased. In 2004, the number of international students enrolled in higher education in Denmark, either as short-term exchange students or full-degree students, was approximately 7,500 (= 4% of the total student population). 12 years later in 2016 it had gone up to approximately 22,100, equaling 8% of the total student population (Uddannelses- og Forsk-

ningsministeriet [Ministry of Higher Education and Science] 2018b).¹

A main challenge related to international education in Denmark lies in ensuring that transnationally mobile students who do not speak Danish are included in the educational environments they are a part of. While English functions as the lingua franca in international study programmes (at least nominally, cf. below), Danish continues to play an important role in the general landscape of tertiary education. International programmes are typically offered alongside a number of Danish-language programmes and are situated in an environment with a majority of Danish-speaking students, teachers and administrators. This means that students who do not speak Danish may have limited access to certain activities as part of their education, including committees and various informal events that often provide the 'glue' for social life at most educational institutions.

For the educational institutions, another and more recent challenge related to internationalisation lies in ensuring that international students remain in Denmark after graduation. This challenge has become increasingly relevant because Danish politicians, as part of a general counter-reaction to the strong drive towards internationalisation which characterised the first part of the century, have begun to question the relevance and value of international education for the Danish taxpayers. A common complaint is that too many transnational students leave Denmark after finishing their degrees, instead of putting their education to use in the country where they were educated. So, the onus is now on the institutions to make sure that their students become part of the Danish job market after graduation.²

The two challenges we have sketched here are to do with short-term and long-term inclusion of international students, and we would argue that issues related to language are central to both. We know from other internationalising contexts in Denmark and beyond that language choice plays an important role in relation to inclusion, for instance in work teams (Lønsmann 2017; Tange and Lauring 2009; Wilczewski,

Søderberg and Gut 2018) and everyday social interactions (Dovchin 2019). Similarly, previous studies in education contexts have shown that English-medium study programmes are often multilingual, with students and teachers drawing on diverse language resources both inside and out of class (Hazel and Mortensen 2013; Moore et al. 2013; Mortensen 2010, 2014, 2018; Söderlundh 2013). While the programmes are billed as ‘international’, they are inescapably situated in a specific local context, which means that the local language is prominent in the everyday lives of students, which may have an impact on the inclusion of international students. The occasional use of the local language rather than English as a lingua franca in nominally English-medium programmes has been found to have a negative effect on international students’ feeling of being included in the classroom and in social settings more widely (Fabricius, Mortensen and Haberland 2017; Steinhoff 2011).

Challenges related to linguistic diversity and inclusion are compounded by the transient nature of international education. Study programmes are temporary settings, at least from the perspective of students, who will typically attend a given programme for a number of years and then move on. With English firmly established as the dominant lingua franca in the educational setting, and with perhaps limited need or opportunity to engage extensively with the local language outside school, the idea of learning the local language often presents itself as an undesirable proposition to many students. Ironically, however, learning the local language may in itself be an important factor in ensuring long-term inclusion and generating a sense of belonging in the local setting (Kirilova and Lønsmann 2020). Thus, while the use of English at international programmes may help ensure short-term inclusion in the educational environment, relying too strongly on English may present challenges when it comes to inclusion beyond the transient social configuration at the educational programme.

Against this background, the contributions in this volume investigate the roles English and Danish play for students who attend international programmes at Copenhagen School of Design and Technology (KEA). The five chapters are written by MA students in English at the University of Copenhagen, based on their participation in a larger research project developed in collaboration between Dorte Lønsmann, Janus Mortensen and KEA under the heading of *Language, Identity and Inclusion*. This project revolves around the following general research question:

How do language practices, language ideologies and language policies impact processes of learning and processes of social inclusion for Danish and international students in international study programmes at KEA?

In the qualitative studies included here, developed as part of a research integration project supported by the University of Copenhagen, the focus is specifically on language ideologies and the roles Danish and English are seen to play for the KEA students in processes of social inclusion and exclusion at the educational programmes they attend, and in Danish society more widely. The chapters are based on semi-structured qualitative interviews with 15 students from KEA. By examining the language ideologies the students draw on when talking about their current lives inside and outside school and their plans for the future, the chapters offer insights into the sociolinguistic complexity of international higher education in Denmark. It is our hope that that these insights can help students and educational institutions alike improve the experience and value of international education.

This introduction is organised as follows. To introduce the overall theoretical framework of the volume, we begin by outlining the concept of language ideology and discussing its relevance for the study of transnational mobility and internationalisation of higher education. The account is brief, since

all chapters include their own introduction to the field of language ideology research. Having introduced the theoretical framework, we then provide an introduction to KEA and the research project the papers in this collection are part of, including an outline of the ‘research integration experiment’ which laid the foundation for the contributions. Finally, we offer a brief summary of the five chapters, identifying some of the key themes they bring out.

Language ideologies and research on transnational mobility and internationalisation

Language ideologies can be defined as ‘the beliefs and attitudes that shape speakers’ relationships to their own and others’ languages, mediating between the social practice of language and the socioeconomic and political structures within which it occurs’ (Cavanaugh 2020, 52). They often remain unarticulated, but they can be gleaned through the study of metapragmatic discourse – talk about language and language use – and the way language is used as part of particular forms of social practice. Even when they go unnoticed by language users, language ideologies play a fundamental role in shaping the way speakers see and position languages and their speakers in the social world. Language ideologies are thus powerful constructs that need to be reckoned with when trying to understand and potentially alter the nexus between social practice, language and power, for instance in relation to processes of social inclusion and exclusion.

Previous studies of the role of language ideologies in relation to transnational mobility and inclusion relate primarily to the ‘one nation, one language’ ideology. This language ideology posits a natural link between a nation state and a specific language, and is based on an ideal of a homogeneous and monolingual nation state (Simpson and Whiteside 2015). In relation to transnational mobility, this ideology translates into beliefs about the necessity for migrants to learn the language of the country they are residing in, especially if they want to gain access to the job market (Flubacher, Coray and

Duchêne 2016; Flubacher, Duchêne and Coray 2018). In the Danish context, Lønsmann (2011, 2014) has found that interest in learning and using Danish is regarded positively and is seen as a willingness on behalf of transnationals to integrate into Danish society. In the study reported in Lønsmann (2011), Danish workers at an international company specifically expressed the belief that integration depends on the foreigners' willingness to learn Danish, not necessarily their actual achieved language competence. Foreigners who expressed an interest in learning Danish were also believed to be easier to talk to, as they signalled that they wanted to get to know the Danes. In contrast, choosing not to learn Danish was viewed negatively, indicating a lack of willingness to join Danish society.

Ideologies of English are also relevant in relation to transnational mobility and inclusion. In the corporate sector, both in Denmark and abroad, English has been found to be constructed as the language of ultimate status and utility (Millar, Cifuentes and Jensen 2013), as necessary for international collaboration (Millar 2017) and as the 'natural' language for international communication (Angouri and Miglbauer 2014; Kraft and Lønsmann 2018; Nekvapil and Sherman 2013). Despite the general positive view of English, research has also found that there is often a multitude of ideological positions surrounding English, and different *kinds* of English in particular. In her study from a corporate context in Denmark, Lønsmann (2011) finds evidence of two seemingly contradictory ideologies, one based on a language hierarchy with 'native-speaker' varieties at the top and another which puts a greater premium on English used as a lingua franca, based on the view that the aim of communication is to understand each other (Lønsmann 2011). Similarly, a study of language attitudes and ideologies among students at an international study programme in Denmark (Mortensen and Fabricius 2014) finds that interview participants take up ambiguous stances regarding the value of 'native-like' English as opposed to other forms of English, and their potential for ensuring

effective communication and helping establish interpersonal relationships.

Previous studies such as the ones we have reviewed here point to the perceived close link between language and inclusion, in particular how local language competence is bound up with beliefs about willingness and ability to fit into the host society. While the status of English as an international language with seemingly universal usefulness is quite clear from the above studies, beliefs about different varieties of English are less homogeneous, as we will also see in some of the studies included in this volume.

The KEA case

As mentioned above, the data generation for this project took place in collaboration with the Copenhagen School of Design and Technology (Københavns Erhvervsakademi, KEA). KEA is a university college that offers practice-oriented higher education programmes, including two-year academy profession degree programmes and three-and-a-half-year bachelor's degree programmes. Topics range from Production Technology and Multimedia Design to Computer Science and Business Economics & IT. With 21 Danish and 11 international programmes, KEA has a distinct international profile. 20% of KEA's 5,000 students are international students, many from Europe, but also some from Asia, Africa, North America and South America. In addition, KEA welcomes and sends out exchange students, and many KEA students choose to do internships abroad.

During the collaboration, our partners at KEA have made it clear that they are very interested in learning more about the role of language within their international study programmes. KEA offers free Danish language courses tailor-made for their international students, but only a small number of students sign up for the courses. The partners have also expressed their interest in learning more about the role of language in facilitating their graduates' way into the Danish labour market.

Table 1. Overview of data

Observations of Global Welcome week and Danish classes for international students (DL)	Autumn 2019
Focus group with international students taking Danish classes (DL)	November 2019
Interview with administrator (DL)	February 2020
29 interviews with Danish and international students (MA students)	April-May 2020

The qualitative interviews that are the focus in the current volume are part of a larger data set collected from August 2019 to May 2020, cf. Table 1. Initial observations and a number of interviews were carried out by Dorte Lønsmann (DL), while 29 qualitative interviews were carried out by master’s students at the English programme at the University of Copenhagen. The contributions in this volume are based on 15 of these 29 individual interviews (three interviews per chapter).

The research integration experiment: Students as researchers

As mentioned above, a special feature of the research reported in this volume is that it has been carried out as a collaboration between researchers and students as part of a so-called ‘research integration experiment’. While higher education in Denmark is traditionally research-based, closer integration of research into university teaching has become a focus point at Danish universities in recent years (Damsholt et al. 2018). Integration of research and teaching can take many different forms. Teachers may introduce their own research in class, they may include students in their research projects as e.g. student transcribers, or students and their teachers may collaborate on a joint research project (Damsholt and Sandberg 2018).

The research integration project we designed and carried out in the spring of 2020 was framed as an integral part of a master's level elective at the English programme at the University of Copenhagen. Throughout the course *Socio-linguistic Perspectives on English and Globalization* the students were introduced to sociolinguistic theories and methods with a thematic focus on the role of English in Denmark and other contexts around the globe where English plays a role in otherwise non-Anglophone settings.

For the students, the research integration experiment involved formulating research questions, creating and piloting an interview guide in collaboration with the course teachers and their peers, discussing research ethics, initiating contact with interview participants, carrying out interviews, and subsequently transcribing, coding and analysing the interview data. An essential part of the research integration was the development of two workshops on transcription and coding that supplemented the other course activities. These workshops were developed by us, as the course teachers, in collaboration with our colleague, Kamilla Kraft. As the final assignment for their exam portfolio, the students then wrote an individual project report detailing the results of their analysis of the interviews. The students were organised in smaller 'research groups' of 3-4 students, which meant that each student had access to their own interview plus two or three other interviews conducted by their fellow group members. Within each group, the interviews conducted by the group members formed the data set for each final assignment.

Participation in the research integration experiment was voluntary for the students on the course (with other options available for the final exam for students who preferred a different format), but all but one of the students chose to participate in the experiment, leading to the generation of 29 interviews which were subsequently added to the overall data set of the KEA study, cf. Table 1.

The way we designed the experiment meant that students engaged in research in a number of different ways.

Working with research questions and the interview guides in class meant that they were introduced to their teachers' ongoing research, and that they provided feedback on the research process. By carrying out and analysing the interviews, the students would at the same time learn research methods and carry out research tasks such as data collection, transcription and coding. Being introduced to the teacher's own research area and learning about research methods can be categorised as research-based teaching. Taking it a step further, carrying out research in collaboration with trained researchers can be categorised as research-integrated teaching (Københavns Universitet n.d.).

Investigating language ideologies through qualitative interviews

The research integration experiment was based on qualitative interviews, designed to generate data on language ideologies concerning Danish and English, as well as narratives concerning the day-to-day life of the KEA students and their future hopes and plans.

Qualitative interviewing is a useful method for understanding how participants experience and understand their social worlds (Brinkmann and Kvale 2018). In the research integration experiment, we used semi-structured qualitative interviews, inspired by ethnographic interviewing as outlined by Spradley (1979). That the interviews were semi-structured meant that all student interviewers followed the same thematically organised interview guide, developed collaboratively as part of the course, but were at liberty to focus less on certain questions and explore others in more depth, depending on where their interview was going.

The ethnographic approach to interviewing involves framing participants as experts in their own culture and asking broad descriptive questions with the aim of understanding this culture. For instance, we included a question where participants were asked to describe a typical day at school (see the full interview guide included here as Appendix 1). In

addition to these descriptive ‘grand tour’ questions, we also included questions that more directly enquired about attitudes and ideologies, including the question “Is it important to be good at English at school?”.

As we mentioned above, language ideologies can be investigated both by analysing metapragmatic and metalinguistic discourse, i.e. explicit talk about language and language use, as well as by analysing the implicit assumptions that frame the talk (Woolard 1998, 9). Combining open questions with more specific ones as we did in the interview guide meant that the interviews provided us with rich data for both sorts of enquiry. The interview data was analysed with a view to exploring language ideologies by paying attention not only to *what* was said, but also *how* it was said, and what assumptions and forms of ‘logic’ the unfolding conversations between interviewer and interviewee can be said to draw on. The interviews in the data set are quite varied, which follows naturally from the fact that they were produced by different interviewers, who were often relatively inexperienced in the art of conducting a research interview.

Doing qualitative interviews via Zoom

While the interviews initially had been planned as face-to-face interviews, the COVID-19 pandemic entailed a change of plans. Instead of our students recruiting participants through visits to KEA, participants were now found by one of our KEA partners, who works with internationalisation at KEA. We then put our students in touch with prospective participants via email, and they handled the process from there, obtaining written consent from all participants, planning and carrying out online interviews, mostly using Zoom (via a University of Copenhagen installation).

As mentioned above, the student interviewers were instructed to use the interview guide *as a guide*, meaning that they did not necessarily have to ask every single question it contained. In some cases, interviewers added questions in order to explore their particular interests. After the interviews

had been conducted, the students transcribed them in ELAN (2020) and started their analysis.

Introducing the chapters: Five studies of language ideology

After evaluation of the exam projects, five students were approached and asked to contribute to the current volume. While many of the mini research projects handed in by the students were of a high quality, these five had the clearest potential for being developed into contributions to a thematically coherent publication. The chapters in this volume are the result of the work these students have subsequently put into reworking their exam assignments into research publications. All five chapters take their point of departure in the theoretical framework of language ideologies, but each contribution has its own focus and analyses its own data set. As such the five chapters uncover several different aspects of the language ideological beliefs that circulate among students who attend international study programmes at KEA. While we suggest that this introduction and the chapters that follow be read as an integrated whole, the five contributions can also be read independently of each other.

In the first chapter, Simone Møller Krogh discusses the valuation of non-standard varieties of English as well as beliefs about the necessity of learning Danish. She finds that the use of non-standard varieties of English contributes to creating an ingroup feeling among international students, and that Danish is constructed as a language that is nice-to-know rather than necessary for living in Denmark. Karen-Sofie Ahrenfeldt Madsen also focuses on ideologies about learning Danish. She concludes that participants distinguish between the short-term and long-term value of learning Danish, and that their decisions about language learning are influenced both by ideologies about the usefulness of Danish in Denmark and about the role of English in Danish society.

In her contribution, Ida Moth Kej investigates how different varieties of English are valued by the student participants, and how Danish is valued at school and outside it. She discusses how language ideologies are linked with inclusion in Danish society and concludes that ideologies of both English and Danish impact the processes of getting access and being included. Frida Lundquist Andersen investigates language ideologies of English, in particular how different varieties of English are evaluated. She argues that although some participants value ways of speaking English that are influenced by their non-Anglophone 'roots', they also seem to subscribe to familiar 'native speaker' ideologies in relation to English. Her contribution also brings out how not all 'native speakers' of English are treated equally by the standard language testing regime used in the educational sector in Denmark. Finally, Niels G. van Leeuwen challenges existing notions of 'the native speaker' with his investigation of the native-language ideology. While he finds a consensus amongst his interviewees regarding the positive evaluation of native-speaker language use, one of the participants also challenges traditional notions of who can be included in the category of native speaker.

Together, the five chapters show the complexity of the language ideological landscape international students in Denmark navigate. Ideologies about (the usefulness of) Danish intersect with students' individual trajectories that in various ways are characterised by transience and mobility. This means that while the students draw on similar ideological beliefs about the role of Danish in Denmark, decisions about learning Danish are to a large extent influenced by where they see themselves building a life and having a career. Ideologies about Danish are also shown to be inextricably tied up with ideologies about English in Denmark. Not surprisingly, English is accorded a high status and is seen as useful in Danish society. To some extent the large presence of English means that Danish is not immediately necessary for the students.

The analyses also reveal interesting paradoxes in relation to ideologies about who counts as a native speaker, and

what kinds of English are valued. While English generally is highly valued, the range of interpretations as to who counts as a native speaker and which varieties of English are considered legitimate suggests that English is far from the neutral lingua franca it is sometimes presented as. Instead, these internationalised settings where English is used as a lingua franca may become the backdrop for linguistically based inequalities and power struggles about the 'right' kind of English.

The contributions attest to the fact that international higher education in Denmark takes place in a sociolinguistic context where both Danish and English play important roles in relation to inclusion. It is clear, however, that the two languages play different roles in the different parts of students' lives. While English is constructed as overall useful in the educational context of an international study programme, Danish has a bigger role to play when it comes to finding work and building a career in Denmark. Investigating students' ideologies about language use and language users allows us to better understand the role of language in the inclusion of these students, both inclusion into the educational institution and into Danish society at large. The findings presented in this volume suggest that while English may be the most prominent language in international study programmes, it is important to also consider the role of Danish for inclusion into the educational institution at large and into Danish society.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank our contact at KEA, Iben Ørbæk Andersen, the 29 students at KEA and our MA students at the University of Copenhagen who participated in this study and made it possible. It has been quite remarkable to witness the energy, dedication and skill the students all put into this project, particularly considering the difficult circumstances caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. We are also grateful to Jacob Thøgersen for reading earlier versions of all chapters in the volume and providing helpful feedback to the authors as well as us.

Notes

¹ The numbers represent students with a non-Danish or non-Nordic citizenship and without prior educational experience at primary or secondary level in Denmark.

² In June 2021 while this issue was being prepared for publication, a large majority of the Danish parliament agreed on reducing English-language programmes in Denmark (Uddannelses og forskningsministeriet 2021). Citing increasing expenses for the Danish students' Grants and Loans Scheme (SU) for transnationally mobile European students as the main problem, the agreement targets English-language programmes in university colleges in particular. The agreement text notes that the English-language university college programmes have 72% English-speaking students, and only 21% find work in Denmark after graduation. With some minor exceptions, all these programmes will therefore be shut down or rebranded as Danish-language programmes from 2022. As part of the same agreement, university colleges will get an annual bonus if they manage to increase the percentage of international students who find a job in Denmark after graduation.

References

- Angouri, Jo & Marlene Miglbauer. 2014. 'And then we summarise in English for the others': The lived experience of the multilingual workplace. *Multilingua* 33(1-2). 147-172.
- Brinkmann, Svend & Steinar Kvale. 2018. *Doing interviews*. 2nd ed. London: SAGE.
- Cavanaugh, Jillian R. 2020. Language ideology revisited. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 263. 51-57.
- Damsholt, Tine & Marie Sandberg. 2018. *Af lyst eller nød. En etnologisk undersøgelse af integration mellem forskning og undervisning i praksis*. Københavns Universitet: Det Humanistiske Fakultet.

- Damsholt, Tine, Hanne Nexø Jensen & Camilla Østerberg Rump (eds.). 2018. *Videnskabelse på universitetet. Veje til integration af forskning og undervisning*. Frederiksberg: Samfundslitteratur.
- Dovchin, Sender. 2019. Language crossing and linguistic racism: Mongolian immigrant women in Australia. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses* 14(4). 334–351.
- ELAN (Version 5.9) [Computer software]. 2020. Nijmegen: Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, The Language Archive. <https://archive.mpi.nl/tla/elan>.
- Fabricius, Anne H., Janus Mortensen & Hartmut Haberland. 2017. The lure of internationalization: Paradoxical discourses of transnational student mobility, linguistic diversity and cross-cultural exchange. *Higher Education* 73(4). 577–95.
- Flubacher, Mi-Cha, Renata Coray & Alexandre Duchêne. 2016. Language, integration, and investment: The regulation of diversity in the context of unemployment. *Multilingua* 35(6). 675–696.
- Flubacher, Mi-Cha, Alexandre Duchêne & Renata Coray. 2018. *Language investment and employability: The uneven distribution of resources in the public employment service*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hazel, Spencer & Janus Mortensen. 2013. Kitchen talk – Exploring linguistic practices in liminal institutional interactions in a multilingual university setting. In Hartmut Haberland, Dorte Lønsmann & Bent Preisler (eds.), *Language alternation, language choice and language encounter in international tertiary education*, 3–30. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Kirilova, Marta & Dorte Lønsmann. 2020. Dansk – nøglen til arbejde? Ideologier om sprogbrug og sproglæring i to arbejdskontekster i Danmark. *Nordand – Nordisk tidsskrift for andrespråksforskning* 15(1). 37–57.
- Kraft, Kamilla & Dorte Lønsmann. 2018. A language ideological landscape: The complex map in international companies in Denmark. In Tamah Sherman & Jiri Nekvapil (eds.), *English in business and commerce*:

- Interactions and policies*, 46–72. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Københavns Universitet [University of Copenhagen]. n.d. Hvad er forskningsintegration? [What is research integration?]. <https://fbu.ku.dk/forskningsintegration-paa-ku/forskningsundervisningstrappen>.
- Lønsmann, Dorte. 2017. A catalyst for change: Language socialization and norm negotiation in a transient multilingual workplace. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 27(3). 326–343.
- Lønsmann, Dorte. 2014. Linguistic diversity in the international workplace: Language ideologies and processes of exclusion. *Multilingua* 33(1–2). 89–116.
- Lønsmann, Dorte. 2011. *English as a corporate language. Language choice and language ideologies in an international company in Denmark*. PhD Dissertation. Roskilde University, Dept. of Culture and Identity.
- Millar, Sharon. 2017. The sociolinguistic economy in contexts of transience and change in Danish multinational companies. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 27(3). 344–360.
- Millar, Sharon, Sylvie Cifuentes & Astrid Jensen. 2013. A social representational perspective on languages and their management in the Danish corporate sector. In Anne-Claude Berthoud, Francois Grin & Georges Lüdi (eds.), *Exploring the dynamics of multilingualism. The DYLAN project*, 101–120. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Moore, Emilee, Eulalia Borràs & Luci Nussbaum. 2013. Plurilingual resources in lingua franca talk: An interactionist perspective. In Hartmut Haberland, Dorte Lønsmann & Bent Preisler (eds.), *Language alternation, language choice and language encounter in international tertiary education*, 53–84. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Mortensen, Janus. 2018. Language regulation in collaborative student writing: A case study. *Language and Education* 32(6). 529–47.

- Mortensen, Janus. 2014. Language policy from below: Language choice in student project groups in a multilingual university setting. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 35(4). 425–42.
- Mortensen, Janus. 2010. *Epistemic stance marking in the use of English as a lingua franca: A comparative study of the pragmatic functions of epistemic stance marking in problem-solving sequences at student project group meetings, with special emphasis on meetings where English is used as a lingua franca*. PhD Dissertation. Roskilde University, Dept. of Culture and Identity.
- Mortensen, Janus & Anne H. Fabricius. 2014. Language ideologies in Danish higher education: Exploring student perspectives. In Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen & Jacob Thøgersen (eds.), *English in Nordic universities: Ideologies and practices*, 193–223. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Nekvapil, Jiří & Tamah Sherman. 2013. Language ideologies and linguistic practices: The case of multinational companies in Central Europe. In Erzsébet Barát, Patrick Studer & Jiří Nekvapil (eds.), *Ideological conceptualizations of language: Discourses of linguistic diversity*, 85–117. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Simpson, James & Anne Whiteside (eds.). 2015. *Adult language education and migration: Challenging agendas in policy and practice*. London: Routledge.
- Söderlundh, Hedda. 2013. Language choice and linguistic variation in classes nominally taught in English. In Hartmut Haberland, Dorte Lønsmann & Bent Preisler (eds.), *Language alternation, language choice and language encounter in international tertiary education*, 85–102. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Spradley, James. 1979. *The ethnographic interview*. New York: Holt, Rinehard and Winston.
- Steinhoff, Kathrin Maria. 2011. English, please! The English language as an element of inclusion/exclusion: The dilemmas of an 'international' university. MA thesis. Roskilde University, Dept. of Culture and Identity.

- https://rucforsk.ruc.dk/ws/files/57615403/-English_please_Master_thesis.pdf
- Tange, Hanne & Jakob Lauring. 2009. Language management and social interaction within the multilingual workplace. *Journal of Communication Management* 13(3). 218–32.
- Uddannelses og forskningsministeriet [Danish Ministry of Higher Education and Science]. 2021. Aftale om reduktion af engelsksprogede videregående uddannelser [Agreement on reduction of English-language programmes in higher education]. [https://ufm.dk/lovstof/politiske-aftaler/aftale-om-reduktion-af-engelsksprogede-videregaende-uddannelser.pdf](https://ufm.dk/lovstof/politiske-aftaler/aftale-om-reduktion-af-engelsksprogede-videregaende-uddannelser/aftale-om-reduktion-af-engelsksprogede-videregaende-uddannelser.pdf). Last accessed 10 September 2021.
- Uddannelses- og Forskningsministeriet [Danish Ministry of Higher Education and Science]. 2018a. Uddannelses- og Forskningsudvalget. UFU, Alm.del. Endeligt svar på spørgsmål 162. <https://www.ft.dk/samling/20171/-almdel/ufu/spm/162/svar/1499193/1913887.pdf> Last accessed 2 March 2021.
- Uddannelses- og Forskningsministeriet [Danish Ministry of Higher Education and Science]. 2018b. Justering af engelsksprogede uddannelser [Adjustment of English-language educations]. <https://ufm.dk/publikationer-/2018/filer/pjece-justering-af-engelsksprogede-uddannelser.pdf>. Last accessed 18 September 2020.
- Wilczewski, Michał, Anne-Marie Søderberg & Arkadiusz Gut. 2018. Intercultural communication within a Chinese subsidiary of a Western MNC: Expatriate perspectives on language and communication issues. *Multilingua* 37(6). 587–611.
- Woolard, Kathryn A. 1998. Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In Bambi B. Schieffelin, Kathryn A. Woolard & Paul V. Kroskrity (eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory*, 3-47. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Appendix 1

Interview guide

Welcome and introduction to the interview

- **Thank the interviewee for their participation:** I'm so glad that you wanted to participate in this interview.
- **Consent and purpose:** So, in this interview I am going to ask you some questions. We are going to talk for an hour or so. As you may remember from the information sheet, I am part of a research project where we are interested in knowing about how you, as an international student, experience studying in Denmark, and what it's like to be in an environment where different languages are used. You have already signed the consent form – thank you very much for that! – but do you have any questions about the interview at this point?
- **Recording and rights explanations:** I would like to record our conversation by using Zoom. Would that be okay with you? When we use this interview for our research, you will be anonymous.
At any point, if you do not wish to continue with the interview, you can just let me know. You don't have to give a reason. Also, if you would like to withdraw from the study after the interview is over, you can always contact us, using the contact details on the consent form.
- **Questions and answers:** Basically, I'm interested in knowing something about *you* about *your* experiences as an international student. So, there are no wrong answers. If you want me to repeat or rephrase something, you are always more than welcome to ask me to do that.
Do you have any questions before we begin?
Okay great! Let's start.

Theme 0: Getting to know you

- Okay, to get us started, could I perhaps ask you to tell me a little bit about yourself and your background?
- How long have you been in Denmark for?
- How long have you been studying here at KEA?
- What do you study at KEA?
- Why did you decide to come to Denmark to study?
- Which languages do you speak?

Theme 1: Being an international student at KEA

- Could you describe what a typical day at school looked like for you before the lockdown?
 - What sort of activities were you typically involved in during a day?
 - Who do you spend time with?
 - How do you keep in touch with your fellow students?
- Did you participate in social activities at KEA apart from classes?
- Could you describe one of these events for me?
- How has the lockdown affected your school activities and other activities at KEA?

- Thinking about the time *before* as well as *during* the lockdown, which languages are involved as part of your studies?
 - Which languages do you use yourself at school?
 - Which languages do others use – inside as well as outside of class?
 - Do you use different languages for schoolwork and more social stuff?
- Could you give examples of situations where English, Danish and other languages are used?
 - Perhaps in class? – in group work? – during breaks? – for reading textbooks? – when you're online as part of your studies?

- Have you ever been in a situation at KEA where language was a barrier?
 - Can you give an example?
 - Can Danish be a barrier? (How? Can you give an example?)
 - Can English be a barrier? (How? Can you give an example?)
 - Can other languages be a barrier? (How? Can you give an example?)
 - Can you give an example of a time where you missed out on information because it was not available in a language that you understand?

Theme 2: Language and social integration in Danish society

- Can you describe a typical day in your life *outside KEA* before the lockdown and now?
 - Who do you talk to? Online or face-to-face?
 - How do you spend your time?
- Who do you spend most of your time with?
 - What languages do you speak when you hang out with your friends outside school?
 - What languages do you use with your family?
- Do you have a job?
 - What does a typical day/shift at work look like?
 - What languages do you use at work?
- What languages do you use in shops/with Danish authorities/other places you can think of?

Theme 3: Language ideologies and attitudes

- Is it important to be good at English at school?
 - Does it matter what sort of accent you have?
 - Do you think that your fellow students are good at English?
 - Can you give examples?

- Have you experienced a situation where you had trouble communicating with someone at KEA in English?
- How do you feel about speaking English? And Danish?
 - In class?
 - In social situations?
- Before you started as a student at KEA, did you have an idea of what languages would be used here?
- Did you need any formal language qualifications to be enrolled in the program?
 - What do you think of the requirements or the lack of requirements?
 - Do you think there should be additional/fewer requirements?
- Do you know if KEA has a language policy? (rules concerning language use)
 - [If yes] Do you know what it says in the language policy?
 - [If no] Do you think it would be helpful to have such rules/guidelines at KEA?
 - If you don't know, what do you think KEA's language policy would be or should be?
- Are there any unwritten rules about language use at KEA?
 - Can you give an example?
- Imagine I'm a student who wants to apply for an education at KEA. What advice would you give me in relation to language use?

Theme 4: Language learning and future plans

- Where did you learn English?
 - Have you actively pursued improving your English after you've come to Denmark?
 - Have you attended English language classes?
- Have you actively pursued learning Danish – why/why not?
 - Have you attended Danish language classes?

- When do you use Danish? / Are there situations where you wish you knew Danish?
- Do you think it is necessary to learn Danish as an international student in Denmark?
 - Can you give an example of a situation where you would benefit from knowing Danish?
 - If no, why not?
- What are you planning to do after you finish studying at KEA?
 - Have you thought about where you want to live?
 - Is Denmark an option? Why/why not?
- Do you think it is necessary to learn/know Danish to live in Denmark after graduation?
 - Why/why not?

Rounding off

- I don't have any more questions for you. Is there anything you would like to add? Anything we haven't covered yet?
- Thank you so much for taking the time to do this interview. I really appreciate it. If any questions come up afterwards, you are always welcome to get in touch. Our contact information is on the information sheet.

Appendix 2

Transcription key

Pauses shorter than 0.3 seconds	(.)
Pauses measured in seconds	(0.6)
Overlap	[]
False start/self-interruption	-
Latch	=
Uncertainty	??
Unintelligible speech	xxx
Meta-comments	(())
Inbreath	.hhh

CHARTING THE LANGUAGE IDEOLOGICAL LANDSCAPE OF DANISH HIGHER EDUCATION: LONG-TERM INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVES ON DANISH AND ENGLISH

Simone Møller Krogh

Recent years have seen a surge of internationalization in Danish higher education, inevitably altering the linguistic practices of the classroom. Through the analysis of interview data, this chapter addresses language ideologies surrounding English and Danish from the perspectives of long-term international students. The three students interviewed perceive English as the natural lingua franca among international students, and they even suggest that the use of English as a lingua franca facilitates the creation of a group identity among international students. Furthermore, the interviewees explicitly voice a high degree of tolerance toward non-standard varieties of English, thus valuing communicative effectiveness higher than aligning with certain norms. In terms of Danish, the students agree that Danish is nice-to-know, but not need-to-know in order to live in Denmark. While the students know of expats who perceive Danish as a local, unimportant language, they themselves believe that knowing Danish eases social integration into and cultural understanding of Danish society. In sum, this chapter contributes to filling a gap in the literature by addressing language ideologies from the perspective of long-term international students in Denmark.

Introduction

The turn of the millennium heralded an era of internationalization in European institutions of higher education, facilitated and characterized by the use of English as a lingua franca. Increased transnational mobility of researchers, lecturers, and students rapidly changed language practices in classrooms and lecture halls, and today many institutions of higher education offer international programs, i.e., English medium instruction (EMI) programs, parallel to or in lieu of programs conducted in the local language. Key motivations underlying the use of EMI include attempts to attract funding and international talents as well as attempts to strengthen the foreign language competencies of local staff and students (Hultgren et al. 2014). Crucially, however, the shift to EMI has presented its own linguistic, cultural, and pedagogical obstacles, resulting in, e.g., higher student dropout rates and increased workload for students and staff (Henriksen et al. 2018, 2).

Northern European countries have been among the front runners in adopting EMI and internationalizing higher education. Using Denmark as a case in point, the effects of such endeavors are clearly seen: From 2004 to 2016, Denmark experienced a tripling in the number of international students (Uddannelses- og Forskningsministeriet [Ministry of Higher Education and Science] 2018, 5). Furthermore, no less than 28% of Danish higher education programs were taught in English in 2018 (Uddannelses- og Forskningsministeriet [Ministry of Higher Education and Science] 2018, 7), thus contrasting with the way Danish enjoyed almost complete monopoly in higher education during the twentieth century (Mortensen and Haberland 2012, 185). EMI and transnational student mobility have thus unquestionably become integral parts of Danish higher education. Such developments are mirrored in the spread of English in Danish society more generally. Although Danish remains the native language of most people living in Denmark, many encounter English on a daily or weekly basis, and the majority of Danes consider themselves quite proficient in English (Preisler 2003). This

may in part be due to the fact that many Danes see English as “the default foreign language of Danes” in addition to English indexing modernity and internationalism (Thøgersen 2010, 321).

The multilingual landscape of Danish universities has received considerable attention. Existing research can be divided into two groups according to the primary focus: research on language practices, i.e., the actual languages used in everyday life, and research on language ideologies, i.e., beliefs about languages. While this is necessarily a simplification, not least because the two influence each other, the dichotomy may be helpful in surveying the existing literature (Hultgren et al. 2014, 2).

A substantial body of research has focused primarily on language practices by examining general developments (Mortensen and Haberland 2012) or by zooming in on language practices from the perspective of students (Hazel and Mortensen 2013) and academic staff (Jürna 2014; Preisler 2014; Tange 2010; Thøgersen 2013). With regard to language ideologies, some research examines how ideologies manifest themselves in top-down imposed language policies (Hultgren 2014; Saarinen and Taalas 2017) or bottom-up in student project groups (Mortensen 2014). Less attention, however, has been given to language ideologies articulated by the day-to-day performers of university internationalization. A notable exception to this is Mortensen and Fabricius (2014) who explored ideologies of different forms of English among Danish and international students. Interestingly, they found that while students to some degree subscribed to ideologies favoring standard varieties of English, the students emphasized the importance of communicative effectiveness (Mortensen and Fabricius 2014, 220). Mortensen (2018) similarly explored language ideologies among Danish and international students, zooming in on students’ joint writing activities. He found that the students in this study also emphasized meaning over form, and that self-imposed language regulations

were to some extent medium-specific, i.e., some norms applied to spoken language, others to written language (Mortensen 2018, 541-542).

Other studies of interest—albeit conducted in a corporate context—are Lønsmann’s (2014; 2015) explorations of language ideologies in an international company in Denmark. She found English to be considered the language of power, prestige, and internationalization, while Danish was regarded as the natural language in Denmark and perceived as necessary for social mobility (Lønsmann 2015, 350). Despite the presence of other languages than English and Danish, these were attributed little value (Lønsmann 2015, 353). Crucially, Lønsmann emphasizes the need for future research to consider the entire language ideological landscape and relate it to the local context as well as actual language practices (2015, 354).

In this chapter, I present results from a study on language ideologies based on interviews with three international students at KEA (Copenhagen School of Design and Technology, in Danish: *Københavns Erhvervsakademi*), an institution of higher education in Denmark. While the students interviewed attend or have attended an international program taught in English, they encounter a multitude of other languages on a daily basis within and outside of KEA. Consequently, international study programs with their diverse and ever-changing student populations—what has elsewhere been defined as a “transient multilingual community” (Mortensen 2013, 37)—are particularly interesting sites to investigate multilingual and multicultural diversity as manifested in language ideologies.

The aim of this chapter is thus to examine language ideologies among international students with a particular focus on ideologies related to English and Danish. Methodologically, I employ discourse analysis to elucidate language ideologies as emergent from the interview data. While most previous studies have taken universities as their locus of study, this chapter (alongside the other contributions to this volume) is novel in that it studies language ideologies among

international students at a non-university tertiary educational institution. Additionally, the students interviewed constitute an under-researched group given that they are all long-term transnational residents in Denmark, thus representing a different perspective than that of the “typical” transient international student. Although it is reasonable to expect some shared language ideologies between different institutions of higher education as well as between short-term and long-term international students, these cannot be assumed a priori.

The chapter is structured as follows: After this introductory section with a brief review of existing literature comes a section on language ideologies as a theoretical framework. The third section provides information concerning the specific sociocultural setting of the study, followed by a section that presents the three interviewees and methodological considerations specific to this chapter. The fifth section combines analysis and discussion of the results while the final section presents the conclusions.

Language ideologies and semiotic processes

The study of language ideologies began in earnest with Silverstein’s influential formulation of linguistic ideologies as “any sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use” (1979, 193). Various scholars have since contributed with other definitions, many of which emphasize the sociocultural aspect such as language ideology being “the cultural (or subcultural) system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interests” (Irvine 1989, 255) or language ideologies as “shared bodies of commonsense notions about the nature of language in the world” (Rumsey 1990, 346). For the purpose of the present chapter, I align with what I believe to be a simple, yet effective, definition of language ideologies as “beliefs, or feelings, about languages as used in their social world” (Kroskrity 2004, 498).

Common to most researchers in the field is the view of language ideologies as tied in with the social position of the speaker (Woolard and Schieffelin 1994, 58). A speaker's social position is marked by social constructs such as gender, race, and class as well as previous experiences. As a result, language ideologies are "inherently plural", at all times partial and positioned because it is always possible to view the world from a different perspective (Irvine 2012). This effectively means that various complementary and competing language ideologies often coexist in any given community of practice (Kroskrity 2004, 503). A related consequence is that language ideologies are not necessarily true from an objective point of view; however, as Hultgren et al. note, "[i]deological constructs are just as 'real' as observed practices in the sense that they shape our world and they have real, concrete consequences" (2014, 13).

The framework of language ideologies may thus productively be used to explore beliefs and assumptions about the social world and, in turn, shed light on how people structure and perceive the external world. Similarly, language ideologies are employed in "the creation and representation of various social and cultural identities" (Kroskrity 2004, 509), playing a particularly important role in mapping the boundaries between social groups. In this respect, it is worth mentioning Irvine and Gal's (2000) model of the semiotic processes of iconization, erasure, and fractal recursivity, which has proven a useful tool to reveal ideological representations of linguistic differences between groups. Iconization refers to the supposedly inherent linkage of a given linguistic feature with a certain group. The process of erasure involves the (un)conscious disattention to persons, activities, or sociolinguistic phenomena inconsistent with the ideological schema, often causing these to become invisible. Finally, fractal recursivity refers to the replication of opposition at one level to another level (Irvine and Gal 2000, 37-38).

While language ideologies may be shared across different communities of practice, they should always be consid-

ered in their specific sociocultural setting. Like the other chapters of this volume, the sociocultural setting informing the study presented below is the product of influences from Danish society in general and KEA more specifically. Coincidentally, all three students interviewed for the present chapter attend or have attended the same international Academy Profession (AP) Degree Program at KEA, thus justifying a brief presentation of such programs below.

The setting: KEA and international programs

KEA offers eleven international programs, most of which are English-language equivalents to Danish programs. Consequently, such international programs are often presented as separate but identical with the exception of the language of instruction. While no official statistics on the distribution of students in Danish and international programs exist (to my knowledge), the interviewees state that in the case of their particular AP Degree Program (which I refrain from naming here in order to ensure the anonymity of participants), only few Danes choose the international program while the Danish program is primarily comprised of Danes. This may, at least partially, be explained by different language requirements for admission into the Danish and international programs.

The curricula for Danish and international programs present respectively Danish and English as the primary language of instruction although cross-program electives are offered in Danish and/or English. Consequently, students from Danish and international programs may be mixed when taking their electives as was indeed the case for two of the three students interviewed (one had not yet taken electives). Chances are therefore that international students at KEA—at least for a semester or two—will encounter a larger proportion of Danish in the classroom (e.g., classmates talking) compared to other languages. While KEA thus advertises their international degrees as programs conducted in English, the local language may still play a key role in the program.

Data material

The data analyzed in this chapter was collected as part of the research project “Language, Identity and Inclusion” led by associate professors Dorte Lønsmann and Janus Mortensen from the University of Copenhagen. Based on interviews conducted and transcribed by student groups at the University of Copenhagen, the research project examines language use at international study programs at KEA. This chapter only examines the three interviews conducted by myself and my fellow group members Cathrine Pape and Annette J. Madsen.

Methodological considerations

In line with procedures outlined by Lønsmann and Mortensen, Cathrine Pape, Annette J. Madsen, and I each conducted an online interview in English with an international KEA student of 1 to 1½ hours. The interviews were recorded via the videoconferencing software Zoom. The interviewer and interviewee could see and hear each other, while another group member attended the interview as a passive observer to make a back-up recording. The interview guide developed for the research project (see Appendix 1 in Lønsmann and Mortensen, this volume) was used to loosely structure the interviews, thus tapping into a range of topics with some questions directly addressing language ideologies and others invoking them indirectly, thus potentially providing insights into different but coexisting value systems.

Following each interview, the interviewer produced a low granularity transcript of the interview in ELAN (ELAN 2020). I then coded and analyzed the three interviews in order to identify key sequences, some of which have been reproduced as transcripts in this chapter. Informed by Bucholtz's (2000) discussion of reflexive transcription practices, I have opted for naturalized transcripts using standard spelling rules (except for the occasional nonce word) interspersed with certain oral discourse features, e.g., (filled) pauses, repairs, and repetitions. For my analysis I used a discourse analytic approach informed by Paltridge (2016), focusing both on what

is said and how it is said in order to chart language ideologies as expressed directly and indirectly.

The design of the current study is largely influenced by superimposed considerations related to the subsequent use of the data in the larger research project, which leads to a number of methodological caveats. One such is the choice of interviews as data. Although interviews are rich sources of information, the interview situation is necessarily artificial, and professed beliefs about languages may reveal little about actual practices. Further insights—with regard to actual practices in particular as well as the interplay between language use and language ideologies—may thus have been obtained by coupling the interviews with other ethnographic methods such as participant observation (Duranti 1997, 103). Another caveat is the inevitable heterogeneity of the interviews as a result of making student researchers responsible for an interview each, e.g., due to differences in researcher positionality, combined with a lack of experience with conducting interviews. On the other hand, the interview situation may have benefitted from being framed as a peer (the student researcher) interviewing another peer (the KEA student). Had the interviewer been a professional researcher, this could have resulted in a power disequilibrium.

A final remark on the use of Zoom to conduct interviews is in order. While the initial research design involved face-to-face interviews, the COVID-19 induced lockdown necessitated online data collection. Although research on the use of videoconferencing tools for research purposes remains scarce, a recent study by Archibald et al. (2019) reports positively on researchers and participants' experiences with using Zoom for qualitative interviews. Our group likewise experienced Zoom as a worthy replacement of face-to-face interviews despite minor technical difficulties, e.g., initial problems with turning the microphone on and the occasional lag due to poor internet connection. Once the call had been established, the unusual circumstances (i.e., the lockdown and the use of Zoom) even provided a good starting point for some small

talk before initiating the actual interviews. From the very beginning, the interviewees appeared to be at ease in the situation, a potentially added bonus from participating in an online interview from the comfort of your own home.

The participants

The students interviewed by my group were Pablo, Basha, and Maria (see Table 1, which includes information about the interviewees, their respective first language [L1] and the interviewers). Pablo is in his mid-thirties and first came to Denmark in 2014 from a country in South America, where he had studied English. He used to be married to a Danish woman with whom he has a child, who is the primary reason Pablo has chosen to stay in Denmark. Over the years, Pablo has developed an extensive social network in Denmark that includes Danes and other expats. At the time of the interview, Pablo was about to complete his second semester of the AP Degree Program and planned to apply for a top-up program at KEA upon graduation.

Basha came to Denmark from Poland as a young teacher in 2014 as part of an EU program allowing her to teach at an educational institution abroad. Following a brief period where she traveled back and forth between Poland and Denmark to visit her Danish boyfriend, Basha permanently moved to Denmark in the middle of 2015. The two now have a child. Like Pablo, Basha's social network includes Danes and expats. When the interview was conducted, Basha was finishing up the AP Degree Program and had applied for a top-up program at KEA. In addition to the degree awarded from this particular AP Degree program, Basha has a humanities degree as well as her own company.

The last interviewee, Maria, was recruited to the study by Basha. Maria is a Portuguese woman in her thirties and came to Denmark in 2014. She received her first degree in Portugal, but since neither Maria nor her Portuguese fiancé were able to find jobs in Portugal, they decided to try their luck abroad. While they have built a life for themselves in Den-

mark, their social network is primarily comprised of other expats. At the time of the interview, Maria had recently finished her studies at KEA and was taking a gap semester before potentially applying for a top-up program at KEA.

Table 1. Overview of interviews

Interview	Interviewee's L1	Interviewer
#1 – Pablo	Spanish	Cathrine Pape
#2 – Basha	Polish	Simone Krogh
#3 – Maria	Portuguese	Annette J. Madsen

Notably, Pablo, Basha, and Maria are all established expats. Unlike exchange students who study abroad for a brief period of time (often only one or two semesters), all three interviewees have been living in Denmark approximately six years with large social networks and other commitments firmly anchoring them in Danish society. Such information thus needs to be kept in mind when exploring the data below.

Language ideologies among international students

The following two sections comprise my analysis and discussion of the students' beliefs about English and Danish as well as the underlying language ideologies they may be indicative of.

English as the natural lingua franca, even though “nobody speaks English perfectly”

This AP Degree Program at KEA may be considered a prime example of a transient multilingual community, comprised as it is of individuals with different linguistic and cultural backgrounds grouped together for two years while pursuing their degrees. As the interviewees note, this manifests itself in the concurrent use of various languages for social and academic activities alike. In addition to linguistic competencies, each student also brings with her certain language ideologies shaped by prior sociocultural experiences, many of which are

renegotiated in this new and foreign setting. Despite the linguistic pluralism inherent in the AP Degree Program, its nature as an EMI program establishes English as the foremost lingua franca of academic activities, whether it be in classroom discussions or during group work.

The use of English as “natural” is remarked upon by all students with the following statement from Maria as representative of their beliefs: “I study international course so (.) everything was in English”. The use of “so” indicates an implication of causality, i.e., that because the program is international, the language used must necessarily be English. Implicit in Maria’s statement is also her indirect subscription to the well-known ideology of English as the language of internationalization (cf. Thøgersen 2010; Lønsmann 2015), which is seen in the way she equates “international” and “English” as well as her unquestioned acceptance of the use of English at an international program. Later in the interview, she reiterates this belief when recounting an episode where a student from the Danish program asked the teacher a question in Danish in the presence of international students:

Example 1

01 Maria: the English line was a bit (.) er
02 (0.4) international line was a bit
03 .hhh er (.) mad about that
04 be[cause they would like]
05 Annette: [ha ha ha]
06 Maria: for them to speak in English
07 because it’s international .hhh
08 at least with the teacher I don’t
09 say they don’t speak i- Danish
10 together as a group or as a .hhh
11 er i- that is fine for us it’s no
12 problem but at least with
13 the teacher .hhh you we would like
14 them to speak in English so you
15 could understand also =
16 Annette: = mhm =
17 Maria: = er [or at]
18 Annette: [that’s]

19 Maria: least the teacher will explain
20 exactly what they said if they
21 cannot er (.) in any ways er
22 .hhh explain them in English

Several things are of interest here. First, Maria voices an expectation that matters relevant to the entire class are handled in English, not Danish, although students from both the Danish and international programs are present. Secondly, her self-correcting behavior when changing “the English line” to “the international line” is interesting. While “the English line” may simply be shorthand for “the English-language line”, this seems unlikely since neither Maria nor the other students at any other point refers to their program as “the English line”. Rather, Maria’s alternation between the words “English” and “international” suggests that she (sub)consciously considers the two synonymous. Finally, this example with its repeated juxtaposition of “we”, i.e., international students, and “they”, i.e., Danish students, reveals how language use may nurture the creation of groups based on language, something I will return to at the end of this section.

The ideology of English as the language of internationalization is also directly expressed by the students. When asked whether her attitude toward English has changed after coming to Denmark, Basha explains that although she never liked English, she perceives it as necessary for communicating with people across the world:

Example 2

01 Basha: I definitely reevalute er my
02 ?hatred? towards English .hhh
03 [er]
04 Simone: [ha ha] ha ha ha .hhh (0.4)
05 Basha: er we do get er get along and be
06 friends er because it was
07 impossible to avoid it erm (.) erm
08 (.) I was traveling way too much
09 er so I I was in er too much need
10 of using it and er you (0.6) could
11 not (1.1) you know patch it out
12 (0.9) with just other languages

As a result of extensive traveling and living abroad, Basha has thus come to perceive English as superior in terms of usefulness. A similar belief is expressed by Maria when comparing English with her native language; while she can only use Portuguese with certain people (i.e., speakers of Portuguese), such restrictions do not apply to English since everyone speaks it:

Example 3

01 Annette: what are your feelings er towards
02 er (.) the .hhh the English
03 language and and .hhh and er er
04 the ability to to speak English
05 (2.3)
06 Maria: ?right? I think I think it's a
07 really practical language it
08 doesn't have much er (0.9) but
09 probably it's also because of
10 Denmark this i- in Portuguese I
11 feel that when talking .hhh in (.)
12 er Portuguese would depend on the
13 people I have to do .hhh in some
14 other ways [er] depend on
15 Annette: [mm]
16 Maria: the people that I xxx when talking
17 in English I don't feel that so I
18 think it's like a really practical
19 and (0.3) freedom language who can
20 speak er in the same way for
21 everyone that you talk

In this excerpt, Maria thus contrasts Portuguese and English, and by labeling the latter as “practical” she indirectly positions Portuguese as “unpractical” or at least “less practical than English”. Implicit is furthermore Maria’s conception of English as representing some kind of neutral ground of communication, which is “the same way for everyone” regardless of one’s L1. Interestingly, Maria later modifies this belief when referring to native English speakers, a point I will return to below.

In addition to being “practical”, Maria also describes English as a “freedom language”. While this ties in nicely with

her personal experience as an expat relying on English to communicate with non-Portuguese people, using a word like “freedom” inevitably invokes certain connotations. Maria does not pursue the notion of English as liberating further, but what Pablo says when asked to evaluate the English competencies of his classmates adds an intriguing dimension:

Example 4

01 Cathrine: what about (.) the other students
02 do you think they're good at
03 speaking English
04 Pablo: .hhh (0.6) mmm (0.4)
05 yeah I think so
06 Cathrine: mhm (0.4)
07 Pablo: yeah (0.5) [I think] it's er
08 Cathrine: [yeah]
09 Pablo: all they're they're a lot younger
10 than me they're between twenty and
11 thirty (0.7) ah (0.3)
12 [twenty twenty-five] let's say
13 Cathrine: [ha ha ha]
14 Pablo: [.hhh er ha ha .hhh] (.)
15 Cathrine: [ha ha ha]
16 Pablo: erm (0.6) but (.) but of course we
17 are more prepared for er (0.3) for
18 the world in a in a way .hhh they
19 all come from countries where (.)
20 most of them at least (.) where
21 maybe the future is not so bright
22 as [it is] here .hhh erm hhh
23 Cathrine: [yeah]
24 Pablo: so er it makes sense that they
25 prepare themselves (.) for er for
26 speaking at least (0.4)
27 Cathrine: ye[ah]
28 Pablo: [I've] noticed a lot of er typos
29 and bad grammar (0.7) but (0.8)
30 they can communicate and that (.)
31 that should be enough
32 the rest comes with er practice

In other words, Pablo not only perceives English skills as useful in a global world, thereby aligning with the ideology of English as the language of internationalization; he even considers such skills necessary to escape less bright futures. English thus not only indexes internationalization, it also indexes “the good life” and social mobility in a global world.

The example above with Pablo commenting on other students’ “typos and bad grammar” is further illustrative of the interviewees’ awareness of and beliefs about “good” and “bad” English. Other studies (e.g., Fabricius and Mortensen 2014; Lønsmann 2014) have found that English spoken by native speakers, i.e., someone with a “standard” accent and a high level of competence, is often associated with prestige and evaluated more positively than nonstandard varieties. The interviewees in this study, however, do not unequivocally seem to subscribe to such an ideology favoring standard varieties. In Maria’s experience, encounters with native speakers or people highly proficient in English tend to be problematic for both parties; they may have problems understanding her English, while she herself becomes intimidated and gets “the feeling that [she’s] not speaking really correctly”. As evident from the excerpt below where Pablo answers a question regarding the importance of accents, it is clear that he does not particularly admire native speaker competence or accent either:

Example 5

01 Pablo: accent is not important in KEA
02 (0.4)
03 Cathrine: because [there are so]
04 Pablo: [?no one?]
05 Cathrine: many different nationalities
06 [so]
07 Pablo: [yeah] no [no]body speaks
08 Cathrine: [yeah]
09 Pablo: English perfectly (0.5)
10 Cathrine: no that’s [true]
11 Pablo: [the] the closer you
12 get is er is er an American girl
13 in my class (0.6) er and let’s

14 face it Americans don't speak
15 the best English [either ha ha ha]
16 Cathrine: [ha ha ha ha ha]

While Pablo in this excerpt recognizes his American classmate's superior English competence, he also rejects the importance of this by adding a derogative comment about American English. This comment should presumably be understood fully or predominantly as a joke given the following bursts of laughter from both Pablo and Cathrine (not transcribed in full). The crucial point from this excerpt, however, is Pablo emphasizing that "accent is not important in KEA" and "nobody speaks English perfectly"—whatever mistakes one makes are therefore irrelevant as long as the general message comes across.

Maria aligns with this belief; when asked whether it is important to be good at English to study at KEA, she notes:

Example 6

01 Maria: I think it's not er a big deal if
02 it's er if you don't er (0.3)
03 speak something correctly
04 I think the teachers doesn't =
05 Annette: = mm =
06 Maria: = you know at least I don't didn't
07 feel (0.7) er (0.3) any
08 disapproval of if I sp- (0.4)
09 speak something in
10 wrong in English

Once again, the importance of speaking English flawlessly is downplayed—to the interviewees, English is simply a tool for communication. This resonates with the findings of Mortensen and Fabricius (2014) and Mortensen (2018), who also found the utilitarian value of English rather than correctness to be emphasized among students at an international program.

Curiously, both Mortensen and Fabricius (2014) and Mortensen (2018) found that students nevertheless also displayed a certain (often implicit) reverence toward "standard"

varieties of English; a reverence that is replaced simply with an awareness of standard and nonstandard varieties in the current study. However, a brief comparison of the students interviewed by Mortensen and Fabricius and those in the current study reveals two factors that may (partially) explain such lack of reverence. First, Pablo, Basha, and Maria have all been expats for a considerably longer period of time than the students interviewed by Mortensen and Fabricius, perhaps desensitizing them to the ideology idealizing “standard” varieties of English. Second, the interviewees of this study attend a study program primarily comprised of international students that are non-native speakers of English, while the study program examined by Mortensen and Fabricius was comprised of 70% Danish students and 30% international students (2014, 198). Since Danes are generally perceived to have quite good English skills—in this study as well as in the one by Mortensen and Fabricius—correctness may have been ascribed a larger role at that particular program due to a predominance of Danish students (but see the contribution by Andersen in this volume for students at KEA who seem to subscribe to ideologies that are more favorable towards “standard” varieties of English).

Overall, the three students explicitly voice a high degree of tolerance toward different accents and levels of competence in English. According to Basha, this general acceptance of linguistic diversity owes to the fact that international students frequently encounter people from all over the world, each of whom speaks English in their own unique way. As she notes in the example below, nonstandard varieties are therefore not evaluated negatively:

Example 7

01 Basha: some languages has a strong erm
02 (1.5) er ?features? of the
03 pronunciation from its own er
04 language and that’s also very hard
05 to remove and actually I think
06 it’s it’s pretty charming (.) .hhh
07 [er]

08 Simone: [mhm]
09 Basha: that sometimes you can meet er and
10 and speak English and er with the
11 people that you don't know and
12 then just guess okay which culture
13 (0.6) er er you are and from where
14 you are er based er through the
15 way how you pronouncing .hhh so we
16 we we finding it charming and er
17 (0.3) erm and we don't have that
18 (.) problem that we are (0.3)
19 we all feel (0.4)
20 that we are not perfect (0.5) that
21 we are not (0.3) ashamed of it

Notably, Basha—like Maria in Example 1—repeatedly uses the first-person plural pronoun in this excerpt, thus invoking group solidarity by positioning herself as a speaker of a non-standard variety of English. In other words, she implies that international students are in this together while refuting the presence of ideologies idealizing standard varieties. And as evident in Maria's statements in example 6, this leniency toward the English of other non-L1 speakers of the language seems to extend to the interviewees' own English skills. As will be seen in the next section, however, the students seem to place higher demands on themselves when it comes to their Danish skills.

Considering Irvine and Gal's (2000) model, it is evident that the semiotic processes of iconization and erasure are employed in creating and sustaining a group identity shared between international students. The inherent heterogeneity of the student population at this international AP Degree Program makes the use of English as a lingua franca one of the sole unifying factors, rendering such a linguistic practice iconic of them as international students vis-à-vis Danish students speaking Danish. In a similar vein, erasure is employed in the neutralization of in-group differences, i.e., the way that the heterogeneity of Englishes spoken by international students is disregarded or explained away with the purpose of strengthening group identity.

Danish as nice-to-know, not need-to-know

While English seems to hold a special position among international students at this AP Degree Program, they are all residents of Denmark, making it interesting to examine their ideologies relating to Danish. First, however, a brief characterization of the students' knowledge and use of Danish is in order.

The three students interviewed have all taken Danish language classes for a prolonged period of time; nevertheless, they rate their Danish skills very differently. Basha and Pablo have both completed five modules of Danish language classes (the equivalent of B2 in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR)) and reportedly use it on a daily basis, not least because they each have a Danish-speaking child. They generally prefer to use Danish with Danes, whether they be friends, authorities, or check-out assistants at the supermarket. Furthermore, they both repeatedly emphasize their fascination with learning and speaking foreign languages; Pablo, for instance, defines himself as "a bit of a language nerd", while Basha explicitly highlights her knowledge of an impressively high number of languages.

Maria, on the other hand, characterizes herself as a "not really good person in languages". Although she has some knowledge of French and Spanish in addition to having completed four modules of Danish (the equivalent of B1 in CEFR), she does not believe her Danish is very good. The reason for this, she explains, is partly due to Danish being difficult and time-consuming to learn and partly due to a lack of opportunities for her to practice Danish since the majority of her social circle is comprised of expats with whom she speaks English. Occasionally, however, she tries out her Danish skills when talking to strangers. In the following excerpt, Maria describes a successful conversation in Danish with an employee from her unemployment fund, who later complimented Maria on her Danish skills:

Example 8

01 Annette: how does that make you feel when

02 when when (.) when (0.5) when she
 03 said that (.)
 04 Maria: yeah I f- I feel happy that I
 05 [?did?] good
 06 Annette: [yeah]
 07 Maria: but .hhh [I] I think I I cannot
 08 Annette: [ha ha ha]
 09 Maria: understand completely what she
 10 says so it's always like in er
 11 (0.3)
 12 Annette: mhm (.)
 13 Maria: a half feeling of good and er
 14 (0.5) trying to be better or
 15 something .hhh
 ...
 16 Maria: I I prefer that (0.4) they speak
 17 in in Danish with me and continue
 18 and try than just pass to English
 19 and .hhh basically for me if they
 20 pass to English without say
 21 anything it's basically saying
 22 you're not speaking .hhh
 23 any Danish at all

As Maria explains, receiving praise for her Danish, i.e., having her hard work acknowledged, makes her happy. On the other hand, she also has mixed feelings about it because conversations in Danish remind her of how much she still has to learn. Additionally, the latter part of the excerpt illustrates how Maria often finds her lack of Danish skills to be exacerbated by discouraging learning environments—as she explains, Danes tend to switch to English although she addresses them in Danish. Although Danes may do this for various reasons, e.g., to accommodate Maria's limited Danish skills or to ensure easy and efficient communication, they presumably construct Maria as a non-Danish speaker and concurrently belittle her efforts to learn the language.

While Pablo and Basha both describe themselves as good speakers of Danish, they also recount frustrating experiences and desires to “push” themselves to get better at the language. The following example where Pablo notes a self-imposed need to prove himself to his child is a case in point:

Example 9

01 Pablo: usually when my kid is here I
02 speak Spanish to him (0.3)
03 Cathrine: yeah (0.7)
04 Pablo: but er (0.9) but when when other
05 people are involved he speaks
06 Danish so he speaks Danish around
07 me and and if there's other people
08 involved then I'll speak Danish
09 too (.) [just to] like (0.3)
10 Cathrine: [okay]
11 Pablo: prove to my kid that I can

Examples 8 and 9 illustrate that the students strive for a good command of the Danish language; elsewhere, Basha even notes—in all seriousness—“you know I still cannot read Danish poetry”. Such a desire to master the Danish language is not expressed to the same degree with English, which is perceived primarily as a tool for communication. In other words, the students seem to subscribe to an ideology idealizing native-like competence of Danish, likely due to the permanent nature of their stay in Denmark.

While all three students have some knowledge of Danish, the interviewees frequently state that such knowledge is not a requirement to live in Denmark. In the following excerpt, Pablo unpacks a number of beliefs entertained by other expats who perceive Danish as “useless”:

Example 10

01 Pablo: most international groups that
02 are er highly educated .hhh
03 they're like (0.9) mm I don't want
04 to learn Danish (.) it's u[seless]
05 Cathrine: [okay]
06 Pablo: (0.8) ?so that's? a lot of my
07 friends I don't know if it's er if
08 it's like that everywhere .hhh but
09 (0.3) er (.) they are all like no
10 I don't care about Danish (0.5)
...

11 Pablo: anybody can just live here for
12 twenty years without learning a
13 single drop of Danish and they're
14 gonna be fine because .hhh Danish
15 people are really really good at
16 language (0.5) and =
17 Cathrine: = thank you ha ha [ha]
18 Pablo: [I] as I've er
19 heard (0.5) they they know Danish
20 is not a big language .hhh (1.1)
21 so they know they've got better
22 chances if they learn a second
23 language like English

Several things are of interest here. First, it seems to be a widespread belief among expats that communication with Danes does not necessitate knowledge of the local language; the expats instead seem to rely on Danes' language skills, which are generally believed to be quite good. Curiously, Pablo does not specify that Danes are good at English but languages in general. Given the context and the predominance of English in the sociolinguistic landscape of Denmark, it is reasonable to assume that Pablo is in fact referring to Danes' English skills, although he elsewhere in the interview also mentions Danes impressing him with their Spanish skills.

Second, the lack of need to learn Danish seems to be coupled with strategic considerations on behalf of the expats. As Pablo notes in the example, Danish is a little used language in a global context, and expats therefore generally perceive Danish as a relatively unimportant language. Instead, the expats seem to prefer to focus their attention on other languages giving them a greater advantage in a globalized world. In other words, these expats see their stay in Denmark as temporary, as transient in nature, and knowing English more than fulfills their needs while in Denmark. Such beliefs echo those found by Jürna (2014, 242) among international staff at a Danish university with many respondents indicating that learning Danish requires a disproportionate amount of energy compared to the potential gain. Two somewhat contradictory ideologies are thus at play here: An ideology valuing

foreign language skills positively and an ideology constructing Danish as a local language not worth the time and effort.

If an ideology of Danish as a local and unimportant language is prevalent among expats, why do Pablo, Basha, and Maria strive to learn it? Personal motivations such as family relations aside, they all subscribe to the ideology of Danish being the natural language in Denmark as also found by Lønsmann (2014; 2015). This ideology manifests itself in numerous ways. First, the interviewees perceive Danish skills as practical in preventing potential language barriers when speaking with Danes who do not speak English. Interestingly, the interviewees seem to believe it is their responsibility to be cooperative and ensure ease of communication by learning and using Danish rather than regarding this a joint responsibility shared between interlocutors. Such beliefs may thus be indicative of the “one nation, one language” ideology identified by Lønsmann (2014, 108) in which it is the migrant’s responsibility to overcome any linguistic barriers.

In addition to Danish being convenient, knowledge of the local language is also seen as valuable for other reasons. Pablo, for instance, perceives Danish skills as necessary for social mobility and career advancement: “if there is another one that’s as good as you (0.4) that speaks Danish (.) they’re gonna get him”. In contrast to example 4 where Pablo links English skills with the vague statement of coming from countries where “the future is not so bright”, Danish skills are closely tied to the Danish job market. The relationship between linguistic skills and social integration in Denmark is also emphasized, e.g., Maria states at one point that it would be “weird” not to be able to say “good morning” in Danish. When asked how she would recommend future international students to prepare themselves for studying at KEA, Basha emphasizes both cultural and linguistic knowledge as essential. In the excerpt below, she recounts her own experiences of how knowledge of Danish made her feel at home in Denmark (underscored by the “house”-imagery in line 15):

Example 11

01 Basha: I would (0.5) more advice to (0.8)
02 get a little bit of culture (0.7)
03 and and knowing some language it's
04 also because it's er it's a huge
05 difference in each day life (1.0)
06 er since the moment that I er
07 start to be able to use Danish
08 normally in everyday life I (1.0)
09 I feel so relaxed and so welcome
10 (.) er (.) [I can] see
11 Simone: [mm]
12 Basha: the difference of er approaching
13 er (0.5) Danish people and how
14 they reacting to me and I know
15 (0.9) it's more (0.3) my house
16 than it was before

Basha's observation that Danes perceive her differently when she approaches them in Danish is particularly interesting and echoed by the other students. A similar point is made by Lønsmann (2014, 112), who found that both international and Danish employees shared the belief that Danish was important for social inclusion as knowing Danish indexes a willingness to integrate into Danish society.

Interestingly, the students not only highlight the relationship between language skills and social integration; they explicitly point to knowledge of Danish as providing a window on Danish culture. In the excerpt below, Basha explains the way cultural understanding is intertwined with linguistic abilities:

Example 12

01 Simone: would you say that (.)
02 international students (0.4) er
03 in Denmark (0.4) benefit from
04 knowing Danish like do you think
05 it's necessary or is it more like
06 an extra advantage in your opinion
07 (0.6)

08 Basha: .hhh I mean er it's it's different
 09 er of the goal erm (.) if somebody
 10 is aiming to stay here for longer
 11 (0.3)
 12 Simone: mhm
 13 Basha: then definitely because er (0.8)
 14 erm (0.3) I mean it's er (0.9)
 15 whenever you are (.) er the first
 16 half year (.) first year (0.9) you
 17 have a pink glasses on your nose
 18 and and things are (.) just
 19 gorgeous (.)
 20 Simone: ha ha [ha ha .hhh]
 21 Basha: [no there is (.) there is]
 22 nothing wrong this is a paradise
 23 culture right (0.3) .hhh but (.)
 24 you know the the glasses will
 25 crash eventually and then you will
 26 erm (0.6) er you will gonna (.)
 27 see some details that er (0.5) you
 28 know will give a pain in your eye
 29 even erm (0.5) and you can easily
 30 misunderstand it (.) erm (0.3) and
 31 er you're gonna have a
 32 culture shock and if you won't
 33 get any language (0.8) er classes
 34 yo- you won't understand it and
 35 eventually (1.7) hhh it's not that
 36 you (.) gonna hate (0.4) the the
 37 the culture .hhh but you're not
 38 gonna be a part of it

Using pink glasses as a metaphor, Basha here indirectly describes Oberg's (1960) widely used model of cultural adjustment: From the honeymoon phase, where a place is "gorgeous" and has "a paradise culture", to the stage of cultural shock marked by misunderstandings and details giving you "a pain in your eye". Similar to Oberg, Basha points to language competencies as key to understanding the new cultural environment, ultimately paving the way for social integration. In sum, the interviewees seem to view learning Danish as closely related to putting down roots in Danish soil, thus laying bare an ideology in which nation and language are two

sides of the same coin. This may not least be due to the permanence of the interviewees' living situations—as Pablo at one point notes, “Denmark is my home now”.

As illustrated above, different ideologies surrounding Danish coexist among expats in Denmark. While some expats reportedly perceive Danish as a local language not worth the effort, the interviewees clearly subscribe to an ideology of Danish as the natural language in Denmark, e.g., due to the ways it eases social mobility, social integration, and cultural understanding. In terms of Gal and Irvine's semiotic processes, the interviewees thus perceive knowledge of Danish as iconic of being part of Danish society, something the interviewees all seem to aspire to. That being said, the students generally regard foreign language competencies as immensely valuable, and all three interviewees express a desire to learn more languages or improve existing skills. Living abroad seemingly provides a particularly ideal setting to learn a new language compared to simply conjugating verbs in a classroom—as Pablo notes, “this is a perfect opportunity to learn a weird language”.

Concluding remarks

In this chapter, I have presented results from an analysis of prevalent language ideologies of English and Danish among long-term international students at KEA. As members of a transient multilingual community, the international students navigate a complex environment marked by the constant negotiation of norms and local practices shaped in situ. Even so, English enjoys special status as the “natural” lingua franca used among international students, probably due to the uncontested ideology of English as the language of internationalization. The students generally display heightened awareness and acceptance of linguistic diversity as expressed in their positive attitudes toward nonstandard Englishes, whether it be in terms of accents or levels of competence. This thus contrasts with common language ideologies positioning

standard varieties as ideals to strive for. Rather, linguistic solidarity characterizes the beliefs of the international students: Your accent and whatever “mistakes” you make are irrelevant as long as you are able to convey your message.

The second section of the analysis further investigated ideologies of Danish among international students, revealing a multiplex web of contradictory but coexisting beliefs. While the interviewees know of other expats who view Danish as a local and unimportant language, the interviewees themselves believe that Danish skills facilitate social integration into and cultural understanding of Danish society. Ideologies of Danish as a local, unimportant language versus Danish as the natural language in Denmark thus seem to coexist among expats. Furthermore, the interviewees generally regard it as their responsibility that communication with Danes progresses smoothly, and in such situations, Danish is assigned a key role. Interestingly, the interviewees are more prone to subscribing to an ideology favoring native-like competence in Danish than in English; while English is primarily viewed as a tool for communication, knowledge of “correct” Danish is seen as a potential source of pride.

In addition to contributing to the literature on language ideologies in an educational context, this chapter distinguishes itself by focusing exclusively on the perspectives of long-term international students in the setting of an Academy Profession Degree Program rather than a university. More often than not, international students are transient and comprise a minority of the student population at international programs in the Danish context, a fact often reflected in other studies investigating language attitudes and ideologies in Scandinavian countries (cf. Kuteeva et al. 2015; Mortensen 2014; Mortensen 2018; Söderlundh 2012). In contrast, international students by far outnumber the Danish students at this particular AP Degree Program. The linguistic practices and ideologies of the interviewees are thus contingent on the very structure of the AP Degree Program with its separate but identical programs taught in respectively Danish and English, resulting in the creation of a collective group identity among

the international students based on English as a lingua franca. Future research may benefit from further exploring the ways in which AP Degree Programs compare with university programs, e.g., in terms of different student populations, distinct approaches to learning, and mandatory internships.

In sum, this chapter presents findings which merit further investigations in order to fill the gap in existing research identified in the introduction, i.e., language ideologies as expressed by long-term international students at non-university institutions of education. In addition to consolidating the above findings, addressing the nexus between ideology and practice by broadening the scope of methodologies to, e.g., quantitative surveys and participant observation, may further prove illuminating in order to assess the relationship between language ideologies and actual practices. Only through the application of various theoretical and methodological perspectives will it be possible to chart the multilingual landscape of Danish higher education in this age of internationalization.

References

- Archibald, Mandy M., Rachel C. Ambagtsheer, Mavourneen G. Casey & Michael Lawless. 2019. Using Zoom videoconferencing for qualitative data collection: Perceptions and experiences of researchers and participants. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 18. 1–8.
- Bucholtz, Mary. 2000. The politics of transcription. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32. 1439–1465.
- Duranti, Alessandro. 1997. *Linguistic anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ELAN (Version 5.9) [Computer software]. 2020. Nijmegen: Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, The Language Archive. <https://archive.mpi.nl/tla/elan>.
- Hazel, Spencer & Janus Mortensen. 2013. Kitchen talk—exploring linguistic practices in liminal institutional

- interactions in a multilingual university setting. In Hartmut Haberland, Dorte Lønsmann & Bent Preisler (eds.), *Language alternation, language choice and language encounter in international tertiary education*, 3–30. Berlin: Springer.
- Henriksen, Birgit, Anne Holmen & Joyce Kling. 2018. *English medium instruction in multilingual and multicultural universities: Academics' voices from the Northern European context*. London: Routledge.
- Hultgren, Anna Kristina. 2014. Whose parallellingualism? Overt and covert ideologies in Danish university language policies. *Multilingua* 33(1-2). 61–87.
- Hultgren, Anna Kristina, Frans Gregersen & Jacob Thøgersen. 2014. Introduction. In Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen & Jacob Thøgersen (eds.), *English at Nordic universities: Ideologies and practices*, 1–26. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Irvine, Judith T. 1989. When talk isn't cheap: Language and political economy. *American Ethnologist* 16. 248–267.
- Irvine, Judith T. 2012. Language ideology. In *Oxford bibliographies online: Anthropology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/obo/9780199766567-0012>.
 Last accessed 24 February 2021.
- Irvine, Judith T. & Susan Gal. 2000. Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In Paul V. Kroskrity (ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, Politics, and Identities*, 35-84. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Jürna, Merike. 2014. Linguistic realities at the University of Copenhagen: Parallel language use in practice as seen from the perspective of international staff. In Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen & Jacob Thøgersen (eds.), *English at Nordic universities: Ideologies and practices*, 225–250. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Kroskrity, Paul V. 2004. Language ideologies. In Alessandro Duranti (ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology*, 496–517. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Kuteeva, Maria, Niina Hynninen & Mara Haslam. 2015. "It's so natural to mix languages": Attitudes towards English-medium instruction in Sweden. In Andrew Linn, Neil Bermel & Gibson Ferguson (eds.), *Attitudes towards English in Europe*, 193–212. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Lønsmann, Dorte. 2014. Linguistic diversity in the international workplace: Language ideologies and processes of exclusion. *Multilingua* 33(1-2). 89–116.
- Lønsmann, Dorte. 2015. Language ideologies in a Danish company with English as a corporate language: "It has to be English". *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 36(4). 339–356.
- Mortensen, Janus. 2013. Notes on English used as a lingua franca as an object of study. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 2(1). 25–46.
- Mortensen, Janus. 2014. Language policy from below: Language choice in student project groups in a multilingual university setting. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 35(4). 425–442.
- Mortensen, Janus. 2018. Language regulation in collaborative student writing: A case study. *Language and Education* 32(6). 529–547.
- Mortensen, Janus & Anne Fabricius. 2014. Language ideologies in Danish higher education: Exploring student perspectives. In Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen & Jacob Thøgersen (eds.), *English in Nordic universities: Ideologies and practices*, 193–224. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Mortensen, Janus & Hartmut Haberland. 2012. English—the new Latin of academia? Danish universities as a case. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 216. 175–197.

- Oberg, Kalervo. 1960. Cultural shock: Adjustment to new cultural environments. *Practical Anthropology* 7. 177–182.
- Paltridge, Brian. 2012. *Discourse analysis*. London & New York, NY: Bloomsbury.
- Preisler, Bent. 2003. English in Danish and the Danes' English. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 159. 109–126.
- Preisler, Bent. 2014. Lecturing in one's first language or in English as a lingua franca: The communication of authenticity. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 46(2). 218–242.
- Rumsey, Alan. 1990. Wording, meaning and linguistic ideology. *American Anthropologist* 92(2). 346–361.
- Saarinen, Taina & Peppi Taalas. 2017. Nordic language policies for higher education and their multi-layered motivations. *Higher Education* 73. 597–612.
- Silverstein, Michael. 1979. Language structure and linguistic ideology. In Paul R. Clyne, William F. Hanks & Carol L. Hofbauer (eds.), *The elements: A parasection on linguistic units and levels*, 193–247. Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Söderlundh, Hedda. 2012. Global policies and local norms: Sociolinguistic awareness and language choice at an international university. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 216. 87–109.
- Tange, Hanne. 2010. Caught in the Tower of Babel: University lecturers' experiences with internationalization. *Language and Intercultural Communication* 10(2). 137–149.
- Thøgersen, Jacob. 2010. Coming to terms with English in Denmark: Discursive constructions of a language contact situation. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 20(3). 291–326.
- Thøgersen, Jacob. 2013. Stylistic and pedagogical consequences of university teaching in English in Europe. In Hartmut Haberland, Dorte Lønsmann & Bent Preisler (eds.), *Language alternation, language*

choice and language encounter in international tertiary education, 181–199. Berlin: Springer.

Uddannelses- og Forskningsministeriet [Danish Ministry of Higher Education and Science]. 2018. Justering af engelsksprogede uddannelser [Adjustment of English-language educations].

<https://ufm.dk/publikationer/2018/filer/pjece-justering-af-engelsksprogede-uddannelser.pdf>. Last accessed 18 September 2020. Archived version at: <https://web.archive.org/web/20210223203629/https://ufm.dk/publikationer/2018/filer/pjece-justering-af-engelsksprogede-uddannelser.pdf>

Woolard, Kathryn A. & Bambi B. Schieffelin. 1994. Language ideologies. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23. 55–82.

THE VALUE OF LEARNING DANISH: LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES AT AN INTERNATIONAL STUDY PROGRAMME IN DENMARK

Karen-Sofie Ahrenfeldt Madsen

Using the theoretical framework of language ideologies, this chapter explores ideologies of English and Danish among international students at a professional bachelor programme in Denmark in relation to the students' thoughts and decisions about learning Danish. Analysing individual qualitative interviews with three students, the study finds that the interviewees talk about learning Danish in terms of its short-term and long-term 'value'. To two of the students, learning Danish is only worth 'investing in' if they are planning on staying in Denmark long-term whereas the third student believes that being able to speak Danish is useful in a short-term perspective as well as a long-term one. The students express three recurring language ideologies that can be seen to inform their thoughts and decisions about learning Danish: 'English is the language of international business', 'English is enough' and 'Danish is useful in Denmark'. As such, this chapter offers a view into how the interviewees experience their social worlds through language.

Introduction

This chapter is part of a larger research project taking place at Copenhagen School of Design and Technology (KEA) which aims to shed light on how language practices, language ideologies and language policies impact processes of learning and

processes of social inclusion for Danish and international students in international study programmes.

With 11 study programmes taught entirely in English and 1145 international students as of June 2020, the situation at KEA clearly reflects the ongoing internationalisation of Danish educational institutions. The consequences of increasing internationalisation of educational institutions in Denmark are many, but one is that international students coming to Denmark to study have to consider whether they want to learn Danish. As part of the larger research project at KEA, three in-depth interviews were conducted with three international students facing this choice. As the study programmes at KEA are taught entirely in English, at least in principle, learning Danish is in many cases an optional decision that international students have to make actively, and one that is often informed by underlying assumptions about language. One way to tap into these underlying assumptions is the theoretical framework of language ideologies, which can help us unpack how international students think about language. On that background, the research question explored in this chapter is: Which language ideologies in relation to English and Danish do international students at KEA express, and how do these beliefs relate to the participants' thoughts and decisions about learning Danish?

Language ideologies as a theoretical frame

For this chapter, I make use of the theoretical framework of language ideologies. The concepts of language ideologies and language attitudes have many overlaps and are often used interchangeably. The concept of language ideologies, however, comes from the tradition of linguistic anthropology (Garrett 2010, 34) whereas the notion of language attitudes originates in the field of social psychology (Garrett 2010, 19). According to Kroskrity, there is a tendency for studies using the framework of language attitudes to use more quantitative methods where language ideologies studies tend to use more

qualitative methods (Kroskrity 2016). In Garrett (2010), language attitudes are understood as a 'methodological option for studying language ideologies' (Garrett 2010, 35).

Definitions of language ideologies vary greatly and there is no clear definition of language ideologies that all scholars can agree on. An early definition of language ideologies is that of Silverstein who defines them as 'any sets of beliefs about language articulated by the users as rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use' (Silverstein 1979, 193). Central to this definition is that language ideologies are seen as explicitly articulated. Rumsey has offered a broad and relatively simple definition of language ideologies, which he sees as 'shared bodies of common-sense notions about the nature of language in the world' (Rumsey 1990, 346). According to Kroskrity, however, this definition is controversial because it 'does not problematize language ideological variation (by age, gender, class etc.) and therefore promotes an overly homogenous view of language ideologies within a group' (Kroskrity 2006, 496). In an attempt to capture 'a wide range of analytic possibilities', Kroskrity defines language ideologies as 'beliefs, or feelings, about languages used in their social worlds' (Kroskrity 2006, 498; 512).

For the purpose of this chapter, I adopt Kroskrity's broad definition because of the range of analytic possibilities it offers. My understanding of language ideologies draws on Kroskrity's idea of language ideologies as context bound as they are 'grounded in social experience' (Kroskrity 2006, 503). Central to my understanding of language ideologies is also that language ideologies are ideas that are rarely questioned by the speakers expressing them, as they are seen as 'common-sense' as Rumsey (1990) describes them, or 'naturalized' which means that they are seen as 'universally and/or timelessly true' (Woolard and Schieffelin 1994, 58). This aspect is echoed in Garrett's definition of ideology which 'comprises a patterned but naturalised set of assumptions and values about how the world works, a set which is associated with a particular social or cultural group' (Garrett 2010, 34).

In this chapter, ideologies are furthermore understood as multiple. Kroskrity states that '*language ideologies are profitably conceived as multiple* because of the plurality of meaningful social divisions (class, gender, clan, elites, generations, and so on) within sociocultural groups that have the potential to produce divergent perspectives expressed as indices of group membership' (Kroskrity 2006, 503; emphasis in the original). People will necessarily have different social experiences, even within sociocultural groups, and their varying social experiences will lead to multiple, different language ideologies that can exist alongside each other at the same time.

Language ideologies can be expressed both explicitly and implicitly: 'Ideology is variously discovered in linguistic practice itself; in explicit talk about language, that is, metalinguistic or metapragmatic discourse; and in the regimentation of language use through more implicit metapragmatics' (Woolard 1998, 9). This means that an analysis of language ideologies can focus on what is explicitly expressed by the users or the implicit assumptions that underlie and inform what the language users express.

Language ideologies are particularly useful as a theoretical framework 'because they offer a way of analysing how people make sense of the social world, particularly the linguistic part of the world' (Lønsmann 2015, 341). I use language ideologies as a framework because they can tell us about many things other than language: 'Ideologies of language are significant for social as well as linguistic analysis because they are not only about language' (Woolard and Schieffelin 1994, 55). Language ideologies can also have an effect on the behaviours of people in their social worlds. Seargeant incorporates this view in his definition of ideologies as 'any entrenched system of beliefs which structures social behavior' (Seargeant 2009, 40). This view is also clear from Woolard's introduction to *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* where she says of language ideologies that 'the point is not just to analyze and critique the social roots of linguistic ideologies but to analyze their efficacy, the way they transform the

material reality they comment on' (Woolard 1998, 11). As such, language ideologies can be seen to have the potential to transform or structure behaviour and the material reality. This relationship between language ideologies and behaviour is clearly not straightforward, but there is widespread consensus in the literature that language ideologies can inform our opinions and decisions. In this chapter, I use the framework of language ideologies to explore the common-sense beliefs about languages used in their social worlds as expressed by the participants and discuss how these beliefs might inform their thoughts about learning Danish.

Literature review

Ideologies in relation to English and Danish in a Danish context was one subject of inquiry in Lønsmann's (2011) PhD thesis. Through fieldwork at Lundbeck, a Danish multinational pharmaceutical company, she identified several language ideologies and discussed the hierarchy of languages at that company. Lønsmann (2014) examined how language ideologies influence processes of social in/exclusion in the same Danish company and how language ideologies organise varieties of English hierarchically. In Lønsmann (2015), she further elaborated her research on language ideologies at Lundbeck where she found that Danish is seen as 'natural' in Denmark, English is linked to quality, power and prestige and English is seen as the only international language.

Similar to this final point, Haberland (2009) has discussed the ideology of English as the 'language of globalism' where English becomes 'the only relevant international language on a global scale' (2009, 33), and Thøgersen (2010) has investigated Danes' attitudes towards English where English is constructed as the default foreign language of the world.

Language ideologies at international study programmes in Denmark have also been the focus of Mortensen and Fabricius (2014). They were interested in language ideologies in transient multilingual communities and investigated

language ideologies in a Danish university setting. They identified the parameters of competence and effectiveness as important to the students' evaluation of English but observed that the students also articulated more familiar language ideologies as they preferred 'native' English varieties and accents.

In a recent article, Kirilova and Lønsmann (2020) analyse language ideologies in relation to language learning in two different work contexts in Denmark. They find that Danish is considered a necessary skill for refugees, but not for academics employed at a Danish university. They also find that both ideologies can affect the groups' experiences.

Similar to this chapter, many of the above articles also make use of the language ideologies framework (Kirilova and Lønsmann 2020, Lønsmann 2011, 2014, 2015, Mortensen and Fabricius 2014). Because of its specific interest in language ideologies and language learning at an international study programme in Denmark, this chapter relates more closely to Mortensen and Fabricius (2014) with their focus on language ideologies at an international study programme in Denmark and to Kirilova and Lønsmann (2020) with their focus on how language ideologies affect international staff at Danish universities and refugees' motivation in relation to language learning. In the analysis and discussion below, I will discuss the language ideologies described in the above articles in relation to the language ideologies identified in this chapter.

Methods

Background information

The data set explored in this chapter consists of three interviews with international students on their fourth semester of an international study programme at KEA. The students arrived in Denmark just before starting their studies and at the time of the interviews (May 2020), they had been living in Denmark for approximately 18 months. All interviews were conducted in English and only the interviewer and the participant were present.

Interview 1

The interviewee, William, is from Finland and his first language is Swedish. He also speaks English, Finnish and some Danish, which he describes as very 'Swedish-like'. He has attended Danish lessons and found them too easy. I conducted this interview.

Interview 2

The second interviewee is Anna who is from Sweden. Her first language is Swedish, but she also speaks English, Norwegian and Danish. Anna knew Danish before coming to Denmark as she had to speak 'Nordic' (a mix of Danish, Swedish and Norwegian) for her previous job as a ski guide. This interview was conducted by my fellow student, Cathrine Sommer Jacobsen.

Interview 3

The third interviewee in this data set is Peter. Peter is from England and his first language is English. Peter states multiple times during the interview that he does not speak any other language than English, but he does say that he knows the basics of French, Spanish and Italian from travelling and the basics of Danish from living in Denmark. Camilla Randsøe, another of my fellow students, conducted this interview.

Data collection

The general methodological framework of the study has been covered in the editors' introduction to the volume, so I will only touch upon issues that are specific to the research interest of this chapter and my own data collection.

Garrett (2010) outlines three broad approaches to the study of people's language attitudes, namely a direct approach, an indirect approach and what he calls societal treatment studies. While language attitudes differ from language ideologies (as discussed above), I find that this outline of approaches can be used to describe research into language ideologies as well. Where an indirect approach means 'using more subtle, even deceptive, techniques' (Garrett 2010, 41), the data collection approach for this chapter can be seen as a

mix of the direct and indirect approach as the interview guide consisted of questions directly related to language such as ‘Does it matter what sort of accent you have?’ (with this particular question being inspired by an interview guide developed by Anne Fabricius, cf. Fabricius and Mortensen (2013)), but also what Spradley (1979) calls ‘grand tour questions’ which might let the interviewer tap into unconscious attitudes – or underlying ideologies – as well (cf. Garrett 2010, 42-3).

Because of the COVID-19 pandemic, the interviews could not take place in person as originally planned. Instead, the interviews had to be conducted and recorded via the online communication platform Zoom. Hoffman recommends that interviewers try not to draw too much attention to recording equipment because ‘the presence of recording equipment highlights the artificial nature, or at least, the main purpose of the interview’ (2014, 35). When conducting an interview over Zoom, however, the participant is constantly reminded that they are being recorded as they will be looking at the recording equipment throughout the interview. This awareness of being recorded could lead to not only the participants but also the interviewer feeling more self-conscious and as a result speaking less freely. In the case of the KEA interviews, the interviewers were aware that their interviews would be used for further research by their teachers, and this may also have contributed to a heightened degree of self-awareness. In my interview with William, I experienced a shift in how the conversation was flowing at the end of the session where the interaction became more casual. It is not clear, however, if this difference was caused by William or me behaving differently because the recording was stopped or because an hour had passed at this point.

Data analysis

Following the interview, my fellow students and I made a low-granularity transcription of the interview we had conducted, using the annotation software ELAN (2020). These rough transcriptions aimed at providing an overview of what was being said in the interview, but the transcription of an interview can

also be thought of as the first step of the analysis as it always involves judgments and decisions about what to transcribe and how to transcribe it (Brinkmann and Kvale 2018, ch. 8). The transcriptions were shared in smaller groups, which left me with three interviews in total (as outlined above) for further qualitative analysis.

My approach to the analysis of the three interviews was based on 'meaning coding' (Brinkmann and Kvale 2018, ch. 9). This implies that I mainly focussed on the meaning of what was said in the interviews and analysed the interviews as sources of meaning rather than focusing on linguistic form (Brinkmann and Kvale 2018, ch. 9). According to Brinkmann and Kvale, the analysis of interviews can either be guided by inductive, deductive or abductive processes – or a combination of the three. An inductive approach entails establishing a theory on the basis of the data, a deductive approach will start out with existing theory and use it to explain the data, while abduction entails that the researcher through inference tries to form an understanding of the underlying 'logic' of something that is "initially diffuse" (Brinkmann and Kvale 2018, ch. 9). I would describe my approach as a combination of abductive and inductive reasoning as my analytical process involved trying to infer what sort of language ideologies would serve as plausible explanations for the worldviews expressed by each individual interviewee and subsequently identifying similarities across the interviews.

The interviews were coded in ELAN. In order to code the interviews, I watched and listened to the recordings several times. I started out trying to use unmotivated looking while taking notes, but my process became more guided by my research question as I made the initial codes. I proceeded to refine my codes and group them by theme and finally into categories. I could then search for codes and categories across the interviews, which enabled my analysis of the interview data as I was able to establish recurring themes.

My coding of the interviews was thus data driven rather than concept driven as I started out without codes and developed them throughout the coding process rather than using

codes that had been developed in advance (Brinkmann and Kvale 2018, ch. 9). However, the fact that I had already decided on a research question before beginning to code the interviews will undoubtedly have affected my choice of codes. My codes consisted both of analyst's codes such as 'language competence' or 'self-evaluating' and informants' codes such as 'Scandinavian/Nordic language'.

Analysis

Through my coding and categorisation of the interview data, many recurrent themes were identified across the three interviews. One theme that I want to particularly focus on in my analysis is how the Danish language is seen as a commodity by the participants. Linguistic commodification can be explained as a process where 'language comes to be valued and sought for the economic profit it can bring through exchange in the market, rather than for some other form of significance' (Park and Wee 2012, 125). We see this process when the participants talk about learning Danish based on considerations related to its short-term or long-term 'value'.

To the participants in this data set, learning Danish is seen as an 'investment' that only really has 'value' if they plan on staying in Denmark after graduation. When asked how he feels about speaking Danish, Peter expresses his thoughts on learning Danish like this:

Example 1

```
01 Peter:          so for me I guess for me
02                ?in? (.) investing ?in?
03                learning the language (1.5)
04                it would (0.6)
05                I would have to kind of be
06                (2.0) like confident that I
07                was probably gonna be here
08                for say the next six
09                or seven years or (0.3)
10                whereas I kind of don't know
11                (0.8) I mean I hope to be
```

12 beyond my studies um
 13 for how long
 14 I don't know (.) so
 15 (...)
 16 for me to to learn it (1.5)
 17 it would just probably depend
 18 on like time and how long
 19 I was gonna be here
 20 and what my like long-term
 21 long-term plan was
 22 if I was to know that (0.4)
 23 et cetera et cetera (.) um

In this example, it appears that Peter sees his short-term and long-term plans as the determining factors for whether he chooses to learn Danish. It seems that to Peter, learning Danish is an investment that will only pay dividends if he stays in Denmark after graduation but is not worth it if he is only staying in Denmark for a shorter period of time.

A similar answer is given by William when asked whether he thinks it is necessary to learn Danish as an international student in Denmark:

Example 2

01 Karen-Sofie: um do you then think it's
 02 necessary to learn Danish
 03 as an international student
 04 in Denmark
 05 (2.0)
 06 William: um I feel like (.) in in a
 07 short-term (.) perspective
 08 like (0.9) if you're only
 09 planning on staying here
 10 during your degree
 11 (0.7)
 12 Karen-Sofie: yeah=
 13 William: =uh (0.5) I don't really
 14 see the (1.0) like (1.2)
 15 I don't see too much value
 16 in learning Danish (1.2)
 17 [u]m (1.9)
 18 Karen-Sofie: [?yeah?]
 19 William: but if you're planning on

20 staying here (0.3) then
21 (0.8) definitely

Like Peter, William also expresses that short-term and long-term plans are the determining factors for whether learning Danish has value. What is clear from these examples is that learning Danish is expressed in terms of being 'valuable' and an 'investment' but is considered by the participants in a short-term versus long-term perspective. In the following sections, I will illustrate and discuss some language ideologies that appear to be informing the participants' belief that Danish is only worth learning if they will be staying in Denmark after graduation.

Danish is 'not really the go-to business language' in multinational companies

The first ideology I want to discuss as informing the participants' decisions about learning Danish is the 'English is the language of international business' ideology. This idea is something that particularly two of the participants express in their interviews. This language ideology posits English as the 'obvious' language of international business while Danish is seen as having little – if any – value in an international business setting.

When talking about the necessity of learning Danish as an international student in Denmark, it is clear from William's answer that he does not see it as useful in a more internationalised setting outside Denmark:

Example 3

01 William: uh I would say it's (0.4)
02 it's uh a matter of how long
03 you're (.) uh you're planning
04 on staying here
05 (0.6)
06 Karen-Sofie: yeah okay
07 William: ?cause? I I don't see
08 if you (0.5) if you go (1.1)
09 move back to let's say London
10 or somewhere after that (.)

11 ?well? what are you gonna use
 12 (.) Danish f[or]
 13 Karen-Sofie: [ha] ha
 14 [ha]
 15 William: [ha] ha ha (.) it's not really
 16 uh (1.1) the go-to
 17 business language in like
 18 (0.6) multinational companies
 19 or (0.5) [u]h
 20 Karen-Sofie: [no] no ha ha
 21 [ha]
 22 William: [the sa]me with Finnish like I
 23 I don't see any point [of]
 24 Karen-Sofie: [ha ha]
 25 William: ha ha ha keeping up my Finnish
 26 but (0.7) other than connecting
 27 with old friends

While Danish and Finnish can be used in social situations such as connecting with old friends, William does not see 'any point of' learning Danish if he is not going to be living in Denmark long-term.

The explicitly expressed belief that Danish is not a plausible option as the 'go-to business language in like multinational companies' (lines 16–18) is likely to be informed by the implicit belief that English in contrast *is* the go-to business language since English, as opposed to Danish, is a 'highly valued commodity' in the global linguistic market (Cameron 2012, 1).

This ideology, in which English is the language of international business, is so 'naturalized' (Woolard and Schieffelin 1994, 55) or 'common-sense' (Rumsey 1990, 346) that to even think about Danish being a useful language in an international setting is being co-constructed by William and me – as the interviewer – as a laughable proposition.

Peter presents the same ideology when asked how he feels about speaking Danish:

Example 4

01 Camilla: so I have a ha ha question
 02 how do you feel about
 03 speaking English but I'm

04 I'm guessing that you're
 05 quite comfortable with it
 06 (0.7) um (0.5) but how about
 07 but how about Danish (0.3)
 08 at all (0.5) I mean you said
 09 that you had these
 10 common phrases down but
 11 (3.1)
 12 Camilla: [?do you feel?]
 13 Peter: [?say again?]
 14 xxx
 15 (0.6)
 16 Camilla: sorry
 17 (0.4)
 18 Peter: s- say that again sorry
 19 (0.4)
 20 Camilla: uh it's just that
 21 how how do you feel about
 22 speaking Danish at all
 23 Peter: um (2.8) that's uh (0.9)
 24 that's a tough question
 25 I get asked that a lot because
 26 (2.5) for me and the kind of
 27 (0.3) industry that I work in
 28 or I'm (0.6) potentially
 29 gonna be working in
 30 or hope to work in or wh-
 31 which I've worked in before
 32 the kind of like you know um
 33 (1.3) sort of
 34 big corporate companies
 35 that kind of (1.0)
 36 speak English (0.4)
 37 predominantly (1.0) um (0.8)
 38 as the main language
 39 whether it'll be here or
 40 (0.3) England or Australia
 41 or wherever

While the language ideology was expressed implicitly in William's response, it is expressed explicitly in Peter's response as he states that English is the main language in large companies all over the world. When asked how he feels about speaking Danish, Peter responds by talking about English as a corporate language. That he does this implies that

he, like William, does not see Danish as valuable in these settings – even if the company is located in Denmark. Interestingly, Peter only mentions English-speaking countries when talking about these companies. All other countries and possible languages are just grouped into ‘wherever’.

‘I can get by very comfortably with English’

Another ideology that appears to inform at least two of the participants’ ideas about whether learning Danish is worthwhile is ‘English is enough’. According to this ideology, it is not necessary for international students to be able to speak Danish in a short-term perspective because all their activities take place in English and everyone in Denmark speaks English.

This ideology is articulated explicitly in Interview 3 as Peter, in his answer to the question of how he feels about speaking Danish, explains that because all of his social life, work and school life is in English, he does not really need to learn Danish beyond ‘the basics’:

Example 5

01 Peter: I I can get by very comfortably
02 with English (0.9)
03 and the basics of Danish (.)
04 obviously my course
05 is in English (0.4)
06 um we have a lot of tourism
07 in the restaurant (0.7) um
08 (1.5) all my friends (.)
09 speak English mainly

Again, this is an example of how language ideologies are context-bound as this one is grounded in Peter’s social experiences. Others with different experiences would most likely produce divergent perspectives as ideologies can be multiple (Kroskrity 2006, 503). The ideology activated by Peter furthermore seems to assume that everybody in Denmark speaks English and thereby it ‘erases’ even the potential relevance of knowing more than ‘the basics of Danish’ e.g. if you wanted to strike up a new friendship with someone who does not speak

multiple and divergent within sociocultural groups, but individuals can also express multiple and divergent ideologies. We see this final language ideology expressed across all three interviews in this data set.

While Danish is not seen as particularly valuable in the short term by William, he does appear to find that learning Danish is valuable in a long-term perspective:

Example 7

01 William: i- it it opens up a lot of
02 opportunities to you
03 Karen-Sofie: hmm
04 William: in a country like Denmark
05 I would say because um
06 yeah I f- feel like you you
07 feel more connected to to Danes
08 and also all the
09 job opportunities
10 ?there's? so many uh jobs
11 that require some Danish um
12 and English

This belief appears to be informed by the 'Danish is useful in Denmark ideology', which is explicitly expressed by William in the above example. According to this ideology, being able to speak Danish 'opens up a lot of opportunities to you' socially but also in terms of one's career.

In Interview 3, Peter also touches upon how learning Danish can be a meaningful long-term investment:

Example 8

01 Camilla: um do you think it is necessary
02 to learn Danish at all
03 as an international student
04 in Denmark
05 Peter: absolutely
06 I think it would really help
07 with like job prospects
08 and depending on what industry
09 you are in um xxx

10 industry my girlfriend is in
11 is like construction erm
12 and architecture
13 so a lot of those firms are
14 contracts and that are
15 predominantly written up
16 in Danish and stuff
17 so I think you can be quite
18 restricted in in not in all
19 but I think it
20 definitely will give you
21 a lot more opportunity
22 if you if you know it

In example 8, Peter talks about being able to speak Danish as something that 'definitely will give you a lot more opportunity' in terms of job prospects. In this sense, Peter also explicitly presents the 'Danish is useful in Denmark' ideology, even though he only focuses on its usefulness in terms of job prospects. He furthermore mentions that not being able to speak Danish can 'restrict' you somewhat in certain industries. When looking back at example 4, however, it seems that Peter does not necessarily think this applies to the industry he wants to work in.

In interview 2, Anna echoes these statements as she says that being able to speak Danish 'makes it a lot easier to get work' after graduation. While Peter and William focus on how Danish is useful in a long-term perspective, Anna specifically mentions that being able to speak Danish is useful in the short term as well:

Example 9

01 Cathrine: do you think that if (0.3) uh
02 (0.5) if you didn't want to
03 stay that it would be (0.9)
04 I don't know (0.9)
05 unnecessary to learn Engli-
06 or ?to learn? Danish
07 (1.4)
08 Anna: um (0.6) not I no I
09 cause I think it gives so much

10 when you stay here (0.9) uh
11 (0.3) and live here (.) and
12 it also makes it a lot easier
13 to to get work (0.5)
14 for just a student (0.7) job
15 (0.9) um (1.5) uh (0.6)
16 Cathrine: it's necessary ?or? in order
17 (0.2) to socialise and work and
18 (0.6)
19 Anna: yeah
20 (4.3)
21 Cathrine: yeah (0.5)
22 you think it's a xxx
23 it's a benefit for you (1.4)
24 you [know]
25 Anna: [yeah] (1.2) I think so (1.2)
26 um cause I we I do have s-
27 (0.7) some friends in (2.0)
28 in xxx school (.)
29 that doesn't speak Danish (0.4)
30 uh (0.3) that have really
31 struggled to get (.)
32 to to get a student job (0.4)
33 and since (0.3) you can't
34 they can't get (0.5)
35 ?a? student job they also have
36 ?uh? struggle with
37 (0.3) to apply for ?the? SU
38 (2.3)
39 Cathrine: yeah okay (2.1) okay to
40 do y- you think it's necessary
41 to to learn Danish (.)
42 like after graduation
43 if you want to stay
44 Anna: yeah if you want to stay (0.8)
45 and uh (0.4) have a job here
46 (0.4) um then I think
47 it's necessary
48 (0.5)
49 Cathrine: yeah (0.9) okay (1.1) so it's
50 basically because of work
51 you think
52 (1.9)
53 Anna: yeah (0.4) I would say so
54 kind of like the work culture
55 (0.5) um (0.3) I also used to

56 live with a girl (.)
57 from from Italy (0.5)
58 and she worked at a company
59 that were supposed to be
60 this international
61 and all English-speaking
62 Cathrine: [yeah]
63 Anna: [but] they did a lot of
64 meetings in Danish (0.3)
65 in (0.4) instead (.)
66 of English (.) and (0.4)
67 she could come home from work
68 and be really frustrated

In this example, the 'Danish is useful in Denmark' ideology is again presented explicitly. Here, Danish is constructed as a valuable skill that makes it easier to socialise and get a job while studying in Denmark, but also after graduation. Anna's anecdote about her former roommate's experiences at work furthermore contradicts the 'English is the language of international business' ideology expressed by the other participants. Here we can also see how ideologies can be grounded in social experience (Kroskrity 2006, 503) as her friend's experience informs Anna's beliefs that Danish is a useful language if you want to get a job in Denmark.

Discussion

Three recurring language ideologies that can be seen to be informing the participants' ideas about learning Danish were identified in this data set. These language ideologies are: 'English is the language of international business', 'English is enough' and 'Danish is useful in Denmark'.

The 'English is the language of international business' ideology expressed by the international students at KEA is very similar to Thøgersen's (2010) and Haberland's (2009) points about English being constructed as the only possible international language in a global context and the ideology Lønsmann (2015) identified as 'English: the one and only language of internationalisation'. According to Haberland, these

ideologies come to exist because English is a hegemonic language in the sense that: 'by general consent, speakers of other languages choose English in a large number of situations, and consider this choice natural with respect to the existing linguistic world order' (Haberland 2009, 25). Central to his point is the idea that because of hegemonic discourse, speakers consider English 'natural', which is also the case in the KEA data set that I have analysed. Lønsmann argues that 'when English is constructed as the one and only language of use for international communication, other languages are 'erased' from the context' (Lønsmann 2015, 353). We can see an example of this erasure in this data set as Peter and William do not consider other languages an option for communication in an international company. That a similar ideology has also been identified among international students in the KEA data set suggests that this ideology is very widespread across different international contexts in Denmark.

Kirilova and Lønsmann (2020) argue that Danish is constructed differently for refugees and highly educated international employees. While highly educated international employees see learning Danish as unimportant, it is constructed as a necessity to get a job for refugees in Denmark. The situation is different when you look at what the three international students at KEA express in their interviews. To them, Danish is constructed differently depending on their short-term and long-term plans. If they are only going to stay in Denmark while they are studying and then get a job in an international company somewhere else afterwards, they, like the highly educated international employees of Kirilova and Lønsmann's study, see learning Danish as unimportant. If they, however, want to get a job in Denmark after graduation, Danish is constructed as a valuable skill that opens opportunities, but it is not seen as a *necessity* as in the case of the refugees who participated in Kirilova and Lønsmann's study.

It is interesting to note how the participants' ability to speak Danish or lack thereof might also be informing their beliefs about English and Danish. Anna presents herself as someone who speaks Danish fluently, William says he speaks

some Danish though he describes it as Swedish-like and Peter does not see himself as a speaker of any other languages than English but says that he knows 'the basics' of Danish. Anna appears to have the strongest feelings about the usefulness of Danish in a short- and long-term perspective. Coincidentally, Anna is also, according to the participants' own evaluations of their abilities, the only participant who is fluent in Danish. In this sense, 'Danish is useful in Denmark' is an ideology, which furthers her interests. Similarly, William, who only speaks some Danish, and Peter, who appears to essentially be a monolingual speaker of English, most clearly express the ideologies 'English is the language of international business' and 'English is enough', at least in a short-term perspective. In addition, the participants' linguistic backgrounds might be playing a role in their beliefs about learning Danish. Anna and William, who are both multilingual with Swedish as their first language, have actively tried to learn Danish, while Peter has not attempted to learn Danish yet though he expresses some interest in it in the interview.

Language ideologies are context bound (Kroskrity 2006, 503) and as this data set includes two participants from Scandinavia and one from England, this might have an effect on the language ideologies that they express. If the data set was more diverse in terms of participants, the conclusions of this chapter would perhaps look different. Peter's study group for example consists of students from Jordan, Lithuania and Croatia, and these students might subscribe to very different language ideologies than students from Northern/Western Europe. William also specifically mentions that 'the Eastern Europeans' in the class, in his view, are particularly difficult to understand because of their accent. It would be interesting to explore how e.g. Eastern Europeans self-evaluate their language competences compared to someone like William who considers himself to be speaking 'a more international English' and to what extent they subscribe to similar or different language ideologies than the ones identified in this chapter.

As stated earlier, language ideologies have the ability to transform or structure behaviour and material reality

(Sergeant 2009, 40; Woolard 1998, 11). While it is difficult to say to what degree and how exactly this is the case with the language ideologies mentioned above, it seems very likely that they inform the participants' thoughts about whether learning Danish is 'worth investing in'.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have aimed to answer the research question: Which language ideologies in relation to English and Danish do international students at KEA express and how do these beliefs relate to the participants' thoughts and decisions about learning Danish?

In my analysis, I found that Danish is seen as a commodity by the three participants, who talk about its 'value' in a short-term and long-term perspective. I furthermore identified three recurring language ideologies that inform the participants' evaluation of the value of investing in learning Danish. I have chosen to call these three ideologies 'English is the language of international business', 'English is enough' and 'Danish is useful in Denmark'. These ideologies were shown to be expressed both explicitly and implicitly. They can furthermore be seen as 'naturalized' (Woolard and Schieffelin 1994, 55) or 'common-sense' (Rumsey 1990, 346) as they are not questioned or problematised by the participants. The language ideologies analysed and discussed in this chapter are also context bound (Kroskrity 2006, 503) since they are shaped by the experiences of the participants themselves or their social groups. Finally, the complexity of language ideologies was highlighted as the ideologies I identified can be said to be multiple (Kroskrity 2006, 503) and to some extent contradictory across what can be seen as the same sociocultural group.

Because of the methods for data collection, these conclusions are not immediately generalizable but they offer an in-depth view into the social worlds of international students at KEA. The language ideologies relating to learning Danish

are also likely to be of interest in relation to other studies of language ideologies in international contexts in Denmark.

In KEA's annual report from 2019, one of the institution's strategic goals is the retention of international graduates in Denmark. They have had some success with their initiatives in this regard with an increase from a 14% baseline to 18.8% in 2018 (KEA 2019). Research into language ideologies at KEA might be the first step to provide some insights into some of the mechanisms at play in relation to language learning when an international graduate from KEA decides to leave or stay in Denmark. The findings of this chapter suggest that this is a very complex area with several, sometimes contradictory, language ideologies influencing international students' decisions.

References

- Brinkmann, Svend & Steinar Kvale. 2018. *Doing interviews*. 2nd ed. London: SAGE.
- Cameron, Deborah. 2012. The commodification of language: English as a global commodity. In Terttu Nevalainen and Elizabeth Closs Traugott (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the History of English (Vol. 1)*, 353-363. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ELAN (Version 5.9) [Computer software]. 2020. Nijmegen: Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics. Retrieved from <https://archive.mpi.nl/tla/elan>.
- Fabricius, Anne & Janus Mortensen. 2013. Language ideology and the notion of construct resources: A case study of modern RP. In Tore Kristiansen & Stef Grondelaers (eds.), *Language (de)standardisation in late modern Europe: Experimental studies*, 375-402. Oslo: Novus.
- Garrett, Peter. 2010. *Attitudes to language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Haberland, Hartmut. 2009. English – the language of globalism? *RASK Internationalt tidsskrift for sprog og kommunikation* 30, 17–45.
- Hoffman, Michol. 2014. Sociolinguistic interview. In Janet Holmes & Kirk Hazen (eds.), *Research methods in sociolinguistics: A practical guide*, 25–41. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- KEA. 2019. Årsrapport 2019. *KEA – Copenhagen School of Design and Technology*.
<https://kea.dk/%C3%A5rsrapporter>. Last accessed 26 September, 2020.
- Kirilova, Marta & Dorte Lønsmann. 2020. Dansk – nøglen til arbejde? Ideologier om sprogbrug og sproglæring i to arbejdskontekster i Danmark. *Nordand – Nordisk tidsskrift for andrespråksforskning* 15(1), 37–57.
- Kroskrity, Paul V. 2016. Language Ideologies and Language Attitudes: *Oxford Bibliographies: Linguistics*.
 doi:10.1093/obo/9780199772810-0122.
- Kroskrity, Paul V. 2006. Language ideologies. In Alessandro Duranti (ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology*, 496–517. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Lønsmann, Dorte. 2015. Language ideologies in a Danish company with English as a corporate language: ‘it has to be English’. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 36(4), 339–356.
- Lønsmann, Dorte. 2014. Linguistic diversity in the international workplace: Language ideologies and processes of exclusion. *Multilingua* 33(1-2), 89–116.
- Lønsmann, Dorte. 2011. *English as a corporate language. Language choice and language ideologies in an international company in Denmark*. PhD Dissertation. Roskilde: Roskilde University, Dept. of Culture and Identity.
- Mortensen, Janus & Anne H. Fabricius. 2014. Language ideologies in Danish higher education: Exploring student perspectives. In Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen & Jacob Thøgersen (eds.), *English in Nordic*

- universities: Ideologies and practices*, 193– 223.
 Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Park, Joseph Sung-Yul & Lionel Wee. 2012. *Markets of English: Linguistic capital and language policy in a globalizing world*. New York: Routledge.
- Rumsey, Alan. 1990. Wording, meaning, and linguistic ideology. *American Anthropologist* 92(2), 346–361.
- Seargeant, Philip. 2009. *The Idea of English in Japan: Ideology and the evolution of a global language*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- Silverstein, Michael. 1979. Language structure and linguistic ideology. In Paul R. Clyne, William F. Hanks & Carol L. Hofbauer (eds.), *The elements: A parasession on linguistic units and levels*, 193–247. Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Spradley, James. 1979. *The ethnographic interview*. New York: Holt, Rinehard and Winston.
- Thøgersen, Jacob. 2010. Coming to terms with English in Denmark: Discursive constructions of a language contact situation. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 20(3): 291–326.
- Woolard, Kathryn A. 1998. Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In Bambi B. Schieffelin, Kathryn A. Woolard & Paul Kroskrity (eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory*, 3–49. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Woolard, Kathryn A. & Bambi B. Schieffelin. 1994. Language ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23, 55–82.

'IT HELPS ME FIT IN BETTER': A STUDY ON LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES AND NOTIONS OF INCLUSION

Ida Moth Kej

This chapter examines the relationship between language ideologies and social inclusion in the context of a higher education institution in Denmark and Danish society more generally. It does this through a micro-level discourse analysis of a small set of data collected by myself and two of my fellow students at the University of Copenhagen. We interviewed three students attending an international study program at KEA – Copenhagen School of Design and Technology – about their experiences regarding language use inside as well as outside of school. In the interviews, the students draw on language ideologies that place English spoken by native English speakers at the top of a hierarchy of Englishes and place high value on the English language in general. Further, the interviewees seem to include themselves in conceptual, language-based groups of 'good' English speakers in opposition to other groups. Additionally, all three students subscribe to a language ideology that deems Danish society a place for Danish speakers. However, as the students' relations to Danish society differ, so do their views regarding Danish and English use in different contexts. I conclude the chapter by arguing that language ideologies are powerful, performative entities that contribute to the students' conceptual navigation through, and construction of ideas of inclusion in, the social environment at KEA and in the broader context of Danish society.

Introduction

In the current globalized landscape, institutions of higher education in Denmark offer an increasing number of English-medium instruction programs and courses (Kling 2015, 201). These are attended by Danish as well as international students. However, such programs are often, to varying degrees, characterized by the use of Danish alongside English, compelling students to observe and detect how the uses of Danish and English are valued and evaluated in different social situations (Mortensen and Fabricius 2014, 196-7).

In this chapter, I explore how three students attending international programs at KEA, Copenhagen School of Design and Technology, talk about uses of Danish and English when interviewed by students in English at the University of Copenhagen. One of the KEA students is a non-native speaker of English on exchange at KEA for one semester only, while the two others are native English speakers permanently residing in Denmark. In my analysis below, I compare how the three speakers navigate the landscape of Danish and English – both in the international setting at KEA and in Danish society more generally. I do this by focusing on the language ideologies they foreground in the interviews, and how their notions of social inclusion relate to such ideologies.

I set out to answer the following research question: What language ideologies are conveyed by the three students at KEA and how are these language ideologies related to the students' notions of inclusion in Danish society? To answer this question, I first provide an overview of the theoretical framework that constitutes the basis of my study. Next, I outline my methodological approach, including a critical review of my role as an interviewer and transcriber of data. Subsequently, I analyze the three interviewees' metalinguistic talk about uses of Danish and English and discuss language ideologies in relation to the students' views on social inclusion. Lastly, I conclude by arguing that in this case, the interviewees' ideas about language use are closely connected to conceptions of social inclusion in specific social contexts.

Theoretical Framework

In the following, I provide a detailed account of my theoretical perspective. I do this by unpacking key concepts related to my study and delimiting my own use of these terms, beginning with the concept of language ideology.

Defining language ideology

Kroskrity (2004) notes that the study of speakers' thoughts and beliefs about language has only relatively recently gained scholarly attention. As academic interest in this area has increased, a range of different approaches have arisen (2004, 496). In order to delimit my own use of the term 'language ideology' I have looked to various approaches by different scholars within the field. These include that of Silverstein (1979), who gave an early, seminal definition of the concept as "sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use" (1979, 193). Thus, according to Silverstein, language ideologies or "sets of beliefs about language" shape speakers' reasoning when it comes to language use and structure.

Another important contribution to studies of language ideology, which has shaped the basis of my analysis, is that of Irvine (1989). Her argumentation emphasizes that one cannot assume a direct, causative link between language features and social differentiation, because doing so would mean ignoring the role of language ideologies. She defines language ideologies as "the cultural (or subcultural) system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interests" (Irvine 1989, 255). Thus, Irvine views language ideology as a mediating factor between language and social organization (Irvine 1989, 255). Reflecting on Irvine's definition, Kroskrity points out that, from this perspective, language ideologies are not fixed and stable within social or cultural groups, but are multiple and changing (Kroskrity 2004, 497).

My analysis in the present chapter will draw on a joint understanding of Silverstein and Irvine's perspectives. Together, they provide a view of language ideologies as shared cultural, multiple, and varying belief systems about social and linguistic relationships, on which speakers draw when articulating their ideas about language structure and use, and which may shape or rationalize specific sociolinguistic differences in specific contexts (Silverstein 1979, 193; Irvine 1989, 255).

The 'sitings' of language ideologies

Another discussion within the study of language ideology has to do with how to trace such ideologies (Woolard and Schiefelin 1994, 57-8). Woolard (1998) points out that different scholars have different approaches to what she calls the 'sitings' of language ideologies within linguistic practice. This means that language ideologies may both be viewed as present in explicit, metalinguistic talk, as well as through unexpressed assumptions that implicitly convey a certain understanding (Woolard 1998, 9-10). In my analysis, I examine language ideologies through metalinguistic speech as well as unexpressed assumptions, thus exploring both the content of what interlocutors convey, as well as how they express it.

Language ideologies and transient multilingual communities

The three students interviewed here attend international study programs at KEA. In these programs, multiple languages are spoken, and some students are only part of this environment for a limited amount of time. Therefore, the setting at KEA is an example of what Mortensen and Fabricius (2014) call a *transient multilingual community* (Mortensen and Fabricius 2014, 194,197; see also Mortensen 2017). Mortensen and Fabricius distinguish transient multilingual communities from more stable communities in which certain common-sense ideas of language use tend to prevail (2014, 194). In transient multilingual communities such established language ideologies cannot, in advance, be assumed to be

present (Mortensen and Fabricius 2014, 194). They must be explored empirically.

In my analysis, I examine students' accounts both regarding language use at KEA and in the general context of Denmark. Thereby, I analyze language ideologies not only in relation to the transient multilingual community at KEA, but also in the context of Danish society as a more stable, national community. That said, I do not assume that Danish society actually consists of one homogenous group consisting of people who perceive the world according to the same common-sense ideologies. Instead, I am interested in discovering what ideologies the three informants express regarding Danish society in comparison to the transient context at KEA.

I should emphasize that I do not seek to explore whether the language ideologies at play in relation to KEA were present in the interviewees' conceptualizations before they began their studies there or whether these are influenced by the interviewees' social experiences at KEA.

The performativity of ideologies

This chapter focuses on ideologies about language and their connections to notions of social inclusion. This prompts me to touch upon language ideologies as performative entities. The performativity of language has been widely studied since Austin (1962) argued that instead of focusing on the degree of truth or falsity of statements, utterances should be described in terms of what they "do" (Austin 1962, 5-6; Hall 1999, 184). However, since academic approaches in this area are many and varied, I will, in the following, elaborate on my own use and understanding of performativity in relation to language ideologies.

To examine how language ideologies perform, we must take a closer look at how they come into being. Seargeant (2009) argues that ideologies are the result of internalized ideas and behaviors which people learn over time. These learned behaviors and ideas shape individuals' "expectations about ways of being in the world" and cause these expectations to seem natural (Seargeant 2009, 28). When it comes to

language ideologies, these are thus shared belief systems that are shaped on the basis of specific internalized cultural, historical, and sociopolitical ideas and behaviors regarding language and how language functions in relation to specific social settings. Language ideologies then again function by affecting both how individuals conceptualize, categorize, and evaluate language practices and how they use language in specific social settings, thereby reproducing sociolinguistic hierarchies. In this way, language ideologies are, at the same time, products of and productive of power relations (Seargeant 2009, 27-28).

Gal and Irvine (1995) emphasize that language ideologies affect the way people act in the world. They stress that speech and linguistic forms index social identities and social activity. Language ideologies are constructed on the basis of such indices, and language ideological constructs affect not only the way speakers view each other, but also the way they act in relation to each other (Gal and Irvine 1995, 973). Here, I therefore apply a perspective of language ideologies as performative social entities that play a role in shaping the way social worlds are viewed and organized by speakers, as well as the ways in which speakers behave in specific social contexts.

It is important to stress that my study is based solely on interviews, and therefore my data does not enable me to draw any direct lines between the interviewees' metalinguistic talk and how they actually act in society. Instead, I analyze the interviewees' verbal accounts of language and connect these to their verbal accounts on how they navigate social settings. I do this in order to discuss how language ideologies perform in the sense that they may contribute to the interviewees' construction of specific notions of inclusion. Only in the last section of the discussion do I offer my own interpretations of how language ideologies may be connected to practical social organization.

Language ideologies and social inclusion

As mentioned above, my aim is to examine the performativity of language ideologies in relation to social inclusion. Lønsmann (2014) studied language ideologies in a Danish multilingual workplace and found that they play a role in processes of social inclusion and exclusion (2014, 93). She argues that in drawing on specific language ideologies, speakers organize the social world by categorizing themselves and others into groups based on what languages they speak and how they speak them. They thereby judge and evaluate these groups in relation to each other in positive and negative ways (Lønsmann 2014, 102). Thus, language ideologies play a role in constructing individuals' inclusion or exclusion from social groups in specific social contexts based on their language competencies (Lønsmann 2014, 112). By adding this perspective, I am able to examine how the KEA students' language ideological evaluations relate to their constructions of social inclusion.

From these theoretical perspectives, I set out to conduct my analysis. However, first I will address some of my methodological considerations for this study.

Methodology

Throughout this study I continuously weighed my methodological procedures. Since a detailed account of the general analytical and methodological approach of this research project has been given in the introduction to this volume, in the following I reflect upon my own specific data, my data collection and my analytical process. I start out by touching upon my own positionality in the interview, and from there I move on to discuss aspects of one of my central methods of data analysis, namely transcribing. Lastly, I consider my discourse analytical approach and give a brief outline of the three interviewees and their connection to Denmark.

Positionality

Spradley (1979) argues that an ethnographic interview, such as the ones conducted for this study, is a specific kind of

speech event: an asymmetrical, situated conversation between a researcher and an interviewee. Therefore, I carefully considered my positionality and focused on maintaining rapport by treating the interview as a friendly conversation (Spradley 1979, 58).

My two fellow student interviewers, Signe Due Ilsøe and Joanna Skovlunn Laursen, and I were all keen to create open and safe interviewing environments for the interviewees. Since we were all novices at interviewing, we helped and supported each other. For example, with the consent of the interviewees, we let each other sit in to quietly listen and learn during our respective interviews.

In the case of my own interview, I attempted to avoid interrupting John, the interviewee, in order to make room for silences or pauses in the conversation, thus giving him time to answer and reflect on the questions. Additionally, I was thorough in informing John of the purpose of the interview, recording procedures, and my aim to learn about his experiences with language use. I did these things because, as Spradley points out, they help establish rapport, and at the same time they shape the interviewee's position as a *teacher*, making space for him or her to share his or her cultural knowledge (Spradley 1979, 59).

When conducting ethnographic interviews, one crucial aspect involves the interviewer's own positioning (Duranti 1997, 212). As I attempted to place John in a teaching position I therefore, at the same time, positioned myself as an *observer*. Thereby, I tried to maintain an egalitarian relation to John and avoid appearing too controlling. My aim with this approach was to withdraw myself as much as possible from affecting the outcome of John's answers and instead appear neutral, so that he would not be influenced by me and my interests. However, as Duranti (1997) points out, when carrying out ethnographic research, the observer's subjective stance can never be excluded from the data collection process. This means that when conducting interviews, researchers are always part of the interaction – and thus they themselves, along with their own views and preconceptions,

are embedded in the studies they conduct (Duranti 1997, 85). This is the case because ethnographic researchers do not observe informants' speech, utterances or actions from a safe distance, but engage in social interactions with them (Duranti 1997, 89). Therefore, in my interview with John, factors of my own theoretical and cultural knowledge are likely to have affected the interview process and maybe even influenced John's answers.

As I reflected on this, I considered two such relevant factors to be my native language and sociocultural background. Since this study focuses specifically on language ideological constructions in relation to the interviewees being international students in Denmark, my position as a native Dane and Danish speaker is a necessary factor to consider in connection to John's descriptions. This is especially interesting in the light of the view of language ideologies as performative. From this perspective, my own linguistic background as a native Danish and second language English speaker is likely to have indexed a certain social identity to John, thus shaping his view of me and his way of interacting with me – and vice versa (Gal and Irvine 1995, 973). It may be impossible to locate exactly where and how my own positioning could have influenced John's ideological constructions. However, one thing this perspective illustrates is that language ideologies are shaped on the basis of sociolinguistic indices foregrounded in specific speech events, such as the interviews conducted for this study.

With this I want to emphasize that the interviewees' accounts in this chapter should always be seen in relation to the above-mentioned factors of positioning and cannot be removed from the specific situated speech event in which they were expressed.

Transcribing data

After carrying out the three interviews and sharing them with each other, my fellow students and I worked extensively with the data, transcribing and coding them in ELAN (2020). Such coding and transcribing activities are far from being objective

processes. I could easily devote the remainder of this chapter to discussing the power and art of transcribing, but instead I give a condensed account of the choices I made in the transcription process, as well as how these may have influenced my results.

Geertz has famously stated that “man is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun” (Geertz 1973, 5). As mentioned above, my own participation in the interview that formed the basis for the data collection may have affected John’s responses. And yet, my own embeddedness in the data formation continues into my subsequent transcription of the data.

Geertz notes that when handling ethnographic material, researchers navigate through a wide range of conceptual structures articulated by informants, in order to extract meaning from their data (Geertz 1973, 10). Similarly, Brinkmann and Kvale (2019, ch. 8) point out that transcribers make an array of choices and judgments which have implications for subsequent analytical stages. As I navigated the data, the choices I made were focused on keeping a balance between staying loyal to the interviewees while transforming their oral speech to written form in a manner that would be coherent to the reader. Therefore, I used elements of what Bucholtz (2000) calls a *naturalized* approach – adapting oral speech to a conventionalized written form – as well as a *denaturalized* approach – keeping the written form of the transcribed speech as close to the oral style as possible (2000, 1461). As will be evident in the transcribed interview excerpts later in this chapter, this means that it is not possible to detect the three interviewees’ pronunciation, intonation, or other phonetic features from the transcription alone. I made this choice because the specific aim of my study was to explore speakers’ ways of rationalizing and talking about language, and thus I did not find it relevant in this instance to provide an overly technical rendition of the speakers’ language use. However, I find it crucial to make it clear that this was the specific transcription strategy I adopted, and that the transcribed data

therefore represent my subjective renditions of the interviewees' oral accounts. This illustrates that a transcriber can simply not be detached from her own data. Or, in Geertz' terminology, the researcher is suspended in the very web which she is spinning, and thus she herself is instrumental in the formation of data.

Micro-level discourse analysis

Mortensen and Fabricius (2014) take a micro-level approach in their analysis of language ideologies in Danish higher education. I adopt a similar analytical method here as I study language ideologies based on only three interviews. I realize that a data set of three interviews cannot be used to generalize about international students in Denmark. However, generalizing is not what I wish to achieve. By analyzing and discussing the three interviewees' metalinguistic talk I instead seek to gain a deeper understanding of how language ideologies and social inclusion may be connected from *their* perspectives.

To do this, I apply a discourse analysis on my data. Brinkmann and Kvale (2019, ch. 9) describe discourse analysis as an approach that, instead of valuing interviewees' statements as true or false, generally explores how talk is constructed as well as the implications of discursive presentations of specific social settings. This is exactly what I seek to get an understanding of here, as I apply a discourse analytical perspective to analyze interviewees' metalinguistic talk about the languages they use and their ideas about English and Danish in different social situations. Before moving on to the analysis, I now turn to a brief presentation of the interviewees.

The three interviewees

I have anonymized the three interviewees under the pseudonyms of John, who was interviewed by me, Matt who was interviewed by Joanna Skovlunn Laursen, and Eric, who was interviewed by Signe Due Ilsøe.

Eric is an exchange student from Germany, whose time at KEA is limited to one semester. Eric describes that he

mostly spends time with other exchange students at KEA, and he does not have plans to move to Denmark in the future on a permanent basis. At the time of the interview, Eric was back in Germany due to the outbreak of Covid-19, and he has thus only spent a couple of months in Denmark. Eric speaks English and German, and while he did sign up for Danish classes at KEA, he states that this was not so much to gain proficiency in the language as to obtain social connections with other learners.

John and Matt are from the United States and Canada, respectively. They both live in Denmark and are studying their full degree at KEA. They are both married to Danish women, both have actively pursued learning Danish while in Denmark and speak both Danish and English. John is a Danish citizen.

This means that the three students' relations to Denmark differ. While Eric's connection to Denmark is largely based on his temporary exchange semester at KEA and thus characterized by transience, Matt and John have firmly established lives, families and future plans in Denmark, making their relationship to Danish society one of permanence and stability.

According to Kroskrity, language ideologies in specific contexts are influenced by the sociocultural position and language experience of the individual (Kroskrity 2004, 507). In the following analysis and discussion, I therefore seek to explore and compare these three different individuals' experiences with English and Danish language use in Denmark.

Analysis

In the present analysis, I first examine the three interviewees' stances towards English at KEA, the language ideologies in which these may be rooted, and the implications these ideologies may have. Subsequently, I move on to explore the students' metalinguistic talk, not just in relation to KEA but in relation to language practices in Danish society more generally.

A hierarchy of Englishes

When the students were asked whether they find it important to be good at English at school all three answered yes. In his answer to this question, Matt foregrounds his competences as a native speaker of English:

Example 1

1 Joanna: so do you think that it's important
2 to be good at English in school
3 Matt: yeah a hundred percent (0.4)
4 uh I think it makes a big difference
5 I think (0.8) for me (0.6)
6 having English as my mother language
7 is a huge advantage
8 especially when it comes to
9 presentations (0.4)
10 uhm because things (0.4)
11 they just come out naturally
12 and I'm able to kind of (0.6)
13 yeah (0.5) formulate my sentences
14 in a way that sounds (0.3)
15 yeah professional
16 even if I don't necessarily
17 know what I'm talking a[bout]
18 Joanna: [ha]

Here, Matt notes that being a native speaker is an advantage for him at school, because it lets him sound professional – even if the content of his talk does not hold much substance. He thus implies that sounding professional in English comes more easily to native speakers than non-native speakers. Further, his remark indicates an assumption that good English is less about the *content* of what is said and more about *form*, specifically about sounding professional.

To gain a deeper insight into the language ideologies at play regarding 'good English', all interviewees were asked whether accents matter when speaking English. The following example shows my own interaction with John regarding this question.

Example 2

1 Ida: uhm does it matter what sort of accent
2 you have (0.9) [when y]ou mh
3 John: [yeah]
4 (1.0)
5 Ida: how how does it m- matter you think
6 (0.3)
7 John: uh well there are some students
8 who aren't very good at English
9 (0.4)
10 Ida: okay=
11 John: =uh (0.3) maybe they didn't
12 they didn't use English very much or
13 (0.5) before they came
14 to study at KEA (0.8)
15 and it it makes a difference
16 with them communicating
17 asking questions with the teachers
18 (0.2)
19 Ida: mhm=
20 John: =uhm mh when they have to
21 present things (0.5)
22 uh they don't sound as professional
23 (0.4) [I would ha]ve to say uhm
24 Ida: [mm]
25 John: they don't maybe they don't
26 get their point across (0.3) as good

Here, John uses the pronoun “they” to describe a number of students who are not good at English. Thus, he categorizes them as a group based on their language competences, while indicating that he is not himself part of this group. He explicitly states that the members of this group have a hard time communicating their points and, much like Matt's statement, sounding professional during presentations.

Eric similarly makes a distinction between students who are good at English and students who aren't. When asked whether he finds his fellow students to be good at English he says that “some are, some aren't”, and mentions that some of the international and Danish students in his class do not seem comfortable in English and tend to avoid speaking it altogether. He goes on:

Example 3

1 Eric: but everyone was able to articulate
2 themselves in a way
3 that was understandable
4 there was no one that could-
5 couldn't speak it at all
6 or something
7 so everyone (0.4)
8 got their point across
9 some just especially in grammar were
10 (0.5) lacking a bit in (0.8)
11 very basic (1.4) rules I would say
12 for example when you say (0.5)
13 he doesn't
14 loads of people would just say
15 he don't
16 (0.6) and stuff like that you know
17 so that was very very (0.9) apparent
18 in lots of students around me

Here, Eric starts out by mentioning that all his fellow students are able to use English as a communication tool and make themselves understood. However, he then continues to talk about “some students” whose grammar is “lacking a bit in very basic rules”. Two things are happening here: First, Eric foregrounds subject-verb agreement as a significant and basic language feature that is important to master when speaking English. Thus, he assigns a negative value to students who use “doesn't” and “don't” incorrectly, indicating that these students are less good at English. Much like in Matt's example above, when asked this particular question, Eric values language form over content when it comes to English, suggesting that being able to get the content of one's points across is a practical and useful skill, but that students who fail to conform to what he calls “basic rules” of grammar are less good at English. Second, by framing “some” students, “loads of people” and “lots of students around me” as not conforming to these rules in opposition to Eric's pronouns of “I” and “me”, he categorizes himself in opposition to this group of students

who are less good at English – much like John in the above example.

At a different point in the interview, Eric describes that “speaking English, to me, is the same as speaking German”. He also mentions that he has learned English first in school and then during a year-long stay in the US, after which English has gone from feeling like “just another language to my mother tongue kind of” (compare the contribution by van Leeuwen in this volume). When asked about his everyday life in Denmark before the lockdown, Eric states that during his time there, he appreciated the fact that he could always assume that everyone around him spoke English and people welcomed his English skills. He elaborates:

Example 4

1 Eric: more so I got compliments for
2 oh you speak English so well
3 and it's so nice to speak
4 to someone who actually enjoys
5 speaking the language you know
6 especially for my classmates
7 because they are all
8 (0.5) trying to learn
9 (0.5) so because I've-
10 I've lived in (0.2) the U.S.
11 when I was younger for a year
12 as like an exchange year (0.3)
13 and then I've travelled loads
14 so I've been kind of familiar
15 with the language (0.5)
16 so people always enjoy that
17 and thought they could learn
18 a bit and stuff to- (0.3)
19 through talking which is nice

In these examples, Eric emphasizes his year in the United States as an important contributing factor to his current English abilities. Moreover, he mentions that others compliment him for his English skills, and he places himself in a position of a teacher who is able to pass on his English abilities to

others – especially to his classmates who are still in the process of learning. Thus, he further emphasizes the distance between himself and the group of fellow students whose English skills are not as good as his own. Furthermore, as Eric categorizes himself as a speaker of good English, he expresses that to him speaking English is almost the same as speaking his native language, and says that English is close to a mother tongue for him. The above examples thus also indicate that Eric places a high value on English spoken by native speakers.

What we see in the above is that both native speakers John and Matt as well as Eric, who is a non-native English speaker, stress that language form, such as sounding professional and using grammar in a certain way, plays a large role in what constitutes ‘good English’ in the transient multilingual school setting at KEA. I argue that these views draw on language ideologies such as *there is such a thing as good and bad English* and *English spoken by native speakers is the best English*, which place a certain kind of English at the top of a language hierarchy. According to Lønsmann, such language ideologies play a part in the way individuals navigate the sociocultural landscape, as the ideologies place high value on certain practices and groups and low value on others (2014, 92-3). From this perspective, Eric, Matt, and John navigate through the multilingual community at KEA by ideologically placing themselves in high-value groups, defined by their good English, which stand in opposition to other groups whose English is less good. Thus, these language ideologies are performative, as they affect the way the three students view their own positions in relation to other English speakers at KEA.

In the following parts of my analysis I will widen my scope and examine how the students perceive and navigate the landscape of Danish and English in school and Danish society in general.

Is English enough?

In the final section of the interviews, the interviewees were asked where they plan to live after they graduate. To this question, Eric answered that though he loves Germany, he

would like to live somewhere else, such as France or Italy, partly because he could then learn a new language. He elaborates:

Example 5

1 Eric: yeah I think that would be
2 fascinating and I know you can
3 get by by speaking English (0.4)
4 but it would also be (0.2)
5 nice for me personally to (0.7)
6 be forced to learn (0.2)
7 a new language again
8 you know because (0.6) I'm-
9 I'm now like like every English
10 or American person like I don't
11 have to learn a language
12 everyone understands me (0.6)
13 uhm (0.3) that's like pretty much
14 the mind set they have
15 it's nice to try but in the end
16 they don't really need to

There are several things going on in Eric's remarks here. First, on the basis of language proficiency – and in line with my above findings – Eric categorizes himself as included in a specific group with English and American people. Second, he observes a mindset within this group according to which learning languages other than English is unnecessary, because English is the dominant international language. While Eric does not subscribe to this view himself (as evidenced by his desire to learn another language), the stance he relays can be seen to belong to an overall ideology that I will call *English is a universally useful language*.

Despite the usefulness of English, all three interviewees mention that Danish also plays a role in their studies. According to John, Danish is present in literature and research at school. Matt and Eric mention that their teachers sometimes struggle with English terminology and switch to Danish instead. Moreover, John, Matt, and Eric all mention that the use of Danish affects the social environment at KEA outside

teaching situations. For example, when Matt is asked about what languages are spoken at social events at KEA, he notes that advertisements for such events are usually available in both Danish and English, but continues:

Example 6

1 Matt: yeah .hhh uhm (0.5)
2 with that being said uh
3 usually there's going to be like
4 a large number of Danish people
5 and a and a quite a small number
6 of English-speaking people (0.5)
7 uhm so (0.4) usually that will
8 create a- a couple little pockets
9 of people who are who are
10 speaking English and then the rest
11 of the people are speaking Danish

Matt is describing a clear social divide at KEA based on language use. Tange and Lauring call this *language clustering* (2009, 224-225). An interesting dimension is that Matt describes this language clustering as divided into Danish people (i.e. one group which he defines by nationality) on the one hand, and English-speaking people (i.e. groups which he defines by language use), on the other. Matt's statement thus indicates that at social events at KEA that reach beyond the classroom of the international program, factors of both Danish language and nationality are connected in creating one large language cluster where Danish is spoken, against a smaller English-speaking group. As a speaker of both Danish and English, Matt does not mention which, if any, of the groups he categorizes himself to be a part of in such scenarios. However, his descriptions do convey a language ideology that views access to the large group of Danes being determined by people's ability to speak Danish, which means that non-Danish speakers are excluded. Let us call this language ideology *Danish is a pass key to some social groups*.

If we then compare this to Eric's ideology of *English as a universally useful language* at the beginning of this section, it appears that Matt here constructs English, in spite of its ideological placement in the top of the language hierarchy, as not being quite enough in this specific social context that extends beyond the learning environment at KEA.

In the following section, I will explore this notion further by comparing the students' views on language use at KEA with their views on language use in social contexts of Danish society more generally.

English and Danish at KEA and in Denmark

When Eric is asked whether he finds it necessary to learn Danish to live in Denmark, he says that he finds it beneficial because:

Example 7

1 Eric: I feel like unless you speak
2 Danish ver- very well (0.2)
3 You're always gonna be the hhh
4 foreign person
5 (0.3)
6 Signe: yeah=
7 Eric: =erm and fro- dh er (0.4)
8 from what I learned or heard
9 about Danish culture is that
10 they (0.6) like to be (0.7)
11 surrounded by people who are
12 like them just like Danes
13 I think that's what (0.4)
14 people mostly feel comfortable with

Eric expresses a view that deems Danish proficiency an important precondition for becoming part of Danish culture and society. This stance, he notes, is based on his own observations that Danes like to be surrounded by people who are like themselves. Thus, I argue that what Eric expresses here is rooted in a certain common-sense language ideology, which I

name *Danish society is for Danish speakers*. This ideology categorizes Danish society as consisting of an exclusive group in which you may only be included if you speak Danish. However, shortly before he states the above, Eric gives the following remark on whether it is necessary to speak Danish in Denmark:

Example 8

1 Eric: but even then I think if you have
2 the choice between learning
3 English or Danish (0.4)
4 [while liv]ing in Denmark
5 Signe: [mm]
6 Eric: I think English would still
7 (0.3) be (0.3)
8 Signe: ha ha
9 Eric: it would h- help you out more .hhh

He goes on a for a little while and then finishes this statement by saying “so I think that you can get further with English to be fair”. Statements made in interviews may be self-contradictory (Mortensen and Fabricius 2014, 215). This is to some extent what is happening here, when Eric within a short time frame both conveys a stance towards English as being more useful than Danish in Denmark, and also expresses a view that Danish is important to be socially included among Danes. Eric is thus drawing on multiple ideologies. This language ideological ambiguity may be linked to Eric’s more transient, and less stable, connection to Danish society. Matt and John are more clear-cut in their views on the use of Danish in Denmark, which becomes evident in the following.

John says that in general he prefers speaking English, because “it is easier”. When asked how he feels about speaking English at school compared to in social situations, he states the following:

Example 9

1 John: uh I I want uh I prefer to speak
2 English in class but (0.6) uh

3 in social situations I uh (.)
4 I would like to speak Danish
5 (0.2) more (0.4)
6 [because I'm in] Dani- I'm in Denmark
7 Ida: [yeah]
8 John: Danish society (0.4)
9 I feel like it helps me fit in better
10 (0.4)
11 Ida: o[kay]
12 John: [the more] Danish I can speak

John thus distinguishes between preferring to speak English in class and preferring to speak Danish in his social life outside KEA. He emphasizes that speaking Danish in social contexts outside school makes him feel like he fits better into Danish society. Furthermore, later in the interview John mentions that he has taken Danish language courses because he knows that “I have to speak Danish if I want to have a successful career in Denmark eventually”.

Matt gives a similar answer when he is asked whether he believes that it is necessary for international students to learn Danish:

Example 10

1 Matt: I'd say if (0.9)
2 if you speak English then you're
3 I mean as far as education goes (0.2)
4 you're you're good to go (0.2)
5 uhm (0.3) as far as finding (0.9)
6 jobs and and socializing
7 outside of KEA it would be smart
8 to learn Danish

John and Matt explicitly express ideas that in the transient multilingual community at KEA, English is an advantage. However, the two of them at the same time convey the view that this does not apply in the more stable larger social context of Danish society. Here, they instead express an idea that Danish is a prerequisite if you want to 1) be able to fit in socially and 2) have a successful career. Thus, Matt and John's stances towards English vary depending on what social setting they

are talking about. They both stress that they find Danish to be a valuable tool if you want to live in Denmark long-term, feel like you fit in as part of Danish society, and be accepted, socially and professionally. They therefore seem to subscribe to the same common-sense ideology as Eric in the above, namely *Danish society is for Danish speakers*. From the perspective of this ideology, becoming a permanent Danish resident is intrinsically linked to Danish proficiency.

Now that I have taken a close look at some of the language ideologies present in Eric, John, and Matt's accounts, I shall turn to a discussion of the performative potential of these ideologies in connection to notions of social inclusion.

Discussion

As argued earlier, the three interviewees seem, in their metalinguistic talk about language use, to draw on language ideologies that categorize themselves and others into social groups based on language competencies. When it comes to the learning environment at KEA, the speakers thus place themselves into high-value groups of good English speakers and certain other students into more negatively valued groups of less good English speakers. Now, let us return to Lønsmann's argument that language ideologies play a role in constructing speakers' in/exclusion from social groups (Lønsmann 2014, 112). In the light of this, John, Matt, and Eric's language ideological views not only categorize English speakers who don't master rules of subject-verb agreement and don't sound professional as belonging to a group of less good English speakers – they are also, on the basis of their English skills, constructed as being excluded from the groups of good English speakers.

Fitting in

As shown in the above, the language ideology *Danish society is for Danish speakers* is conveyed by all three interviewees in different ways. This ideology plays a crucial role in how the three speakers describe their navigation in Danish society.

Eric expresses that he believes learning Danish is key to not being viewed by Danes as “the foreign person”, while Matt regards Danish an important tool for socializing and getting a job. Moreover, John mentions that while he prefers to speak English at school, he wants to increase his use of Danish outside school, because, according to him, it helps him “fit in better”.

These statements show how a certain language ideology that deems Danish society a place for Danish speakers influences each of the interviewees’ conceptualizations of what they should and should not do to become included in, or “fit in better”, to social groups outside of school. Much like the previous example of the interviewees’ notions of in/exclusion regarding groups of good and less good English speakers at KEA, this illustrates that the language ideologies John, Matt, and Eric draw on cause them to construct a notion of social inclusion as something that is specifically determined by language competences.

Language ideologies and social behavior

As a final point of discussion, let us now turn to a previously mentioned argument made by Irvine and Gal. They describe language ideology as not merely conceptually performative, but also as something that shapes individuals’ behavior in the social world (Gal and Irvine 1995, 973). As such, language ideologies may not merely function as mediating links between language and conceptual constructions of social organization, but also links between language and individuals’ actual social behavior.

John and Matt both say that they have learned Danish, and their accounts generally convey ideologies that deem Danish a pass key which it is necessary to have in order to become part of Danish society and the job market. As I have argued, this may be connected to their stable, permanent positions in Danish society. This suggests that John and Matt have learned Danish in order to become included in Danish society and increase their mobility on the job market and in their social lives. On the other hand, Eric, whose relation to

Danish society revolves largely around the transient community at KEA, and who expresses ambiguous language ideologies regarding Danish, primarily signed up for Danish classes with the purpose of meeting other learners.

All this indicates that there may be a connection between the individuals' social positions of stability or transience, the language ideologies they draw on, and their actual behavioral navigation in specific social settings. However, as the present study is based solely on interview data, I cannot draw any conclusions regarding a possible causality between individuals' language ideologies and their life choices in practice. Nevertheless, it provides an interesting subject for in-depth investigation and discussion in future studies.

Conclusion

In this paper, I have explored the research question: What language ideologies are conveyed by the three students at KEA and how are these language ideologies related to the students' notions of inclusion in Danish society?

My attempt to answer this question led me on an analytical journey, which began with examining what language ideologies the three students talked about in the school context at KEA. Here, all three speakers valued English highly. The language ideologies found to be at play in the context of KEA were, *there is such a thing as good and bad English* and *English spoken by native speakers is the best English*. These perspectives caused Matt, John, and Eric to perceive themselves and their fellow students as belonging to groups of good and less good English speakers, where positive values were put on English spoken by native speakers and negative value was assigned to others. This illustrated that language ideologies are performative, as they assist individuals in navigating their social environments and in justifying their assigning of positive and negative value to groups in which they place themselves and others.

My further analysis showed that language ideologies are performative in that they may make certain views on language use and users seem like common-sense ideas. Especially John and Matt's accounts convey a language ideology that I have called *Danish society is for Danish speakers*. Thus, John and Matt express that proficiency in Danish is important in order to fit into Danish society, become included in the job market, and maintain a social network in Denmark. In contrast to the two others, Eric's stances towards Danish and English use are more ambiguous. I have argued that the ambiguity of Eric's views is connected to the notion that his primary relation to Denmark is that of the transient, multilingual community at KEA, whereas the other two have stable connections to Danish society outside KEA. Thus, factors of transience and stability in the students' social environment play a role in how the students construct language ideologies.

From this, I conclude that participants' notions of inclusion in Danish society are tightly linked to language ideologies that construct native English as good English and Danish society as a place for Danish speakers. As has become clear, the students view the social landscape at KEA and the larger context of Danish society as divided into social groups based on language. In their perceptual navigation through these groups, their ability, or lack thereof, to use English and Danish are important factors in getting access and being included. Language ideologies are thus powerful and performative entities that play an important role in determining John, Matt, and Eric's conceptualizations of Danish and English as well as their notions of social inclusion into their transient school environment at KEA and the broader setting of Danish society.

REFERENCES

- Austin, John Langshaw. 1962. *How to do things with words. The William James lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Brinkmann, Svend & Steinar Kvale. 2019. *Doing interviews*. London: SAGE.
- Bucholtz, Mary. 2000. The politics of transcription. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32(10). 1439–65.
- Duranti, Alessandro. 1997. *Linguistic anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ELAN (Version 5.9) [Computer software]. 2020. Nijmegen: Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics. Retrieved from <https://archive.mpi.nl/tla/elan>.
- Gal, Susan & Judith Irvine. 1995. The boundaries of languages and disciplines: How ideologies construct difference. *Social Research*, 62(4). 967–1001.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*. New York: Basic Books.
- Hall, Kira. 1999. Performativity. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 9(1/2). 184–187.
- Irvine, Judith T. 1989. When talk isn't cheap: Language and political economy. *American Ethnologist* 16(2). 248–267.
- Kling, Joyce. 2015. "You try with a little humor and you just get on with it": Danish lecturers' reflections on English-medium instruction. In Slobodanka Dimova, Anna Kristina Hultgren & Christian Jensen (eds.), *English-medium instruction in European higher education*, 201–222. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Kroskrity, Paul V. 2004. Language ideologies. In Alessandro Duranti (ed.), *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*, 496–517. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Lønsmann, Dorte. 2014. Linguistic diversity in the international workplace: Language ideologies and processes of exclusion. *Multilingua* 33(1-2). 89–119.

- Mortensen, Janus. 2017. Transient multilingual communities as a field of investigation: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 27(3). 271–88.
- Mortensen, Janus & Anne Fabricius. 2014. Language ideologies in Danish higher education: Exploring student perspectives. In Anne Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen & Jacob Thøgersen (eds.), *English in Nordic Universities: Ideologies and Practices*, 193–224. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Seargeant, Philip. 2009. *The idea of English in Japan: Ideology and the evolution of a global language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Silverstein, Michael. 1979. Language structure and linguistic ideology. In Paul R. Clyne, William F. Hanks & Carol L. Hofbauer (eds.), *The elements: A parasession on linguistic units and levels*, 193–248. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Spradley, James. 1979. *The ethnographic interview*. New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston.
- Tange, Hanne and Jakob Lauring. 2009. Language management and social interaction within the multilingual workplace. *Journal of Communication Management* 13(3). 218–232.
- Woolard, Kathryn A. 1998. Introduction. In Bambi B. Schieffelin, Kathryn A. Woolard & Paul V. Kroskrity (eds.), *Language ideologies. Practice and theory*, 3–50. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Woolard, Kathryn A. & Bambi B. Schieffelin. 1994. Language ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23(1). 55–82.

EXPLORING LINGUISTIC BIASES IN AN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION CONTEXT: A QUALITATIVE STUDY OF KEA STUDENTS' LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES

Frida Lundquist Andersen

This chapter investigates how language ideologies voiced by three international students reflect general sociocultural structures in the context of international education in Denmark. The study is approached through the theoretical framework of language ideologies, with a focus on native speaker ideologies and the relationship between language ideologies and English as a lingua franca. The analysis is based on explorative, semi-structured interviews with two non-native English speakers from Chile and Denmark, and one native English speaker from Zambia. I present evidence of two language ideologies: The first one is English is a valuable resource and the second is native-like English is better. My findings suggest that there is a subconscious positive ideological bias towards inner circle English varieties and accents, which indicates that not all native speaker voices are equally valued.

INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, higher education in many parts of the world has become internationalized to an unprecedented extent (Murray 2016). As a result, courses and programs have become available in English at educational institutions in countries where English is not the majority language, making the use of English as a lingua franca widespread within aca-

demia. This development has increased transnational mobility and created study-abroad opportunities for a variety of students.

In this chapter, I examine the language ideologies which three students at an international study program in Denmark 'see the world through' with the aim of exploring potential dynamics of inequality and linguistic bias that may exist in an international educational context. The study is explorative, based on a qualitative analysis of semi-structured interviews with students at KEA, *Københavns Erhvervsakademi* (Copenhagen School of Design and Technology). Two of the participants are non-native English speakers and one of them has English as a native language. My analysis focuses on the participants' views concerning the value of English, English accents and native-speaker voices, and how these views provide an insight into the way language ideologies contribute to structuring the social world of the participants.

I begin with an introduction to the theoretical framework of language ideologies. This includes a section about the relationship between language ideologies and English as a lingua franca. Additionally, I give a brief introduction to native speaker ideology, and a clarification of how I use the terms 'native speaker' and 'non-native speaker' (abbreviated NES and NNES, respectively) throughout the chapter, as well as a short definition of Kachru's concentric circles model of English. Afterwards, I provide a literature review which includes a succinct outline of relevant studies conducted on the topic of international students' language ideologies. Then follows the analysis, which is divided into two sections, each examining expressions indicative of a particular language ideology. Lastly, I conclude by offering a discussion of my findings in relation to the theoretical framework and overall research question of the chapter.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Language ideologies as a theoretical concept

A great amount of interdisciplinary research has been conducted within the framework of language ideologies, which has led to multiple definitions of the term, none of which are entirely agreed upon. Kroskrity (2006) gives a comprehensive overview of the development of theory on language ideologies as well as the various definitions. Silverstein, for example, defines language ideologies as “sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use” (quoted in Kroskrity 2006: 497). According to Kroskrity, this definition favours the idea of language users’ rationality, linguistic awareness and agency in the process of language change, but it undermines the embeddedness of language ideologies in the existing sociocultural structures. Irvine defines language ideologies as “the cultural system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interests” (quoted in Kroskrity 2006: 497), which places more emphasis on the sociocultural aspects of the structures and functions of language ideologies. Kroskrity does not find Irvine’s definition sufficient because of the absence of an aspect of variation within language ideologies. He believes that language ideologies should be understood as multiple and diverse since they are based on the individual’s sociocultural experiences and social position, which are influenced by a variety of social divisions such as race, gender, and socioeconomic class (Kroskrity 2006: 503).

I will be following Kroskrity’s approach in this chapter, because only by acknowledging that language ideologies are dependent on the individuals’ social position, is it possible to uncover how they contribute to the structuring of the speakers’ social world. To further define language ideologies as a theoretical concept, I take my point of departure in two of Kroskrity’s five dimensions of language ideologies (Kroskrity 2006: 501). The first of these is that “language ideology repre-

sents the perception of language and discourse that is constructed in the interest of a specific social or cultural group” (Kroskrity 2006: 501). Language ideologies thus often reflect and reproduce social structures that serve the interests of powerful groups or institutions. Lippi-Green (2012: 67) argues that language ideologies are constructed and reconstructed by the overarching institutions in society, such as the educational system, which consequently benefits from them. She suggests that an individual’s negative judgment of certain forms of language use or certain language varieties is based on the language ideologies he/she subscribes to, which can, as a result, lead to language discrimination (Lippi-Green 2012: 67).

The second dimension relevant for this study concerns the way language ideologies mediate between social structures and language.

Language users’ ideologies bridge their sociocultural experience and their linguistic and discursive resources by constituting those linguistic and discursive forms as indexically tied to features of their sociocultural experiences. (Kroskrity 2006: 507)

Language ideologies help us “decode” linguistic practices and consequently influence how we interpret the world. They function as a tie between our experience with language use and our interpretation of what that language use means. Consequently, language ideologies are constantly renegotiated through our social experiences and are therefore both shaped by and part of creating the social world. For this reason, language ideology as a theoretical concept is useful when investigating the social world on a micro level of communicative action as well as a macro level. As Woolard and Schieffelin point out,

The topic of language ideology is a much-needed bridge between linguistic and social theory, because it relates the microculture of communicative action

to political and economic considerations of power and social inequality, confronting macrosocial constraints on language behavior. (Woolard & Schieffelin 1994: 72)

In relation to the current study, I am interested in the language ideologies of international students. Internationalisation of higher education and the spread of English as a lingua franca (ELF) can be seen as consequences of a changing globalized macro-structure. I am particularly interested in exploring the language ideologies of international students who are users of ELF in order to investigate how these ideologies may reflect social inequalities brought about by macrosocial changes. In the next section, I will consider the connection between ELF, identity and language ideologies based on a discussion of Jenkins (2007).

Language ideologies and English as a lingua franca

Since two of the three informants for this study are NNES who study in an international environment where English is the nominal lingua franca, I find it relevant to include Jenkins' (2007) perspective on NNES identity in relation to English as a lingua franca. My understanding of English as a lingua franca is based on Seidlhofer's definition of ELF as "any use of English among speakers of different first languages for whom English is the communicative medium of choice, and often the only option" (Seidlhofer 2011: 7). This definition does not exclude NES as users of English as a lingua franca, which is useful in this study, because one of my informants is a NES, and in the context of his studies at KEA, I also consider him a user of ELF.

Jenkins (2007) argues that linguistic identity is closely related to language ideologies and that identity and ideology influence each other through a dynamic relationship, which, in the case of English, is becoming more and more complex due to globalization. She finds that her NNES informants express the belief that native-like English accents are 'good', and accents influenced by a speaker's first language (L1) are 'bad' (Jenkins 2007: 209). In other words, despite the growing

amount of expanding circle English speakers, inner circle varieties of English (Kachru 1985: 11) were, at the time of Jenkins' study, still considered the 'best' ones (see the next subsection for a brief introduction to Kachru's concentric circles model). Jenkins also mentions work by Andreasson (1994), who argues that while outer circle English speakers tend to speak in ways that emphasize their local identity, expanding circle speakers, who are the main users of English as a lingua franca, strive towards native-like accents. Jenkins states that while Andreasson's point still has some merit in 2007, ELF speakers' wish to adhere to the identity of their L1 should be considered when discussing the paradoxical nature of accent attitudes. She says:

In particular, it seems possible that while below the level of consciousness there may be a desire to express aspects of L1 group membership by retaining some aspects of the L1 accent in L2, there may be a tension between this desire and the conscious belief that a nativelike English accent is somehow better. (Jenkins 2007: 196-197)

Jenkin's study suggests that ELF speakers, to some extent, have a native-speaker-oriented way of thinking about English. This calls for an exploration of some of the prevailing native-speaker ideologies that influence the way linguistic practices unfold.

Native-speaker ideologies

In the common use of the term, a native speaker of English is a person who has spoken English for the majority of his/her life, but the concept is not as straightforward as it might seem. The very concept of 'the native speaker' is contested and has been much discussed and severely criticised in recent decades (see e.g. Doerr 2009, Bonfiglio 2010, among others). Pennycook argues that the concept of the native speaker embodies an 'idealized person with a complete and possibly innate competence in the language' (Pennycook 2017: 175).

He goes on to outline a few of the dominating language ideologies that are tied to the concept of the native speaker. One of them is that the native speaker is part of a homogenous speech community, in which there is one standard version of the language that all members of the speech community speak. Doerr (2009) argues that this ideology comes into existence through the semiotic process of *erasure*, which was introduced by Irvine and Gal (2000). Doerr writes:

Through erasure, language ideology renders invisible some persons or activities that are inconsistent with the ideological scheme by making them go unnoticed, by transforming them to match the scheme, and/or by explaining them away. (Doerr 2009: 19)

In a study by Brutt-Griffler and Samimy (2001), the concept of the native speaker is assessed through the perspective of four speakers of English, two of whom are from outer circle countries and have spoken English for the majority of their lives. From their findings, Brutt-Griffler and Samimy conclude that

The determination of the identity of the international speakers of English as 'native' or 'nonnative speakers' depends upon social factors that are not contemplated within the linguistic construct of the native speaker. (Brutt-Griffler and Samimy 2001: 102)

They mention ethnicity, nationality, appearance, and accent as some of the social identifications that come into play when a speaker is identified as either native or non-native (Brutt-Griffler and Samimy 2001: 102, 104). They further emphasize that the binary classification effectively leads to exclusion within academia and the professional lives of the individuals who are marked as non-native speakers because the concept of the native speaker is so strongly established as a measure of categorization (Brutt-Griffler and Samimy 2001: 104-105).

Despite the obvious weaknesses of the terms native and non-native speaker, I have decided to use them because they provide a convenient classification of a speaker's relationship to a particular language (in this case English), and because the categories they represent seem to have some relevance for the participants in my study (though not necessarily under these particular names). I will use NES about a person who has English as his or her first language (L1). A NNES is someone who has another L1 than English, and who uses English as an L2 or a foreign language, often in lingua franca contexts.

Additionally, I will use Kachru's (1985) concentric circles model of English as a theoretical tool to differentiate between varieties of English. Kachru divides the spread of English into a stratifying structure that consists of the inner circle, the outer circle and the expanding circle. The inner circle refers to the traditional cultural and linguistic bases of English: USA, UK, Australia, Canada and New Zealand. The outer circle includes countries in which the use of English has been introduced on an institutional level due to extended periods of colonization, predominantly by inner circle speakers (Kachru 1985: 12). In many of these countries, English is a well-established part of society and often one of multiple official languages. Lastly, users of English in countries that belong to the expanding circle are not native speakers of English, but have English as a foreign language and generally use it for international communication. For this reason, English speakers of the expanding circle are catalysts for the growth of English as an international language (Kachru 1985: 13).

Literature review

Much research has been conducted on the increasing internationalisation of higher education, and students in international environments have often been the preferred informants on this topic due to their proximity to the reality of the international institution. For example, an Australian study which examined Australian students' language ideologies, suggests that multilingualism and accents influenced by non-

native English speakers' L1 are often ideologically equated with 'low English language proficiency (ELP), low motivation to learn and perhaps even weak academic skills in general' (Bodis 2020: 2). However, while this study problematizes the monolingual mindset, it does not explore the perspective of ELF speakers and their language ideologies.

In a study of language ideologies among students in the English department at Belgrade University, Stojić (2017) argues that her findings indicate

the need for optimal and balanced instructional practices in English language teaching, which would enable students to master Standard English for the sake of intelligibility and academic and career success on the one hand, and to recognise the importance of linguistic diversity on the other. (Stojić 2007: 253)

While the paradoxical nature of the relationship between the standard language ideology and the importance of linguistic diversity is interesting, the study does not question the assumed role of standard English as inherently more intelligible and valuable in terms of academic and career success.

Language policies and their effects on international students and academic quality in general have also been explored through the theoretical framework of language ideologies. According to Jenkins, the international students in her study

[...] were [...] critical of what the institution's native English ideology meant for them in practical terms, and saw its effects on their academic identities and self-esteem [...] as harmful in a range of ways relating to their daily academic life and work. (Jenkins 2013: 201)

Jenkins' study suggests that the NNES students could potentially be negatively positioned compared to their fellow NES students. However, the informants in the study were all studying at UK universities, which meant that a good part of the negative experiences the international students had encountered was in communication with NES staff and students. While the overall research interest of Jenkins' study is similar to the one I pursue here, the present study adds the perspective of international students studying in Denmark who may be expected to communicate less with NES speakers.

Finally, since my analysis is based on interviews with students studying in Denmark, it is appropriate to briefly consider research that has been conducted on the use of English in Danish higher education. The contributions in Hultgren, Gregersen and Thøgersen (2014) investigate the cause and effect of the increasing internationalization and Englishization of Nordic Universities, contrasting language ideologies and practices. The research presented in the book is based on the assumption that there is a discrepancy between ideologies and practices, which 'have become exceptionally far removed from one another, in a way that we would suggest has become unproductive and unhelpful' (Hultgren, Gregersen & Thøgersen 2014: 2). Though the book investigates multiple issues related to internationalization through concepts like parallellingualism, nationalism, domain loss and Englishization, there is no specific focus on whether the students' language ideologies and attitudes towards varieties of English can be a reflection of linguistic biases at an institutional level.

DATA AND METHODOLOGY

This study is based on a qualitative data set of three interviews detailed in Table 1. All interviewee names are pseudonyms. The interviews with Martin and Sebastian were conducted by my fellow students Ingrid Kruse and Elizabeth Havers-Christensen respectively, while I conducted the interview with Emil. In the following I will offer some reflections on the interview process, mainly based on my own experience.

The interviews were semi-structured and all based on the same interview guide which was split into five main themes related to inclusion and language use in Danish higher education (the interview guide is included as an appendix to the introduction to the present volume). Because Emil was Danish, I had to modify the interview guide slightly. I decided to, for example, change the question *why did you decide to come to Denmark to study?* to *why did you decide to join an international course?* Even though we both speak Danish, Emil's interview was conducted in English like the two other interviews because the interview guide was in English, and I needed to be able to analyse all the data through the same coding process.

Table 1. Overview of the three interviews

Interview	Interviewer	Interviewee	Interviewee's nationality	Interviewees' L1	Interview language
1	Ingrid	Martin	Zambian	English	English
2	Elizabeth	Sebastian	Chilean	Spanish	English
3	Frida	Emil	Danish	Danish	English

While I wanted some of Emil's thoughts on the life of the international students, I also tried to focus on his experience as a Dane in an international environment. This was more difficult in some of the themes than others since Emil had not had issues with social integration in Denmark based on his Danish language competency. Overall, the interview went well, and the semi-structured format of the interview created a nice balance of structure and room for elaboration on the topics that Emil had the most to say about. However, conducting the interview via Zoom made it challenging for me as the interviewer to connect with the informant. The lighting was not very good in his video, which made it difficult to read his body language and facial expressions. I also think that I could have made a better impression if we had met in real life, which would have made it easier to gain Emil's trust and make

him feel secure and comfortable sharing his thoughts with me.

Transcription and Coding

After I had conducted the interview, I began transcribing it using the annotation software ELAN (2020). I first produced a rough transcription of the entire interview with Emil and my fellow students did the same for their interviews. This included annotations with transcriptions of what was being said, placed as precisely as possible so that overlaps between utterances were graphically visible in the ELAN file. When all the interviews in the data set had been transcribed, I began to code them, following an inductive procedure (Brinkmann & Kvale 2018). I did not have a specific hypothesis I was looking to confirm or falsify. I was looking for parts of the data that could be said to reflect the participants' language ideologies, but I did not have specific pre-established beliefs about what these ideologies would be. I ended up coding parts of the interviews that did not turn out to be relevant for my analysis, but the process gave me a good overview of the data and an analytical openness that I would not have had if I had specified my research question and analytical categories in detail from the beginning.

The most frequent categories in my analysis became 1) *English language competence*, 2) *English as an international language* and 3) *national/cultural differences*. The first category included codes such as *proficiency expectations, processing fluency, accent attitudes and insecurities, trustworthiness and language confidence*. The second included codes like *English as lingua franca, English in higher education, the possibilities of English, language barrier, language modification and linguistic assumptions*. The last one included *cultural prejudice, cultural barriers, critique of home nation, attitudes towards Denmark and inclusion/exclusion*.

In order to capture every detail, I did a fine-grained transcription of all the bits of data I wanted to use as examples in my analysis. To avoid issues of representation of non-

standard speech in these excerpts, I decided not to use eye-dialect and colloquial spelling in my transcription (Bucholtz 2000: 1461). Since the focus of my analysis is on the informants' expressed thoughts, opinions and lived experience, rather than the way they speak, I did not want the visual representation of the informants' speech to distract from the content of their utterances. The fine-grained transcription therefore only includes marking of pauses, overlaps, latching and self-interruption (see transcription key included in the introduction to the volume). However, by not representing non-standard speech I may have missed some information in the data that could potentially have provided relevant perspectives. Colloquial spelling, for example, would have made it possible to track whether the informants' speech changed when they talked about accents, and whether their thoughts about accents generally were reflected in their speech.

ANALYSIS

In the following section, I analyse the interviews with a focus on the language ideologies the three students draw on. I have divided my analysis into two subsections focusing on the predominant language ideologies I found evidence of in my data, the first one being *English is a valuable resource* and the second being *native-like English is better*.

Language ideology 1: English is a valuable resource

Though expressed in different ways, and from the perspective of two different sociocultural experiences, both Sebastian and Martin subscribe to a language ideology that constructs English as a valuable resource when it comes to success and opportunity.

The following excerpt suggests that Sebastian's language ideological valuation of English is rooted in his education:

Example 1 (Interview 2)

1 Sebastian well I came from a good school back
2 in Chile and my teachers put a lot of
3 effort into teaching and .hhh I
4 always had the notion that I would
5 (.) wanna leave my home country at
6 some point in my life so I said (.)
7 I better get good at English because
8 it's what you talk outside this (.)
9 you know frontiers .hhh

Sebastian presents 'getting good at English' as a precondition for living and working outside his home country. Indeed, his statements point towards a language ideology in which English is considered the main language for transnational communication: 'it's what you talk outside these frontiers'.

At one point in the interview, the conversation turns to how and when Sebastian learned English, and in answering this, he compares himself to his friends at home. In line 1 of example 2, 'it' refers to Sebastian's interest in bettering his English abilities. The comment is made in response to Elizabeth asking him where he learned English.

Example 2 (interview 2)

1 Sebastian that's when it all started
2 when I was a kid and it was (0.6)
3 in my school but (0.4) just like
4 a tree branches not all of them (0.3)
5 went too long not all of them went
6 too high .hhh so (0.3) it's in a big
7 way what you choose to do with the
8 language

I interpret his metaphor of a tree with branches as an illustration of the different aspirations of Sebastian and his friends. Sebastian creates an image where he to a higher degree than his friends used the resource of English to move beyond the borders of Chile. In other words, he again constructs English as a valuable resource that he chose to utilize.

Martin speaks Zambian English and is the only one of the participants who is from a country where English is an official language. This next excerpt is a response to a comment made by Ingrid in which she suggests that the Covid-19 lockdown might challenge the sense of community between international students:

Example 3 (interview 1)

1 Martin you have to have that?s?
2 (0.9) common thing that kind of
3 brings you to relate with any- with
4 anyone (0.5) really (0.2) so
5 sometimes it's uhm (0.3) sometimes
6 it's your purpose of studying at KEA
7 sometimes it's if it's you living in
8 the same area with someone obviously
9 you'll be able to communicate with
10 them more
11 Ingrid hmm
12 Martin you know so (.) there's just those
13 different things and (0.6) you
14 know (0.2) for me like that's the
15 that's the that's the main thing
16 really is just (0.4) what that helps
17 me is just my ability to (.) to
18 communicate in English really because
19 then I can just (0.2) like someone
20 can easily understand what I'm saying
21 and what not we may be so different
22 I mean (0.2) I was born and raised in
23 an African country (0.4) like most of
24 the people in my class are from
25 Europe
26 Ingrid okay [yeah]
27 Martin [?not?] all of almost all of
28 them so (0.5) you know of course
29 like (0.3) yeah I want them to learn
30 more about me but of course if I'm
31 able to to communicate to them
32 then it's a bit easier

Martins says that it is important to have things in common with the other students. For him, 'the main thing' that gives

him an advantage in social settings is his ability to communicate in English. He mentions that he was born and raised in an African country, whereas most of his classmates are from Europe, which I believe he is saying to emphasize the cultural gap between them; a gap which he is trying to bridge through his ability to tell them about himself in English. Martin suggests that even though he does not share nationality, culture or frame of reference with the European students, at least he is well equipped to talk about himself and where he is from. In other words, he views his English competence as a strength and a communicative resource, which is an expression of a language ideology in which English is valuable and useful, in this case as a means of cross-cultural communication.

Unlike the interviews with Sebastian and Martin, my interview with Emil did not lead to an explicit discussion of the value of English – perhaps because this topic was less obvious to discuss for Emil as a local student. To sum up, Martin and Sebastian both subscribe to a language ideology that constructs English as a valuable resource, especially in an international context. Sebastian expresses the ideology through a construction of English as a prerequisite for succeeding outside Chile, while in Martin's case, English is framed as a useful communicative resource that is valuable in the context of ELF and within international education.

Language ideology 2: Native-like English is better

The second ideology I have identified, *Native-like English is better*, mainly surfaces in parts of the interviews where the participants explicitly talk about accents. This is the case in Example 4, where Sebastian expresses a language ideology in which native-like accents are positively valued, while he also indicates an appreciation of the cultural implications of L1-influenced accents. He says:

Example 4 (Interview 2)

1 Sebastian I used to have a very (.) American

2 (.) kind of English like [really]
 3 Elizabeth [mmh]=
 4 Sebastian =American they actually asked me all
 5 the time are you American and I was
 6 like hell no so I ha ha erm (0.7)
 7 a- you know after spending some
 8 time here (0.8) I kinda started to
 9 (0.2) listen to variations of English
 10 such as my wife's English (0.5)
 11 such as you know guys of KEA or
 12 stuff like that so .hhh (0.3) I don't
 13 know why but (0.7) there is a weird
 14 process that happen in which my
 15 English just became more Spanish
 16 accent .hhh
 17 Elizabeth mmh
 18 Sebastian erm (0.2) I embrace it (0.2) I-
 19 I love my roots I think it's good to
 20 (.) love your roots but .hhh
 21 Elizabeth ((giggles))yeah
 22 Sebastian I would've rather just gotten the
 23 American one back it was a bit more
 24 fluent and a bit easier to come
 25 across with the confidence part

An American accent clearly has positive indexical meaning for Sebastian. He finds that when he himself had (or was perceived to have) an American accent it was 'a bit more fluent and a bit easier to understand', which made it easier for him to feel confident. In reference to an interaction with an American acquaintance earlier in the interview, he additionally uses the words 'flawless', 'soft' and 'fluent', to describe the American accent, in opposition to his own current accent which he describes as 'tough' and 'slow'. These comments indicate that Sebastian subscribes to a language ideology in which an inner circle accent, specifically an American one, is positively valued. However, the fact that Sebastian quotes himself as answering 'hell no' when people ask if he is American suggests that this does not necessarily mean that he wants to be associated with America or American culture in general.

Despite his apparent preference for an American accent, Sebastian also refers to embracing his Spanish accent as a way of showing appreciation for his roots. This indicates

a degree of awareness of the language ideologies he subscribes to, and it activates a language ideological stance that potentially challenges the ideology he otherwise seems to espouse, that inner-circle English is better. Nevertheless, it still seems like his longing for a native-like accent (specifically an American one) trumps his wish to embrace his roots.

When Elizabeth asks Sebastian what advice he would give a new international student at KEA, he uses the verb 'polish' in relation to English:

Example 5 (Interview 2)

1 Elizabeth what about language-wise then
2 Sebastian err polish your English((laughs))
3 Elizabeth yeah
4 Sebastian you need to yeah like it's (0.5).hhh
5 (0.5) I mean it is an- an essential
6 requirement to- to have
7 an approved test with a good score
8 which I think it was over ninety
9 (0.6) out of one-hundred-and-twenty
10 Elizabeth ((clears throat))
11 Sebastian and tha- (.) .hhh no I think I
12 ?defy it? but still you know a margin
13 in the end of .hhh err (0.9) in the
14 end of the spectrum but .hhh (0.3)
15 err if you can pass the test (0.2)
16 you will be (.) good (0.5) at (0.2)
17 you know your career but if you
18 wanna be excellent .hhh you
19 kinda have to go way beyond that
20 you have to .hhh (0.2) you know
21 like (0.3) social aspect is
22 so so important and English
23 (.) plays a (0.2) major role
24 (.) mmm so (.) you need
25 to go all in as much as you can

He begins by stating that his advice to a new international student at KEA would be to 'polish your English'. When he says that 'it is essential to have an approved test' (line 7), to get admitted to KEA, he refers to the standardized English tests, such as TOEFL or IELTS. In his view, you will be fine with regard to 'career' if you pass the test. However, he goes on to say that

in order to be 'excellent', you must go beyond the requirements of the test. This 'going beyond' suggests another level of language competence, which indicates that when he uses the word 'polish', he is not referring to the ability to simply understand and communicate in English (as expected to pass the test), but an unspecified refinement beyond that. In the context of Sebastian's personal preference for an American accent rather than a Spanish-sounding one as discussed above, it would perhaps seem reasonable to suggest that 'polishing' one's language in Example 5 implies adopting or aiming for an English accent not clearly influenced by one's (non-English) L1.

Taken together, Examples 4 and 5 suggest that Sebastian subscribes to two apparently contradictory language ideologies when it comes to accent. On the one hand, he values a Spanish way of speaking English as a way of embracing his roots. On the other hand, he believes that a 'polished' form of English, particularly an American-sounding one, is the way to be 'excellent', in terms of professional as well as social position. This relates to Jenkins' point about the existence of a discrepancy between a speaker's wish to acquire an English native-like accent, and the awareness of the connection between his/her L1 and cultural background, nationality or 'roots'.

At one point in the interview, Sebastian talks about his own and his peers' accents in relation to doing projects at KEA, and he uses the word 'trust':

Example 6 (interview 2)

1 Elizabeth so do you think it matters which
2 accent you have like in-
3 Sebastian up to (0.2) I think in a
4 subconscious level it does err it's
5 very important to build trust you
6 know between your peers and in
7 projects and everything .hhh and if
8 you happen to have an accent
9 that might seem (.) even when your
10 English is amazing you have an
11 accent that just seems like .hhh

12 you're- (.) might not be fully
13 close to the language
14 like Russian tends to be you know a
15 hard accent .hhh
16 Elizabeth ((giggles)) yeah
17 Sebastian it might inspire me less trust (.)
18 than you know for instance a
19 Swedish person that might speak a
20 very (.) easy and fluent kind of
21 English I might feel easier to
22 communicate with them in a
23 subconscious level

Here Sebastian arguably expresses a language ideology in which a non-native accent may index a lack of language competence (being 'not fully close to the language'), which makes the speaker less trustworthy. He further states that a 'hard' Russian accent 'inspires less trust' than a Swedish 'easy and fluent' accent. In other words, Sebastian feels less inclined to trust that his peers at KEA are capable of doing a good project if they have a certain kind of accent. Taking Sebastian's positive valuation of the American accent into account, I would argue that a native, inner circle-oriented accent plays a part in his characterization of 'good English', at least in terms of academic success. Because Sebastian's stance on English relates to the ability to *succeed* in an academic setting, it is closely related to language ideology 1, *English is a valuable resource*, which I accounted for above.

Like Sebastian, Emil also discusses how English may be influenced by one's L1. He is generally critical of this process, though he ends up taking a quite ambiguous stance:

Example 7 (Interview 3)

1 Emil ((coughing)) I don't uh
2 like particularly like the uh
3 (0.3) the very Danish sounding (.)
4 uh English accent uhm
5 Frida he he
6 Emil .hhh so I'm trying to stay
7 away from that
8 Frida [mmh]
9 Emil [uhm] .hhh so when people say

10 oh you don't sound Danish
11 at all uhm (0.5) I take that as a
12 very very huge compliment I really
13 like that uh .hhh .hhh (0.6) but I
14 don't really care with other people
15 (0.4) like uh (1.4) for some reason I
16 think it goes for everyone you don't
17 like the (1.2) the accent that you
18 have (0.4) or your country your .hhh
19 language has but uh you don't really
20 care about other people and sometimes
21 it's kind of (0.5) cool and exotic
22 that people speak with (.) .hhh
23 different accents as long as it's
24 like (1.2) in a way that you can
25 understand it like some people have
26 a hard way of pronouncing words but
27 if you can pronounce words clearly
28 Frida mmh
29 Emil (0.3) then (1.0) it doesn't really
30 matter

Emil states that being told that he does not sound Danish is a 'very very huge compliment' for him, which makes it clear that he assigns great personal value to *not* having a Danish accent. Emil's accent is one of the linguistic resources available to him, and the well-received comments are part of his sociocultural experience. Following Kroskrity (2006), Emil's language ideologies function as a tie between his linguistic resources and his sociocultural experiences. I would argue that the fact that he takes the comment as a 'huge compliment' suggests that the Danish accent has negative indexical meaning for him, which could reflect a language ideology in which a standardized and native-like accent is valued higher than an L1-influenced accent.

As mentioned above, Kroskrity points out that language ideologies mediate between language and the social world, and in that sense *reflect* just as much as they *create* the way we see the world. It is thus likely that Emil's animosity towards his own accent reflects his social experience and the language ideologies he has been exposed to.

Interestingly, Emil does not express a negative attitude towards *other* speakers with L1-influenced accents, quite the

opposite, which suggests a paradox in the way his own accent is valued as opposed to that of others. Finally, it is worth noting that Emil does not appear to be experiencing the tension Jenkins (2007) mentions of being caught between the wish to show L1 membership while at the same time aiming for a native-like English accent.

Moving on from the interviews with Sebastian and Emil, Martin represents a rather different case. In the following excerpt, Martin talks about his experience with English in Denmark:

Example 8 (interview 1)

1 Martin in the beginning if I used to talk in
2 my normal accent you might
3 not be hea- able to hear some of the
4 things that (1.7) I was saying
5 but (0.3) you know now I'm used to
6 this accent this is how I talk
7 Ingrid okay so do you actually feel like
8 you have (.) uhm changed your-
9 the way you speak English since
10 you came to Denmark
11 Martin definitely I've changed my accent
12 and I've changed the range of my
13 vocabulary (0.4) I remember
14 yesterday I was trying to write
15 eh an academic paper and I (0.5)
16 there are words that (0.5)
17 I don't even (0.4) know as well
18 anymore=
19 Ingrid =[he he]
20 Martin [like] (.) the vocabulary is
21 going slowly (0.3) I have to
22 google what (.) what (.) what word do
23 you use when you're trying to
24 explain this and you know so
25 (0.6) yeah

This excerpt provides a basis for understanding how Martin views his own position in a community where English is often used as a lingua franca by NNES. He mentions that he had to change his accent, and that Ingrid probably would not have been able to understand his previous 'normal accent'. He also

had to downplay the range of his vocabulary, which, as a result, is 'slowly going'. Unlike Sebastian and Emil, Martin does not talk about accents as bound to nationalities, nor does he express a wish to attain another kind of accent because it carries a more positive indexical meaning. Instead, changing his accent seems to be caused by comprehensibility issues.

Later in the interview, Martin and Ingrid talk about the English language testing system that includes tests like TOEFL and IELTS. Martin was required to do one of these tests to get admitted to KEA, which he was 'actually not happy about' and 'didn't even have to study for'. Prior to the excerpt below, Martin says that he believes that taking a test like TOEFL or IELTS is a basic requirement at KEA because KEA expects to receive students from Europe mainly, and outside the UK, Europeans do not have English as their first language. He goes on:

Example 9: (interview 1)

1 Martin so it's like okay maybe that's
2 what they take into account
3 and that's why they make it a
4 basic requirement and they're
5 like okay xxx at least you other
6 countries like the UK the US
7 where they speak English all the
8 time but they didn't really go
9 the extra mile to like (0.8)
10 you know research more about it
11 because they're like oh okay like
12 it should be they should be
13 a a few more exceptions
14 (1.3) really (0.5)
15 Ingrid okay [yeah]
16 Martin [that's] that's my opinion
17 in terms of like other countries
18 that speak English that's that's
19 my only thing because I've seen
20 you can just imagine being a
21 bright mind who wants to .hhh
22 study (0.8) at KEA and kind of
23 contributes (.) you know and they
24 would I mean they would a hundred
25 percent benefit from that person

26 but because they have to (1.0)
27 take this test (0.3) which costs
28 money and (0.3) it requires time
29 and they don't even necessarily
30 have to take the test (0.3)
31 because I mean of course if other
32 people have (0.4) exemptions
33 then (0.3) they should
34 have an exemption too

Martin tries to make sense of why he had to take the test despite being from a country where English is the official language. He argues that the problem is based on ignorance and that 'they' (which I take to mean KEA) do not prioritize researching and acknowledging varieties of English beyond those of the inner circle. By stating that English-speaking students from outer-circle countries like Zambia should 'have an exemption too', Martin is arguing that they should be granted the same native-speaker status as students from inner-circle countries like USA and the UK. This indicates that he is drawing on a language ideology that awards certain privileges to native speakers. However, the language ideology Martin expresses is more inclusive than the one expressed by Emil and Sebastian, as well as the language ideologies KEA's English testing guidelines are supposedly based on, which according to Martin's account appear to be specifically predisposed towards inner-circle varieties of English.

Martin subscribes to a language ideology that grants a certain status to native speakers, but he also explains how he had to change his vocabulary and his accent when he came to Denmark, and take a test which he believes he is over-qualified for. This provides an interesting perspective on the inner circle-focused language ideologies expressed by Emil and Sebastian, and it calls into question the position of native speakers from the outer circle. Martin additionally raises the potential problem of a 'bright young mind' getting lost in the bureaucracy of the testing system, because his/her NES status is not acknowledged. This is related to Lippi-Green's notion of English as the language of the powerful, and the role of educational institutions in recreating social structures that

lead to language subordination through a language ideology that favours certain varieties of English.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

This chapter has provided insight into the language ideologies expressed by three students in the context of international education. While we might expect internationalization of higher education and the spread of ELF to lead to ideologies valuing a range of accents, I have found evidence of language ideologies that are related to native speaker ideologies. Sebastian and Emil, who are both non-native English speakers, express a preference for inner circle varieties of English, which suggests that they subscribe to a language ideology that favours native-like English and consider it superior to non-native varieties when it comes to academic as well as social contexts. However, despite the prevalence of the NNES/NES dichotomy, my analysis further suggests that not all native-speaker voices are valued equally. Just like Sebastian and Emil, Martin draws on a language ideology that constructs English as a valuable resource. He argues that speakers from 'other countries where they speak English' should be exempted from tests in the same way speakers from the UK and the US are, which indicates an appreciation and acknowledgement of the privileges that come from the NES status.

Martin's account suggests that he experiences a subordination of his outer-circle variety of English. Arguably, this subordination is facilitated by a language ideology that favours inner circle varieties of English and erases other native-speaker varieties. The prevalence of such ideologies favouring certain types of native speakers are a prerequisite for a bias towards certain varieties in the English language testing system. As Lippi-Green argues, language ideologies are constructed and reconstructed through the overarching institutions in society, such as the language testing systems. Therefore, language ideologies are also influenced by the testing system's disposition towards a certain variety of English as a

measure of language competency. Ideology and institutional structure are thus reinforcing the status quo through a circular dependency.

In other words, there is a dynamic of inequality at work in which *English is a valuable resource* for some native speakers to a higher degree than others. This is reflected in the institutional policy regarding language tests that Martin talks about (which can be found on the KEA website (see KEA n.d.)), but I would argue that this linguistic bias is also present in the language ideologies expressed by the other interviewees, in which different varieties of English are assigned unequal value.

It can be argued that this dynamic of inequality is related to the problematic implications of the NNES/NES distinction. It should be reconsidered whether the NNES/NES distinction is relevant for the evaluation of language competence when linguistic identity is increasingly influenced by the spread of ELF. As argued by Brutt-Griffler and Samimy (2001), making native-speaker English a requirement within academia (and everywhere else for that matter) may enable exclusion and missed opportunities for everyone involved. Changing existing practice, however, is a development that would require not only a change of language policy with regard to language testing, but also a change in language ideology.

In conclusion, I would argue that for internationalization of higher education through the medium of English to be considered successfully accomplished, acknowledgement and legitimization of all varieties of English need to be reflected in the language ideologies of the international students. However, that is only possible if the institutions contribute to change on a structural level through a re-evaluation of the language ideologies they are building their language policies upon.

REFERENCES

- Bodis, Agnes. 2020. 'Double deficit' and exclusion: Mediated language ideologies and international students' multilingualism. *Multilingua*. Online ahead-of-print.
- Bonfiglio, Thomas Paul. 2010. *Mother tongues and nations*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Brinkmann, Svend & Steinar Kvale. 2018. *Doing interviews*. London: SAGE.
- Brutt-Griffler, Janina & Keiko K. Samimy. 2001. Transcending the nativeness paradigm. *World Englishes* 20(1). 99–106.
- Bucholtz, Mary. 2000. The politics of transcription. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32. 1439-1465.
- Doerr, Neriko Musha. 2009. Investigating “native speaker effects”: Toward a new model of analyzing “native speaker” ideologies. In Neriko Musha Doerr (ed.), *The native speaker concept: Ethnographic investigations of native speaker effects*, 155-46. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- ELAN (Version 5.9) [Computer software]. 2020. Nijmegen: Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics. Retrieved from <https://archive.mpi.nl/tla/elan>.
- Hultgren, Anna Kristina, Frans Gregersen & Jacob Thøgersen (eds.). 2014. *English in Nordic universities: Ideologies and practices*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Irvine, Judith T. & Susan Gal. 2000. Language ideology and language differentiation. In Paul V. Kroskrity (ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, policies and identities*, 35–84. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.
- Jenkins, Jennifer. 2007. *English as a lingua franca: Attitude and identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, Jennifer. 2013. *English as a lingua franca in the international university: The politics of academic English language policy*. London: Taylor & Francis Group.

- Kachru, Braj B. 1985. Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the outer circle. In Randolph Quirk & H. G. Widdowson (eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures*, 11–30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- KEA, n.d. Application and admission. *Københavns Erhvervsakademi*.
<https://kea.dk/en/programmes/application-and-admission> (4 February, 2021).
- Kroskrity, Paul V. 2006. Language ideologies. In Alessandro Duranti (ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology*, 496–517. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Lippi-Green, Rosina. 2012. *English with an accent: Language, ideology and discrimination in the United States*. 2nd edition. London and New York: Routledge.
- Murray, Neil. 2016. *Standards of English in higher education: Issues, challenges and strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pennycook, Alastair. 2017. *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. London: Routledge.
- Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2011. *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stojić, Svetlana R. 2017. Language ideologies in the mirror of some Serbian students' attitudes towards variation and change in British English. *Issues in Ethnology and Anthropology* 12(1). 241–257.
- Woolard, Kathryn A. & Bambi B. Schieffelin. 1994. Language ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23. 55–82.

**'IT TURNED INTO A MOTHER TONGUE':
IDEOLOGIES OF ENGLISH AS A 'NATIVE' LANGUAGE
AMONG INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS IN COPENHAGEN**

Niels G. van Leeuwen

This chapter investigates ideologies of English as a 'native' language among international students in Denmark. Using three semi-structured interviews with international students studying in Denmark as data, the study finds that in all three interviews, similar ideologies regarding 'non-native' and 'native' speakers of English are constructed. They all present an ideology that 'native' and 'non-native' speakers have different levels of competence in and authority over English, but they differ in who they regard as a 'native' speaker. Two of the three interviews construct a relatively traditional view of the interviewees respectively as a 'non-native' and 'native' speaker of English while the third interview constructs the idea that the interviewee's 'native' language has changed to English after mainly using that since he moved to Denmark. It is concluded that people's ideologies of English as a 'native' language can be connected to processes associated with globalisation as increased cultural reflexivity and pluralism give rise to new ways to claim authority over the language.

Introduction

The process termed globalisation has led to, among many other things, an increase in meetings between people with different linguistic backgrounds. This intermingling of people with diverse cultural roots has created the conditions for

increased reflexivity concerning the idea of the 'native' language. Just as Doerr (2019, 74) states that students can learn from 'critically analyzing this notion of "native speaker"', I find that we can equally learn from studying students' ideas of the notion. In this chapter, I investigate ideologies of English as a 'native' language in circulation among students in an international, multicultural and plurilingual environment. The study is guided by the research question 'Which language ideological views concerning English as a 'native' language do international students in Copenhagen show, and how do these ideologies relate to globalisation?'. I first briefly present the concept of language ideology and the concepts of 'native' language and language authority. Then I present the investigation in the study, whose data comes from three interviews with students with experience from an international study programme in Copenhagen, before analysing the data and discussing the results. Finally, I discuss how these ideologies tie in with globalisation.

Theoretical background and central concepts

In this section, I account for and discuss the central theories and concepts employed in the chapter. I start by looking at the term *language ideology*. Then I move on to the concepts of 'native' speaker and 'native' language. These concepts have been criticised among scholars, but are still prevalent both among linguists and non-linguists, and, I argue, useful for analysing language ideologies. To finish the section, I tie this discussion in with the concept of *language authority*.

Within the field of sociolinguistics, language ideology is a term that has to do with the way people think about language. After reviewing several definitions of language ideologies, Kroskrity (2004, 498) pins them down as 'beliefs, or feelings, about languages as used in their social worlds'. Peterson (2020, 7) offers a similar and yet distinct definition of language ideologies as 'preconceived notions, beliefs and/or emotions that people hold about certain social styles, varieties, or features of a language'. Language ideologies can be considered

sociocultural conceptualisations that not only have to do with language but also ‘speakers, and discursive practices’ (Irvine 2012). As such, a study of language ideology is a study of how people think about language practice and language users. In this chapter, language ideologies will be explored through their discursive construction in the interaction in three interviews. I will elaborate on this in the methodology section.

When I from now on stop using scare quotes around the word ‘native’ when talking about the concept of the/a ‘native language’ and the associated notion of the/a ‘native speaker’, it is only for the sake of convenience. The term native and its collocations are rightfully controversial and have been widely criticised (Davies 1991; 2004; Phillipson 1992; Pennycook 1994; Myhill 2003; Jenkins 2006; Liddicoat 2016). Some scholars have called for a need to move beyond the notion of the native speaker altogether (Doerr 2009; Houghton, Rivers & Hashimoto 2018; Lowe & Lawrence 2018), calling out the term as ideologically problematic and theoretically flawed. In Liddicoat’s (2016, 410) words, it is ‘apparent’ that ‘the category native speaker is an ideological product’, and he goes on to explain that the concept is often criticised for a lack of clarity as to who exactly constitutes a native speaker.

Despite these issues, I will employ the terms ‘native speaker’ and ‘native language’ in this chapter because they arguably have salience to the participants in my study and because they play a role in the language ideologies that emerge from the data. Since my work thus entails an analysis of non-specialists’ constructions of what a native language is, it makes little sense to use the term in a strictly technical sense. To approach an understanding of the everyday meaning of the term ‘native language’ (as opposed to a more critically informed perspective), the following definitions from a selection of online sources offer a good starting point:

The first language that you learn
(Cambridge English Dictionary n.d.)

One's first language, learned in early childhood.
(Wiktionary n.d.)

The language of the country that someone is born in
or native to (Collins English Dictionary n.d.)

The two first definitions present an idea of the native language as being entirely based on the sequentiality of learned languages. The third definition is different, offering the perspective that a native language is tied to a region rather than an individual (also discussed in Bonfiglio 2010). In my analytical approach, I follow these broad definitions and focus on cases where the interview participants draw on conceptions of a native language as a first-learned language or a language that is identified as belonging to a particular place. Relative to a native language, I take a native speaker to be someone who identifies as or is identified by others as having a particular language as their native language.

I argue that a trait afforded to native speakers is language authority, which is based on native speakers having social legitimacy to govern language norms, i.e. what *is* and *is not* to be considered correct language use. In this context, norm governance is not limited to the work of formal institutes for language planning but includes less formalised groups and individuals. Bourdieu (1977, 650) writes that legitimate, or authorised, language use is characterised by 'legitimate phonological and syntactic form'. He goes on to argue that the school system perpetuates the belief that 'discourse should be recognized if and only if it conforms to the legitimate norms' (Bourdieu 1977, 650), which could be considered a language ideology. In turn, my argument is that the native speaker is characterised by having norm-governing authority through legitimacy. Regarding native English, a relevant theory to bring up here is Kachru's (1982) concentric circles model that divides the English-speaking world into groups of countries according to the role English plays in the countries. The inner-circle countries, such as the UK, the US and Australia, are the ones that have traditionally been seen

to provide the norms of English use, which can be considered a consequence of the authority native speakers are afforded, in accordance with a native speaker language ideology.

Methodology

The data analysed in this chapter comes from three semi-structured qualitative interviews with people who were studying or had recently studied on an international study programme at the Copenhagen School of Design and Technology (KEA). The interviews were recorded and subsequently transcribed. Due to restrictions from the COVID-19 lockdown, the interviews were conducted via teleconference, two through Zoom and one via Microsoft Teams. Amena Ghannoum, Sára Olsen and myself, all master's students of English, each conducted and transcribed an interview as part of a master's degree course on sociolinguistics and globalisation. The combined length of the interviews amounts to around 2 hours and 45 minutes. The informants are John, who grew up in the US, Alexandru, who grew up in Romania speaking Romanian and Hungarian, and Małgorzata, who grew up in Poland. These names are pseudonyms.

Table 1: Overview of the interviewee-interviewer pairs behind the interviews

Interviewee	Interviewer
John	Amena
Alexandru	Sára
Małgorzata	Niels

Note that while I have coded (cf. below) all three interviews, I have only transcribed the one I conducted myself. The excerpts from Amena Ghannoum's and Sára Olsen's interviews that I have included in the chapter were modified by me on the basis of the transcriptions provided to me by them.

My interview was recorded with both sound and video on, but the transcription was made on the basis of only the sound file because the informant did not give permission to store the video recording. Haberland and Mortensen (2016, 583–84)

use the term *first-order entextualisation* to describe 'the recording of a stretch of human activity, including verbal and non-verbal activities' and *second-order entextualisation* to refer to 'the transfer of a recorded stretch of human activity to some form of written representation'. In my specific situation, the second-order entextualisation was thus based on a file that did not contain the visual part of the first-order entextualisation since this had been deleted by the time of transcription.

As mentioned, the interviews are semi-structured qualitative interviews. According to Brinkmann and Kvale (2018, chap. 2), the purpose of the qualitative interview is to obtain 'qualitative knowledge as expressed in normal language [...] The interview aims at nuanced accounts of different aspects of the interviewee's life world'. They describe the knowledge emerging from qualitative interviews as 'constituted through linguistic interaction, where the participants' discourse, its structures and effects, is of interest in its own right' (Brinkmann and Kvale 2018, chap. 2). This view of meaning as something interpersonal that arises in the moment of interaction belongs to the *interpretivist, constructivist* paradigm, which is a common framework to analyse qualitative data in (Check and Schutt 2012, 15) and what I will employ.

Denzin and Lincoln (2011, 13) describe constructivism as ontologically relativist and epistemologically subjectivist and as a paradigm which assumes that 'knower and respondent co-create understandings'. My analysis will broadly fall within what I have referred to as the constructivist paradigm, and the interaction will be close-read in an empirical approach to the data as commonly done in the field of *interactional sociolinguistics* (Verschuereen 2010). Verschuereen (2010, 171) characterises interactional sociolinguistics as 'thoroughly empirical, rigorously centered around observable phenomena'. With inspiration from conversation-analytical methods (see e.g. Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson 1974; Sacks 1995), I consider meaning creation a joint process that should be analysed through interpretation of utterances and their uptake of other participating interlocutors, which indicates

the co-construction. Thereby, I aim to take into consideration as much of the communication situation as possible.

It is important to note that the chapter is not primarily interested in interaction per se; it falls into the ethnographic tradition of linguistics (Duranti 1997, chap. 4; Rampton, Maybin and Roberts 2015). However, the constructivist approach does still work under the assumption that meaning is co-constructed in interaction. The meaning that can be extracted should thus not be seen as an ontologically static entity that exists 'out there', but more like a negotiated state of affairs established in the inter-action and discursive context.

My analysis involved coding the data. Coding can be described as the structural conceptualisation of raw data (Corbin and Strauss 2008, chap. 4) or as the construction and attribution of meaning to pieces of data with 'summative, salient, essence-capturing, and/or evocative attribute[s]' for subsequent 'pattern detection, categorization, theory building, and other analytic purposes' (Saldaña 2013, 3–4). While coding has been criticised for being theoretically deficient (Mishler 1986; Packer 2011), I find the method appropriate for the current investigation. First of all, whether or not there are some potential theoretical weaknesses to the method, it is a useful, practical way to manage relatively large amounts of qualitative data. Secondly, as Corbin and Strauss (2008, chap. 4) state, coding 'involves interacting with data', which is similar to the assumption I have made with my constructivist approach. Of course, at this point, the co-construction of meaning has been extended beyond the interview situation, but the engagement with the data continues.

My coding was relatively simple, and I did not move beyond coding to categorising (cf. Saldaña 2013, 9–15). This was due to the relatively narrow focus of the chapter and concerns of space. In my qualitative analysis, I chose to focus on native-speaker ideologies as laid out in the beginning. The coding was therefore especially focussed on capturing any points in the interaction where I deemed that ideologies regarding the native speaker were activated or themes related

to it explicitly came up. This meant that I coded passages concerning things like language proficiency and multiculturalism as such passages often activated relevant language ideologies.

Findings on ideologies of English as a native language among international students

As mentioned, the data analysed in this chapter comes from three interviews with international students in Copenhagen. All the interviews saw ideologies about the idea of (English as) a native language activated.

Connecting language and place

As mentioned above, a native language is often seen as intrinsically tied to a person's place of origin. This section of the analysis will look at how this ideological connection between language and place is constructed in the interviews.

At one point during her interview, Małgorzata responds to a question of which languages she speaks (see the transcription key in the introductory chapter of this volume):

Example 1

01 Małgorzata: hm I learned a bit of few (.)
02 languages but don't speak er
03 (0.9) er in any of them I've
04 been learning Latin some time
05 ago I've (.) been like in
06 secondary school then I've been
07 learning Spanish but I have a
08 very very long break
09 Niels: okay
10 Małgorzata: so I don't remember (0.8)
11 ye[ah I]
12 Niels: [but can]
13 Małgorzata: tried (.) German and Russian
14 but it's just er (.) little
15 (0.6) n- now I (.) forgot
16 ha ha ha everything=
17 Niels: =okay (0.3) and can I assume

Example 2

01 Małgorzata: so I was very excited that I
02 will meet people from other
03 nationalities (0.6) but er it
04 turned out (.) that (.) there
05 were (.) er was a half of
06 Polish people
07 Niels: uh-huh
08 Małgorzata: so due to the language (0.6) uh
09 sometimes it was easier to work
10 (.) together

Here, the ideology behind the conflation of nation and language is explicitly activated. Nowhere in the example is the native language directly mentioned, but the reasoning in Example 2 that 'it was easier' for Polish people to work together 'due to the language' seems to come from an assumption that people with Polish nationality have ideal communicative competence in the Polish language. Furthermore, the underlying assumption is that this communicative competence causes people to group together in certain configurations based on nationality, considered emblematic of language proficiency. Thus, in the interview, the interlocutors coconstruct and perpetuate an ideology that links native language to a particular place, and Małgorzata explains how this connection plays a role in the classwork group formation as it is seen as ensuring 'easy' communication.

The ideological linkage between language and place is also present in the wider institutional setting at KEA. All the international students in this context speak English, and as per KEA's own website (KEA n.d.), admission to KEA requires certification of English competence assessed at a sufficient level in one of the English language tests IELTS, TOEFL or one of three Cambridge tests, with exceptions from this condition granted to applicants with a secondary-school degree from the UK, Ireland, the US, Canada, Australia, New Zealand or South Africa. As Małgorzata phrases it elsewhere in the interview, the organisations that manage the tests 'are professional in

checking your language level'. The exemptions from the English-language tests generally are given to citizens of countries that could be considered inner-circle, i.e. the core of the Anglosphere with a tradition of English in both official settings and ubiquitously among the population, or, in the case of South Africa, outer-circle (Gottlieb 2020, 344). However, in any case, taking a secondary-school degree in any of these countries presumably requires English competence at a reasonable level. As the implementation of this measure likely serves to ensure communicative competence among all students, the fact that the test exemption is based on the applicant's country of origin perpetuates the ideology tying language to place. We see this ideology not only being constructed in the interviews, but also present in the institutional structures at KEA.

Iconisation: Linking linguistic and non-linguistic competences

We see above that the students, according to Małgorzata's account, seem inclined to assume that people communicate better with people from the same country as themselves because they presumably speak the same language. However, the use of the native language is not just a question of communicative competence, at least in the case of English. For Małgorzata, the use of native English accents in English also indexes 'awesomeness' and professionalism:

Example 3

01 Niels: you think (0.5) in school (.)
02 that it matters er what sort of
03 accent you have
04 (2.1)
05 Małgorzata: I don't think so because we er
06 we had some presentations so of
07 course it's better to have (0.2)
08 good English and people from
09 Great Britain (.) were (.)
10 better because (0.5) they could
11 sound (0.8) awesome

12 ...
 13 Niels: do you have an example of the er
 14 (.) of the latt[er]
 15 Małgorzata: [xxx]xxx
 16 (1.3)
 17 Niels: ?of some? (.) of of (.) the
 18 accent being a problem
 19 (0.6)
 20 Małgorzata: .hhh (.) er no but I think if it
 21 can be (0.2) .hhh hm (0.7) yeah
 22 maybe er people who have good
 23 accents sound more professional
 24 (0.6) and reliable (.) than
 25 someone (.) who can't er speak
 26 properly

I argue that the same idea as from before ('people from the country X, here the UK, speak language X, here English, well') is present, but it is not limited to communicative competence. The ideology that comes to light in Example 3 does not come in a comment on communicative competence or language choice. It is a question of language variation and accent being tied to non-linguistic traits such as awesomeness (cf. 'awesome', l. 11). It is interesting to note that Małgorzata initially answers that accent does not matter but immediately afterwards states that 'of course it's better to have good English, and people from Great Britain were better'. Afterwards, I, the interviewer, request an example, and Małgorzata explains that 'people who have good accents sound more professional and reliable than someone who can't speak properly'. As not being able to support your position can cause loss of face, a justification of her previous claim, which this comment by Małgorzata might essentially be, seems like a natural response to a possibly, although not necessarily, sceptical request for elaboration. Thus, it seems that the interaction here plays a role in constructing the language ideological output as a joint product. This is a clear instance of an ideology about English as a native language: people who speak English natively '*sound* more professional and reliable'. Thereby, they are not only more competent in English, their work is also more appreciated.

Another question is if English native speakers are also perceived as *being* more 'awesome' or professional, cf. Irvine & Gal's (2000, 37) definition of *iconisation* as the view that 'a linguistic feature somehow depict[s] or display[s] a social group's inherent nature or essence'. While the interview with Małgorzata only goes as far as constructing a link between accent and professionalism, things go further in the interview with Alexandru as he connects language features with a speaker's competence in areas outside of just language. In Example 4, he talks about one teacher's English proficiency after being asked if he has ever had problems communicating with someone in English at KEA. Accent and professional competence are not linked as in the interview with Małgorzata, neither directly in the discourse nor indirectly in the underlying ideologies, but language form is suggested to be an indicator of teaching qualifications, serving as an icon of the speaker's competence outside of communication.

Example 4

01 Alexandru: she cannot answer what we are
02 asking because she doesn't know
03 what what we actually are saying
04 (.) or either she doesn't know
05 what she's teaching or she
06 doesn't know what we are saying I
07 don't know what it how it works

Alexandru expresses that when a teacher fails to answer a question, he is unsure if the cause is the teacher's low English proficiency or deficient competence in the subject they are teaching. The problems that Alexandru describes do, however, seem to not just concern the teacher's supposed inability to speak with a UK or similarly prestigious accent. The challenges of teaching in a language that is different from your primary language of academic discourse socialisation have been outlined in a number of studies (Jensen et al. 2013; Preisler 2014), and Example 4 above arguably aligns itself with an also widespread language ideology that language competence reflects academic competence. Compare also the

different ideologies of non-standard English constructed in the interviews with Małgorzata and Alexandru:

Example 5a

01 Małgorzata: because it's not (.) English
02 with British people or American
03 .hhh it's international English
04 and we all make mistakes

Example 5b

01 Alexandru: uh the- the- some of our teachers
02 are (.) are not the best at
03 English I must ?ad-? tell you
04 like uh (.) .hhh they they always
05 ?er? translate (.) and then the
06 phrasing doesn't come out as it
07 should (0.4) and then it doesn't
08 make any sense at all but they
09 think that they are speaking well

In Example 5a, Małgorzata is explaining why she feels that her English has improved a lot as a result of communicating with her co-students at KEA. Because they are internationals who speak 'international English', their English, it is claimed, has norm deviations that English spoken by people from the UK or the US would not have. There is an underlying ideology here that is consistent with traditional perceptions of English native-speakerism: people from inner-circle countries speak correct English whereas people who come from non-English-speaking places do not (always). Returning to the idea of authority, it becomes apparent that the English norms are dictated in these linguistic power centres and that speakers from these contexts are granted a high degree of authority by default. Speakers from the more peripheral areas of the concentric circles are not seen as equally norm-observing. Furthermore, the question of correct or incorrect English is framed as a matter of a speaker's place of origin, phrased as 'English with British people or American'.

Alexandru's statement in Example 5b, on the other hand, constructs a high degree of self-imposed authority over the English language. He very clearly passes judgment over the quality of his teachers' English, commenting that they 'are not the best at English' and that what they say 'doesn't make any sense at all'; thereby, he himself must know what would make sense. In this way, he positions himself as an authority on the English language who can rightfully govern the language norms, at least over his teachers, despite the fact that he grew up speaking Romanian and Hungarian in his home in Romania. In Example 5a, Małgorzata asserted that deviations from the standard are expected in interaction among non-native English speakers, but in contrast, Example 5b shows Alexandru granting himself authority over the English language by delegitimising the English of other people who have presumably not used English as their home language.

A perspective similar to Alexandru's is found with John, who grew up in the US and thus fits with the stereotypical idea of a native English speaker. He describes how his teachers at KEA make mistakes in English when they give classes:

Example 6

01 John: .hhh you know they do their best but
02 a lot of them have very thick accents
03 the tea[chers] (0.6) and so (.)
04 Amena: [yeah]
05 John: sometimes it is like (.) and I'm I'm
06 a litte bit like (0.2) er I'll be
07 sitting there (0.4) and it's like
08 they say something and it's like in
09 my mind I'm like correcting their
10 grammar ha ha
11 Amena: ha ha okay yeah

Expressing that the teachers 'do their best' and stating how he corrects the teachers in his head during class are indicative of an ideology that does not afford much legitimacy to the English spoken by his teachers, who come from non-English-

speaking countries. Normally, there is a sense of hierarchy between, on the one hand, teachers and students, and on the other, native and non-native speakers of English, and these two hierarchies seem to clash in the situation. John's laughter is met by laughter from Amena, and the laughter may be a way of alleviating a statement that would otherwise, if taken at face value, be seen as a deviation from social norms. Later in the interview, John also laughingly states 'my English is perfect' when asked if he has tried to improve his English after coming to Denmark. Again, his laughter is met with laughter by the interviewer. In this context, it can be hard to say what exactly to make of John's statements. Taken at face value, they clearly represent an ideology positioning him as an authority over the English language as he can correct other English users' grammar and as he could not improve his own English. However, the statements are contextualised and negotiated with laughter, which could mean different things, but Amena's acceptance of it in any case possibly helps alleviate any potential tensions from the statement. In my view, this helps carry a co-construction of John's authority with regard to the English language.

Who is a native English speaker?

Correcting other people's English and claiming to speak perfect English are two ways of taking authority over the English language and displaying yourself with at least some level of legitimacy. An ideology linking place of origin with language authority would grant US-raised John authority over English and legitimacy to correct non-native speakers even if it would not be appropriate in all social settings. However, such affordances would probably not be granted as automatically to Alexandru due to his country of origin and home languages. What, then, exactly gives Alexandru the authority to govern the norms of English, call out what he considers low-standard English and correct people? It could be because he, as a matter of fact, constructs himself as a native speaker of English:

Example 7

01 Alexandru: then I it got like er it turned
02 into a mother tongue because I
03 was speaking it every day every
04 moment the ha ha it was like
05 English ?at? all over (0.3) and
06 then I was ha- actually having
07 trouble speaking my native
08 languages

At the time of the interview, Alexandru had lived in Denmark for nine months and had used mainly English in his everyday life during this period. Describing the development of his relationship with the English language in Example 7, Alexandru seems to take the ultimate step into his self-identification with it by claiming that 'it turned into a mother tongue' (which we may take to be a synonym for 'native language' in this case). Before Example 7 occurs in the interview, he also comments on his own English that 'I don't think I have an accent'. When put together with his previously presented statements that mentioned corrections of other people's English, I argue that Alexandru's claim to English nativeness in addition to self-identification is also an act of constructing legitimacy and the authority to govern English norms.

With reference to the previously cited definitions of native language, the constructions in the interviews are closer to the traditional understanding in Małgorzata's and John's interviews than Alexandru's. Alexandru's interview sees the construction of a similar ideology that divides English speakers into native and non-native speakers, but the difference is that the status of English nativeness can change and that people can legitimise themselves as having native-like authority over English despite not coming from an inner-circle country or having spoken it in early childhood. From the construction of non-native English speakers, it is also evident that not just anyone can claim such authority over English, however. People with 'thick accents' or teachers who speak Eng-

lish in a manner that he deems incomprehensible are presented as making language mistakes and possibly not even being knowledgeable in the subjects they talk about.

Globalisation and different approaches to English as a native language

What exactly leads to these dissimilar ideologies about language authority, and where does this non-traditional use of the term 'native language' come from? With the status English has as the world's most widely spoken non-native language and a language that has been carried to diverse regions and cultures (Crystal 2003; Seargeant 2012), the connections between language and place have been complexified. This development relates to processes associated with *globalisation*, a term that according to Scheuerman (2018) refers to

fundamental changes in the spatial and temporal contours of social existence, according to which the significance of space or territory undergoes shifts in the face of a no less dramatic acceleration in the temporal structure of crucial forms of human activity.

Coupland (2010, 2–3) provides a list of societal changes he had experienced in the time before his text was published in 2010. Select items from the list include 'an increasing mediation of culture and greater cultural reflexivity', 'developing ethnic pluralism, especially in urban settings' and 'increasingly familiar cultural landscapes, widely dispersed'. It seems that these reasonably specific reported changes would, indeed, lead to the somewhat abstract shift in existence that Scheuerman (2018) deems globalisation as a phenomenon. Regarding the relation between globalisation and language, Blommaert (2009) argues that language does not travel around the world, but that genres, ways of speaking and semiotic resources do, and that this makes specific uses of language mobile across time and space.

Semiotic resources from English have become a primary mediator among international students in Copenhagen as English has become the language of choice in higher education in and outside the classroom setting (Hazel and Mortensen 2013; Lueg 2015). Increased contact between people from different cultural backgrounds necessitates not only a facility for communication but also leads to increased cultural reflexivity, as mentioned by Coupland (2010). A rose-tinted glasses outcome of this is what Małgorzata referred to as 'international English', implying that non-native English speakers are excused in their deviations from the norms that native speakers would follow. However, we could also see directly in Alexandru's and John's comments that a high level of tolerance is not always afforded to non-native speakers of English. Similarly, the interview with Małgorzata also presented a construction of the ideology that e.g. English spoken with an accent characteristic of the UK indexes professionalism to a higher degree than 'improper' English.

If we sharply contrast the three interviews, we can say that the three interviewees are co-constructed as ideologically representing three different 'types' of English speaker: the traditional non-native English speaker in Małgorzata, the traditional native English speaker in John and a kind of non-traditional neo-native English speaker in Alexandru. Standard ideologies that give native English speakers more authority over the English language than others are constructed in all the interviews. The differences largely remain in who can be regarded as a native English speaker. Alexandru's interview sees him constructed as a native English speaker as the authority and ideological status of a native speaker is imposed on him while his background in a non-English household in a non-English-speaking country arguably challenges the English native speaker category.

While it can be dangerous to generalise from qualitative data, it seems logical that these somewhat diverse ideologies about English nativeness would be heightened the more intense the cultural contact situation is; the larger the number of people that meet and the wider the array of cultural variety

in the meetings, the more opportunities there will necessarily be for people to use English with non-native English speakers. Thereby, these ways of conceptualising the native English speaker and native English are an indication of globalisation in the sense that they are facilitated by a heightened interconnectedness of the world. The contact situation that this has generated involves extensive physical displacement of people, and it also leads to a high level of cultural reflexivity, both of which are characteristics associated with globalisation. In that sense, the conceptualisations both rely on the processes of globalisation as well as bolstering the features of it. Many people live away from their country of origin and use mainly English in their everyday lives with people with diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds. In the interview with Alexandru, a narrative is created in which he has moved away from feeling close to his childhood languages and over to considering a language he learned later in life a native language.

This is at the very least a correlative link between globalisation and changing ideological conceptualisations of the notion of the native language, but I would argue that there are good reasons for contending that the two developments are related. I claimed on the basis of both the dictionary entries and the interview data that the native language is often tied to a place of origin. This is a good starting point, but there are contrasting views on the matter, in the present chapter voiced most clearly in the interview with Alexandru. The physical displacement of people that I described before has also caused a displacement of linguistic resources that seems to have, for some, loosened the bonds that tie the native language to a place, at least in the case of English.

The same phenomenon can also be expanded into the conceptualisation and understanding of language authority. I previously argued that Alexandru's native language authority is redefined into encompassing also English, and with the previous discussion of ideologies of English as a native language in mind, it seems clear that globalisation can also be a factor that can help explain his sense of English legitimacy. His new

sense of legitimacy is constructed as a result of using mainly English, which in his case has come about because he has moved, but which of course also depends on the status English has as a default lingua franca. Because a global spread of people and semiotic resources is a process in and result of globalisation, it seems natural to conclude that globalisation is a useful explaining factor also regarding a new approach to language authority.

Conclusion and further perspectives

In conclusion, this chapter argues that ethnic and linguistic pluralism has led to an increased cultural reflexivity that has given rise to new views on English as a native language. Analyses of my qualitative interview data showed that while the nativeness of English often is attributed to people from Kachru's (1982) inner-circle countries, other English users construct a different view of English nativeness. All the interviews saw the construction of a native-speaker ideology that characterises the native English speaker as an ideal language user; English is best spoken by native speakers of English, and non-native English speakers tend to make mistakes. This challenges the non-native speakers' professional legitimacy and competences in areas not related to language proficiency. However, the interviews did not present similar constructions as to who constitutes a native speaker of English. In one interview, legitimacy and authority over a language was constructed as something that comes with familiarity regardless of cultural and linguistic background while this position did not appear from the two other interviews. The findings presented in the study could benefit from being scrutinised further under the theories associated with the paradigms of English as a Lingua Franca and World Englishes as it would make it more apparent not just what people's ideologies concerning language authority are, but also what consequences such views have for English and English users in specific communication situations and, more generally, for English as a global language.

REFERENCES

- Blommaert, Jan. 2009. A sociolinguistics of globalization. In Nikolas Coupland & Adam Jaworski (eds.), *The new sociolinguistics reader*, 260–73. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bonfiglio, Thomas Paul. 2010. *Mother tongues and nations: The invention of the native speaker*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. The economics of linguistic exchanges. *Social Science Information* 16(6), 645–68.
- Brinkmann, Svend & Steinar Kvale. 2018. *Doing interviews*. London: SAGE.
- Cambridge English Dictionary. n.d. native, <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/native>. Last accessed 24 February 2021. Archived version: <https://web.archive.org/web/20210224225122/https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/native?q=native+language>
- Check, Joseph & Russell K. Schutt. 2012. *Research methods in education*. London: SAGE.
- Collins English Dictionary. n.d. native language, <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/native-language>. Last accessed 24 February 2021. Archived version: <https://web.archive.org/web/20151130234805/http://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/native-language>
- Corbin, Juliet & Anselm Strauss. 2008. *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.
- Coupland, Nikolas. 2010. Introduction: Sociolinguistics in the global era. In Nikolas Coupland (ed.), *The handbook of language and globalization*, 1–27. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Crystal, David. 2003. *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Davies, Alan. 1991. *The native speaker in applied linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Davies, Alan. 2004. The native speaker in applied linguistics. In Alan Davies & Catherine Elder (eds.), *The handbook of applied linguistics*, 431–50. Malden: Blackwell.
- Denzin, Norman K. & Yvonna S. Lincoln. 2011. Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In Norman K. Denzin & Yvonna S. Lincoln (eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research*, 1–19. London: SAGE.
- Doerr, Neriko Musha (ed.). 2009. *The native speaker concept: Ethnographic investigations of native speaker effects*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Doerr, Neriko Musha. 2019. *Transforming study abroad: A handbook*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Duranti, Alessandro. 1997. *Linguistic anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gottlieb, Henrik. 2020. *Echoes of English: Anglicisms in minor speech communities – with special focus on Danish and Afrikaans*. Berlin: Peter Lang.
- Haberland, Hartmut & Janus Mortensen. 2016. Transcription as second-order entextualization: The challenge of heteroglossia. In Alessandro Capone & Jacob L. Mey (eds.), *Interdisciplinary studies in pragmatics, culture and society*, 581–600. Cham: Springer.
- Hazel, Spencer & Janus Mortensen. 2013. Kitchen talk: Exploring linguistic practices in liminal institutional interactions in a multilingual university setting. In Hartmut Haberland, Dorte Lønsmann & Bent Preisler (eds.), *Language alternation, language choice and language encounter in international tertiary education*, 3–30. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Houghton, Stephanie Ann, Damian J. Rivers & Kayoko Hashimoto. 2018. *Beyond native-speakerism: Current explorations and future visions*. New York: Routledge.
- Irvine, Judith T. 2012. Language ideology. In *Oxford bibliographies online: Anthropology*. Oxford: OUP. <https://doi.org/10.1093/obo/9780199766567-0012>. Last accessed 24 February 2021.

- Irvine, Judith T. & Susan Gal. 2000. Language ideology and language differentiation. In Paul V. Kroskrity (ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, policies and identities*, 35–84. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.
- Jenkins, Jennifer. 2006. Current perspectives on teaching world Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *TESOL Quarterly* 40(1), 157–81.
- Jensen, Christian, Louise Denver, Inger M. Mees & Charlotte Werther. 2013. Students' attitudes to lecturers' English in English-medium higher education in Denmark. *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 12(1), 87–112.
- Kachru, Braj B. 1982. *The other tongue: English across cultures*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- KEA. n.d. Application and admission.
<https://kea.dk/en/programmes/application-and-admission>. Last accessed 24 February 2021. Archived version:
<https://web.archive.org/web/20201205092741/https://kea.dk/en/programmes/application-and-admission>
- Kroskrity, Paul V. 2004. Language ideologies. In Alessandro Duranti (ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology*, 496–517. Malden: Blackwell.
- Liddicoat, Anthony J. 2016. Native and non-native speaker identities in interaction: Trajectories of power. *Applied Linguistics Review* 7(4), 409–29.
- Lowe, Robert J. & Luke Lawrence. 2018. Native-speakerism and 'hidden curricula' in ELT training: A duoethnography. *Journal of Language and Discrimination* 2(2), 162–87.
- Lueg, Klarissa. 2015. English as a medium of instruction and internationalization at Danish universities: Status, perspectives, and implications for higher education. *Communication & Language at Work* 4(4), 53–73.
- Mishler, Elliot G. 1986. *Research interviewing: Context and narrative*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Myhill, John. 2003. The native speaker, identity, and the authenticity hierarchy. *Language Sciences* 25(1), 77–97.

- Packer, Martin. 2011. *The science of qualitative research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pennycook, Alastair. 1994. *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. London: Longman.
- Peterson, Elizabeth. 2020. *Making sense of 'bad English': An introduction to language attitudes and ideologies*. London: Routledge.
- Phillipson, Robert. 1992. *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: OUP.
- Preisler, Bent. 2014. Lecturing in one's first language or in English as a lingua franca: The communication of authenticity. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 46(2), 218–42.
- Rampton, Ben, Janet Maybin & Celia Roberts. 2015. Theory and method in linguistic ethnography. In Fiona Copland, Sara Shaw & Julia Snell (eds.), *Linguistic ethnography: Interdisciplinary explorations*, 14–50. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sacks, Harvey. 1995. *Lectures on conversation*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel A. Schegloff & Gail Jefferson. 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50(4), 696–735.
- Saldaña, Johnny. 2013. *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. London: SAGE.
- Scheuerman, William. 2018. Globalization. In Edward N. Zalta (ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2018/entries/globalization/>. Last accessed 24 February 2021.
- Seargeant, Philip. 2012. *Exploring world Englishes: Language in a global context*. London: Routledge.
- Verschuereen, Jef. 2010. Interactional sociolinguistics. In Jürgen Jaspers, Jan-Ola Östman & Jef Verschuereen (eds.), *Society and language use*, 169–75. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Wiktionary. n.d. native language. https://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/native_language. Last accessed 24 February 2021. Archived version: https://web.archive.org/web/20210130162220/https://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/native_language