# Speaking Strange:

# Discourses and Representations

# of

# Danish as a Second Language

## Sophie Véricel

**Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the instructional MLitt in Cultural Studies (By Distance Learning) at the University of Strathclyde**

# Abstract

Debate on the integration of foreigners is currently prominent in the headlines of today's newspapers in Denmark. Language is a key component of this debate. My aim is to study linguistic discourses and representations of the way foreigners speak Danish. To do so, I sketch out the linguistic context in which current discourses take place. This context is the result of a long process of standardisation linked to politics and discourses about equality. The Reformation propagated Copenhagen's dialect throughout Danish territory. In the nineteenth century, the war of Schleswig-Holstein contributed to the eradication of German cultural influence and the development of a national consciousness. Educational policies strengthened the normative model of one sole language to be taught at school. This study is informed by a questionnaire conducted in standardised face-to-face interviews with 35 Danish native speakers. I investigate ordinary people's representations of Danish as a foreign language. The official representation that foreigners do not speak Danish well is confirmed by popular representations, despite an outward positive discourse on linguistic tolerance. The main hypothesis put forward in the premise of the questionnaire is that there is an overlap in native speakers' representations, from speaking a language well and pronouncing it well. I finally argue that the importance of pronunciation in the representation of the Danish language shapes and is shaped by the construction of an ethnic model of the nation.

# Table of contents

Les Danois parlent une langue étrangère, on ne se comprenait pas, et je sentais qu'on allait avoir de bons rapports.

*Pseudo* (Emile Ajar)

Danish people speak a strange foreign language. We could not understand each other but I thought we'll get on very well. (My translation)

# Introduction

In short, good Danish is the prerequisite to be able to contribute positively to Danish society. Bad Danish, not to say bad pronunciation, cuts you off from contact with Danish society, the employment market, political and private life.[1]

Effective integration is and depends on foreigners learning Danish. That's why the government has introduced new legislation that should make it possible for all foreigners to have intensive course in Danish, even before their arrival in Denmark.[2]

Competent mastering of Danish will very often be the main key for immigrants in order to obtain a Danish education and be integrated on the labour market. Besides, mastering of Danish will strengthen the links between foreigners and Danish people.[3]

'Foreigners must learn to speak proper Danish' is, as the above quotations show, a commonly heard statement in today's public and media debate in Denmark. Recently a group of well-known intellectuals added their voice to this debate by publishing a sensational article, titled 'It is time for us to apologize'[4], in which they strongly attacked the nature of the debate on immigration and foreigners. They openly blamed the media and politicians for discriminating against ethnic minorities both in linguistic and legislative terms.

'Foreigners must learn to speak proper Danish'. The implicit assumption of this statement is that, in fact, foreigners do not speak Danish well enough. But what does 'not speaking Danish well' mean exactly? The purpose of this dissertation is to study the discourses and representations of language in Denmark, more specifically of Danish as a second or foreign language, both at official and

---

[1] My translation from a quotation of the director of KISS, S.A.Christensen, one of the first Danish school for foreigners, subsidized by the government (Internet 1)

[2] My translation from a quotation of the Danish Minister of Foreigners, Refugees and Integration, R. Hvilshøj in the official publication *I job nu 1/200* (Internet 2)

[3] My translation from 'Foreigners' integration in the Danish Society', think tank established by the Ministry of Interior (Internet 3)

[4] My translation from 'Det er på tide vi siger fra', *Politiken*, (15.12.05), p.1

popular levels. I want to examine which representations these discourses produce and how they are interwoven with wider discourses about national identity. I shall thereby propose a definition of an ethnic as opposed to a civic discourse about national language.

By discourse, I mean the relationship between power, knowledge and language. According to Foucault (1971) a discourse is a system that defines the possibilities for knowledge, a framework for understanding the world. A discourse exists as a set of rules which determine what the criteria for truth are, for instance what is to be understood in Denmark by speaking Danish well or badly. Discourses are linked with power and ideology. That is discourses do not merely reflect the reality but are 'controlled, ordered, classified and distributed' (Foucault, 1971: 10) to construct a certain view of the world. Foucault does not assign the power to construct discourses to any particular group but rather shows how power is disseminated by processes, practices and institutions. In this study, I take the church, the political institutions and the educational system as examples of these public structures and popular representations as practices.

One of the questions when it comes to power and discourses is to what extent it can be said that official or dominant discourses influence straightforwardly common and widely shared views of the world. Although it is true that discourses can be a major site of ideological production, they are also a field of struggle in the sense that there is a dialectic between the processes of production and the activities of consumption. 'Ordinary people' are not passive victims of these dominant discourses but also producer of discourses. Foucault (1971) also sees the relationships between the production and the consumption of discourses as dependent. The 'discourse market' is somehow a free market where consumers altogether buy, transform and produce in their turn the discourses. In the same vein, Michel de Certeau (1984) shows how users in everyday practices appropriate the objects of

consumption.   That is the reason why, following Cameron (1995), this dissertation asserts that 'ordinary' people's discourses and representations can be investigated in their own.

But how discourses can be grasped? One of the means is given by recent works from French sociolinguists about what they call 'representations'. Representation, in this view, is not a 'symbol that stands for something else' or a distorted expression of reality.

> The concept of representation expresses all the images that speakers associate with the languages they speak, namely the values, the aesthetics, their ideas of what the linguistic norm is. It gives the possibility to escape from the radical opposition between the 'reality', i.e. the objective facts, and the 'ideology', i.e. the subjective judgements seen as false and biased representations[5]. (Branca-Rosoff, 1996: 79)

In this sense, representations participate in the construction of reality. They shape the real. Thus, the statement "foreigners do not speak Danish well" reflects specific representations, or images, of language, like representations of what the correct language is, how far variations from the standard are tolerated or which competences are valued in the teaching of foreign languages in the educational system.

Among all representations circulating in Denmark about language, the scope of this study is to more specifically examine some of the representations of Danish language as a second or foreign language.  In the debate about integration of ethnic minorities, and thus the representation of self and the other, the question of how foreigners speak the national language is crucial. First, because it gives useful insights into the way foreigners and their cultural and linguistic background are accepted in the national community. Second, because it gives us a hint to how national identity, i.e. who are Us, who are Them, is constructed. Since national identity is always in process, the definition constantly varies according to new political, economic or cultural elements. This

---

[5] My translation

dissertation is about the analysis of the current popular representations of language although a broad historical linguistic context will firstly be sketched out.

Chapter 1 gives an account of the linguistic context in Denmark. It examines the politics of language, namely the standardisation process. In effect, "foreigners do not speak Danish well" implies that a standard language exists and serves as reference against which L2 Danish is evaluated. How has this standard been constructed? What are popular attitudes towards this standard? Chapter 1 shows also how the politics of language are articulated around socio-political discourses on social equality.

Chapter 2 investigates, by means of a questionnaire, some of the representations native speakers have about L2 Danish. It aims firstly to examine the articulation between official discourses and popular representations and secondly to offer an interpretation of what these popular representations of language really are. To do so, I pose the following hypothesis: in Denmark, representations on the mastering of a foreign language tend to focus on one particular aspect of the language, pronunciation.

Chapter 3 seeks to relate these representations of language with wider discourses about national identity. According to Giles (1979:2), it is important to 'move us from the what, when and where to the why of sociolinguistics.' Describing linguistic representations or discourses of Danish people is a way to understand the construction of the world that they imply, notably the construction of national identities.

# Chapter 1

## Linguistic context in Denmark: standardisation for the sake of equality

Before analysing what popular representations of Danish as a foreign language are, it is important to understand the linguistic context from which such representations emerge. This chapter will firstly give an account of the politics of language in Denmark. This is characterised by a 'standard ideology' that leads to the spread of language of dominant groups from the capital and the gradual suppression of external influences and regional and social variations. The first part of this chapter also argues that Danish politics of language are framed by a strong socio-economic discourse on equality. The second part draws a link between these official discourses and their influence on popular discourses by analysing several Danish academic works on language attitudes.

### 1 - Language in official discourses: the public treatment of language

Danish belongs to the North Germanic languages, a sub-group of the Germanic branch of the Indo-European languages. Around the tenth century, the common ancestor language of this branch, Old Norse, split into two groups: West and East Scandinavian, with Danish and Swedish forming part of the second group. This split was due to the growing differences in sounds, for instance, the lost of diphthongs and the adoption of monophthongs (Haugen: 1968). During the same period, the change from a Runic to a Latin alphabet, as a result of the establishment of Roman Catholic Church, modified the written language and it acquired new letters (the Runic alphabet used the same rune for different vowels). Division between Swedish and Danish dialects was officialised in1523, when Sweden dissolved the Union of Kalmar and became an independent country.

From 1523 on, the history of the Danish language is the history of its long process towards standardisation. I will explain the standardisation effect through three key factors: the role of religion, the development of national consciousness and the politics of education. Since the dissertation is about spoken Danish, I will concentrate mainly on the standardisation of spoken speech rather than the written language, but correlation between the two is obvious. Hence I will also mention a few, but important, steps in the development of the written language.

### 1.1 A religious factor: the Reformation

In 1536, the Reformation was institutionalised in Denmark and became the official religion of the Court. The Danish church was Lutheran. With the Reformation, the need for a Bible translated into vernacular appeared. In 1529, Christiern Pedersen completed the first translation of the New Testament from German into vernacular language, based on the dialect of Copenhagen. A great deal of phonetic changes occurred at this time, differentiating the dialect in Copenhagen from the rural neighbouring dialects (Baggioni: 1997 and Haugen: 1968) and Pedersen was uncertain how to spell them. He therefore adopts a spelling which borrows its forms to both the historical pronunciation and the new ones. 'The spelling partly concealed and partly revealed pronunciations and could not have corresponded to anyone's speech at the time of the normalisation' (Haugen, 1968: 570). Nevertheless, the rules adopted in Pedersen's first translation were followed in the official and complete Bible, the so called 'Bible of Christian III', printed in 1550. With the Christianisation of the peasantry, the Christian III Bible spread all over the country, displaying its linguistic norm. The Bible became the reference in terms of written language and was the first printed book in the Danish language. The next step towards standardisation came with the publication of the first Danish grammar (Den Danske Sprog) in 1865 and the Copenhagen dialect gained fixed

grammatical rules. During the following centuries, the teaching of literacy to the peasantry by the Church was based on these two books.

When exactly the written norm became, to a certain extent, also the spoken norm is unclear. For Skautrup (Hauger: 1968), it did not happen in the sixteenth century since Queen Elizabeth is said to have spoken a 'vulgar' speech; nor is it for Baggioni (1997) in the seventeenth century who describes the quarrel between tenants of the pronunciation of Copenhagen with its spoken reference of the Bible, to tenants of the Zealand pronunciation, a composite of dialects of Zealand. For Helle (1992), the dissemination of Copenhagen speech started right after the Reformation and was due to the constitution of a new state clergy from Copenhagen. After the confiscation of the Church's goods and the abandonment by the nobles of clerical charges as they had become less prestigious, clerical power was left to the lower classes. Spoken language in the churches thus became the language of the bourgeoisie and the peasantry.

In Denmark, the dialect of the political and particularly religious centre progressively became the reference for written and spoken usage, hereafter called rigsdansk and rigsmål[6]. Paradoxically, the language of the Court continued to be German as it had been since the Reformation. Protestant German rulers had always exerted an important influence in Denmark. The process of standardisation and the spread of Danish all over the country, to the point of becoming the 'language of all the people', became linked with another major factor. That is the growth of nationalist feelings and the desire for a sole national language which was witnessed in the nineteenth century. Linguistic standardisation is thus also due to the suppression of German cultural and linguistic influence. And this was one of the aims of the war of Schleswig-Holstein.

---

[6] Rigsdansk is usually the name for the written standard and rigsmål for the spoken standard. However, there is confusion around these terms and Danish sociolinguists do not use them in the same way. This confusion has been pointed out by Kristiansen (2001a:2) and Kristiansen & Jørgensen (2003:7). For the stake of clarification, I use the terms according to the above definition.

## 1.2 A national identity factor: the Schleswig-Holstein war (1830-1864)

By the beginning of the nineteenth century, due to widespread teaching of literacy by the Church, rigsdansk and rigsmål had been disseminated all over the country. Regional dialects though remained string and were spoken alongside the standard. At Court, however, German was still widely spoken by the elite. At the time there was an important colony of Schleswig-Holstein and German nobles living in Copenhagen who had key political functions. Moreover, educated Danes continued to have their children schooled in German.

The Schleswig-Holstein war is at the core of the linguistic question in Denmark. Hobsbawn (1990) and Thyssen (1980) mention it as a characteristic element in the growing feelings of national identity that developed in the nineteenth century Europe. The conflict of Schleswig-Holstein is labelled by both historians as a conflict primarily around language. Without going into too much historical detail of this complex war, several important elements should nevertheless be mentioned. For Thyssen (1980), the first wave of Danish nationalism manifested itself as a reaction to German influence. Since the Reformation and the spread of Lutheran ideas, German cultural influence had played an important role in Denmark. The introduction of absolute monarchy in 1660 reinforced this influence and led the monarch Frederick III to surround himself with aristocrats from Germany and Schleswig-Holstein. German-speaking nobility occupied key positions at Court as well as in political and economic positions. As a result, German was the language of the elite.

The desire to implement Danish language at all official levels had started back in 1770 when the minister of Christian VII, Guldberg, decided to make Danish the language of the army and the monarchy. At the same time, he made Danish-Norwegian-Holstein citizenship a requirement for employment in the civil service. Frederick VI (1808-1839), the following monarch, resumed this

policy and encouraged the development of Danish literature based on Old Norse literature and Danish history. The turning point occurred when a Royal ordinance from 1840 decreed Danish as the language of Courts and local authorities in the border region of the kingdom with Germany, namely North-Schleswig. It prompted a strong resistance among the assemblies of the Duchies who demanded separation from the Danish government. Reinforced by the growing German nationalist movements that supported them, the issue of Schleswig-Holstein developed into war which was subsequently lost by Denmark. And in 1864 the two Duchies were incorporated into the German Confederacy.

If the Schleswig-Holstein war can be described in part as a war over language, it can also certainly be described as a war in which cultural identity played a major role. One of the major actors in the development of a new national consciousness was bishop N.S.F. Grundtvig.  He developed poetry inspired by glorious heroes from the past and the revival of Scandinavian mythology based on Old Norse literature and the traditions of Danish folk culture. But at the same time, Grundtvig linked this national consciousness with a strong opposition to the elite and his concerns with education of the peasantry. He strongly defended the right for access to high education for everyone and created what is still known today as the 'Folk High School' - a school for life. The curriculum of these schools for adults during the winter period was primarily Danish language, history and literature, distilling therefore both national pride and self-esteem among the peasants, and the idea that political life was not restricted to the elite (Rerup: 1980).

The consequences of the Schleswig-Holstein war are crucial: at a political level, it resulted in the withdrawal of Denmark from international affairs. Having lost (after a defeat against Norway) two thirds of its territory, Denmark became more inward-looking after 1864. The motto of the nation became: "What is lost outwardly must be gained inwardly". It was translated, at a social level, into

internal policy based on Grundtvig's principles: "A nation where a few have a lot and even fewer have less". The social-democratic Party elected in 1876 implemented such an egalitarian policy. At cultural and linguistic levels, it resulted in a strong anti-German feeling and the development of Danish-based cultural life, manifested by the creation of Danish plays, newspapers and literature. After the war, Danish became the sole language spoken in Denmark.

The Schleswig-Holstein episode was a conflict where language and national identity were inextricably bound. The expulsion of German influence strengthened links between the Danish language and the Danish people and reinforced the linguistic standardisation process through the development of schools. Indeed, if Grundtvig's ideas on anti-elitism were so influential it is also because they were relayed by the politics of education. The following section explores how these policies have contributed to the process of standardisation by suppressing regional and social variations in order to create a society based on equality.

### 1.3 **An educational factor: the 'standard ideology'**

A key element to explain the standardisation process is obviously the political discourse of language conveyed by social institutions, schools in particular. Since Grundtvig, the ideals of democracy and equality are part of dominant discourses within Danish society. Ladegaard (1998) analyses the U90 programme which is the framework for educational planning from the 1970s to the 1990s. References to Grundtvig sustain the discourse of this programme. Explicit goal of education is:

> To work for a deliberate abolition of any behavioural or attitudinal pattern which reflects differences in people's social class, sex, nationality, race or socio-economic status. In other words, one of the major goals of Danish education is to socialise children to uniformity and to work against social, regional or ethnic diversity. (Ladegaard, 1998: 193)

One way to achieve this objective is language prescription. The school and the folk school have taken the view that linguistic uniformity should be achieved by eliminating variations. One common language for everyone taught at school.

Kristiansen (2003) also studies the treatment of language by institutions, including the role played by the Danish Language Council created in 1955, schools and the media. They have all developed and strengthened what he calls, according to Milroy & Milroy (1985), the 'standard ideology' or endeavour for one common language viewed as the 'best language'. Kristiansen analyses educational policies and shows, from the beginning of compulsory school in 1814 until the 1970s, how the only language taught in school is the 'best language of the best people', i.e. rigsdansk or rigsmål. His argument is that, although a wider approach of the notion of 'text' was introduced in the 1970s which let different sources give voice to other varieties of Danish, the school continues to prescribe what the correct language is and should be. It has only moved from a concept of 'good/bad' language to a concept of 'appropriate/inappropriate' language. Evidence lies in what he considers one of the last strongholds of standard ideology: 'the children must learn how to speak standard Danish or else they won't learn how to spell' (Kristiansen, 2003: 62). The presumed connection between spelling and pronunciation – that he strongly denies – is a way for the school to reinforce the legitimacy of the spoken standard and to criticise other varieties, particularly young people's speech, close to Low Copenhagen speech and characterised by sloppy pronunciation of word endings.

### 1.4 Conclusion: de-dialectalisation and standardisation

All Danish linguists (Kristiansen, Pedersen, Kristensen), although to a different extent, agree today that Denmark is a very homogeneous society regarding languages: 'In a hundred years, Denmark

has changed from a society of classical dialects where people from different places often did not understand each other very well, into an area with more or less shared speech'(Kristensen, 2003: 45). In a rather astonishing conclusion, Pedersen even notes that it could be the case that 'Denmark would be a good candidate to be the first country to accomplish total linguistic standardisation' (Pedersen, 2003: 26). Denmark is about to be in the situation of total uniformity dreamed by Honey (1989) for Britain. Kristiansen observes that variations in spoken Danish today concern almost exclusively phonetic/phonological aspects and that there is practically no grammatical variations left: 'variation in modern Danish is a matter of accent only' (Kristiansen, 2001b: 11).

'One common language for all the Danish people'. The 'centripetal forces to create a unitary language' (Bakhtin, 1981: 75) have, as we have seen, at different institutional levels, led to the intense standard ideology displayed in Denmark since the Reformation until today. I would like here to point out how linguistic homogeneity in Denmark is strongly related to the discourses on equality and education. The Reformation, which first contributed to linguistic standardisation, conveyed undeniably a discourse that benefited the peasantry in terms of education and thereby contributed to a more equal society. Similarly, the Schleswig-Holstein war, which raised a national consciousness based on a shared memory and language, allowed the expulsion of the German elite and contributed to deeper linguistic homogeneity. It is therefore then not surprising that the modern institutions prolong and reinforce the 'sacred' link between education, language and equality.

However, whatever the political discourses may be, it is surprising how well they have worked. The second part of this chapter examines the impact of these official discourses and policies on popular representations and attitudes. We will see how and why the standard ideology has not really been questioned in Denmark.

**2 - Language in popular representations: discourses and attitudes towards the standard**

Although undoubtedly to some extent influenced by official discourses, popular perceptions must be taken into account on their own if we are to understand how linguistic homogeneity has been achieved. Under the influence of the work of Labov (1972), numerous studies in Denmark measure popular attitudes (called 'covert attitudes' and measured by the matched-guise technique of Lambert (1967)) and to a lesser extent what can be associated to representations ('overt attitudes' expressed in direct questioning) of language. Danish sociolinguists have privileged studies on covert attitudes with the view that, as Ladegaard (1994: 272) puts it: 'subjects may not report their honest opinions but only what is politically correct. Indirect attitude measures of some form seem to have certain advantages in terms of eliciting the biased views held by members of one social group'

2.1 **Adherence to standardisation**

Contrary to studies in Britain or in France, the vast majority of the Danish studies on popular representations of language show a global adherence to official discourses.

Kristiansen (2001b- 2003) shows how people consistently reproduce, when asked directly, the official hierarchy of varieties with standard Danish (rigsmål) at the top, regional standards at the middle and Low Copenhagen at the bottom. When it comes to covert attitudes measured by indirect methods, he also finds that rigsmål is globally assessed more favourably in terms of competence, superiority and sociability; although his aim is to show that young attitudes are slightly divergent from the general one. He concludes that there is 'solid evidence that this hierarchization represents a strong and stable value system' (Kristiansen 2003: 66).

Ladegaard (1994), in a similar language attitude study based on the matched-guise technique to evaluate reactions to different regional varieties of Danish, also agrees that rigsmål, contrary to RP in Britain, has all positive dimensions: status and competence and social attractiveness. He concludes, comparing with Trudgill's (1972) and Ryan's (1979) results on similar studies in Britain, that the notion of in-group solidarity and covert prestige associated with non-standard language use does not function in Denmark. For him, the success of the quick standardisation in Denmark can be explained by this aspect.

Møller & Quist (2003) have conducted a language attitude study among young bilingual Danes who have Danish as their second language. They have identified what they call a 'multi-ethnolect', i.e. a variety of Danish distinct from rigsmål by phonetic, syntactic and lexical features. They found that the multi-ethnolect is not assessed positively even by the ones who speak it. For their respondents, it is incorrect language. Again, no in-group solidarity could be found among the speakers. They therefore conclude that adolescents by and large in Denmark reproduce the elite discourses on language variations and convey the standard ideology.

The aim of another study by Jørgensen & Quist (2001) is to evaluate native speakers' reactions to L2 bilingual Turkish-Danish students. The results show that the respondents evaluate harshly L2 speakers and that tolerance towards variation is low. Respondents were even more negative when consideration was given to the fact that the speakers were not native Danes, even though this trend was not so strong among young respondents.

## 2.2 **Persistent pockets of resistance against standardisation**

The above studies ought to be sharpened. If the general concept of standard ideology is not really challenged, it is restricted in some aspects. Several sociolinguists consider that the definition varies on what standard Danish is. Thus, although the notion of the standard is not questioned, the standard itself means different things for different people.

Ladegaard (2001) has used the matched-guise technique to measure folk linguistic awareness of regional variations. He finds that the notion of the standard was in fact linked with the regional background of the respondent. That is, people take their regional standard as rigsmål.

Kristiansen (1997) comes to the same conclusion when he writes about youth language. In a study of cinema goers in Næstved, he shows how young people tend to upgrade Low Copenhagen speech. They define standard language from their own perspective, i.e. with lots of borrowings from Low Copenhagen's speech. As in Ladegaard's (2001) study, there was though no evidence of a fundamental rejection of standard ideology.

Finally, we shall take the results of Ladegaard's study (Ladegaard: 1998) on class consciousness in Denmark. In his article, he displays the results of another matched-guise analysis. He presents the view that class accent still exists in Denmark, and that the intense politics of equality has not totally eradicated stigmatisation of non-standard accent since people are quite capable of assigning social membership to the informants. It seems that there is therefore a contradiction between what dominant ideology displays and what people's uncensored stereotypes are. But again, this can be measured only by indirect methods on covert attitudes.

I would like to conclude that it is not yet the case for Denmark to be viewed as a country of total linguistic uniformity. Regional, generational, ethnic and class variations are still at work.

Nevertheless, one of the characteristic features of Danish linguistic situation might be that popular discourses against these variations are particularly strong. Popular discourses and attitudes advocate for an adherence to standard ideology and a willingness to conform to the norm. It is probably the case that adherence to the linguistic standard ideology can be related to the adherence to the discourses that sustain this ideology. In Denmark, as we have seen, the idea of equality has since long been the motto of political discourses. The idea that equality will be achieved through education and a shared common language has encountered a favourable echo in popular views. Though, as Kristiansen and Jørgensen (2003) put it, there is a flip side of the coin: "the striving for equality is accompanied by certain regimentation; a pressure to adapt to middle-of-the-road normality (…) Deviation from the norm is unacceptable." (Kristiansen & Jørgensen, 2003: 2).

It is in this quite intolerant context regarding linguistic variations that I would like now to present the field study that I have undertaken. My starting point is precisely the discourses of some of the media and the political actors towards a particular linguistic variation: the way foreigners speak Danish.

# Chapter 2

# The questionnaire

This is a study of Danes' representations of their language as a second language. I would like to insist on the fact that it is a work on discourses and not on attitudes. I do agree that the medium of matched-guise technique permits an access to people's private uncensored attitudes. However, my intention is to focus on discourses in the Foucauldian sense, 'a framework for understanding the world'. The scope is therefore not to analyse the capacity of native speakers to evaluate foreign speakers (as in Jørgensen & Quist: 2001) but to define what popular representations of native speakers are of the proficiency of foreign speakers.

French studies on linguistic representations are usually conducted in non directive interviews since the concept of 'representation' implies that representations are constructed in the interaction between two or more speakers. Unfortunately, I was not able to undertake such interviews. On the one hand, I had a clear limitation: I do not speak enough Danish. On the other hand, I took the view that even if I framed the questions, hence the representations about language, my respondents could have contested the 'framework of the language' I was imposing on them. As we shall see with some of the answers to question 1, this was partly the case. Besides, I have adapted the questionnaire to French respondents in order to measure if answers show consistent differences. And it was the case: French respondents clearly privileged the grammatical aspect of their language.

It is however not a study of the way in which all Danish people think of their language as a foreign language. The questionnaire has been conducted with 35 people and should be seen as a pilot project.

**1- The speaker variables**

Five variables have been taken into account for population design. In sociolinguistic work, the aspects normally singled out for attention are those of class, sex and age. I have added two criteria about languages (mother tongue and foreign languages spoken).

a)  Mother tongue

The respondents are exclusively native speakers of Danish. The respondents all live in Copenhagen, i.e. they are supposedly people constantly exposed to the standard speech (rigsmål). Unfortunately, it was not possible to take into account the regional origin of the respondents although this might be an important factor. Perception of foreign speakers might vary with the variety of standard spoken by the informants. We might expect more tolerance towards variation from people who themselves speak a non standard language.

b)  Foreign languages spoken

Supposedly, the more foreign languages one speaks, the more linguistic awareness one has regarding the difficulties of speaking a foreign language. My respondents speak all several foreign languages, as is usual in Denmark. However, one might expect that linguistic awareness is less important if the foreign languages spoken belong to the same linguistic group as the mother tongue. That is precisely the case in this study where most people speak several languages belonging to the Germanic branch: German (30 out of 35 respondents), English (35), not to mention other Scandinavian languages (35). However, I have to add that French speaking respondents (18) are overrepresented in relation to their prevalence in Danish society.[7].

c)  Age

Age of the respondents ranges from 17 to 75. I chose to establish 2 age groups:

Group 1: 16 informants from 17-35 years

---

[7] About half of the respondents were my students

Group 2: 19 informants from 35-75 years

I predicted that discourses about Danish L2 would be different in these two groups. Regarding contacts with non-native speakers, the youngest group 1 has had more opportunities to be exposed to non-native Danish since immigration in Denmark accelerated in the 1970s when they were born. Group 2 grew up in a time when Denmark had little immigration[8] and its members were consequently isolated in an almost exclusively Danish speaking environment. Nevertheless, as we shall see, results did not show significant differences between the discourses of the two groups.

d) Sex

There is a deliberate balance of 17 male respondents and 18 female respondents.

e) Social-class

No attempts were made to control the subjects' social class. Although social classes are at least to be defined on the basis on educational level, occupation, income, and family background, the question referring to social-class in the questionnaire concerns only occupation. It is partly due to material limitations and partly because I consider that social class differences are not a fully operating factor in Danish society[9]. Occupations are distributed as follows: students at University (5 out of 35 respondents); social workers (10), employees from the Ministries – Education, Research and Transport (6), teachers (2), business managers (9), consultants in development (2) and journalist (1).

## 2   - The design of the questionnaire

The questionnaire was conducted in face-to-face interviews during November 2005. Two people conducted the interviews. As an interviewer, I conducted the questionnaires in English. To anticipate the fact that it could be difficult to express representations on language in English, and

---

[8] I mean: non Scandinavian immigration nor EU immigration

[9] Actually, this dissertation attempts partly to demonstrate that politics and discourses on equality have been successful in Denmark. One of the outcomes is the at least the partial elimination of social classes.

although English is like a second language in Denmark (at least in Copenhagen), I requested a Danish collaborator to undertake some of the questionnaires (10 of the 35) in Danish. However no consistent differences could be found between the answers in Danish and the answers in English. Besides, standardised face-to-face interviews limit interaction, and thus possibility for misunderstandings.

The questionnaire had two main objectives. The first objective was to evaluate whether discourses about Danish as a foreign language are as negative in my respondents' representations as they are in official discourses. The second objective was to verify the following hypothesis: is it possible to affirm that the statement 'to speak a language badly' is widely understood in Denmark as 'to pronounce a language badly.' Two further objectives were to verify if pronunciation is also a key criterion when Danish people think of themselves as speakers of foreign languages, and to investigate Danes' attitudes towards the sound of their own language. The following part is a brief chronological presentation of the questions and their aims. In the third part, I turn to the presentation of the findings.

## 2.1 Danes as foreign language speakers

The aim of the first three questions is to evaluate which criteria Danish native speakers focus on when they evaluate themselves as speakers of foreign languages. My hypothesis is that the focus on pronunciation is expressed not only in the representation of Danish native speakers towards Danish foreign speakers, but also more widely when Danish speakers evaluate themselves as speakers of a foreign language.

For the purpose of the study, I have singled out three aspects of the language: grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation. This is not to say that languages are only defined by these three aspects:

grammar can be subdivided into morphology and syntax, pronunciation into phonology and prosody and so on. However, I thought these would have overcomplicated the questions for non specialist interviewees. Indeed, the distinction grammar-vocabulary-pronunciation was not so clear for some of the interviewees. Four of them answered "I'm" (for question 1: 'When you speak a foreign language, which aspect of the language do you think you are the best at?') or "we're (for question 3: 'When Danes speak a foreign language, which aspect of the language do you think they usually are best at?') good at speaking" which could indicate that for them mastering a foreign language should rather be defined in terms of language competences like speaking, writing or listening. It indicates also that these respondents did not fully accept the representation that language is divided into the three categories I was imposing on them. When this was the case, I had to elicit how I understood the terms.

## 2.2 The focus on pronunciation in Danish as a foreign language

Questions 4 to 12 aimed at verifying the hypothesis about the overlap between speaking and pronouncing Danish language. To do so, they measure two points. There is a first set of questions regarding the difficulty of Danish. Interviewees are asked to measure on a scale from 1 to 4 this difficulty (question 4) and give reasons for it (question 5); they are also asked to measure more specifically and on the same scale the difficulty of pronunciation (question 7) and of grammar (question 8). The second set of questions concerns the importance of pronunciation when they consider how non-native speakers speak: if they correct them and on which aspect (question 6), what are their impressions about the level of Danish of the foreigners they have recently talked to (questions 10: "Now, I would like you to remember one of the last foreigners living in Denmark that you have heard speaking Danish. How would you say his or her Danish was?" and 11: "Now, I would like you to remember one of the last foreigners living in Denmark that you have heard

speaking Danish badly. In your opinion, why was his or her Danish bad?"), and finally to evaluate the level of Danish of some famous foreigners living in Denmark (question 12).

If pronunciation is perceived as more difficult than other aspects of the language, but at the same time an essential part of it, one may conclude that pronunciation is at the core of the mastering of the language.

Regarding question 12: I asked six Danes to give me a list of famous non-native Danes living in Denmark. I selected the eleven famous people according to the following criteria:

- The people must have been mentioned by at least three of my informers, to ensure that they really are famous.

- The people must have been living in Denmark for more than 15 years (this is the case in all of them except Princess Alexandra who has been in Denmark for 10 years), to be realistic in the expectation of their level of Danish: Danish is for them more a second language than a foreign language.

- They must represent a wide range of occupations, in order to embody different cultural backgrounds. They cover the following positions: members of the Royal family, actors, singers, sportsmen, journalists and MPs.

- They must represent a wide range of mother tongues. Their mother tongues are: American English, Scottish English, French, Spanish, German, Croat, Lebanese Arabic, Egyptian Arabic, Kalenjin and Urdu. I was careful not to choose only the languages of the main immigrant groups in Denmark (like Urdu, Arabic and Croat) but also dominant languages.

I am aware of the limitations of this question. Since there is a sole 'representative' of each language, it is difficult to conclude that speakers of this language are more discriminated against than speakers of another language. It is however not the intention. The interest of the question lies

in the diversity of people that it represents and results should be taken as a whole. Another problem is that the personality of the celebrity interferes (a problem that is avoided in the matched-guise technique). A beloved celebrity (like Princess Alexandra) has far more chance to be evaluated positively in terms of language than a celebrity who is disliked (as Prince Henrik is). But again, I assumed that out of eleven famous people covering different cultural and linguistic backgrounds, I would be able to draw some conclusions on discourses about Danish L2 speakers. Besides, question 12 is partly open which allows some interpretation of the answer.

Regarding the evaluation of the pronunciation of these people (question 12: how is his/her accent: standard or non standard and beautiful or ugly), I took two questions that have been used in previous questionnaires. The question about the standardness of the accent is from Jørgensen and Quist (2001) from their study of native speaker's judgements of second language Danish and the question about the beauty of the accent is from Haugen (1966) from his comparison between the perceived beauties of the three Scandinavian languages. I wanted to evaluate if non-native Danes would be regarded as having a standard accent, which would demonstrate that they are considered to be part of the in-group. I also wanted to evaluate if non-standard accents could be found to be beautiful, which would imply a certain tolerance towards variations.

## 2.3 How well foreigners speak Danish

Again, I should say that I did not want to use the matched-guise technique as it is usually the case in sociolinguistic studies concerning attitudes. Since the study focuses on discourses and not attitudes, question 6 (about the eventual corrections of linguistic errors), questions 10 and 11 (about the level of Danish of the last person they talked to) and question 12 aim to evaluate whether popular discourses correspond to the official view that foreigners speak Danish badly.

**2.4 Perception of Danish sounds**

Finally, and again adapting Haugen's questions (1966), there follows two questions about the sound of Danish language (question 13: "How do you like the sound of Danish?") and question 14 ("How do you think foreigners like the sound of Danish?") It is a widely held opinion that some languages are more musical or guttural than others. Such clichés obviously reflect wider opinion about the people who speak these languages. As Haugen (1966: 489) put it 'a simple judgement of beauty contains a strong component of social and national attitudes'. My intention was here to connect the question of linguistic awareness with wider national feelings.

### 3- The results

**3.1 Representations of Danish L2 speakers are ambiguous**

At first glance, questions 10 to 12 might allow one to conclude that the respondents have a generally positive discourse towards speakers of Danish as a second language. 28 out of the 35 respondents willingly gave examples of foreigners speaking Danish well (6 answers) or fairly well (22 answers). Contrary to expectations, group 1 of young respondents was not more positive than group 2. The only exception being that no members from the youngest group cited in their answers to question 10 that there were any foreigners that they could not understand (versus 5 answers for group 2). They are also less disposed to quote foreigners who speak Danish badly: 5 out of the 16 of group 1 answered 'don't remember' to question 11 (only 1 for group 2).

Groups 1 and 2 quoted people as various as neighbours, friends, relatives, colleagues, customers or shopkeepers, which indicates that good speakers of L2 Danish can be found at all social levels. Good L2 speakers also come from different linguistic groups like French, American, German,

Pakistani, Russian, Latvian and Palestinian. The definition of "fairly well Danish" seems to be rather tolerant: when asked to detail the context of communication (question 10b), respondents' answers ranged from: "it was ok, I could understand him" or "it was understandable" or "it was not difficult to understand" to "she made the effort to speak Danish" (about an American woman) or "he was not very advanced but what he said was correct." The respondents seemed to value the willingness of foreigners to speak Danish over their real proficiency. This could be taken as positive discourse towards foreign speakers. However the explanations they gave to justify their positive answers are worth examination: "I meet him at a professional meeting. His Danish was good but he had a good education level." And "he speaks well, but, you know, it also depends if you want to be integrated in the community." A link is made between high level of education, a good level of Danish and the desire to be integrated. But the link implies that speaking Danish well is restricted to those who have academic education and wish to be integrated; one can expect that large segments of immigrants will be excluded from this elite group.

Concerning the evaluation of the celebrities' proficiency, the results also show a rather positive attitude. There were 83 'abstentions' (when respondents could not evaluate the celebrities' level because they did not know them or because they could not remember how they speak). The total of expressed answers is therefore 302. Out of these 302 answers, there were 150 answers for mark 1 (from a scale of 4, with 1: good and 4: bad) and 71 for mark 2 which give a result of 221 positive answers (73%) versus 81 (27%) negative answers (58 for mark 3 and 23 for mark 4). Results for the youngest respondents were similar: 112 (75%) positive answers out of 149. The general conclusion is therefore that the eleven famous foreign people were evaluated very positively by the respondents.

The respondents' evaluations can however be divided into three groups. Group A is a group in which L2 speakers are considered as native speakers or very close to being so. Famous people from this group (notably Princess Alexandra and Paula Larrain, to a lesser extent Kamal Qureshi ) have a majority of mark 1 scores for their level of Danish (respectively 34 out of 35; 26 out of 27 and 26 out of 27), and their accent is considered standard and beautiful. The result is consistent with Jørgensen and Quist's attitude study (2001) which found that 3 of their 10 non-mother-tongue users were judged to be mother-tongue users by half of their respondents. There is therefore a correlation between my respondents' discourse about L2 speakers and the attitude towards L2 speakers in Jørgensen and Quist's (2001) study. But conversely to their conclusion, I can not find consistent differences of tolerance between the youngest group of my respondents and the oldest.

Group A of my respondents is a group that propose a counter discourse to official and media held opinion that foreigners speak Danish badly.


Group B is composed of famous people (Tom Mac Evan, Etta Cameron and Nasser Kader) who still obtained a great deal of mark 1 scores (respectively 18 out of 30; 3 out of 28 and 24 out of 31) but have also various mark 2 scores (respectively 11 out of 30; 17 out of 28 and 7 out of 31); they are also considered as having a non-standard *and* beautiful accent. In other words, famous people from this group are not accepted as native speakers but are still considered as highly proficient in Danish. The result shows that certain tolerance towards variations in Danish is accepted. But it shows also that there is a distinction between members of the in-group and members of the out-group. And this distinction is based on pronunciation. When asked for the reason why they gave mark 2 to these persons (question 12), the respondents answered that it was because the informant had a "heavy", "funny", or "terrible" accent.

Group C consists of informants who received a majority of mark 3 and 4 scores and are judged to have a non-standard and 'ugly' accent. Members of this group are in decreasing order: Wilson Kipketer (15 negative answers out of 20), Prince Henrik (25 out of 35) and Sepp Piontek (17 out of 31). This group of famous people is definitely rejected linguistically and pertains therefore to the group of 'foreigners who speak Danish badly' depicted in the media. Regarding the reasons for this, the main one given is pronunciation (56 out of the 57 negative answers). Explanations for bad evaluation stretch from "heavy accent" to "I cannot understand him". It has to be noted that bad grammar level (for Piontek and Kipketer) is also invoked (respectively 10 and 9 answers); moreover, the fact that the famous people have been living in Denmark for so long and should therefore have a much better level (24 answers out of the 57). Some respondents considered it as a sheer lack of willingness to learn the language properly.

Results of this first part of the questionnaire cannot lead to the conclusion that the respondents' discourses of Danish L2 speakers reflect official discourses of 'foreigners not speaking Danish properly.'

Results show that overt discourses about Danish L2 speakers are not as negative as expected. The respondents seem to appreciate efforts towards accommodation and value highly foreigners who seek to speak Danish. They are prepared to give them very good scores in terms of proficiency in the language. Nevertheless, they also rejected the majority of the famous people in the non-native out-group speakers (group B and C). It means that, although evaluation is positive, it does not lead to a full recognition of variation. Non-standard ethnic accents are stigmatised. In other words, although respondents are prepared to grant outsiders a high level of proficiency in their mastering of the Danish language, they erect a new barrier at the very moment they seem to be removing one. In

all findings, it could not be demonstrated that the younger group of informants was different to the older.

We shall now examine how the stigmatisation on L2 speakers works. Results of the following part demonstrate that stigmatisation is due to the focus on pronunciation.

### 3.2 Pronunciation is the main focus in representations of Danish L2

The hypothesis that native speakers focus on pronunciation when they evaluate Danish L2 speakers is confirmed by the findings. Results illustrate that native speakers consider pronunciation as both a crucial and complex aspect of mastering of language.

As question 4 shows, there is a large consensus about the difficulty of learning Danish: 29 out of the 35 respondents found that Danish language is difficult or very difficult to learn for a foreigner (1 answer for very easy, 4 for easy, 9 for difficult, 20 for very difficult, 1 for 'don't know') and they also basically agree on the reasons why.

Although the reasons given in question 5 can be divided into three categories, one group of answers stands out[10]: pronunciation difficulties are viewed as the main obstacle in the learning of Danish (32 out of the 35 answers). Respondents gave detailed reasons for it: the fact that native speakers usually swallow last syllables of words or hold sounds in their throat (21 answers); a lot of vocal sounds are almost alike (3); and spelling and pronunciation are very different (8). Pronunciation is undoubtedly seen as a major impediment to achieving a good level of Danish.

Nevertheless, pronunciation is not the sole barrier to the mastering Danish. A second group of 13 respondents gave explanations about difficulties caused by grammar. They believe that Danish is difficult to learn precisely because there are so few grammatical rules (whereas 2 out of the 4

---

[10] The total of answers here amounts to more than 35 since respondents usually gave various reasons for difficulty of Danish.

respondents who believe that Danish is easy to learn for foreigners think that Danish grammar is easy). The third group consists of diverse answers mentioned by only one or two respondents and which therefore carry less weight: "Danish as a foreign language is not yet developed"; "few people in the world speak it: you are never exposed to the language"; "people in Denmark are not very tolerant towards foreigners". Although these explanations are relevant, it is interesting that they have been much less mentioned than pronunciation difficulties.

Answers for question 5 (reasons for the difficulty) are consistent with answers for question 7 (difficulty of pronunciation) and 8 (difficulty of grammar): 25 out of the 35 respondents believe that Danish is a very difficult language for foreigners to pronounce (mark 4 on the scale) and 9 that it is difficult (mark 3). But Danish grammar is also perceived as hard: 16 answers for mark 4 of difficulty and 7 for mark 3 which make 23 answers out of the 35. Grammar is therefore also, although to a lesser extent than pronunciation, perceived as difficult for a non-native learner.


Regarding the importance of pronunciation in evaluating L2 speakers, we can conclude it constitutes a key aspect. Question 9 "You have a friend who has just settled in Denmark. He wants to learn Danish. What would you advice him to do?" is conclusive: the vast majority of respondents (22) would advise a friend to concentrate on the pronunciation when learning Danish; whereas only 10 respondents said that grammar should receive the most attention.

In question 10 ("How would you say the Danish of the last foreigners living in Denmark that you have heard speaking Danish was?"), the issue of pronunciation appears in 12 answers, either to express that the foreign accent impedes communication, or to notice how good it was (2 people mentioned foreigners speaking Danish with a Copenhagen accent). This result can be put into perspective with the problem of grammar mentioned twice and the lexical issue mentioned once. Pronunciation is the most salient topic.

Another striking feature comes out in the responses to question 11: 22 out of the 35 respondents found that bad pronunciation is the key problem concerning foreigners speaking Danish poorly, whereas only 8 respondents stated that the key problem is the use of grammar and 9 the poor range of vocabulary. Among those who felt that pronunciation was the problem, it is interesting to notice that several respondents could not give any details on the context of communication (question 11b) but rather expressed that "It's a general feeling."

Similarly, pronunciation is the first criterion used for evaluation of famous people's proficiency in question 12: very good L2 speakers (mark 1) are all considered to have very good pronunciation, and bad speakers (mark 4) are all evaluated as having a bad accent. Two more important conclusions can be drawn from question 12. First, the distinction between a mark 1 and a mark 2 is the presence of a 'heavy/funny/strong/ accent'. Neither grammar nor vocabulary makes the difference. Pronunciation does. Mark 1 and mark 2 speakers are considered to have a high level of vocabulary and grammar; but mark 1 speakers also have 'excellent' pronunciation. Secondly, the difference between group A of 'nearly native speakers' and group B of 'very good foreign speakers' mentioned above is of the same nature: group A has a standard accent, group B a non-standard accent.  There were no famous people who had a combination of mark 2 and had a beautiful and standard accent, which would have indicated that grammar or vocabulary is his or her weak point in the language.

Considering the above results which show that pronunciation is perceived as both difficult and important in speaking Danish, answers to question 6 are surprising. The greatest part of respondents (21) said that they do not feel like correcting errors, except in the rare case when the L2 speakers ask them to. Among them, 5 respondents even stressed that they will never correct pronunciation or

accent because they believe that it is very impolite to do so. Among the 14 speakers who feel like correcting errors, the majority (9 of them) said that they mostly correct grammatical errors and quite surprisingly they give the same two examples of grammatical mistakes made by foreigners: the confusion between the neutral article "et" and the common article "en"; the place of the negative adverb "ikke" which should be after the verb in main clauses and before in the subordinate clauses[11]. Only 3 respondents said they correct pronunciation errors and 2 respondents answered they correct errors that prevent comprehension without mentioning what kind.

In short, native Danish speakers generally agree that pronunciation of their language is both difficult and important for L2 speakers, but, when confronted with L2 speakers who make 'mistakes of pronunciation' they do not correct them – they do not even feel like correcting them. This is an important finding to which we will return in chapter 3.

In conclusion, results show that pronunciation is definitely a fundamental aspect when it comes to evaluating Danish L2 speakers. Even if grammar is not totally neglected, and considered also as important and difficult because of its perceived absence of rules, pronunciation is the focus. It is an aspect that stigmatises the foreigner and distinguishes him from native speakers. The difficulty of achieving Danish native pronunciation is acknowledged, but help to achieve it is not given. Nor are ethnic variations accepted as part of the in-group of Danish accents. There is therefore a double-discourse: on the one hand, respondents are prepared to overtly accept variations: it seems that it is enough to show willingness to learn Danish, to be positively evaluated as L2 speakers. On the other hand, since pronunciation is the focus, tolerance towards variations is low. The label of 'standard Danish' is given to few people, an elite group which overtly demonstrates eagerness to be integrated.

---

[11] Although I do believe that these errors are often made by foreigners, I would like to mention that they can definitely not be considered as preventing understanding; I consequently doubt that one would correct such errors

## 3.3 Other findings

Another aspect of the questionnaire was to find out if the tendency to consider pronunciation as the essential part of the mastery of foreign languages was also present in the evaluation of Danish speakers themselves as speakers of a foreign language. I assumed Danish speakers would find themselves particularly good at pronunciation. However the results of the first three questions do not completely confirm the hypothesis. The respondents find themselves in particular (question 1) and Danes in general (question 3) better at vocabulary (respectively 18 and 16 answers); whereas pronunciation with respectively 9 and 15 answers comes in second position. The pre-eminence of pronunciation over other aspects of the language is not demonstrated. However it must be added that several respondents also pointed out their ability to speak and communicate. This could also be partly interpreted as ability in terms of pronunciation. Besides, results show that the respondents have a representation of themselves as not very proficient in grammar when they speak foreign languages (6 answers for question 1 and 5 for question 3).

Finally regarding the last two questions about the perceived beauty of the Danish language, results confirm what Haugen (1966) found 30 years ago. 33 out of the 35 respondents think that foreigners regard their language as ugly. For 'threatening' question 13, although only 15 out of the 35 respondents overtly expressed that Danish is 'ugly', another 15 were not able to answer. This is a significant high percentage of 'don't know' answers and could be interpreted as an implicit negative answer. Only 5 respondents assert that Danish language is beautiful. The consciousness of an internal downgrading on one of the aspects of their own language, in this case the pronunciation, is undoubtedly an important point confirmed by this study. We shall come back to it in chapter 3.

Chapter 2, in its analysis of the questionnaire devised for this study, has shown that the respondents' opinions do not concur with the commonly held idea that foreigners speak Danish badly. When asked about the ability of outsiders to speak Danish, the respondents expressed positive attitudes. However there is a major contradiction in the discourses of the respondents. Despite being considered as good speakers overtly, L2 speakers are rejected because of pronunciation variations.

Chapter 3 will now consider what conclusions can be drawn from the results of the questionnaire, and link linguistic aspects with the wider approach of national identity. It will show how the focus on pronunciation can be related to the construction of an ethnic model of the nation.

# Chapter 3

# National identity and national language: pronunciation

# as a sign of membership

Chapter 1 has shown how linguistic policies and discourses of Danish language have created the conditions for linguistic homogeneity through the gradual suppression of foreign, regional, and social variations. This linguistic context outlines the questions of the tolerance towards ethnic variations (questionnaire in chapter 2). Results show how today, in Denmark, Danish native speakers are reluctant to accept 'ethnic' variations and thereby exclude most of L2 speakers in the out-group. The denial of full linguistic proficiency is in part explained by the focus on pronunciation that native speakers operate when they evaluate L2 speakers. Chapter 3 now suggests that discourses on language in Denmark are to be understood within the wider discourse on the construction of national identity. I argue that the focus on pronunciation in Danish language stems from and reinforces the ethnic-based model of the nation as well as working as an exclusionary system.

## 1   - Ethnic versus the civic model of the nation

According to Smith, nations are originally divided into two different models: the 'ethnic' and the 'civic' model. The ethnic model is characterised by "its emphasis on a community of birth and native culture." (Smith, 1991: 11) A nation is a group of people that are linked to each other by a supposed common ancestor, a shared vernacular culture, customs and language. The civic model, by contrast, is defined in terms of 'historic territory, legal-political community, legal-political equality of members, and common civic culture and ideology' (Smith, 1991: 11). It means that individuals can choose membership of a nation based on civic grounds – if they adhere to the values the nation promotes – whereas the belonging to a nation based on the ethnic model is given by birth. Smith also points out that these two models are not clear cut and most of the European nations today "contain civic and ethnic elements in varying degrees and different forms" (Smith, 1991: 13).

This view of an original and deeply-rooted conception of the nation, has been challenged, as exemplified by the debate between modernists and ethnicists historians on how culturally constructed nations are. For the former, nations are 'a modern invention' (Hobsbawm: 1990), 'imagined community' (Anderson: 1983). They argue that national consciousness is a nineteenth century political idea, and go even further in suggesting that nation is a cultural construct, a way of defining differentiating and classifying social groups.

This is a very complex debate among historians and I do not want to engage directly with it. Nevertheless, the dichotomy between civic and ethnic models of the nation, whether original or constructed, is a powerful tool to understand the relation of language to nation from a sociolinguistic perspective. That is, in a Foucauldian approach, I take the view that 'nation', like 'madness' or 'the criminal', is above all a discourse. In every moment of its history, competing discourses struggle to create a representation of the nation. Ethnic and civic models are part of these discourses on the nation. Countries and social groups within countries, all have their own representation of what the nation is. At each time of their history, Denmark, France or Germany create a discourse on the nation. The aim of chapter 3 is to understand how some discourses on the nation are created through representations on the language.

Language undoubtedly plays a major role in the making of national consciousness. Language is most frequently seen as a core component of the ethnic basis of national identity. In the case of Germany, a prime example of the ethnic conception of the nation, Fichte (Kedourie, 1960: 58) describes the language as 'the most important criterion by which a nation is recognized to exist and to have the right to form a state on its own'. For Fichte, to speak the 'original language is to be true

to one's character, to maintain one's identity'; 'since a nation ipso facto must speak an original language, its speech must be cleansed of foreign accretions and borrowings, since the purer the language (…) the easier it becomes for the nation to realize itself' (Kedourie, 1960: 61). The language is the soul of the people. Indeed, German intellectuals and nationalists have long defended language as the only adequate indicator of nationality.

They were not the only ones. National consciousness in nineteenth century was frequently rooted in language: the defence of Irish language was used to construct an idea of a pure and original Irish national identity (Crowley: 1996) , the 'creation' of the Nynorsk after Norway gained independence, or Modern Hebrew by the Zionist movement, to quote only few of them, participated in the same idea. In all these forms of nationalism, language was seen as the soul of the nation, the soul of the people.


## 2   - Some facts about population and immigration policies in Denmark


Before examining how discourses of language and nation are interrelated in Denmark, I wish to point out some figures about immigration and population.

Contrary to continental European countries, and due to its northern location, Denmark did not experience the great migration movements of the Middle Ages. Moreover, after the loss of two thirds of its territory in the nineteenth century, the borders of Denmark constricted enclosing a small population, all speaking Danish[12]. Still today, Denmark is considered to be almost entirely inhabited by ethnic Danes and has, compared to other European countries, low rates of immigration[13].

---

[12] As we have seen in Chapter 1 and despite variations
[13] OECD Report (Internet 4)

Modern immigration policies first developed at the end of the 1960s when 'gæstearbejdere' were invited to Denmark to provide the working force Denmark needed to sustain its growing economy. These immigrants came primarily from Turkey, Yugoslavia and Pakistan and are still today the main non-EU minorities in Denmark. According to official figures, there were 5.8% non-EU immigrants living in Denmark in January 2004 and 9.8% 'bilingual children'[14] in schools.

Since 2002, the number of immigrants has dramatically decreased due to restrictive immigration and asylum policies. Under the influence of the Dansk Folkeparti, a populist party elected to Parliament in 2002 and opposed to immigration, a vigorous policy against immigration has been implemented. For instance, a law passed in 2002 restricted marriage to foreign nationals by requiring spouses to be more than 24 years old to live in Denmark[15].

Danish citizenship is of 'jus sanguinis', i.e. a child born in Denmark is Danish only if at least one of his parents – and preferably the mother- is Danish[16]. Conversely to the 'jus soli', which bestows citizenship to individuals born on the national territory, like it is the case in the USA, in Britain or in France, the jus sanguinis emphasises the ethnic links between members of a nation.

Citizenship is, however, acquirable. Applicants must be living in Denmark for at least 8 years, have no criminal record and, what is of interest for this study, have passed a language test, Danske Prøve 3. In December 2005, a new rule[17] was issued by the government: the level of this language test was raised from level 2 to level 3. This higher level is intended for people who 'have had a middle or higher education, like for instance secondary school education or university'. The two first levels

---

[14] Danish Ministry for Refugees, Foreigners and Integration (Internet 5)
[15] Danish Ministry for Refugees, Foreigners and Integration: Law 365 of the 6 June 2002 (Internet 6)
[16] French Ministry of Culture (Internet 7)
[17] Danish Ministry for Refugees, Foreigners and Integration (Internet 8)

of the three linguistic tests for foreigners in Denmark are designed respectively for 'people who can not read and write in their mother tongue and whose mother tongue is not written with the Latin alphabet' and for 'people who have had a short education in their country of origin'.


## 3 - The role of language in the construction of today's Danish national identity


The question is now how to define Danish model? And how do discourses of language in Denmark serve the model of the nation?

The main findings of questionnaire in chapter 2 were on the one hand, that popular discourses reflect to some extent official discourses about how badly foreigners in Denmark speak Danish. Two out of the three groups of famous people were put in the non-native speaker out-group. On the other hand, results also suggest that this was the case because representations of foreign languages among the respondents tend to confuse 'speaking a language well' with 'pronouncing it well'. The problem is that pronunciation, unlike other aspects of the acquisition of a foreign language, is less – if at all- fully acquirable.


### 3.1 The L2 speaker's perspective:  the issue of accent

In the acquisition of a foreign language, especially when the learner is an adult, pronunciation is the less acquirable aspect of the language for at least two main reasons: physiological reasons and socio-psychological reasons relative to the identity of the learner.

a) Physiological aspects

All human being are born with the same vocal cord system. Theoretically, we are all able, when we start to learn our mother tongue, to learn any language. However, as we grow up, the vocal muscles

shape into a specific form and it becomes increasingly difficult to pronounce sounds not included in our mother tongue.

Since the 1970s, 'contrastive and corrective phonetics' has made large steps. Its purpose is to offer learners of all foreign languages a method to correct their pronunciation. Sounds are defined in terms of unvoiced/voiced, labial/dental, etc, differences. The closer two phonemes are in the phonological system, the easier they are to pronounce. The method consists of isolating the problematic sounds and pronouncing them in a favourable environment and progressively in a negative one. Although the method has dramatically helped learners to acquire the sounds of the target language, it is also demonstrated that not all pronunciation variations can be corrected. In most individuals, especially adult learners, an 'accent' remains.

The fact that pronunciation is not entirely a matter of cognitive competence and that teaching must take this into account is defended by Jørgensen (1999: 113) in the pedagogical guide for teachers of Danish as a second language *Dansk som andetsprog*. He urges L2 teachers to take this into account in their work. Jørgensen takes the example of the phonological systems of Danish and Turkish to explain how a Turkish speaker, whose vocal system is significantly different from the Danish one, would have problems in pronouncing Danish. He encourages teachers to use the contrastive and corrective phonetics but also advices them not to focus excessively on pronunciation.

 b) Social and psychological identity aspect

Since the famous work of Labov (Labov: 1972) on the pronunciation of the [r] in a New York store, numerous researchers (Trudgill: 1974; Cheschire: 1982) have studied the links between pronunciation and social identity through the co-variation of phonological and sociological variables. It has been demonstrated that variation is not free but a sign of regional, social, identity membership.

From a social psychological perspective, Ryan and Giles investigated the nature of these

memberships. It is generally admitted that:

> The dominant group promotes its patterns of language use as the model required for
> social advancement; and that use of a lower prestige accent reduces opportunities for
> success in the society. Minority group members are then faced with difficult decisions
> regarding whether to gain social mobility by adopting the language patterns of the
> dominant group, or to maintain their group identity by retaining their native speech
> style. (Ryan & Giles 1982:1)

When variations remain, the question is: why do these speakers continue to use language in

accordance with the community norms when it seems clear that the benefits of adopting the social

norms would be much greater? It has emerged from above studies that speakers of socially

disfavoured accents are often aware of the unfavourable judgments made on the way they speak.

But, their accents are seen as an important symbol of group cohesion and identity. Although social

and political pressure on individuals to give up speaking their own dialects or accent is

considerable, the projection of a group's identity appears to be more important than the acceptance

of the social norm with its associated meanings of power and status.

We can assume that this is also true for foreigners living in Denmark. Although the aim of this

study is not to analyse non-native speakers' linguistic discourses, we might have concluded that, if

some particular groups were more willing than others to keep their identity, this would have

appeared in one way or another in the answers of the respondents. For instance, answers to question

11 about foreigners speaking Danish badly would have specified a specific ethnic group. Or, the

distinction into three groups made in chapter 2, between group A, almost native speakers; group B,

good speakers with an accent and group C, bad speakers, would have singled out a linguistic or

cultural groups. But representatives of the main immigrants groups in Denmark are spread out in

the three groups. I conclude, although this should be proved by further analysis, that L2 speakers as a whole are perceived as keeping their accent when they speak Danish.

There are therefore physiological as well as socio-psychological reasons to explain why some L2 speakers never totally give up an 'accent'. Their accent is a manifestation of their identity, the link with the original culture or social groups to which they previously belonged.

Some of my respondents (19 out of 35) answered question 6 by declaring that they do not correct foreigners because they believe it is insulting. These answers may reflect an awareness of the links described above, between pronunciation and social or cultural identity. It is hence striking how the same respondents still insist on pronunciation aspect when they evaluate L2 speakers. The reason could be that the representation of pronunciation is as an essential part of the language and is interwoven with other representations which touch deeply commonly held values. This is what the following part intends to demonstrate.

**3.2 The Danish native speaker's perspective: accent, the key issue**
If pronunciation is to the eyes of the foreign speaker an identity marker, it is equally important for Danish native speakers because it is linked to the construction of Danish national identity. Two elements drawn from the questionnaire illustrate this point.

As we have seen in chapter 1, the social and political pressures that were exerted on Danish people to give up their own regional dialects and social accents were substantial. We saw how this pressure was exerted through policies and discourses based on a standard ideology. If the situation of linguistic homogeneity is almost achieved today, it is because popular discourses have adhered to some extent to official discourses on a common language. The official discourses on linguistic

standardisation proved to be powerful in their overlapping with discourses of equality. Loyalty to

linguistic standardisation is more generally perceived as loyalty to the discourse of socio-economic

equality: 'If we all speak the same language, regional and social classes will be removed, we will all

be equal.' But it is also because the in-group solidarity factor did not work in the case of regional or

social variations. As we saw, in Kristiansen's attitudes and discourse study (Kristiansen: 2001b),

speakers of low Copenhagen do not show solidarity with their fellow speakers but evaluate them

harshly.

It is therefore not surprising that the respondents often criticised L2 speakers they consider to have a

strong accent: "He [Prince Henrik] has been here for such a long time!"; "he [Sepp Piontek] doesn't

make any effort" (answers to question 12). In these statements, there is a double edge. Firstly,

Danish respondents disapprove of what they interpret as a demonstration of ethnic linguistic

solidarity of the L2 speakers. The sense of ethnic linguistic solidarity is not something Danish

people seem to have followed. They have themselves adhered to the 'standard ideology'. Secondly,

it may be the case that Danish native speakers perceive the preservation of ethnic accent as a rather

direct opposition to the cohesive discourse in Denmark on equality. Not willing to adapt to a

middle-of-the-road linguistic standard is potentially seen as a threat to national unity and national

identity.


The second point refers to the representation Danish native speakers have concerning the sounds of

their language (question 13 and 14). We saw that it was the sole question of the questionnaire that

received so many 'don't know' answers (14) and, at the same time, a clear result in the expressed

answers: 15 negative answers versus 2 positive. I argue that, in popular representations of language,

there is a perceived ugliness and peculiarity that works as a cohesive and exclusionary factor. It is a

cohesive factor because members of the in-group are united by this peculiarity; it is an exclusionary

factor because it indirectly impedes outsiders to learn it. Gregersen (2005: 158) wonders in an academic writing about 'Danishness' that 'it is very strange how today Danish people who themselves find their language ugly, expect foreigners to learn it perfectly.' One of the reasons might well be precisely the fact that pronunciation is seen as an organic component of national identity. This might in turn explain why native speakers do not correct pronunciation variations of L2 speakers. The 'correct pronunciation' of Danish is seen as non acquirable. The perceived difficulty and strangeness of the phonologic part of the language work as a frontier between in-group and out-group members. The focus on accent in evaluation of L2 speakers acts both in terms of reinforcing national cohesion and forging an exclusionary system.

## 4 - A counter-example: linguistic nationalism in French civic model

Speaking well the official language of the country in which one lives; mastering this language as well as possible to be integrated in the host country. After all, these might be quite legitimate ideas. And indeed they are defended in most of the European countries that experience multiculturalism today. France, for instance, requires applicants for citizenship to 'demonstrate that he or she can speak and understand French'[18].

Nevertheless, discourses on the language are not all alike; they are the product and the producer of different models of the nation. That is, even if civic models develop, at some moments of their history, what is called 'linguistic nationalism', I argue that these discourses on language are different from the ones produced in an ethnic-model based nation. To illustrate this point, I shall take the example of France.

---

[18] French Civil Code, article 17, paragraph 33

France is generally seen (Smith: 1991; Hobsbawn: 1990; Grillo: 1989) as the paragon of the civic model of the nation. The 1789 Revolution official discourse defined the nation on the basis of the civic elements described above. French nationality was French citizenship: 'ethnicity, history, the language or patois spoken at home were irrelevant to the definition of the nation' (Hobsbawn, 1990: 88). However, when Smith quotes the case of France he considers the defence of French language during the Revolution as a resurgence of ethnicity. For him, the Revolution produced a discourse of the nation which was not cohesive enough and needed therefore to be sustained by appeals to ethnic roots. It is the 'emergence of a linguistic nationalism, reflecting pride in the purity and civilizing mission of a hegemonic culture preached by Barère and the Abbé Grégoire' (Smith, 1990: 13).

It seems to me that there is at least one important distinction between the French linguistic nationalism of the eighteenth century, based on a civic model, and the ethnic based discourse of language. The distinction lies precisely on which aspect of the language is focused on in both discourses. During the French Revolution, official documents, namely the writings of the Abbé Grégoire, stressed grammatical aspects of the language. Language is defined as a set of grammatical rules, quasi-mathematically organised: 'This is why French can become a universal language. The morphology of French language close to that of natural logic, and its clarity, offered the best instrument yet devised for the articulation of human reason' (Grillo, 1989: 33). Mastering French consists therefore on acquiring these grammatical and logical rules. It is true that the revolutionary discourse was not entirely new. Even if it was integrated in a renewed conception of the nation, it followed the discourse of the former regime precisely in its insistence on the grammatical aspects. Indeed, when the Académie Française was founded in 1635 by Richelieu, the idea was to provide the rules of 'good usage' identified as 'speaking like the best elements of the Court.' Emphasis was already made on grammar. Nevertheless, the French Revolution highlighted these principles in

defining grammar as the rules that presided over the future of the language, just as the revolutionary rules presided over the people. The link between the revolutionary ideas and the language was obvious. If their ideas were to be spread, this would be done through a language which was universal and rational, clear and logical, and hereby transmissible. Pronunciation was not a bone of contention.

This very important distinction between two discourses on national language, one basing its focus on pronunciation, the other on grammar, conveys and sustains the definition of the nation. In one case, language is the soul of the people, it emanates from them; in the other case, language is defined as a set of rules coming from above and to be followed. This is how an ethnic-based model of the language differentiates itself from a civic-based model of the language.


We have seen in this chapter how pronunciation can be a real challenge for a learner of a foreign language. But we have also seen how for a Danish native speaker, pronunciation is an essential part of their language. From both points of view, pronunciation is a key aspect in defining identity. Nevertheless, since the mastery of pronunciation is perceived as a key element of the mastery of Danish language, it creates an exclusionary system which irremediably distinguishes native from non-native speakers.


## Conclusion

In a relevant article on representations of language in Chad, Maurer (1998) provides us with a methodology to analyse representations in the field of sociolinguistics. He argues that representations cannot be studied like "something given", but should be studied as "something produced in the interaction between two or more speakers". He postulates a theory of representations that links old categories of discourses with new categories emerging in the interaction. Representations are therefore in constant dynamic. I shall admit here that this definition of what representations are and how to study them is very convincing. Such a method would probably have given interesting results in the study of representations of Danish as a second language. But, it would have required other material conditions, the first of them being to undertake the interviews in Danish. Besides, my questionnaire is taken as a pilot project. And since new representations are constructed from old representations, I would argue that my study focuses on some of these 'fossilised' representations that frame and help to construct new ones. I hope this pilot project contributes to highlight some elements of the discourse of language circulating in Denmark, and could be the basis for a more in-depth project into such representations.

Among the conclusions I came to during this study, I will outline some of the ones that ought to be deepened in a more thorough study.

Firstly, what are the discourses on language that shape the teaching of Danish as a foreign language today in Denmark? Given the intense policy devised for the teaching of Danish language to foreigners, by means of free and in some case[19] compulsory schools, it is important to analyse what place they give to teaching of pronunciation.

Secondly, as already suggested in the first three questions of the questionnaire, does the focus on pronunciation exist only in the representations of Danish as a second or foreign language or also

---

[19] To receive social benefits (bistandshælp), foreigners must attend Danish classes organised by language schools founded by the State. Lessons are free.

more widely in the representations on foreign languages in general? As a teacher of French language, I have often heard my students worry about having a good accent in French. This could indicate that they lack the pronunciation aspect of teaching, precisely because its acquisition in the teaching of foreign languages is not based on the same premises in France as in Denmark. A close analysis of the teaching materials of foreign languages in Denmark could reveal if this is the case. Similarly, interviews of Danish learners of foreign languages could give useful insight into their representations of the acquisition process.

Thirdly, a highly interesting element to a study would be to examine the link between language and nation and how citizenship is acquired in a given country. In Denmark, as we have seen, there is a linguistic test to be passed prior to the application for Danish citizenship. Which representations of the language does this test entail? And how are these representations at work in what is asked to the applicants?

Finally, as I have suggested at the end of the third chapter, it seems to me that links between language and civic/ethnic models of the nation could be furthered. If, as Smith (1991: 13) puts it, "every nation contains today civic and ethnic elements in varying degrees", it is interesting to define which model of the nation the different representations of language serve. In the case of Danish national identity, I have tried to demonstrate that the focus on pronunciation reflects and reinforces the ethnic model of the nation. I have suggested that, conversely, the focus on grammar in French language could reflect the civic-based model of the nation but there are probably other representations of the French or Danish languages that work as forces toward one of the other models.

My intention with this dissertation was to study discourses that underlie the representations of language in Denmark. I hope that I have been able to highlight the fact that representations of

language interact and are the product as well as the producer of a certain convergence between discourses of linguistic standardisation, the construction of an egalitarian society and the ethnic model of the nation.

In the different representations of the Danish language, the focus on pronunciation is one of the core elements of the perceived national identity. 'Small', 'ugly', 'unpronounceable', 'impossible to learn for a foreigner' whatever the terms are, they reflect a sense of attachment to national identity. Danish language is the language of the Danes. Their focus on pronunciation creates what can be described as an 'ethnic model of the language' and with it the barriers to define who is one of them and who is not.

## Annex 1

# Questionnaire

**Mother tongue:**
**Other languages spoken:**
**Sex:**
**Age:**
**Occupation**:

1- When you speak a foreign language, which aspect of the language do you think you are the best at? (one answer)
   a. Grammar :
   b. Vocabulary
   c. Pronunciation
   d. Other: which one?

2- If you compare Danish people with people from other European countries, how would you evaluate their ability to speak foreign languages? Rate from 1 = good to 4 = bad; 5 = don't know

3- When Danes speak a foreign language, which aspect of the language do you think they usually are best of?
   a. Grammar
   b. Vocabulary
   c. Pronunciation
   d. Other aspects: which one?

4- In your opinion, how easy or difficult is for a foreigner to learn Danish? (1 = easy, 4 = difficult; 5 = don't know)

```
|----------|----------|----------|
1          2          3          4          5
```

5- Could you give me any reason for the easiness or difficulty for a foreigner to learn Danish?

6- When you speak Danish with a foreigner, do you ever feel like correcting errors? If yes, which ones?

7- In your opinion, how easy or difficult is it for a foreigner to learn Danish pronunciation? (1 = easy, 4 = difficult; 5 = don't know)

```
|----------|----------|----------|
1          2          3          4          5
```

8- In your opinion, how easy or difficult is it for a foreigner to learn Danish grammar? (1 = easy, 4 = difficult; 5 don't know)

```
|----------|----------|----------|
 1          2          3          4          5
```

9- You have a friend who has just settled in Denmark. He wants to learn Danish. What would you advice him to do:
    a. "Learn carefully the grammar."
    b. "Learn carefully the pronunciation."
    c. "Don't bother! Here everybody speaks English."

10- Now, I would like you to remember one of the last foreigners (living in Denmark) that you have heard speaking Danish.
    a. How would you say his or her Danish is?

Good        Fairly good        Difficult to understand        Don't remember

    b. Could you detail the context of the situation: who was he/she? Where did you hear her/him speaking? What was the context?

11- Now, I would like you to remember one of the last foreigners (living in Denmark) that you have heard speaking Danish badly.
    a. In your opinion, why was his or her Danish bad? Did she or he have a:

Bad grammar        Bad vocabulary        Bad pronunciation        Don't remember

    b. Could you detail the context of the situation: who was he/she? Where did you hear her/him speaking? What was the context?

12- I'm now going to give you a list of famous people. For each person, tell me:

| | How do you think he/she speaks Danish ? | Why did you give this mark, i.e. which criteria did you use? | How is his/her acc | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | scale from: 1= well to 4= bad | | Standard (sound like a native speaker) | Non (doesn a nativ |
| Princess Alexandra | | | | |
| Prince Henrik | | | | |
| Tom McEwan (actor) | | | | |
| Omar Marzouk (actor) | | | | |
| Zlatko Buric (actor) | | | | |
| Etta Cameron (jazz singer) | | | | |
| Sepp Piontek (football coach) | | | | |
| Wilson Kipketer (sportsman) | | | | |
| Paula Larrain (newscaster) | | | | |
| Naser Kader (MP) | | | | |
| Kamal Qureshi (MP) | | | | |

13- How do you like the sound of Danish language?
   a.  It's beautiful
   b.  It's ugly
   c.  Don't know


14- How do you think foreigners like the sound of Danish language?
   a.  They think it's beautiful
   b.  They think it's ugly

# Bibliography

Anderson, B. (1983) *Imagined communities. Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism.* London: Verso

Baggioni, D. (1997) *Langues et Nations en Europe*. Paris : Bibliothèque scientifique Payot

Bakhtin, M. (1981) *The dialogic imagination.* Austin: University of Texas Press

Branca-Rosoff, S. (1996) 'Les imaginaires des langues'. In Boyer, H. (ed.) (1996) *Sociolinguistique. Territoire et objets*. Lausanne : Delachaux et Niestlé, pp.79-114.

Cameron, D. (1995) *Verbal Hygiene*. London: Routledge

Certeau, M. de (1984) 'The Practice of Everyday Life'. In Storey, J. (ed.) (1998), *Cultural Theory and Popular Culture*, Harlow: Prentice Hall, pp.483-494.

Cheshire, J. (1982) 'Linguistic Variation and Social Function'. In Coupland, N. & Jaworski, A. (ed.) (1997) *Sociolinguistics: A Reader and a Course book.* New York: Palgrave, pp.185-198.

Crowley, T. (1989) *The politics of discourse: the standard language question in British cultural debate.* Basingstoke: Macmillan Education

Deacon D. & all (1999) *Researching communications: A Practical Guide to Methods in Media and Cultural Analysis*. London: Arnold

Foucault, M. (1971) L'ordre du discours. Paris : Gallimard

Giles, H. & Powesland, P.F. (1975) *Speech Style and Social Evaluation*. London: Academic Press

Giles, H. & Saint-Jacques, B. (1979) *Language and Ethnic Relations*. Oxford : Pergamon Press

Gregersen, F. (2005) 'Fra leverpostej til frugtsalat, Tanker om danskhed og sprog'. In Knap et al (ed.) (2005) *Hvåd er så Danskhed?* København: Hovedland Københavns Universitet

Grillo, R.D. (1989) *Dominant languages: language and hierarchy in Britain and France.*

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Haugen, E. (1966) 'Semicommunication: The language gap in Scandinavia'. In Firchow et al. (ed.)

(1972) *Studies by Einar Haugen.* The Hague: Mouton, pp. 479-495

Haugen, E. (1968) 'The Scandinavian languages as cultural artifacts'. In Firchow et al. (ed.) (1972)

*Studies by Einar Haugen.* The Hague: Mouton, pp.564-579

Helle, A.E. (1992) *Histoire du Danemark.* Paris : Hatier

Hobsbawm E.J. (1990) *Nations and Nationalism since 1780.* Cambridge: Cambridge University

Press

Honey, J. (1989) *Does accent matter? The Pygmalion Factor.* London: Faber and Faber.

Jørgensen, J.N. (1999) 'Om tilegnelse af dansk udtale hos voksne indlærere'. In Holmen, A. &

Lund, K. (ed.) (1999) *Studier I Dansk som andetsprog.* København: Akademisk Forlag, pp.107-136.

Jørgensen, J.N. (2003) 'Bilingualism and minority languages'. *International Journal of the*

*Sociology of Language 159*, pp.73-92.

Jørgensen J.N. & Quist P. (2001) 'Native Speakers' Judgements of Second Language Danish'.

*Language Awareness 10,* pp.41-56.

Kedourie, E. (1960) *Nationalism.* London: Hutchinson

Kristensen, K. (2003) 'Standard Danish, Copenhagen Sociolects, and Regional Varieties in the

1900s.' *International Journal of the Sociology of Language 159*, pp.29-44.

Kristiansen, T. (1997) 'Language attitudes in a Danish Cinema'. In Coupland, N. & Jaworski, A.

(ed.) (1997) *Sociolinguistics: A Reader and a Course book.* New York: Palgrave, pp.291-305.

Kristiansen, T. (2001a) 'Guest Editorial'. *Language Awareness 10*, pp.1-8.

Kristiansen, T. (2001b) 'Two standards: one for the media and one for the school'. *Language*

*Awareness 10,* pp.9-24.

Kristiansen T. (2003) 'Language Attitudes and Language Politics in Denmark'. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language 159*, pp.57-71.

Kristiansen, T. & Jørgensen J.N. (2003) 'Introduction: The Sociolinguistics of Danish'. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language 159*, pp.1-8.

Labov, W. (1972) *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University Press

Ladegaard, H.J. (1994) 'Language attitudes and language change in Denmark'. In Kotsinas,U.B. & Helgander, J. (ed.) (1994) *Dialektkontakt, spräkkontakt och spräförändring i Norden. Färedrag från ett forskarsymposium*. Stockholm: Stockholm Universitet, pp.270-279.

Ladegaard H.J. (1998) 'Assessing National Stereotypes in Language Attitude Studies: The case of class-consciousness in Denmark'. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 19, pp.182-198.

Ladegaard, H.J. (2001) 'Popular Perceptions of Standard Language: Attitudes to 'Regional Standards' in Denmark'. *Language Awareness 10,* pp.25-40.

Lambert, W.E. (1967) 'A social Psychology of Bilingualism'. *Journal of Social Issues 23,* pp.91-109.

Maurer, B. (1998) 'De quoi parle-t-on quand on parle de représentations sociolinguistiques ?'. In Canut, C. (ed.) (1998), *Imaginaires linguistiques en Afrique.* Paris: L'Harmattan, pp.27-37.

Milroy J. & Milroy L. (1985) *Authority in Language: Investigating Language Prescription and Standardisation*. London: Routledge.

Møller, J. & Quist, P. (2003) 'Research on youth and language in Denmark'. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language 159*, pp.45-56.

Pedersen, I.L. (2003) 'Traditional dialects of Danish and the de-dialectalization 1900-2000.' *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 159, pp.9-28.

Rerup, L. (1980) 'The development of Nationalism in Denmark, 1864-1914'. In Mitchison (ed.)

(1980) *The roots of nationalism: studies in Northern Europe*. Edinburgh: John Donald publishers,

pp.47-59.

Ryan, E.B. (1979) 'Why do low-prestige language varieties persist?' In Giles, H. & St Clair, R.N.

(ed.) (1979) *Language and Social Psychology.* Baltimore: University Park Press.

Ryan, E.B. & Giles, H. (1982) *Attitudes towards Language Variations.* London: Edward Arnol

Smith, A.D. (1991) *National Identity*. London: Penguin Books

Sudman, S. & Bradburn N.M. (1991) *Asking questions: A Practical Guide to Questionnaire*

*Design.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers

Thyssen, A.P. (1980) 'The Rise of Nationalism in the Danish Monarchy 1800-1864, with Special

Reference to its Socio-Economic and Cultural Aspects'. In Mitchison (ed.) (1980) *The Roots of*

*Nationalism: Studies in Northern Europe*. Edinburgh: John Donald publishers LTD, pp.31-46.

Trudgill, P. (1972) 'Sex, covert prestige and linguistic change in the urban British English of

Norwich'. *Language in Society 1*, pp.179-196.

Trudgill, P. (1974) *The Social Differentiation of English in Norwich*. Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press


**Newspaper:**
'Det er på tide vi siger fra', *Politiken*, 15 December 2005, p.1, Brøgger, S., Michael, I., Andersen,
B., Rifbjerg, K., Dalager, S., Thorup, K., Jensen, C., Boberg, T., Mortensen, H., Holst, H.V.,
Eriksen, I., Schultz Jørgensen, P.

**Websites:**
Internet 1: http://www.fremtidensdanskfag.u-net.dk/kortlagning/stenallanchristensen1.htm#Top,
consulted 27.01.06
Internet 2: http://www.inm.dk/Publikationer/I_job_nu_nr_1_2005/index.htm, consulted 10.09.05
Internet 3: http://www.inm.dk/publikationer/integration2001/ren.htm, consulted 27.01.06
Internet 4:
http://www.olis.oecd.org/olis/2004doc.nsf/43bb6130e5e86e5fc12569fa005d004c/bd49a626ee72c2b
dc1256e8b0079e481/$FILE/JT00189092.DOC, consulted 12.01.06
Internet 5: http://www.inm.dk/Index/sos_Detalje.asp?o=56&n=1&h=19&t=7&d=837&s=4,
consulted 12.01.06

Internet 6: http://www.inm.dk/Index/dokumenter.asp?o=25&n=0&h=25&t=3&d=1307&s=4 , consulted 12.01.06

Internet 7: http://www.culture.gouv.fr/entreelibre/Laurette/country/denmarktxt.html, consulted 12.01.06

Internet 8: http://www.inm.dk/Index/dokumenter.asp?o=30&n=0&h=30&d=3169&s=4, consulted 12.01.06