

# Languages and Linguistic Exchanges in Swedish Academia

Practices, Processes, and Globalizing Markets

*Linus Salö*

Centre for Research on Bilingualism  
Department of Swedish Language and Multilingualism  
Stockholm University

Doctoral Dissertation 2016  
Centre for Research on Bilingualism  
Department of Swedish Language and Multilingualism  
Stockholm University

Copyright: Linus Salö, Stockholm University 2016  
Printing: Holmbergs, Malmö 2016

Correspondence:  
SE 106 91 Stockholm  
[www.biling.su.se](http://www.biling.su.se)

ISBN 978-91-7649-326-7  
ISSN 1400-5921

# Acknowledgements

---

Socially, professionally and otherwise, the Centre has provided a splendid environment in which this thesis could grow. For that reason, I thank all of those belonging to the Centre's present and past leadership who have provided the material and symbolic means for maximizing my preconditions for achieving this work. Above all, I have had the privileged access to a network of highly qualified peers and discussants, the contributions of whom have been invaluable. At the outset, thanks go to my thesis advisors K. Hylténstam and C. Stroud – two strategic and 'non-policing' field founders with an eye for removing institutional obstacles when so required. In their roles as scholarly sounding boards and comrades, I thank first and foremost D. Karlander along with N. Ganuza, C. Kerfoot, G. Norrman, M. Bylund, and G. Montero. Outside of the Centre, I am in intellectual debt to a large group of people, many of whom have contributed substantially. First and foremost I shall mention L. Hanell and, moreover, O. Josephson, D. Broady, S. Sörlin, V. Muni-Toke, T. Milani, and E. Nylander. To this group I also count F. Gregersen and a bunch of other Denmark-based scholars: A-K Hultgren, J. Thøgersen, H. Haberland, J. Mortensen, A. Holmen, M.S. Karrebæk, J.S. Møller, M. Maegaard, and T.R. Nørreby. Thanks also go to L. Antieau for extraordinary language editing, and to the editors, reviewers, and co-authors with whom I have communicated and collaborated in the fruitful efforts crowned by this thesis, as well as in work published elsewhere.

Apart from regularly presenting my work at the Centre's seminar series, different parts of this thesis have been aired at a number of conferences and workshops over the past few years, including the following: *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*, Hong Kong, 2015; *GURT*, Washington D.C., 2015; *The First Stockholm Roundtable in Linguistic Anthropology*, Stockholm, 2015; *The Politics of Institutional Multilingualism*, Paris, 2014; *Sociolinguistic Symposium 20*, Jyväskylä, 2014; *Orders of Visibility*, Stockholm, 2013; *Calpiu*, Roskilde, 2012; *ETHOS*, Uppsala, 2012; *4 or More Languages for All*, Faroe Islands, 2011. In addition, work has been presented at a number of seminars such as the following: The Swedish Language Council, Stockholm, 2015 and 2011; SeDyL, Paris, 2015; The LANCHART Centre, Copenhagen, 2015; KTH Royal Institute of Technology, 2014; Lund University, 2013. I am grateful to those who invited or accepted me, and to those who contributed in discussing the work.

*Linus Salö*

Stockholm, March 2016



The present thesis is based on the following studies:

- I. Salö, L. 2014. Language ideology and shifting representations of linguistic threats. A Bourdieusian re-reading of the conceptual history of domain loss in Sweden's field of language planning. In Hultgren, A.K., Gregersen, F. & Thøgersen, J., eds. *English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and Practices*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 83–110.
- II. Salö, L. under review. The sociolinguistics of academic publishing: A relational approach to language choice.
- III. Salö, L. 2015. The linguistic sense of placement: Habitus and the entextualization of translingual practices in Swedish academia. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 19(4): 511–534.
- IV. Salö, L. & Hanell, L. 2014. Performance of unprecedented genres. Interdiscursivity in the writing practices of a Swedish researcher. *Language & Communication* 37: 12–28.



# Languages and Linguistic Exchanges in Swedish Academia

## Practices, Processes, and Globalizing Markets

---

### 1 Introduction

#### 1.1 Discourse in and about Swedish academia

This thesis is concerned with language issues and phenomena in the linguistic marketplace of Swedish academia, as well as the discourses surrounding this vast site of discursive exchange. Narrowed down somewhat, this course of sociolinguistic inquiry is delimited to linguistic practices and processes related primarily to scientific research, as they unfold in history, psychology, physics, and computer science. The thesis focuses on exchanges involving both Swedish and English. The main rationale for doing so pertains to the politics of language: over the past two decades or so, the position of English in Sweden amounts to a – arguably the – key concern in Swedish language policy and planning, LPP (e.g., Milani 2007a). What is more, as part of LPP struggles to manage the Swedish language situation in times of rapid social change, the position of English has long been perceived as most palpably reflected in academic life – research being a case in point. English in the globalizing markets of Swedish academia is therefore a vexed question, and as such an ideologically situated and contested object of knowledge. Exploring it, then, is to delve into a research topic situated ‘between the scientific and the political registers’ (Wacquant 2009a, 125). This, in effect, is what the present thesis does, and by doing so, it contributes to an understanding of what LPP is, and how it functions. Moreover, it furthers the knowledgebase concerning the sociolinguistics of Swedish university life and proposes a number of thinking-tools for its future exploration.

In the four separate yet interconnected studies that form the thesis, a set of different lenses are adopted with the aim of foregrounding different parts constitutive of this topic. For its part, this summarizing chapter serves to focus and contextualize the research object, as well as to pull some of the threads together as they appear in the included studies. I shall be using one of the key opportunities provided by this progressing, article-based format of doctoral theses to apply a metareflexive gaze to the re-reading the studies as part of a whole, as quite naturally, ‘scholars develop and build complexity into their views over time’ (Lizardo 2008, 2). In a similar vein, an ample share of attention will here be given to epistemological matters concerning

my own relationship to the object I have undertaken to study. This pursuit – one facet of *epistemic reflexivity* (e.g., Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992) – will be a central theme in this summarizing chapter, because, as I shall contend, it is a pivotal driver for yielding better sociolinguistic research. As an instrument, it offers researchers a disposition for grasping the principles of their knowledge production (Brubaker 1993).

In the main, two of the studies (1–2) included here are attuned to historicizing, while the other two studies (3–4) probe into the everyday linguistic practices of contemporary Swedish academia. Extensive summaries and commentaries will be presented in section 7. In brief, the studies can be introduced as follows:

1. Study 1: The book chapter *Language ideology and shifting representations of linguistic threats* investigates processes of shifting language ideologies underpinning threats to Swedish in Sweden's field of language planning and policy (LPP). It presents a historical analysis of the social life of the language notion 'domain loss' as it emerged and eventually won recognition in Sweden, vis-à-vis other relevant societal discourses.
2. Study 2: *The sociolinguistics of academic publishing* (manuscript) delves into the *longue durée* of publishing language in two disciplinary fields: history and psychology. It seeks to develop an in-depth understanding of the ever-increasing significance of English as a language of scientific publishing. The study combines accounts of the fields' historical struggles with accounts of the uptake of these histories among contemporary researchers in the two fields.
3. Study 3: *The linguistic sense of placement* is a research article concerned with the place of Swedish in contemporary research practices of computer science and physics. It seeks to account for discourse in the scientific practices that feed into the production of finalized texts in English in these disciplines. Based on observations and interview accounts, the study theorizes regularities in linguistic practices vis-à-vis the researchers' ideas of acceptable language use.
4. Study 4: The research article *Performance of unprecedented genres* examines a Swedish computer scientist's ability to use Swedish in his writing practices. The matter at issue is whether advanced genres can be performed in Swedish here, since Swedish has almost never been used in publishing in the discipline. The study explores the ways in which the resources comprising the scientist's language knowledge come into play in new discursive events.



All in all, then, the studies comprising the thesis endeavor to shed light on discourse in and discourses about Swedish academia over historical courses and in contemporary times, spanning from accounts of ‘the big picture’ to accounts of detailed discursive phenomena. It can be reasoned that large-scale studies and small-scale studies complement and necessitate each other. This is so because different aspects of empirical reality tend to be disclosed at different magnitudes of zoom. On the one hand, large-scale studies dealing with the language situation in Swedish academia often provide useful overviews (e.g., Salö 2010), but seldom are they sensitive to the sociolinguistic realities unfolding in practice, that is, actual language use. But, on the other hand,

the so-called microsociological vision leaves out a good number of other things: as often happens when you look too closely, you cannot see the wood from the tree; and above all, failing to construct the space of positions leaves you no chance of seeing the point from which you see what you see. (Bourdieu 1989, 18–19)

## 1.2 Organization of the summarizing chapter

This summarizing chapter is organized as follows. Section 2 presents some preliminaries, including notes on the theoretical framework adhered to, the conversations engaged in, and the rationales underpinning the agenda for advancing knowledge on this particular research topic. This pursuit of contextualizing object will be furthered in section 3, which focuses attention to the position of Swedish in a globalizing world, particularly in the context of academia. Section 4 introduces Bourdieu’s idea of ‘epistemic reflexivity’, a metaprinciple exemplified by revisiting LPP as a case for situating reflexivity in practice. Section 5 presents an outline of the frameworks and thinking-tools that have guided my work, theoretically, methodologically, and otherwise, and so accounts for the relevant tool-kit from linguistic anthropology and sociolinguistics that this thesis employs as extensions to the reflexive sociology of Bourdieu. Section 6 presents the methods used in the study, as well as the data produced by it and the issues encountered in it, by opting for these methods. Section 7 contains extended summaries of the studies that form the thesis, which include contextualizing preliminaries, summaries, and commentaries. Section 8 discusses a number of relevant subject matters linked to knowledge production and reflexivity, as well as the necessity of turning the tools of reflexivity onto oneself. Section 9 presents concluding remarks where a few attempts at synthesis are made on the basis of the key findings of this thesis. Lastly, a summary in Swedish is provided.

The results of this thesis are neither univocal nor apposite for bold conclusions as to *whether or not* English poses a sociolinguistic problem or a ‘threat’ in Swedish academia. Strong position-takings on these matters – or

so it seems to me – tend to tell us more about the analyst’s position in the academic field than they do about the empirical realities studied. Fundamentally, the intention of the line of inquiry presented here has been to disclose a view that challenges black-and-white accounts of the sociolinguistic state of affairs in Swedish academia and to replace them ‘with a far more detailed and precise view in which shades of grey are allowed’ (Blommaert 2010, 134). In this pursuit I have sought to ‘make reason *uneasy*’ (Bachelard 2002, 245). That said, the key findings presented in the thesis may at a glance be conveyed as follows:

Much knowledge previously produced on the topic of English in Swedish academia stems from Swedish LPP, and should as such be grasped first and foremost as the outcome of language ideological struggles, the stake of which is to safeguard the Swedish language in all areas of society. In so doing, things have appeared as though the linguistic markets of Swedish academia operate practically only through the medium of English. The work presented here belies this general description. However, it does seem to be the case that current trends in the management of research work in a direction that is unfavorable to practices of publishing in Swedish. Fields such as history, with long-upheld practices of publishing in Swedish, are currently gearing toward transnational publishing markets where English predominates, at least partly as a result of newly adopted performance measures in research policy. This tendency is in line with the state’s vision on research politics, but, conversely, runs counter to its vision on language politics at large. This thesis thus maintains that Swedish academia is a context in which English is an ineluctable resource for scientific communication.

The position of English, thus, is most palpably manifested ‘on the surface’, for example, in academic publishing. However, what goes on beneath the surface is not unimportant. In fact, many of the concerns expressed on English as a sociolinguistic problem can be cast in new light when other forms of academic practices are explored. Most importantly, the prevailing position of English in publishing does not entail that Swedish is absent as a scientific language. Binary representations, that is, clear-cut divisions between English and Swedish, here seem to be at odds with the empirical realities as disclosed within the confines of this thesis. Beyond publications, technical and discipline-specific Swedish thrives both orally and in writing in the everyday research practices of Swedish-speaking researchers. It follows from this fact that the abilities of Swedish researchers to use Swedish should not be underestimated. By virtue of these findings, many LPP accounts pertaining to the sociolinguistics of Swedish academia must be said to have overstated and arguably misconceived the dominance of English and, by the same token, overelaborated its implications for the Swedish language and its speakers. On these matters, however, there is much need for further

empirical knowledge. In exploring these issues, analysts are faced with a pivotal balancing act between, on the one hand, not forgetting to problematize excessive and interest-laden accounts on English as a sociolinguistic problem, and, on the other, maintaining a critical eye to the processes that work in favor of uniformity in the scientific field and the asymmetrical power relations it engenders (cf. Jacquemet 2005, 261).

## 2 Preliminaries

Subsection 2.1 introduces Bourdieu and acknowledges his importance to the work presented here. Subsection 2.2 expands upon the rationales for directing attention to the sociolinguistics of academic life and, moreover, presents the two major conversations engaged throughout this work.

### 2.1 Disciplinary trespassing and leitmotifs

At its heart, the thesis deals with language as a social phenomenon, that is, ‘as a phenomenon which is enmeshed in relations of power, in situations of conflict, in processes of social change’ (Thompson 1984, 7). Time and again, though, I have found myself dealing with matters that unfold over language, the understanding of which requires a broader line of inquiry. Often, issues seemingly linked to English are not questions about language *per se*; rather, language is one of several entangled features of human practice, including research. For example, while matters of publishing language are sociolinguistically interesting and politically significant, they are to a great extent caught up in research politics. Even so, as study 2 argues, language does provide a window into struggles that unfold over a range of other values (cf. Blommaert 1999a). To meet the demands of this broad and miscellaneous approach, it has become a prerequisite to extend the hunting grounds conventionally associated with language studies by bringing together strands of research from sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology with those of sociology, history of science and ideas, and research policy. In short, the thesis poses questions that cannot be answered by any monodisciplinary undertaking. On this point, I concur with the French thinker Pierre Bourdieu – as will be evident, a key figure of intellectual inspiration throughout this thesis – who pleads forcefully for the need to transgress, or ‘trespass’, disciplinary boundaries to advance the frontiers of scholarly knowledge about language (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992, 148–149). Bourdieu sees these boundaries as being first and foremost academically reproduced and, therefore, as having ‘no epistemological foundation whatsoever’ (ibid.; also Wacquant 1989a, 47). In this endeavor, though, I am scarcely alone, as these forms of hybrid, multi-perspectival accounts have recently seemed to gain currency at the

forefront of sociolinguistic research (e.g., Bauman & Briggs 2003; Blommaert 2014; Heller 2007a, 2011; Park & Wee 2012; Stroud & Wee 2011).

Additional perspectives notwithstanding, Bourdieusian sociology stands out as the principal leitmotif of the thesis. Bourdieu's influence is probably most easily distinguishable in the conceptual tool-kit employed, where the pivotal concepts *practice*, *field*, *market*, *habitus*, and *capital* each serve as entry points for unraveling analytically relevant aspects of the social worlds investigated. These concepts – ‘thinking tools’ – should be seen as lynchpins aimed at making inroads into specific ways of engaging with the research object, insofar as they propose ways of thinking about and ways of approaching the research object empirically. Moreover, as will be apparent, Bourdieu's well-known concepts do not embrace only the Bourdieusian influence on the thesis, since, at some level or another, a number of Bourdieu's guiding meta-theoretical imperatives for the actual *craft* of research are also of utmost importance. Following Swartz (2013), these will henceforth be referred to as Bourdieu's ‘metaprinciples for research’, and they concern theory as much as questions of methodology. In this summarizing chapter, I shall probe into two of these in some detail, both of which have grown into becoming particularly influential throughout this work: The metaprinciple of ‘relational thinking’ has informed my methodological agenda, and also added explanatory value to several of the included studies. Likewise, Bourdieu's principle of ‘epistemic reflexivity’ has proven to be useful in the efforts leading up to this thesis of producing a new gaze, a ‘sociological eye’ (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992, 251), but also an eye that, as it were, is capable of seeing itself (Wacquant 1989b, 20). As I shall argue and exemplify at some length in this chapter, reflexivity is vital in the construction of a scientific habitus, incorporated as ‘a disposition to monitor its own productions and to grasp its own principles of production’ (Brubaker 1993, 216).

## 2.2 Rationales and conversations

Taken as a whole, the present thesis aspires to add to the topic of languages and linguistic exchanges in Swedish academia empirical specificity, on the one hand, and, on the other, retooled social theory fit for informing sociolinguistic research on these issues. Two interrelated rationales underlie this two-fold agenda of advancing knowledge.

First, while the question of Swedish and English in Swedish academia has been extensively debated, the question has remained surprisingly under-researched as a sociolinguistic object. By and large, the discussion surrounding the subject matter has unfolded primarily in the context of LPP, and here broadened perspectives of macro-social prominence have been privileged. Empirical studies targeting actual language use in the everyday

practices of Swedish university life have been largely conspicuous by their absence. The first objective, thus, aims at filling this gap, that is, to firmly situate the discussion about English in Swedish academia ‘on the terrain of science’ (Bourdieu 1990a, 14). In this quest, however, I am not acting on my own. The last few years have seen a growing body of scholarly work dealing more specifically with the topic of English in higher education teaching and learning (e.g., Airey 2015; Airey et al. 2015; Björkman 2013; Kuteeva 2011; Mežek 2013; Shaw & McMillion 2011; Söderlundh 2010; Thøgersen et al. 2014), publishing (e.g., Kuteeva & Airey 2014; Kuteeva & McGrath 2014; McGrath 2014; Olsson & Sheridan 2012), and policy (e.g., Björkman 2014, 2015; Cabau 2011; Hult & Källqvist 2015; Jansson 2008; Källqvist & Hult 2014) in Swedish academia. There are also studies in which many or all of these areas come together (e.g., Bolton & Kuteeva 2012; Salö 2010; Salö & Josephson 2014). Little by little, then, these studies co-contribute to a comprehensive understanding of the complexity of the research object at stake. It is noteworthy, however, that many of these studies are fairly recent, published as they have been during the past five years or so. Consequently, the English–Swedish question as it emerged in the 1990s and onward has lacked empirical accounts on the basis of which policy decisions could be made and how sociolinguistic theory could be evaluated and engendered (cf. Josephson 2002, 84). In addition, the new scholarly interest notwithstanding, the present state of knowledge reveals an overabundance of pedagogical questions linked to adopting English as a medium of instruction, a trait that Grin (2015, 100) sees as typical in scholarship on language of modern universities. While it is evident that matters such as academic publishing are also investigated with Swedish academia as a case (see Kuteeva 2015 for an overview), significantly less research has centered on language use in research practices other than publishing, where, consequently, the sociolinguistic state of affairs are understudied. As a consequence, there has long been a lacuna in our knowledge concerning the extent to which English *de facto* predominates in Swedish academia, and in so far as there has been a solid knowledge base on the matter at issue, there has been a lack of intellectual means to grasp the language situation.

Second, the prevalent problematizations and conceptualizations that accompanied the research object as I began exploring it were unsatisfactory. Teleman (2003, 251) notes that, traditionally, Swedish LPP has been problem-oriented and pragmatic, but guided by common sense rather than theoretical knowledge. Accordingly, related to the point above about lack of detailed empirical accounts, it was clear from the very beginning of this work that I needed a profoundly new inroad for understanding the dynamics of English at Swedish universities and a new meta-language to account for my findings. By and large, this was due to a dissatisfaction with what could be called the epistemology of macro sociopolitical LPP (Ricento 2000). Since

its launch in the early 1990s, the debate on English in Swedish academia has subscribed extensively to frameworks deriving out of modernist scholarly work on language maintenance and shift, ensnared and driven by discourses of language endangerment. Indeed, on this point Silverstein points out that ‘the field of surveying and inventorying the changes in “status” of local languages has generally been carried out within this conception of a sociology of language’ (1998, 414). These traditions all seemed inept for the purpose of doing justice to the complexity comprising this sociolinguistic object of study, and this skepticism moreover applied to the representations yielded from within the very same frameworks. This point will require further commenting below (section 4.2), since this legacy is by no means unique to Sweden. Rather, as I shall hold, the sociolinguistic developments observed over the last decade of the 20th century were made explicable by means of the conceptual frameworks that at that time were rendered available by the linguistic ideologies of particular scholarly traditions (cf. Teleman 2003, 234; see also Blommaert 1996 and section 4.2).

Seeking to bridge oppositions between academic ‘camps’, Irvine (1989, 250) rightly notes that ‘[l]anguage is a complex social fact that can be looked at from many angles, including the economic.’ As the title of the thesis bears witness to, the work presented here relates to different notions of language: both as named languages (Swedish, English, Latin, etc.) – that is, what Blommaert (2006, 515) calls ‘the artifactual and denotational image of language’, and as activities of linguistic exchange, where, in practice, language boundaries are blurred as snippets of discourse ordinarily lose their distinctiveness as belonging to one or the other language (e.g., study 3, 522ff.). This ambivalence may be motivated as follows. I take from Heller and Martin-Jones (2001) the idea of engaging in a number of more or less disparate conversations as parts of this work as a whole. In the first conversation, I engage with socially interested language sciences, where new light is currently shed on old objects of inquiry, such as ‘competence’ and ‘language choice’, and where efforts are put into understanding the conditions for knowledge production in the social worlds in which scholarly enterprise takes place. In this conversation, it is increasingly becoming a mainstream stance to recognize that linguistic practice does not adhere necessarily to the sociohistorical boundaries of languages (e.g., Blackledge & Creese 2014; Canagarajah 2013a). Still, though, people’s conceptions of languages seem to carry significance in practice. Accounting for this fact, the thesis seeks to demonstrate some of the insights to be won by engaging in dialogue with the epistemological perspectives and thinking-tools developed in the work of Bourdieu, which, to different degrees and purposes, have come to foster all studies included in this thesis. In respect to the study of many sociolinguistic inquires, Bourdieu’s work imports with it a solid social-theoretical base of

the comprehension of human practice, including linguistic practice, which therefore offers some purchase to account for the relationship between local linguistic practices and macrosocial issues (Park & Wee 2012, 17). Ultimately, as I see it, this gaze invites the analyst to think of language as part of the social rather than a mere reflection of it (Cameron 1990, 81–82). Bourdieu's work also ties in nicely with work yielded out of the North American tradition of linguistic anthropology and recent advances in sociolinguistics. This is an ongoing and reciprocally fruitful conversation, and in this summarizing chapter, I shall comment upon the ways in which these approaches to language studies have converged in the work leading up to this thesis.

The second conversation engages the field of LPP, which faces the task of grasping the influxes from English in what appears to be an increasingly globalizing world. Insights to forms of translanguaging practice and the evident arbitrariness of language boundaries in communication are highly relevant to LPP. In the stronger versions, however, it would seem that the translatability of these ontologies into policy is not without complications. Be they social constructions or not, named languages remain important categories for LPP to relate to, and ignoring this fact seems unjustified (cf. Hanks 1996, 232). These questions, however, beg for more attention, and I do not delve into their complexities within the confines of this thesis.

On the whole, I share Josephson's (2004a) prediction that the importance attached to English is likely to increase henceforth – and particularly so in academia. Nonetheless, in respect to LPP I have been driven by the desire for, in Bourdieu's words: 'transforming the hierarchy of importance' (2004, 64) attached to this question. In conversation with LPP, then, the thesis seeks to initiate a discussion that does not revolve around the idea of 'domain loss', which has long prevailed as the master narrative for grasping sociolinguistic change in Swedish and Scandinavian contexts (see section 3.4 and 7.1.1). Certainly, this agenda is linked to the yearning to create what Bachelard (e.g., 2002) calls an *epistemological rupture*, the intentional result of which is 'a change in the epistemological value attached to some particular belief or cluster of beliefs, which, having been taken for granted, are called into question' (Tiles 1985, 57). The thesis endeavors to do this by orienting its focus to previously raised concerns within the field of LPP, so as to separate what I perceive to be acute questions of sociolinguistic inquiry from false sociolinguistic problems – such as those appearing after sober empirical evaluation. At the heart of it, breaking with established ways of bespeaking and bethinking the research object serves as the means of yielding a form of reflective knowledge: 'the product of reflection on previously held beliefs and ways of thinking' (ibid., 58). In this thesis, I withstand that knowledge production benefits from this sort of reflexive return, and in this stance, I concur with Bachelard (e.g., 2002) in arguing that the systematic pursuit of knowledge production advances by virtue of all that it forces itself

to abandon. Accordingly, the thesis additionally proposes new inroads for understanding and discussing the impetus of English in Swedish academia. In so doing, I shall argue, the thesis contributes so that the game can continue (Broady 1983, 73) – but, or so I hope, in accordance with the pointers offered by the work presented here. By this logic, to be sure, this thesis too encloses streaks of knowledge that carry the mark of being first attempts, and which – hopefully – will be examined, refined, or rejected by others who engage in this exciting research site, the object of which we are merely beginning to understand.

### 3 Swedish and English in the marketplace

Subsection 3.1 deals with the position of Swedish and English in Sweden. Subsection 3.2 accounts for globalizing markets and English, using science as a case, and 3.3 reports on the language situation in Swedish academia, whereas 3.4 sheds light on the concerns this state of affairs have raised in Swedish LPP.

#### 3.1 The principal language

All in all there can be no doubt that the fully standardized language of Swedish holds in Sweden the position of what Bourdieu (1977a, 650–652) calls the *legitimate language* – the language used among legitimate speakers and hearers in legitimate situations. In contemporary Sweden, the Swedish language is symbolically recognized as ‘the natural’ code of conduct in most linguistic exchanges (e.g., Bolton & Meierkord 2013). Swedish has ‘the weight of a state behind it’ (Oakes 2005, 152), and as noted already some 40 years ago, this is seen as ‘a means of national cohesion and a symbol of the nation’ (Dahlstedt 1976, 22). Swedish has long served as the main language of schooling and the public sector, and this longstanding praxis is now recognized *de jure*, as the position of Swedish was formally recognized by a Language Act law in 2009, which states the following:

Swedish is the principal language in Sweden.

As principal language, Swedish is the common language in society that everyone resident in Sweden is to have access to and that is to be usable in all areas of society. (*Språklag* 2009, section 4–5)

The term ‘principal language’ is the official translation of the Swedish term *huvudspråk*. It had already appeared by the 1990s, coterminous with initial efforts to provide the Swedish language with statutory protection (e.g., Svenska språknämnden 1998). Unlike terms commonly used elsewhere, such as ‘official language’ or ‘national language’, the term ‘principal language’ was



later preferred by the legislature, as it was seen as signaling the central position of Swedish in Sweden, while a reminder of the fact that there are other languages to consider (*Språk för alla* 2008, 16–17; *Värna språken* 2008, 215; see also Hult 2005).

On the whole, Swedish language policy must be said to have put an effort into accounting for multilingualism in society (e.g., Hult 2004). That said, as the state-mandated language of authority and acceptability (Bourdieu 1977a, 650), Swedish sets the benchmark value on – and so unifies – the linguistic market of Sweden. However, in spite of this seemingly stable sociolinguistic state of affairs, the palpable presence of English in the sociolinguistic scene of Sweden has grown into a chief question – arguably *the* chief question – of national language political concern for well over two decades (e.g., Milani 2007b). One of the most salient features of societal ideology in 20th century Sweden was the embracing of internationalism, replacing the nostalgic nationalism of former decades (Ruth 1984; also Dahlstedt 1976). By virtue of this fact, as Oakes (2005) has shown, English has longstanding links to the Swedish self-image as modern and international. Sweden is a country that has long envisioned English as part and parcel of a modernizing project, with historical ties both to Great Britain and, more lately, the U.S. (Ehn et al. 1993, 62ff.; Löfgren 1992; O’Dell 1997). Consequently, as has been the case elsewhere in Europe and beyond, use of English has become widespread in Sweden, featuring as it does a wide range of discursive sites where language plays a part: popular culture, the business world, the Internet, research and higher education, etc. (e.g., Svenska språknämnden 2004). We can also see this fact reflected in educational settings, where English, to some extent, is construed as a transcultural language in Sweden (Hult 2012; see also Cabau 2009; Hyltenstam 2004). But, while the use of English is certainly widespread across Sweden, nowhere, arguably, is the impact more profound than in some of the key academic practices of academia. Resultantly, it has come to be the widespread and ever-increasing use of English in the so-called ‘elite domains’ that has attracted the most attention (e.g., Berg et al. 2001). In Swedish LPP, academic life is widely understood to be the site where safeguarding the national language is seen as most pressing (e.g., Falk 2001; Höglin 2002; Salö 2010; Salö & Josephson 2014; Svenska språknämnden 2004). This fact is saliently indexed in the government report *Värna språken* (2008) as well as in the *Declaration on a Nordic Language policy* (2006), where the language policy aim of so-called ‘parallel use of language’ is adopted, largely directed as it is toward different aspects of language use and choice in academia (e.g., Bolton & Kuteeva 2012; Hult & Källqvist 2015; McGrath 2014; Mežek 2013, 6ff.; Salö & Josephson 2014).

### 3.2 Markets of English, Swedish in a globalizing world

Although this thesis does not deal with global English *per se*, it seems apt to comment upon the larger contextual frame into which the topic is embedded. At its broadest, this frame is that of *globalization* – ‘[t]he cultural, social and economic movement that displaces people, goods and values from local or national settings and makes them subject to global forces’ (Webb et al. 2002, xii). For several reasons, however, I find globalization to be a slippery notion to handle. Firstly, the process-cum-phenomenon of globalization seems immensely difficult to pin down; it is a ‘shorthand term for a complex set of processes’ (Cameron 2007, 283). Scholars who have elaborated on this fluid concept have addressed a wide-ranging thematic scope of phenomena with diverse historical onsets, spanning from the 15th-century emergence of modern capitalism to the fall of the Berlin Wall as a commencement of global civilization (Haberland 2009, following Beck 2000). Secondly, by virtue of its prior usages, the notion seems to import with it viewpoints with focal effects to ‘the perception grid of the researcher’ (Kauppi 2000, 233). Indeed, in the social sciences, many have hesitated to subscribe to the notion of globalization, as it is seen as projecting an image of an inevitable flow of transformation that is insensitive to the workings of power, questions of agency, and privilege (Kennedy 2015, xii; see e.g., Ahmad 2003).

It can thus be noted, as Heller (2008, 513) does, that globalization is difficult to separate from talk about globalization. Globalization talk, in turn, seems to point in different directions, presumably because of the fact that the notion itself revolves around a plethora of tenets, all of which seem to have specific economic, social, cultural, political, communicative, and other forms of effects. Notwithstanding these remarks, the thesis employs the term *globalizing markets*, which shall be motivated presently. In order to do this, I shall attempt to close in on globalization in a more precise manner centering on academia – first as a market of knowledge that cuts across national borders, and, thereafter, as intrinsically connected to language. Hence, ‘markets are spaces where one form of *capital* can be converted into another form of capital’ (Park & Wee 2012, 27).

#### 3.2.1 Globalizing markets – the case of science

While Bourdieu (e.g., 2010a) generally dislikes the notion of globalization, which he sees as belonging to a dominant taken-for-granted neoliberal discourse, he does see some merit in talking about science in terms of transnational fields (Bourdieu 2000, 98). Few societal contexts, one could argue, are as palpably characterized by the transnational exchange of resources, for example, through various forms of cooperation and communication: conference activities, publishing, etc. In many respects, this state of affairs is any-

thing but new. As Gregersen (2012, 5) aptly notes, it is implicated in the word ‘university’ that academia transcends territorial boundaries, and as study 2 shows, *transnational* connections, that is, exchanges between scholars transcending national boundaries, have been maintained since the onset of academic life in Sweden and beyond (e.g., Sörlin 1989). What we are currently witnessing, however, is a transforming tendency toward globalizing knowledge that has quite recently increased in speed and intensity (e.g., Kennedy 2015). By the end of the 20th century, the term *internationalization* had entered the vocabulary of the university field (e.g., Paasi 2005, 776), hinging upon, as it does, international connections established at the scale of states, often codified through cross-border networks and organizations (Sörlin 1994, 29). Here, not only do individuals compete across borders, but states compete with other states by virtue of the accumulated capital of their institutions (e.g., Putnam 2009; see also study 2). In this process, universities and researchers alike increasingly orient their practices beyond national markets of knowledge exchange to markets around the globe that are increasingly becoming worldwide in scope. On the doorstep to the new millennium, then, these markets may be seen as globalizing in the sense that tendencies toward yielding global interconnectedness of different markets seem to be gaining the upper hand. In the wake of this process, we are also beginning to see traits that we can more accurately classify as being new: ‘the growth of international networks, funding initiatives, publishing and ranking systems’ (Holm et al. 2015, 114). The nature of these transformations does not signify a natural, agentless flow or process but pertains to the active involvement of labor of agents and institutions – thus, there are struggles to globalize (e.g., Kauppi & Erkkilä 2011). Neither can we unreservedly say that the markets of Swedish academia are *globalized* as a state of existence. Firstly, there are still markets for the production and consumption of local research results, often published in Swedish (e.g., study 2 for the case of history as a disciplinary field). Secondly, science by and large is still largely confined within state-boundaries: Swedish universities, for example, are situated in Sweden, largely nationally financed, subject to the regulating frameworks of Swedish research policy, etc. (Crawford et al. 1993, 2). This fact entails that academic work ‘is increasingly located within the complex interplay between global, national and local contexts, pushing and pulling in different directions’ (Currie & Vidovich 2009, 441).

### 3.2.2 English, globalizing struggles, and nationalizing struggles

The insights sketched above lead us to the issue of language as capital in the marketplace of globalizing research, and, in particular, the value that English has acquired in that market. The push toward globally interconnected markets nourishes the need for the adoption of a common medium of communication. Here, then, knowledge markets and linguistic markets intersect. Yet,

as the market metaphor dictates, languages such as Swedish have limited value outside of realms of the national linguistic market, and in their place, English currently affords access to the global knowledge economy of research (e.g., Williams 2010). As Gordin (2015), Kaplan (2001), and others show, the current position of English as the global scientific language is a child of the 20th century, and so has its roots in the historical epoch that Hobsbawm (1994) calls ‘the age of extremes’. A broad range of extra-scientific events of this time period – ‘the confluence of a number of political and economic forces’ (Kaplan 2001, 19) – have transformed global science into a key market of English (Park & Wee 2012). For example, in Swedish academia, Salö (2010) points to a trend in the languages used in doctoral theses whereby German lost its position in Swedish scholarship in-between the two world wars. Beginning in the 1930s, English was adopted as the chief language for written scientific dissemination, thereby breaking up what was previously a ‘joint European linguistic hegemony’ (Haberland 2009, 30) in which German, French and English were all used as thesis languages. It is worthwhile to point out that the rise of global English in science is in this sense the outcome of strategic efforts anchored in the British Empire, but particularly enhanced by investments made on the part of the U.S. in the post-war era (e.g., Gordin 2015; Phillipson 2009).

Much research attests to the fact that currently, and increasingly so, English is the medium through which the globalizing academic marketplace operates (e.g., Williams 2010, 52; see study 2). In the current age, this fact interlinks with powerful discourses of internationalization, which in many respects renders universities into complex sites for sociolinguistic inquiry. Concerning publishing, as Holm et al. (2015) summarize, these transformations are commonly held to work in favor of Anglophone homogeneity along the following chain of concerns: ‘[a] publishing, especially journal articles, is key to professional advancement; [b] the more prestigious the outlet, the more useful the publication will be to a scholar’s career; [c] but, typically, prestigious means an international and English language journal’ (Holm et al. 2015, 116). English is in this sense a resource for mobility: it provides access to global publishing markets, and it moreover serves as a lingua franca at university departments increasingly shaped by influxes of human capital in the form of staff from different parts of the world (e.g. Negretti & Garcia-Yeste 2015). But, as noted earlier, Swedish academia is at the same time overtly nationally embedded: universities are public authorities, major players on the Swedish labor market, education market, etc. (Crawford et al. 1993). Increasingly, from a sociolinguistic point of view, these facts have transformed universities into social spaces akin to what Pratt (1991) calls ‘global contact zones’ – where languages and language ideologies ‘meet, clash, and grapple with each other, often in contexts of highly

asymmetrical relations of power' (p. 34). At least concerning a key academic practice such as publishing, current forces appear to be on the move in the direction toward publishing markets displaced from national settings where material and symbolic goods can be traded (see study 2). Concerning other forms of linguistic exchange, however, other language regimes come into play, many of which owe their significance to the fact that academia is not completely displaced from national settings. Here, then, other resilient sociohistorical perceptions of legitimate language consequently regiment discourse (see study 3 and 4). As this thesis seeks to demonstrate, this perspective is useful for contemplating communication as a form of symbolic exchange enmeshed in power, which has important sociolinguistic implications whether one considers academic publishing through the means of English, or, discourse in the everyday discussions that feed into their production.

Academia is, of course, not the only globalizing market relevant to linguistic exchange. Rather, as Coupland observed more than 10 years ago, globalization 'is proving to be the salient context for an increasing number of local sociolinguistic experiences' (Coupland 2003, 266). In scholarly work on this topic, the global position of English stands out as a central theme (e.g., Graddol 2012; de Swaan 2001). One strand of work here, in turn, is attuned to accounting for the complex process that can be termed 'changing language regimes in globalizing environments' (Coulmas 2005) – that is, the macrosocial effects of global English to national languages and speech communities. Park and Wee (2012) take a critical stance to many prevalent approaches to global English. The general issue they point out is that accounts either tend to reproduce representations that are insensitive to the workings of power, or, conversely, overestimate structural constraints. Here, by their interpretation, whereas work within the framework of 'World Englishes' commonly exemplifies the former, the framework of 'linguistic imperialism' exemplifies the latter. On this point, Park and Wee argue that Bourdieu's work holds the potential to account for 'the central role of practice in the construction of global English, without losing Bourdieu's critical insight about the oppressive and constricting structures and ideologies of English' (Park & Wee 2012, 166). I concur with this position, albeit with the supplementing clarification that 'English is the medium, not the cause' (Paasi 2005, 772). In my view, the point in doing so is that it acknowledges globalization as a complex of processes that rescales and disorders, and so yields *new* patterns of winners and losers (cf. Blommaert 2010). From this vantage point, as I see it, analysts can avoid the narrative on globalization as a force that triggers deviations from a state of affairs that in itself is seen as a genuine, essential, or even a 'natural' mode of human life. By the same token, it circumvents the conception that academia was by default national and thereafter became 'international'. As I attempt to pinpoint here, there are

both globalizing and nationalizing struggles, and, following Hannerz (1990, 237), ‘we had better make sure that we understand what that means.’

A similar template can be adopted on issues concerning national speech communities, which, in state thinking, are perceived as being under the pressure of globalizing forces (see Pujolar 2007). What Bourdieu (1977a) calls a *unified linguistic market* exhibits a relatively stable composition of linguistic capital. At a societal scale, these are the result of drawn-out language ideological vies to controlling people’s linguistic behavior through the institutions of the state, school being a pertinent example. The historical outcome of such processes, typically imposed through the rise of nation-states, manifests itself in the form of domination of an official language in a linguistic community (Bourdieu 1991a, 45). Thus in such a historicized, critical perspective, the imposition of a national language equates to the enactment of a form of symbolic domination involving both legitimization and institutionalization, as well as misrecognition of other languages, practices, and, therefore, groups (May 2011; see also Bauman 1990; Williams 2010, 197). However, as many commentators have noted, processes linked to globalization tend to interrupt such stable orders in a number of ways, in step with increased human and linguistic mobility that reduces the state’s ability to impose its old-established institutionalized language ideologies onto the linguistic practices of individuals and collectives (see e.g., Blommaert 2010; Coulmas 2005; Heller 2007a; Jacquemet 2005). Globalization, in this sense, ‘is reshuffling the cards’ (Kramsh 2012, 115). It stirs up processes that, as it were, transform the values of linguistic as well as other forms of capital, which changes the exchange rates on the linguistic market (Gorski 2013a). What is more, this fact is also perceived as affecting the exchange rates on national linguistic markets. Viewed in this manner, globalization can be seen as triggering dispersed sociolinguistic orders and *disunified* linguistic markets across nation-states, marked by the disestablishment of the total, all-encompassing language regime that it has historically upheld (study 1).

In one sense, then, globalization is often envisioned as a set of pressuring forces that result in cultural uniformity and thereby ‘destroy long-established traditions and flatten out what is locally distinctive’ (Cameron 2007, 283). From the outlook of nation-states, language hegemonies intrinsic to globalization serve as instruments of homogenization (Appadurai 1990, 307). In fact, some scholars even argue that globalization in this vein challenges the sociolinguistic foundations of the nation-state, as the value of languages as national symbols becomes outranked, which in turn undermines the enactment and reproduction of the national speech community (Pujolar 2007, 173–175). Yet, there is ample literature to suggest that states respond to these changes, which triggers ‘nation-ization struggles’ (Gorski 2013a) on the battlefield of language as well as elsewhere. As noted, the Swedish Lan-

guage Act states that ‘Swedish is the principal language in Sweden’ (*Språklag* 2009, section 4), which is a phrasing that owes much of its existence to the perceived impact from English (study 1; Salö 2012). Focusing more distinctly on language use in academia, the *Declaration on a Nordic Language Policy* (2006), legally noncommittal yet acceded to by Sweden, states that ‘the presentation of scientific results in the languages of the Nordic countries essential to society be rewarded’ as an explicit issue to address (p. 94). But the state speaks with many voices. This is so since, at the same time, the state fuels the developments it seeks to control, for example, by actively fomenting the internationalization of research (e.g., Widmalm 2013; also study 2). Accordingly, one consequence of current developments is that research products are increasingly placed on markets where national languages are of little value (study 4, p. 12; see also study 2). In this context, it is remarkable that Sweden in 2009, that is, the same year that the position of Swedish was secured through legislation, implemented a model for performance measures and resource allocation in the university field, serving the explicit aim of providing incitements for scholars to ‘increase the activity on the international publishing market’ (*Resurser för kvalitet* 2007, 418, my translation). It appears as though this strategy has had the intended effects, as English has been increasingly adopted as a publishing language in the humanities, where, until recently, Swedish prevailed (Hammarfelt & de Rijcke 2014, also study 2). In some ways, therefore, the question concerning the power balance between English and Swedish in the university field stands out as a clash of interests between internationalization and the safeguarding of Swedish (Cabau 2011, following Salö 2010). This contradiction shows that the state is an amorphous site of struggles between different stakes and interests that often conflict with one another. For Bourdieu (2014), the state is a field of institutionalized material and symbolic capital, or ‘meta-capital’, granting power over other kinds of capital (Bourdieu 2014, 345), and here, the value of Swedish must be weighed against the value of global engagements. Drawing from Appadurai (1990, 305), we can say that states find themselves pressed to stay ‘open’ by the forces of modern, globalized science; yet ‘these very cravings can become caught up in new ethnoscaples, mediascapes, and eventually, ideoscapes [...] that the state cannot tolerate as threats to its own control over ideas of nationhood and “peoplehood”.’ Future research should address this issue in detail. I now turn to the language situation in Swedish academia as we currently know it.

### 3.3 English in Swedish academia: on the state of affairs

To be sure, internationalization manifests differently in different areas of university life. In education (e.g., Börjesson 2005), for example, it brings with it, among other things, an increased impetus of using English as a lan-

guage of instruction (e.g., Airey et al. 2015). The implementation of the Bologna charter in Swedish higher education in 2007 has resulted in an unprecedented expansion of educational programs taught in English (e.g., Dalberg 2013; Högskoleverket 2008; Salö 2010). This fact connects with the outspoken aim of opening up higher education to international, albeit mostly European, student groups. Airey et al. (2015) observes, firstly, that English medium instruction (EMI) is used most extensively in programs at the Master's level, and secondly, that EMI is most commonly employed within particular educational fields, such as technology. While English in some disciplines is reported to function as an additional language of instruction in parallel with Swedish (Bolton & Kuteeva 2012), English, at least nominally, also seems to serve as the main medium of instruction in certain disciplines, universities, and educational cycles (Salö & Josephson 2014, app. 1).

As for the language of scientific publishing in Swedish academia – a more central theme of this thesis – several quantitative mappings have shown that currently, and increasingly so, English predominates across most disciplines (e.g., Falk 2001; Gunnarsson 2001a; Gunnarsson & Öhman 1997; Melander 2004; Salö 2010; Salö & Josephson 2014). According to the figures provided by Salö and Josephson (2014), 83.6 percent of all scientific texts registered in the database *Swepub* between 2000 and 2012 were published in English, and this figure is even higher, at 92.5 percent, in the most commonly used genres of journal articles and proceedings. However, as many studies have indicated, there are also major disciplinary differences in the use of English in publishing practices. Broadly, while English predominates in the natural sciences, the position of Swedish stands stronger in the humanities. Many of the social sciences typically position themselves somewhere in-between these two poles, although several disciplinary fields belonging to this diverse category have shown to be progressively oriented toward English-language publishing (e.g., Salö 2010). We get a more detailed image, then, by zooming in more closely on disciplines and the literatures of science published there (e.g., Hicks 2004). Salö and Josephson (2014), for example, compare the six disciplines of history, law, psychology, linguistics, physics, and computer science. In the most commonly written genres, Swedish scientific texts are in the majority within law and history, where books and book chapters amount to a large share of the publications. By contrast, Swedish is almost never used in the scientific publications of physics and computer science, fields that are dominated by articles and proceedings, respectively. These two genres also dominate in psychology and linguistics, and here, more than 9 out of 10 texts are published in English, with the exception of journal articles in linguistics where 8 out of 10 are in English (p. 277–285). Study 2 provides further commentary on interdisciplinary differences in publishing (see also Kuteeva & Airey 2014).



### 3.4 Concerns voiced – the rise of domain loss

As noted earlier, the perceived impact of English in Sweden has raised concerns of macrosocial as well as more specific linguistic prominence, which have come to serve as the *raison d'être* for taking language policy measures (study 1). Accordingly, there is by now a substantial body of scholarly work that has sought to unravel the specifics percolating amid these language political concerns (e.g., Bolton & Kuteeva 2012; Bolton & Meierkord 2013; Hult 2004, 2005; Josephson 2014; Linn & Oakes 2007; Milani 2006, 2007b; Milani & Johnson 2008; Oakes 2005; Salö 2012; also study 1). To cut things short, from different point of views these studies attempt to grapple with the fact that English is largely perceived as threatening Swedish in LPP discourse, and that this threat is seen as particularly salient in academia. In this section, I will dissect this multi-faceted argument with a particular focus on the position of English in Swedish academia, as it has advanced in the Swedish language political debate from the early 1990s up to present times. Here, sounding a note of warning is apt: The set of problems raised will be presented in a fairly matter-of-fact manner. Nevertheless, it is one of the central arguments of this thesis that the concerns presented here require a sociological understanding of fields in Bourdieu's sense (see below).

First, a few contextualizing comments on the debate are necessary. To the retrospective analyst, accounts from this debate occur in a vast and diverse body of texts, through which a number of differentiating dimensions cut. Between the accounts yielded there are pivotal differences pertaining to the formality of discourse. In respect to genres, accounts have been placed on a continuum ranging from newspaper articles (e.g., Svantesson 2006) to scholarly, presumably peer-reviewed accounts published by renowned international publishing houses (e.g., Gunnarsson 2001a; Melander 2001). There are also a number of survey reports carried out by or for the Nordic Council of Ministers or the Swedish Language Council (e.g., Falk 2001; Höglin 2002; Salö 2010), as well as governmental reports (*Mål i mun* 2002; *Värna språken* 2008) and legal propositions (*Bästa språket* 2005; *Språk för alla* 2008). Most accounts, however, reside in an intermediating register in which texts are aimed at either the educated public or students enrolled in lower-level university education (e.g., Josephson 2004a; Melander 2007; Svenska språknämnden 2004). To this body of texts, one can also add Swedish periodicals such as *Språkvård*, Swedish journals such as *Språk och stil*, or conference proceedings such as *Språk i Norden* and *Svenskans beskrivning*.

One strand of the discussion played out in this body of texts deals with the position of English in Swedish society more generally, albeit with ample references to the state of affairs in university life (e.g., Gunnarsson 2005; Hyltenstam 1996; Josephson 2004b; Nyström Höög 2008). Other work targets English in Swedish academia more specifically (e.g., Gunnarsson &

Öhman 1997; Melander 2004; Salö 2010). As for agents involved in the debate over English, one may include state-appointed analysts (e.g., *Värna språken* 2008), journalists (e.g., Höglin 2002) and non-linguist representatives of different branches of university life to whom the language issue matters (e.g., Kiselman et al. 2005). However, the vast majority of these texts are authored by agents with linguistic expertise, most commonly by agents from the field of *Nordiska språk*. Roughly, this discipline can be described as a branch of Scandinavian linguistics with intellectual roots in Nordic philology, but which nowadays also encompasses an academic interest in contemporary language-in-use. By tradition, this field has long had strong connections to the Swedish Language Council, which since the mid-20th century has been one of the key bodies concerned with the cultivation of Swedish (e.g., Lindgren 2007; study 1; see section 4.2 here).

At the center of this discussion lies a fear of ‘domain loss’, a language notion that is invoked in the debate throughout, on occasion buttressed by general references to Joshua Fishman’s sociology of language (e.g., Josephson 2004b; Melander 1997; Salö 2010). Initially, commentators also invoked the idea of societal ‘spheres’ in Habermas’ sense, which, combined with the already existing trait of functionalism in corpus planning, was applied to what was seen as a rapidly changing sociolinguistic landscape in Sweden (e.g., Westman 1996). Soon, however, ‘domain loss’ developed into being the chief representation used for talking about the newly observed impact of English. Broadly, it is comprehended as the process – or sometimes the state – whereby a language loses its usability in more or less demarcated societal spaces, such as politics or research and higher education, which is seen as inevitably triggering change in less prestigious settings, with ultimate effects on the vitality of Swedish (e.g., Melander & Thelander 2006a). As summarized by Melander in 2001,

it is obvious that the most serious threat to Swedish from English would be that English will replace Swedish in domain after domain, and that the present trends of internationalization and Europeanisation no doubt may work in that direction. (Melander 2001, 18)

The term ‘domain loss’ is peculiar, not least in the sense that it seems to be used mostly in respect to the Scandinavian discussion on English (see section 7.1.1 for the critique leveled against it). As far as I know, Fishman never uses the term. Nonetheless, the perception of sociolinguistic change suggested by ‘domain loss’ is omnipresent in his writing on language shift in minority language settings and particularly so in his account on their revitalization (see e.g., Fishman 1972, 102, and 1991, respectively). It cannot be said, however, that the Swedish discussion on ‘domain loss’ has been anchored in Fishman’s theory to any great extent. The discussion has advanced

in Swedish LPP, guided by common sense (Teleman 2003, 251) and often legitimized by empirical branches of language studies where the theoretical underpinnings of this language notion were not the focus (cf. Preisler 2009, 10–12 for a similar comment on the discussion in Denmark). What we see here, rather, pertains to a form of snowball effect within a larger text-chain. It seems as though authors who invoke ‘domain loss’ as a concept refer to other texts in which the concept is invoked, but no text endeavors to dig deep into its theoretical foundations. This trait can largely be understood by virtue of the fact that the concept as such emerged in genres with different contextual and communicative ends.

Throughout the debate, issues concerning ‘domain loss’ are often addressed in work devoted to outlining the principles for Sweden’s language policy formation and of highlighting the need for language political measures in Sweden (e.g., Melander 2006, 2007, 2011; Svenska språknämnden 2004). The cross-party committee inquiry *Mål i mun* (2002, 49–51) lists five broad problems caused by ‘domain loss.’ First, Swedish speakers might no longer use their mother tongue, which could potentially lead to decreased quality in educational and workplace settings. Second, the link between English and high-prestigious spheres could lead to a change in attitudes among people, so that Swedish would be thought of as lesser equipped than English. Third, domain losses can lead to communicational difficulties across boundaries of expertise, since Swedish terminology, etc. ceases to develop if Swedish falls into disuse – which, in the worst-case scenario, could lead to a situation where Swedish cannot be used at all. Fourth, domain loss can result in a diglossic situation in which Swedish serves as the low-variety, which would contribute to increased linguistic inequality in the society. Fifth, at least in theory, domain loss could be part and parcel of a process of language shift, where the more dominant language captures domain after domain from the weaker language. This latter trend, *Mål i mun* states, ‘might be difficult to reverse once it has started – it is best to act preventively’ (p. 51, my translation).

### 3.4.1 Domain loss in academia

As a sociolinguistic problem, the strong position of English in Swedish academia first attracted attention in the early 1990s (Teleman 1992). Throughout the 1990s, university life was identified as a domain saliently characterized by an increased use of ‘Anglo-American’, a term that many commentators used as a synonym for English (e.g., Svenska språknämnden 1998, 8; Teleman 1989, 18; see study 1). In 1997, a survey by Gunnarsson and Öhman showed that English in the hard sciences and, increasingly, in other academic fields was used either extensively or exclusively for a range of academic activities: at seminars and lectures, in textbooks, as well as in written production at all levels – most notably in scientific publishing. These cir-

cumstances led Gunnarsson, who single-handedly wrote up the final chapter of the study, to the conclusion that ‘Swedish is almost not used at all within a large part of the university’ (Gunnarsson & Öhman 1997, 73, my translation). In this insurgent language situation, the study pointed toward a case of diglossia, whereby English was used for purely scientific matters and the low-variety of Swedish mostly employed for popularizations and lower-level teaching. There is, Gunnarsson reported elsewhere, ‘virtually no use of Swedish as an academic language in much of higher education in Sweden, nor are German, French, Spanish or Russian used in the faculties concerned either. English has become the dominant language for both oral and written communication’ (Gunnarsson 2001a, 306). The results of Gunnarsson and Öhman’s study attracted plentiful attention in the Swedish LPP field, and the study was reprinted in shorter form (Gunnarsson 1999) reported on (e.g., Höglin 2002) and reproduced some time later (Melander 2004). Throughout such work, assertions about the absence of scientific Swedish were subsequently reproduced in texts published by the Swedish Language Council, by the Nordic Council of Ministers, and elsewhere (e.g., Gunnarsson 1999, 15; Höglin 2002, 30; Melander 2004, 136). For instance, referring to Gunnarsson and Öhman’s study, the 2002 Swedish-language action program *Mål i mun* (2002, 82, my translation) established that Swedish ‘is not used as a scientific language’ within large sectors of the university.

This perceived language situation has been linked to a range of negative consequences that have arisen for the Swedish language and its speakers. For example, it has often been stressed that Sweden, the same as other high-technological countries, is in essential need of having new knowledge ‘transmitted outside specialist circles’ (*Mål i mun* 2002, 50, my translation). It has been argued that these processes are rendered more difficult as researchers become more and more internationally orientated, thereby distancing themselves from the general public, and, in so doing, causing a form of linguistic elite separation (e.g., Gunnarsson 2001b; *Mål i mun* 2002, 27). Many commentators have discussed the situation in terms of ‘diglossia’ (e.g., Gunnarsson 2001a; Melander 1997, 2004); ‘language shift’ (e.g., Berg et al. 2001; Hyltenstam 1996); ‘imperialism’ and ‘self-colonization’ (e.g., Gunnarsson 2001a and Josephson 2004a, respectively); or, occasionally more provokingly, in terms of ‘glottophagy’ – the idea that some languages ‘eat’ other languages (Melander 1997; Salö 2009; Teleman 1992).

Gunnarsson (2001b, 61) draws attention to a number of salient issues linked to the position of English in Swedish academia, ranging from matters of language development to researchers’ cognition and competence in both Swedish and English. In turn, these issues are perceived as feeding into questions of language status and research quality. At stake here is the oft-noted fear that Swedish could lose its usability as an effective means for

communication within certain areas (e.g., Gunnarsson 2005, 223; Melander 1997, 105, 2005, 195). Melander (2001, 28), for example, talks of ‘loss of intertextuality’ as a process whereby Swedish ceases to be used in certain genres and text-types of science, which results in ‘a small reduction of the stylistic spectrum of Swedish.’ By the same token, Gunnarsson (2001b, 62) speaks of ‘genre death’ and of the change of culturally determined text patterns, caused by the impact of English in the realm of science. As for researchers’ language skills, the position of English in Swedish academia has been feared to affect ‘the will and ability’ (Gunnarsson & Öhman 1997, 74) of Swedish researchers to talk about their research in Swedish, due to lack of practice in using Swedish. In light of the dominance of English in publishing, doubts have been raised whether scholars in the natural sciences are capable of discussing scientific matters in Swedish, partly due to lack of practice, partly due to lack of linguistic resources such as terminology (e.g., Gunnarsson 2001b; Melander 2001, 17, 2005, 196, 2006, 30; Teleman 2003, 229; Westman 1996). Whereas Gunnarsson (2001b, 61) frames this as an already observable problem that is likely to worsen, Westman (1996, 184, my translation) more straightforwardly claimed that already ‘[m]any Swedish scientists experience difficulties writing in Swedish, because they are so unaccustomed to explaining and discussing their specialties in the mother tongue.’ On occasion, this state of affairs has been affirmed by scholars in English-dominated fields; for example, Kiselman et al. (2005) have argued that, due to the lack of competence among university teachers and students, even general discussions can sometimes not be held in Swedish.

I shall return to these representations of English as a sociolinguistic problem in Swedish academia. Before doing so, however, I shall introduce Bourdieu’s plea for *epistemic reflexivity* as a never-ending process of critical self-reflection. This insight and the principle on which it rests will be discussed in some detail below.

## 4 Epistemic reflexivity

Subsection 4.1 introduces epistemic reflexivity. Subsection 4.2 exemplifies its application by accounting for a number of academic narratives of language maintenance, shift, and endangerment underpinning the field of Swedish LPP. In 4.3, I present a brief self-analysis as a way of making understandable my prerequisite for breaking with prior viewpoints.

### 4.1 The sociology of the sociological eye

People in general – including researchers – have strong sentiments attached to languages and linguistic practice, and this fact seems to be particularly salient when such languages are perceived as being ‘theirs’ – their mother

tongue, their heritage language, etc. Language thus embodies all kinds of imaginaries with important bearings on people's investments and senses of selves. It should be stressed therefore that the topic of this thesis is vested in language ideologies, that is, 'socially positioned and politically interested constructions of language and communicative processes' (Briggs 2007a, 589). Hence, as Silverstein argues:

Professional students of these transformative phenomena are, perforce, themselves engaging in a kind of explicit, necessarily ideological discourse about them. In its ideological aspects, to be sure, such discourse manifests a range of sociocultural positionalities of imagined linguistic projects within the global and national orders. (Silverstein 1998, 421)

In addition, we can say that sociolinguistics and other intellectuals alike have language ideologies (e.g., Spotti 2011), in the sense that they embody the values and beliefs of the social worlds where they have learned to think and act (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992, 136). Viewed through the prism of Bourdieu's reflexive sociology, research is a form of interested practice governed by a scientific habitus (Brubaker 1993). Like other intellectual inquiries, then, language research is faced with pivotal questions about the status of academic knowledge, and the fact that when researching language, we 'bring our biographies and our subjectivities to every stage of the research process, and this influences the questions we ask and the ways in which we try to find answers' (Cameron et al. 1992, 5). To be sure, this holds ramifications for analysts, who are cultural producers with a stake in their own object, and who also bring their 'spontaneous knowledge of the social world' (Bourdieu, cited in Wacquant 1989a, 44) to their research practices (see Bourdieu 1993a, 8ff.). 'The progress of knowledge', Bourdieu (1990b, 1) therefore holds, 'presupposes progress in our knowledge of the conditions of knowledge.' Reflexivity, here, is what differentiates habitus from scientific habitus, in that the latter includes a disposition to grasp its own principles of knowledge production (Brubaker 1993, 225).

Bourdieu's stance on research and epistemology owes much of its foundations to the French philosopher of science Gaston Bachelard (1884–1962). Commonly labeled as an applied rationalist, Bachelard wrote extensively on historical epistemology and the foundations of the scientific mind (e.g., Bachelard 2002 [1938]; Tiles 1985 and Broady 1991 offer overviews). As summarized by Broady (1991), Bachelard's philosophy of science can be summarized by three broad points. Firstly, it starts from the general proposition that, in essence, science composes a break with everyday mundane thinking, and the spontaneous representations of common sense. It follows from this premise that, secondly, the scientific object must be constructed and therefore not be taken for granted. Thirdly, the researcher's relation to

the object should be analyzed as a dimension of the knowledge about that same object. Bachelard's key insights into these matters have had an impact on generations of scholars in France and elsewhere, not least of all in his view of critique as an essential means for overcoming the 'epistemological obstacles' that hamper the progression of scientific thought (e.g., Broady 1991; Ross & Ahmadi 2006). Bachelard's insights also came to establish the basis of Bourdieu's take on reflexivity – epistemic reflexivity – that is, the integrated, systematic, and continuous device of the research practice whereby the analyst breaks with his or her own pre-given viewpoints, which are often found built into the research questions, theories, concepts, and analytical instruments that he or she has inherited (e.g., Wacquant 1992, 36–46). Frequently discussed under labels such as 'socioanalysis', Bourdieu's take on reflexivity builds on the principles of Bachelardian thinking: Through rupture with the spontaneous thinking of common sense, '[t]he social fact is won, constructed, and confirmed' (Bourdieu et al. 1991, 57).

To be sure, although foci may vary, 'being reflexive' is a watchword in many strands of sciences (e.g., Mauthner & Doucet 2003; Lynch 2000). However, in Wacquant's (1992) opinion, the most novel facet of Bourdieu's take on reflexivity is that it brings to the fore aspects that go beyond the individual researcher and instead emphasize the individual's position in the field that he or she embodies. It pertains to a form of self-analysis that does not privilege the self (e.g., Bourdieu 2007), and in this vein, it is primarily the field's epistemological unconscious that needs to be unearthed, rather than that of the individual researcher (Wacquant 1992, 41). The risk involved in constructing the object of inquiry, posits Bourdieu, is that the researcher naïvely imports into the research practice, as he puts it, 'all that the view of the object owes to the point of view, that is, to the viewer's *position* in the social space and the scientific field' (Bourdieu 1993a, 10). This is an issue fundamentally due to the fact that scientific knowledge can be obtained only by means of a break with common sense – the primary representations or 'pre-notions' in Durkheim's vocabulary – in other words, the sort of mundane knowledge about the research object that the researcher has uncritically acquired elsewhere in the social world (Bourdieu 1989, 15; Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992, 235–238). As a parallel in sociolinguistics, Cameron (1990, 81) similarly regrets what she sees as a bad habit in much sociolinguistic research: the acceptance and subsequent import of sociotheoretically naïve concepts (her examples being 'norm' or 'identity') – 'used as a "bottom line" though they stand in need of explication themselves.' Bourdieu deplores this mistake; for one, in his own work the refusal to borrow common categories has implications down to the level of prose, where he is at pains to avoid the commonsensical understandings 'embedded in common language' (Wacquant 1989a, 31). R. Jenkins (1992), for example, has criticized this position for the reason that it makes Bourdieu's writings difficult to read and

understand (also e.g., Burawoy 2012, 20). Bourdieu, contrarily, sees this trait as an important technique of keeping science free from the everyday discourse on the social world, ‘the discourse of the semi-wise’ (Bourdieu & Chartier 2015, 29). For Bourdieu, then, the easy and readable style is thought of as dangerously manipulative, in that simplified discourse serves the end of oversimplifying knowledge about the social world, consequently found in the false clarity of dominant discourse (Bourdieu 1990a, 52; see also Wacquant 1993, 237, 247f. and note 5 there).

Allied to that, epistemic reflexivity is vital in cases in which analysts are a part of the group or ‘set of observers’ whose apprehensions they aim at unraveling (e.g., Bourdieu 1988). Clearly, this feeds into a well-known insider–outsider dilemma. On the one hand, argues Bourdieu, ‘one cannot grasp the most profound logic of the social world unless one becomes immersed in the specificity of an empirical reality, historically situated and dated’ (Bourdieu 1993b, 271). In this sense, indeed, being a member of the group that is investigated might well buy the researcher entrance into his or her key social worlds. The crux of the matter, however, is that the price paid for this insider’s access is the overwhelming risk of not seeing the viewpoint from which it is stated, and thereby produce an account which says exactly what the researcher’s position in the field allows him or her to say – and nothing else (Bourdieu 1990a, 183–184; Broady 1991, 548). Since the researcher, by this logic, is imprisoned by the field, reflexivity is brought up to date as a question of understanding and, subsequently, handling one’s own position and dispositions, as handed down by one’s field. Hence,

one’s only hope of producing scientific knowledge – rather than weapons to advance a particular class of specific interests – is to make explicit to oneself one’s position in the sub-field of the producers of discourse [...] and the contribution of this field to the very existence of the object of study. (Bourdieu 1983, 317)

Reflexivity, thus, offers the critical researcher the intellectual means to equip oneself with the necessary means to understand one’s naïve view of the object of study (Bourdieu 1996a, 207) and thereby ‘avoid being the toy of social forces in your practice’ (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992, 183, emphasis removed). By this logic, it would seem that epistemic reflexivity is a matter of particular significance in work that deals with saliently ideological and interest-laden topics of research. In what follows, I shall dwell on a poignant example of this sort: representations of English as a language problem in the protection of national languages. Representations, after all, are ‘performative statements which seek to bring about what they state’ (Bourdieu 1991a, 225). Hence, adopting a broad Foucauldian lens, one can question the extent to which the threat against Swedish exists independent of the discourses about it. Swedish LPP, I would argue, has contributed exten-



sively to the existence of the object of study (cf. Bourdieu 1983, 317). Historically, cultivating and later protecting the Swedish language has been the central stake of Swedish LPP (e.g., Teleman 2003, 2005). De facto and de jure, Swedish is the language of the Swedish state; yet, '[t]he existence of a language is always a discursive project rather than an established fact' (Woolard & Schieffelin 1994, 64). It is axiomatic that national languages largely owe much of their existence to romanticist ideology and state formation (e.g., Bauman & Briggs 2003; Hobsbawm 1990). Ultimately, then, those who struggle for the unification of such markets likewise struggle for the upkeep of recognized domination (Bourdieu 1977a, 652). By Bourdieu's logic, it is not an exaggeration to say that the maintenance and protection of Swedish is an object of inquiry 'overladen with passions, emotions and interests' (Bourdieu 1990a, 52). A reflexive posture concerning threats to national languages entails understanding a language problem, on the one hand, as a perceived social problem, one with bearings on people's investments, or their deep-seated feelings about their mother tongue, identity, and national belonging. On the other hand, it entails understanding it as a sociolinguistic problem in the sense of a scientifically legitimate problem (cf. Wacquant 1989a, 55). In this context, Park and Wee state that

[t]he characterization of a 'language problem' usually reflects the apprehension of a social situation from the perspective of a particular observer or set of observers. In other words, what counts as a problem usually reflects the interests or ideological stances (even if subconsciously) of a particular group – and this is particularly so when language issues are involved. (Park & Wee 2012, 23)

The perceived problem of English in Swedish LPP as described in section 3.4 and 3.4.1 serves to illustrate this point, and accordingly, it will be discussed further in the next section.

## 4.2 LPP and language endangerment

The strivings linked to engaging in the debate described in section 3.4 is the object of study in study 1, where the notion of field serves as the key idea. Many of the resources used in representing English as a problem, however, are bound up with particular histories of ideas circulating within the language sciences. In what follows, I will focus on two strands of such histories of ideas, viz. academic narratives on language maintenance and shift, and language endangerment. I shall posit that these narratives have served as powerful resources used in the discursive construal of Swedish as a minority language in relation to global English.

Swedish LPP is a partly institutionalized enterprise whose key players include the Swedish Academy, the Swedish Language Council, and other

agents (see study 1). As Teleman (2007) has noted, up until 2007, the Language Council (up to this point *Svenska språknämnden*) was a semi-official body responsible, first and foremost, for the care and maintenance of Swedish, a mission that was expanded after 2007 to also perform the task of managing the language situation in Sweden as such, as the Council (now *Språkrådet*) was incorporated into a public authority concerned with language and folkloristics. Through this transformation, the scope of the Council's mission broadened even more, however, as it accepted an important stake in maintaining the role and function of Swedish in a multicultural society – and at a time when the global position of English was becoming increasingly dominant.

What is known in Sweden as 'språkvård' comprises a salient strand of functionalist corpus planning with a longstanding history in Sweden, pertaining as it does to the institutionalized standardization and 'cultivation' of Swedish (Dahlstedt 1976; Teleman 2003, 2005; Lindgren 2007). By and large, however, the component commonly known as 'status planning' (e.g., Cooper 1989) had long been neglected, since, as many scholars have pointed out, the position of Swedish was taken for granted for such a long period of time (e.g., Hult 2005; Milani 2007b; Oakes 2001; Teleman & Westman 1997). One possible explanation for this is that Swedish was established as the national language of Sweden already before the 19th century and, unlike neighboring countries such as Norway and Finland, has not had its national sovereignty challenged in modern times (e.g., Josephson 2002, 80f.). In short, there were never reasons to give much thought to the position of Swedish in Sweden, as it had been unchallenged *de facto*. When the need to address issues of this sort arose, the role of English in Sweden was soon grasped by virtue of a particular set of available apprehensions, which will be referred to below as a structural-functional view on language in society (see Williams 1992). In the 1990s, these apprehensions, in turn, were caught up in circulating tropes about language endangerment, which were gaining currency around this time (e.g., Krauss 1992). By no means is the adoption of these scholarly ideologies a place-specific trait explainable by reference to underdeveloped Swedish sociolinguistics; on the contrary, they have served widely on the merits of their translatability into LPP (e.g., Kaplan 2001; see section 7.1.3 below).

Blommaert (1996) explores the international emergence of LPP as a field, which he dates to the mid-20th century. As such, holds Blommaert, LPP emerged as a new market for the application of modernist sociology of language and macro-sociolinguistic research, represented by renowned scholars such as Fishman, Ferguson, Weinreich, Haugen, and others. Under the provoking rubric 'no theory or bad theory,' Blommaert argues that these frameworks have yielded pivotal misconceptions about bilingualism in soci-

ety. In fact, the history of LPP is in many ways entangled with the history of bilingualism as an academic interest, founded by the aforementioned key figures, and informed by the same notion of language in society (see Heller 2007b). Subsequently, as Heller notes elsewhere,

the tools we inherited to make sense of multilingualism belong to an era when we were invested, as social scientists, in understanding languages as whole, bounded systems, lined up as neatly as possible with political, cultural and territorial boundaries. (Heller 2012, 24)

A case in point is Fishmanian domain theory. The term ‘domain’ derives from a structural-functional tradition, by virtue of which multilingualism could be envisioned by way of a view of language in society as an orderly arranged system, within which units and elements were allotted certain functions to play (e.g., Gafaranga 2007; Williams 1992). However, this vision has increasingly attracted criticism in the literature. Martin-Jones (1989), for example, has contended that ‘the notion that languages in a bilingual community fall into a neat pattern of complementary distribution is an overly simplistic one and clearly at odds with sociolinguistic realities’ (p. 112). Many scholars have been at pains to argue that structural-functional frameworks lack analytic purchase in accounting for the use of more than one language in a domain. Crucially, this is because domains, as apprehended in the framework, typically never overlap (e.g., Gafaranga 2007, 85). Hence, Fishman’s (1965, 67–68) well-known account of language choice insists that “[p]roper” usage, or common usage, or both, dictate that only *one* of the theoretically co-available languages *will* be chosen by particular classes of *interlocutors* on particular *occasions*.’ As many have pointed out and shown empirically, this position is far from sensitive to various forms of translanguaging practice that characterize the bilingual realities of late modernity (e.g., Jørgensen 2008; Jørgensen et al. 2011; Spotti 2011). By contrast, studies in contemporary bilingualism yield results that go ‘against the expectation that languages will neatly correspond to separate domains, and stay put where they are meant to stay put’ (Heller 2007b, 11).

A parallel but intersecting strand in the language sciences is scholarly work on language endangerment, which, since the 1990s, ‘has been able to move into the mainstream’ (Cameron 2007, 268). At the core of this enterprise was the counting and detailed description of lesser-known languages, accompanied by emotionally loaded language to describe their future, often their ‘death’ (e.g., Krauss 1992; see Cameron 2007, 269). This trend was soon supplemented by a comprehensive body of literature taking a critical stance toward endangerment discourse (e.g., Bisong 1995; Block 2008; Hill 2002; Heller & Duchêne 2007; Mufwene 2004). Cameron (2007) points to a recurrent theme of adopting biological and ecological metaphors to conceptualize language, and in so doing, recast language as part of a narrative about

loss of biodiversity (Cameron 2007, 283; see also Hill 2002; Pennycook 2010). The problem linked to adopting the species metaphor is that it downplays linguistic practice, but also that, ontologically, it yields a perspective on language as entities with a genetic existence. This is a misleading metaphor, since ‘it is not true that language is a living thing (any more than swimming, or birdsong, is a living thing): it is a vehicle for communication between living things, namely human beings’ (Milroy 1992, 23, cited in Cameron 2007, 272). Analyzing expert rhetoric on these matters, Hill (2002), likewise, criticizes a range of scholarship – including her own – for reproducing what she labels ‘hyperbolic valorization’ as a part of the quest of counting languages. She argues that the invoked discourse on biodiversity casts endangered languages as ‘priceless treasures’, a discussion which in and of itself renders languages into museological objects.

Reviewing the edited volume *Discourses of Endangerment: Ideology and Interest in the Defense of Languages* (Heller & Duchêne 2007), Sallabank (2009), herself a language endangerment scholar, asserts that the critical chapters comprising the book deal primarily with ‘the *misuse* of discourses of endangerment’ (p. 106), as these are drawn from to protect the position of languages that, by most standards, are not threatened. It may be argued that Sallabank seeks to defend her field; yet, in doing so, she points to exactly the point I want to make here, namely that there is an interest-laden crossing in discourse whereby tropes of endangerment and modernist language ideologies have converged in accounts that have sought to promote and protect national languages. This understanding, however, was accomplished throughout the research leading up to this thesis. At the heart of this process lies what Bachelard (2002) calls ‘the formation of the scientific mind’, but which can more straightforwardly be understood as the acquisition of a professional habitus: a scientific habitus (e.g., Brubaker 1993). I shall dwell upon this matter below.

### 4.3 The break: situating reflexivity in practice

Time and again, Bourdieu stresses that reflexivity should not be a narcissistic return to the individual person as a scientist, but rather an attempt at unearthing what the scientist’s vision of the object owes to his or her position in social space (Wacquant 1989b, 19). As a matter of fact, Bourdieu disapproves of self-centered pursuits in which reflexivity is added decoratively, customarily serving the therapeutic aim of self-understanding. However, as noted by Maton (2003, 59), while epistemic reflexivity is designed to be a collective reflexivity, scholars often end up exemplifying enacted reflexivity in individualistic terms. Realizing this, the following account seems appro-

priate for presenting the relevant positions in social space that I have occupied that have had a bearing on my relationship to my object of study.

Having undertaken vocational university training in applied Scandinavian linguistics, and later pursuing a professional career at the Swedish Language Council, I entered the research practice as a socialized agent of the LPP field, armed with pivotal preconceptions with important bearings on the object undertaken for investigation. This fact, then, does not merely pertain to matters of embodying Swedishness on the part of the analyst, but is also intertwined with and amplified by a set of professional dispositions with focal values attached to the significance of Swedish in Swedish society. In undergraduate courses, students of these programs typically read much of the literature reviewed in section 3.4. Later, at the Language Council, I had already made a contribution to the debate on English in Swedish academia that students nowadays presumably read, where the perceived risk of ‘domain loss’ served as the key rationale of the enterprise (Salö 2010). While this circumstance does not necessarily equate to being a deeply immersed insider with perspectives genuinely embedded into the value systems of LPP (see Josephson 2014 for a true insider’s account in that regard), it points to matters of working within a language ideological consensus. This involves reproducing accounts that one knows will be positively sanctioned by the field, after having acquired shared dispositions to a particular language problem.

The field referred to here pertains to the contexts encountered through my prior experiences, viz. a state-mandated body for language planning and its base of recruitment. Subsequently, upon entering the research practice, an inherited vision of the object was my evident point of entry, associated with anterior dispositions acquired across the life-span. With that follows the importing of pre-defined categories as well as a view of English as a problem which resemble language ideologies and ‘the epistemological unconscious’ of the LPP field (Wacquant 1992, 41). It follows from these premises, moreover, that attention should also be paid to the new space I subsequently entered – research on bilingualism in Sweden – and the state and structure of this particular intellectual social space (Brubaker 1993, 221). As Goethe wrote long ago, ‘None are more hopelessly enslaved than those who falsely believe they are free.’<sup>1</sup> The values at stake here are yet to be debunked analytically in scholarly work; nonetheless, a few preliminary traits seem possible to sketch out here. First of all, and generally, university research is a critical enterprise with a salient heirloom to the core values of ‘freedom in the autonomous pursuit of truth’ (Krull 2005, 99). I shall comment further on this issue toward the end of this chapter (sections 7.1.3 and 8.2); here, suffice to say, as discursive practices, science and LPP follow different logics in this

---

<sup>1</sup> *Die Wahlverwandtschaften*, published in 1809 (Eng.: *Elective Affinities*). Quote here from O. Wenckstern’s translation of Goethe 1853 (p. 3).

regard, and are likewise dictated by different terms. While the formal decree regulating the work of the Language Council does make reference to the objective of disseminating language knowledge on a scientific basis (*Förordning med instruktion för Institutet för språk och folkminnen* 2007, section 1), LPP practices are at heart – or so this thesis maintains – language ideologically normative; that is, their stakes and interests center on the politics of a desired language situation (Canagarajah 2005, 153). It must of course be pointed out that, by the same token, research on bilingualism is also endowed with language ideologies – yet, enmeshed with forms of scientific values, these do not unfold in the same way in this context. At the Centre for Research on Bilingualism, Stockholm University, for its part, there has long been a salient ethos linked to giving voice to matters of multilingualism as part of producing a counter-discourse on language in society. The Centre has a history of tending to questions of minorities, and, more often than not, of highlighting the challenges met in the Swedish society by those who do not have the national language as their mother tongue. At least to some extent, then, this self-perception unfolds as a challenger position, opposed to the ways in which state-mandated discourse assign privilege to Swedish, but also more generally attuned to accounting for power asymmetries in the context of language.

It is thus a question of moving from one distinct professional universe into another, each offering their particular point of views – positions from which analysts see what they see (Bourdieu 1989, 18–19). One can only venture the ways in which the work presented in this thesis would have differed had it been produced at a Swedish or English department. To be sure, divergent voices are to be found within each universe. However, seen as agents within a social space of position-takings, these different professional universes each seem to house scholars disposed to understanding the impact of English in ways that are polarized in relation to each other.<sup>2</sup> Presumably, at any rate, the view of the object would have owed much to the point of view, in other words, my position as an observer in social space (Bourdieu 1993a, 10). In the evident absence of such knowledge, my sense is that the Centre provided a viewpoint at some distance from the firing line, so to speak, thus offering a platform for strategically asserting difference (see study 2). Moreover, bilingualism research is a transnational research field, and the Centre accordingly has established access to the international research front. Engaging intellectually with work produced here, I encountered the ‘major ideological shifts in scholarship’ (Heller 2008, 504) reviewed above, namely, a growing body of critical literature on language endanger-

---

<sup>2</sup> See, for example, Duellen, ‘The Duel’, concerning the dominance of English in Swedish academia, *Universitetsläraren* 2016(1), 38.

ment and loss (e.g., Block 2008) and the epistemology of macro sociopolitical LPP (Ricento 2000). Milani (2007a), in a series of works, had thrown light on the case of Sweden more specifically. In the main, it seemed as though the perspectives that had dominated the LPP debate had depicted Swedish academia as situated in an entirely English space, and therefore, already or in some future, as a ‘lost’ domain to the Swedish language. On this connection, it was noteworthy – or so it seemed to me – that the Swedish LPP debate on these issues has not been accompanied by an academic meta-debate in which the representations it has yielded – concerns about diglossia, ‘domain loss’, and language shift, loss, and death – had been subject to much critical appraisal (but see e.g., Boyd 1999; Dahl & Boyd 2006). Instead, the debate had without much intellectual interference subscribed to the narrative on globalization that Pennycook (2007, 20) calls ‘the homogeneity position’ and Jacquemet (2005, 260) identifies as ‘the dystopic pole’, where this form of sociolinguistic change was addressed in terms of imperialism, cultural uniformity, language endangerment, and encroachment, realized in the Swedish setting in terms of internationalization, Europeanization, and imperialism as threats to societal cohesion as manifested by the position of Swedish.

Taken together, these insights, initial and henceforth deepened, gave me reason to look for new inroads to understanding the complexity and nuances, but also the specifics, of the matter at hand. On this point, I have come to find substantial comfort in the framework of Pierre Bourdieu, whose scientific project encompasses the flexibility of allowing for a unified grasp of the micro-dynamics of linguistic practice without losing sight of the uneven distribution of resources in global markets (cf. Park & Wee 2012, 166). These things work in mysterious ways, and I would not say that the Bourdieusian orientation was handed down by the Centre, at least not in any straightforward, easily conceivable way (but see e.g., Stroud 2002, 2004, who draws extensively from Bourdieu). Be that as it may, after an initial attempt to employ the framework (Salö 2012), Bourdieu’s perspectives seemed fit for bringing sensitizing social theory to the study of sociolinguistics of English in academic life. The framework provides a balanced and multi-layered account on language and power, one which, by emphasizing process and practice, encompasses the conceptual means to account for language as an entangled aspect of other forms of social conduct, and the tension between different social spaces of language use. It moreover avoids a romanticist conception of language and does not take the state’s view as the starting point, but at the same time, it shuns the ‘power-free, neo-liberal vision of globalization processes’ (Jacquemet 2005, 261). Extended with a rich array of powerful conceptual tools from sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology, it also provides a viable pathway for the study of English and Swedish in Swedish academia. These perspectives will serve as the theme of the next section.

## 5 Frameworks and conceptual tool-kits

Subsection 5.1 expands upon the work of Bourdieu. In 5.2, his perspectives and thinking-tools are framed by means of his metaprinciple of ‘relational thinking.’ While 5.3 deals with the point of convergence between Bourdieu’s sociology, linguistic anthropology, and sociolinguistics, 5.4 introduces the conceptual tool kit and its application.

### 5.1 Bourdieu: thinking-tools and metaprinciples for research

Broadly, Bourdieu’s *oeuvre* deals with practice and the workings of social worlds, including the study of culture, knowledge, social space, and symbolic power (Grenfell 2007; Swartz 1997; and Webb et al. 2002 provide overviews). Broady (1983, 21) foregrounds a two-sided strand with longstanding anchorage in Bourdieu’s work: on the one hand, the study of social space and the systems of positions it comprises; on the other, the study of people’s dispositions – habitus – that is, the capital that agents come to embody throughout their life trajectories, and which therefore orients their present and forthcoming actions. As already sketched in section 4.1, one can add to this Bourdieu’s profound interest in academic knowledge itself as one of the most distinctive features of his scientific project (Broady 1991; Wacquant 1992, 36).

By and large, then, Bourdieu’s framework offers an inroad to understanding why agents are what they are and do what they do (Bourdieu 1996a, 272). It should be made clear that the present thesis is not attuned to Bourdieu’s commitment to a data-oriented quantitative approach; the thesis, for example, contains no statistical visualizations of the topographies of social space (e.g., Bourdieu 1988). In line with the stance put forth by Lizardo (2008), I have appropriated the tools and perspectives that have seemed useful and omitted the rest. Nor, in fact, is the thesis orthodox in its use of Bourdieu’s thinking-tools. For example, while Bourdieu’s notion of field is central to studies 1 and 2, neither of these studies comprise field analyses in any strict, programmatic sense, for example, concerning the order in which the analytical moments should be enacted (e.g., Bourdieu 1996a; Wacquant 1989a, 40ff.). Put frankly, we know too little about the boundaries of these particular fields and the ways in which agents have struggled to occupy positions, etc. Yet, I have been at pains to argue that the insights provided by the notion of field serve well to foreground particular aspects of the objects it is employed to investigate in the studies. Hence, ‘we can use what we learn about the functioning of each particular field to question and interpret other fields’ (Bourdieu 1993a, 72). Here, I take up Bourdieu on his advice to ‘watch out for methodological watchdogs’ (Wacquant 1989a, 54). Boldly, then, it may be argued that this position resonates well with Bourdieu’s own



eclectic relationship to the authorship of his intellectual predecessors (see Burawoy 2012).

As far as I'm concerned, I have very pragmatic relationships with authors: I turn to them as I would to fellows and craft-masters, in the sense those words has in the mediaeval guild – people you can ask to give you a hand in difficult situations. (Bourdieu 1990a, 28)

In general, I follow Broady (1991) in holding that Bourdieu does not offer a grand theory of society, but rather an envelope of epistemological outlooks and procedures for empirical scrutiny in the social sciences, including sociolinguistics. While the instruments provided within Bourdieu's framework certainly have a wide applicability, they should be scrutinized, criticized, and, in relation to many research objects, interests, and questions, not employed (but see Crossley 2001; Lizardo 2008 for meta-critiques). For example, notions such as habitus and field are not designed to explain every aspect of human life. Bourdieu simply does not do theory in this sense; his modes and tools of thinking derive from the contexts he studied. In studying these contexts, on my reading, it should be acknowledged that Bourdieu tends to privilege zoomed out historicized perspectives in which the inert nature of social order is brought to the fore. Many commentators, at least, acknowledge this to be particularly so in his research on education in the late 1960s (e.g., Bourdieu & Passeron 1977), which were also among the first studies to be translated into English; this seems important for understanding the reception of his work in the North American intellectual field (Broady 1991, 139ff.; Lizardo 2008; Wacquant 1993 – see below).

Bourdieu privileges a view of social practice as engendered by incorporated dispositions to action, which is where habitus is introduced into the framework (see section 5.2.1). In this pursuit, Bourdieu's project seeks to find a middle way between internalist and externalist accounts of social action, thereby overcoming oppositions such as that between freedom and determinism. However, Bourdieu's position, and in particular the notion of habitus, has been accused by many of being too deterministic, on the basis that it reproduces the conditions of its own conditioning and therefore places too strong of an emphasis on structural power (e.g., Farnell 2000; Goodman 2003; R. Jenkins 1992). By and large, this is an issue of what critics see as limitations in reflexive agency in Bourdieu's framework, as an effect of his reluctance to privilege a view in which human beings are utterly free to choose. For example, in the account of Bohman (1999), it is argued that this position leads to the overemphasizing of objective constraints at the expense of reflexive agency. Scholars such as Ortner (e.g., 2006) and Archer (e.g., 2007) have each offered perspectives on practice that, in their view, do a better job of accounting for agency (see Block 2012 for an overview). By contrast, however, it should be noted that many scholars have argued against

or completely dismissed the idea that the notion of habitus is deterministic (e.g., Calhoun 1993; Couzens Hoy 1999; Crossley 2001; Hilgers 2009). Hilgers (2009), for example, stresses that habitus does not exercise a total constraint on people, but rather disposes agents to act freely within the limits yielded by the lasting experiences of occupying a particular position in social space. Habitus, in other words, is durable, which is not to say that it is fixed. At any rate, Bourdieu's emphasis on the inert does not, as Thompson (1984, 53) notes, mean 'that actors are to be regarded as mere dupes of the social structures which determine their every action.' Agents can, albeit with great difficulty, modify their dispositions (see Wacquant 2004 for an empirical case). Indeed, the very endeavor of acquiring a scientific habitus can be seen as an attempt to alter one's original dispositions to objects of knowledge (e.g., Brubaker 1993). Habitus, Bourdieu clarifies,

is not a destiny; it is not a *fatum*, as people have me saying; it is a system of open mechanisms that can be constantly subjected to experience, and by the same token transformed by these experiences. (Bourdieu & Chartier 2015, 57)

Since Bourdieu's pivotal concepts field and habitus reappear in the studies included in this thesis, I will introduce them here. However, like many other concepts in Bourdieu's tool-kit – *interest*, *strategy*, *doxa*, *symbolic power*, to name a few – these are 'open concepts' that are ill-suited to formalistic definitions (e.g., Broady 1991; Wacquant 1989b, 5). For this reason, I introduce key concepts in light of their epistemological foundations and the meta-theoretical assertions they bring into the research practice. In what follows, I begin by introducing the metaprinciple of 'relational thinking'.

## 5.2 Relational thinking

At the heart of Bourdieu's intellectual endeavor lies a relational conception of social life. This understanding, which runs throughout the work of this thesis, serves as the entry point of Bourdieu's hallmark metaprinciple of 'relational thinking' – the idea that relationships, not substances, constitute the prime object of study (see e.g., Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992, 96–97, 224ff.; Hepp 2006; Mohr 2013; Swartz 1997, 61ff., 2013, 22ff.; Vandenberghe 1999). Relational reasoning has deep intellectual roots in the social sciences, and currently, conceptualizing and applying relational sociology is emerging as a research program in its own right (e.g., Dépelteau & Powell 2013; Powell & Dépelteau 2013). At the core of Bourdieu's account is his view of the intrinsically dual nature of social life: 'at once objective and subjective, external and internal, material and symbolic, patterned yet improvised, constrained yet (conditionally) free' (Brubaker 1993, 227). Bourdieu (1990a, 190–191) approaches this dualism in terms of what he calls 'the

two modes of existence of the social' – the reified and the embodied. Bourdieu is at pains to avoid the Durkheimian position of norms as external forces that regulate social action; yet, at the same time, he rejects the idea of social agents as guided solely by rational choice of internal reason (Wacquant 1989b, 10). Social agents, as conveyed through the lens of Bourdieu's framework,

are neither particles of matter determined by external causes, nor little monads guided solely by internal reasons, executing a sort of perfectly rational internal program of action. Social agents are the *product of history*, of the history of the social field and of the accumulated experience of a path within the specific subfield. (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992, 136)

At its core, this position offers a way of circumventing the problem of either over-focusing on the individual (agent, subject, etc.), or, of over-focusing on the social world (context, society, etc.). To do so is misleading, argues Bourdieu, because the proper object of study resides in the relation between 'two realizations of historical action, in bodies (or biological individuals) and in things' (Wacquant 1989a, 44, emphasis removed). In turn, this outlook entails a break with two types of dominant scholastic visions: firstly, that of mechanism, and the idea of constraint by external forces; secondly, that of individualism and the idea of the rational subject (Bourdieu 2000, 138). These are both misconceptions, argues Bourdieu, because

society exists in two fashions. It exists in the objective world, in the form of social structures, social mechanisms [...], the mechanisms of the market, and so on. And it exists also in human brains, in individuals; society exists in the individual state, in the incorporated state; in other words, the socialized biological individual is part of the individualized social. (Bourdieu & Chartier 2015, 55)

As illustrated by this quote, Bourdieu sees the opposition between the individual and society as false, or at least intellectually unfounded. In fact, many of his thinking tools are designed to bridge this opposition. As a substitute for 'society', the notion of *field* allows for a grasp of 'history made into a thing'; likewise the notion of *habitus*, rather than 'individual', produces a view of 'history made into a body' (Bourdieu 1990a, 190–191).

### 5.2.1 Field, habitus, practice

Relational thinking lies at the very heart of Bourdieu's theory of practice, the components of which may be outlined by reference to the formula *habitus/capital + field = practice* (e.g., Bourdieu 2010b, 95). Practice, says Bourdieu, is an encounter between the aforementioned two states of the social, between history internalized in bodies and history in objectified things (Bourdieu 1981, 313, 2000, 150). A *field* exists in a society as a separate so-

cial universe imbued with its own logic and forces of functioning (Bourdieu 1985, 195–196, 1993a, 72–77). Fields are populated by human agents as well as institutions that struggle over something that is recognized as being of mutual value and interest to all (e.g., Broady 1991; see also Hilgers & Mangez 2015a). As sites of struggles, fields appear in Bourdieu’s analyses as ‘structured spaces of positions’ (Bourdieu 1993a, 72). Examples of such social spaces include literature (Bourdieu 1996a), science (Bourdieu 2004), and language planning (study 1). In study 2, the notion of field has merits in denoting the social worlds constituted by academic disciplines, each characterized by their distinct symbolic *capital*. The notion of capital is inherently relational, in that a capital ‘does not exist and function except in relation to a field’ (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992, 101). Here, the idea of field helps in revealing the historical growths of diverse value economies that in different ways unfold in the publishing practices of contemporary academia. Analytically, the idea of fields has merit in that it offers a way of undoing the separation of history and sociology (Wacquant 1989a, 37) and in that it suggests a number of analytical foci as part of the research agenda. Hanks (2005) describes the perspective rendered possible by employing the concept of field in the following way.

To describe a social phenomenon as a ‘field’ is therefore to focus on certain of its features: the space of positions, the historical processes of their occupancy, the values at stake, the career trajectories of agents, and the habitus shaped by engagements. (Hanks 2005, 73)

As can be seen in the quote by Hanks above, the notion of fields is closely linked to *habitus*. By Bourdieu’s logic, the structures of different fields can also be located within biological individuals and their habitus, ‘which are to some extent the product of the incorporation of social structures’ (Bourdieu 1990a, 14). This is to say that field, as reviewed above, can be said to capture one mode of existence of the social, the other being habitus – the incorporated product of social conditionings (p. 31). As social life incorporated, habitus in particular provides ‘a way of escaping from the choice between a structuralism without subject and the philosophy of the subject’ (Bourdieu 1990a, 10). From this perspective, human agents are seen as ‘historical animals who carry within their bodies acquired sensibilities and categories that are the sedimented products of their past social experiences’ (Wacquant 2009b, 138). Study 2, for instance, draws on the foundations of habitus to make the claim that researchers are ‘fields made flesh’ (Bourdieu 2004, 41), and that, methodologically, they can therefore be studied as a complementary inroad to understanding the capital valorization of different disciplinary fields, as embodied in professors and up-and-coming doctors.

As a core assumption, then, the relational mode of thinking brings to bear a view that emphasizes the outcome or relational effect that arise in the inter-

section between the agent and the social world. To Bourdieu, objects under investigation derive their value and meaningfulness from the contexts within which they are embedded (Mohr 2013, 101–102). This insight provides an explanatory value to many of the studies included here. What Bourdieu’s perspective adds is the understanding that analyses must seek to focus both on objectified and embodied forms of historical action (Wacquant 1989a, 42–43). Consequently, people’s choices, actions, practices, and discursive products need to be understood relationally, that is, in conjunction with the fields and the markets in which they act, and the dispositions to action incorporated in people’s habitus. Since representations are born out of that relation, too (e.g., Wacquant 1989a, 44), the discourses on English analyzed in study 1 can be taken as the relational outcome of socialized agents acting in the value-imbued social space or field of LPP (study 1, p. 86). By this reasoning, consequently, the language ideological representation of ‘domain loss’ can be understood as ‘a product of the relation between habitus and field’ (study 1, p. 102). By the same token, in study 2 language choice in publishing is rendered explicable by accounting both for the structure and possibilities of different fields and for the ensuing investment strategies of agents acting there; that is, their dispositions toward publishing practices.

Transposed into his work that deals more specifically with practice-driven discourse phenomena, Bourdieu’s take on language use and choice can be grasped by means of the formula ‘linguistic *habitus* + linguistic market = linguistic expression, speech’ (Bourdieu 1993a, 78). This principle is central to study 3, where habitus is employed to envision researchers’ incorporated language ideologies, which play out in entextualization. Relational reasoning is here enacted to argue that a comprehensive understanding of ‘language choice’ in the research practice must account for the dispositions of socialized agents as well as the social spaces in which their linguistic exchanges take place. In the realm of discursive products, this social space, context, or field is referred to as a *market*. The notion of the market, then, found in the title of this thesis, seeks to highlight the arena into which discursive products are placed and, upon placement, acquire a value. This position, thus, stipulates that discursive products receive their value only in relation to markets, envisioned as unambiguously structured spaces, inherited with censorship to which speakers, through self-censorship, are inclined to adapt (Thompson 1984, 57ff.). The metaphor of the market in this vein ‘provides a way of linking the characteristics of linguistic products with the social and historical conditions of their production and reception, as well as with those properties of the producers and receivers which constitute their linguistic habitus’ (ibid., 64). As exemplified in study 3, habitus can be used to account for regularities in translingual practices, and the ways in which individuals, through their encounters with different markets, have an em-

bodied practical sense of the value of their own linguistic resources in relation to those of the markets.

### 5.3 Bourdieu, linguistic anthropology, and sociolinguistics

Even though Bourdieu's approach provides a broad and solid social basis for the study of linguistic process and practice, it has not on its own sufficed in providing specific analytical instruments for the study of certain fine-tuned discursive phenomena. For this reason, the thesis also draws on work from the North American tradition of linguistic anthropology and recent advances in sociolinguistics. In my reading, matters concerning language in scientific practices have been dealt with for the most part in particular subfields of applied linguistics: language for specific purposes, new rhetoric, etc. These branches have targeted scientific writing and text-oriented accounts of scientific prose, style, and genres. They have been largely preoccupied with products – often *texts* – and I therefore part from these traditions in this thesis, which is more attuned to studying the *modus operandi* of which work, such as a text, is the product (Bourdieu 2000, 53, 1990b, 52ff., 1977b, 72ff.). In opting for this approach, I side with Park and Wee (2012, 103), who maintain that '[t]he essence of language is found in practice, living in the way speakers carry out their daily interactions within given constraints of social life.' This gaze has entailed a concern with practice as the locus of a sociolinguistics of writing (e.g., Lillis 2013), but also, more broadly, with the processes out of which discursive products are yielded (e.g., Silverstein & Urban 1996a), where matters such as genres and registers can be casted as flexible and open-ended products of human practice (Agha 2007; Bauman 1992). One part of this vision has been informed by work done in the sociology of science (e.g., Latour 1987) – yet with a translingual approach to discourse in globalizing environments (Canagarajah 2013a; Kramsh 2012, 115). Additionally, in the work presented here, I take an interest in the broader contexts for which discursive products are aimed, with an eye to accounting for academic publishing as geopolitically embedded in global publishing markets (e.g., Lillis & Curry 2010).

While the perspectives offered in Bourdieu's work have been employed in the language sciences for quite some time (e.g., Woolard 1985), it appears as though the relevance and applicability of Bourdieusian thought have only recently gained currency in socially interested orientations to language research (e.g., Blommaert 2015). For example, the contributions in Grenfell (2011), Grenfell et al. (2012), and Albright and Luke (2008) each exemplify scholarly accounts in which the potential of Bourdieu's work is outlined in respect to different traditions of language studies, such as literacy studies, language and education, language policy, and linguistic ethnography. In

neighboring fields, Bourdieu's applicability to language-related questions has likewise been brought to light (e.g., Harrison 2009; Susen 2013). Bourdieu's position brings to the fore a view of language use as social practice, which, in his account, places particular stress on the fact that what is being done with language is not only designed to communicate, but also to engage in struggles for position-taking, authority, and power (Bourdieu 1977a, 1991a, 37). 'Even the simplest linguistic exchange', states Bourdieu, 'brings into play a complex and ramifying web of historical power relations between the speaker, endowed with a specific social authority, an audience, which recognizes this authority to varying degrees, as well as between the groups to which they respectively belong' (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992, 142–143). Bourdieu's project therefore offers some value to work attempting to approach language as 'a non-neutral medium' (Duranti 2013), or uncover socio-historical processes enmeshed in power, ideology, and interest where language plays a part (e.g., Blommaert 1999b; Heller 2011), as well as to work that seeks to connect to questions of people's active engagements in practice (e.g., Baynham & Prinsloo 2009; Hanks 1996, 2005; Pennycook 2010). It is noteworthy, however, that this relationship is not one-directional; many insights yielded from the language sciences have been able to produce tools and perspectives that Bourdieu's project does not encompass on its own (Park & Wee 2012). In what follows, I shall illustrate this fact by dwelling upon linguistic anthropology and sociolinguistics. In turn, these branches are historically intertwined in ways that are too complex to be dealt with here (but see Gumperz & Cook-Gumperz 2008; Pérez-Milans 2015).

Linguistic anthropology has been programmatically defined as 'the study of language as a cultural resource and speaking as a cultural practice' (Duranti 1997, 2, emphasis removed). More lately, Gal (2006, 171) describes it as 'the study of language in culture and society [which] analyzes linguistic practices as culturally significant actions that constitute social life.' The field has a long history with varying foci (see Duranti 2009 for a historical overview, and Duranti 2013; Shibamoto-Smith & Chand 2013 for contemporary orientations). Common to much linguistic-anthropological work, particularly within the line of work that Duranti (2003, 332) identifies as 'the third paradigm', is the solid anchorage and integration of intellectual thought from social theorists such as Giddens, Foucault, and Bourdieu (see the collection of papers in Schieffelin et al. 1998; Kroskrity 2000). Linguistic anthropology, hence, takes social theory seriously (e.g., Woolard & Schieffelin 1994, 72). By virtue of this fact, it becomes evident that new strands of linguistic-anthropological work align nicely with the sociology of Bourdieu, particularly his cultural theory of action, as well as his work on socialization and symbolic power, which naturalizes dominant ideologies (Duranti 1997, 11; Kroskrity 2006). Correspondingly, much work in linguistic anthropology has

been based on Bourdieusian insights (e.g., Gal & Irvine 1995; Hanks 1996; Irvine 1989; Woolard 1985, 1998).

Another side of this intellectual bond is that, as a result of longstanding theoretical efforts of its own, contemporary linguistic anthropology offers a rich array of conceptual tools that can serve as focused add-on instruments to the scientific projects of Bourdieu and others, where they serve to zoom in on details in the empirical realities that are studied (e.g., Bauman & Briggs 2000, 143). Examples of such linguistic-anthropological glossary include *regimentation* (e.g., Kroskrity 2000), *indexicality* (e.g., Silverstein 2003), *en-textualization* (e.g., Bauman & Briggs 1990; Silverstein & Urban 1996a; 1996b), *genre* (e.g., Briggs and Bauman 1992; Hanks 1987), *interdiscursivity* (e.g., Agha & Wortham 2005; Silverstein 2005), *register*, and *en-registerment* (e.g., Agha 2007). By saying ‘add-on’, however, I mean not to suggest that these concepts are merely, or even primarily, tools. In fact, it can be argued that the very notion of ‘tool’ is somewhat deceptive, since the research objects as such are construed by virtue of the instruments used for dealing with them. At any rate, many of these concepts also carry the mark of being lynchpins, in that they offer a particular gaze to the study of language in society. Moreover, although they were never employed explicitly in Bourdieu’s work on language, they are highly compatible with Bourdieu’s scientific project (see in particular Hanks 2005 and Irvine 1989; see 5.4).

In sociolinguistics more generally, Blommaert (2005a; 2015), Blommaert et al. (2005), Park and Wee (2012), Blackledge (2005), Blackledge and Pavlenko (2002), Stroud (2002, 2004), and Heller (1995, 1996, 2006, 2011) all exemplify the usefulness of Bourdieusian sociotheoretical perspectives in various sorts of globalizing settings. Like linguistic anthropology, sociolinguistics doubtlessly offers a set of suitable thinking-tools and perspectives for the contemporary study of language in society. This is particularly so in relation to far-reaching global influxes, which, more lately, have yielded a vast body of literature on language, mobility, power, and change – that is, a mature sociolinguistics of globalization (e.g., Blommaert 2010; Collins et al. 2009; Fairclough 2006; Slembrouck 2011). In this context, work has moreover focused on the ways in which these globalizing processes unfold in and across the midst of multilingual settings (Canagarajah 2013a; Jacquemet 2005; Pennycook 2007). What is more, sociolinguistics has recently begun to draw close to – or rather develop in tandem with – linguistic anthropology (Gumpertz & Cook-Gumpertz 2008). Accordingly, due to an ever-increasing trans-Atlantic intersubjectivity in the language sciences, many of the aforementioned concepts stemming from U.S. linguistic anthropology are nowadays broadly employed (e.g., Blommaert 1999b, 2008, 2014; Lillis 2013; Stroud & Wee 2011; see Shibamoto-Smith & Chand 2013, 35ff.). I do not seek to engage in a discussion about who is using whose concepts here; ra-



ther, the point is that what we are beginning to see is an emerging line of socially interested language studies where traits from sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology converge with Bourdieusian social theory. Park and Wee (2012) is a particularly illustrative example of a fusion in which a sociolinguistics of globalization draws on the linguistic-anthropological toolkit – language ideology, indexicality, interdiscursivity, etc. – ‘as an extension to Bourdieu’s theory’ (p. 27). Broadly, this emerging nexus is also where I see my work as being theoretically positioned, that is, at the juncture of sociolinguistic, linguistic-anthropological, and sociological insights.

It was noted earlier that Bourdieusian thinking ties nicely into the work of contemporary language studies. This remark requires further commentary, since Bourdieu’s perspectives are also critiqued by many scholars in the theoretical debates of contemporary language studies, not least in his conception of habitus as social life incorporated (e.g., Bucholtz & Hall forth.). For instance, Blommaert (2007), who opts for an account of human action as behavior oriented toward ‘polycentric norms’, avoids habitus because of its ‘suggestions of incorporated automatism’ (p.118; but see Blommaert 2005a and 2015). Bourdieu’s relational view of language as social action speaks against the conception that contexts, markets, norms, domains, etc. *per se* regulate linguistic behavior. Speakers, according to Bourdieu, are not passively ‘pulled and pushed about by external forces, but skillful creatures who actively construct social reality through “categories of perception, appreciation and action”’ (Wacquant 2009b, 142). Yet, scholars in linguistic anthropology often read Bourdieu’s work on language as being ‘too macro’, in that he ostensibly over-emphasizes market principles and partly, therefore, fails to address local forms of legitimacy arising ‘from below’ (e.g., Swigart 2001; see also Agha 2007, 167; Kroskrity 2006, 503–504). In sociolinguistics, by the same token, Stroud (2002) sees limitations in Bourdieu’s perspective to properly account for multilingualism, particularly in postcolonial settings where authority can be ascribed to a given language in spite of weak institutional support; hence, legitimate language does not necessarily entail a unified market. Similarly, Blommaert et al. (2005, 210) see an ‘over-generalization of the case of the unified symbolic market.’ This is a trait that Woolard (1985) and Martin-Jones (2007) see as particularly poignant in educational settings, where processes of language legitimization, as Martin-Jones argues, are more contingent and context-specific than Bourdieu’s emphasis on unified markets seems to acknowledge (2007, 172ff.). I shall have occasion to return to some of these critical points, above all since some of them seem to have a kernel of truth with relevance to the work of this thesis.

## 5.4 The tool-kit and its applicability

In this section I will comment on the ways in which instances of the tool-kit introduced above reappear in the studies that make up the thesis, where they intermingle with Bourdieu's pivotal concepts and perspectives. Together, they are put to work not least of all in relation to a number of classic objects of sociolinguistic inquiry, such as competence and language choice. I have stated that many of the tools and perspectives yielded out of the work of contemporary social orientations to language studies tie nicely in to the foundations of Bourdieu's project. A case in point is the notion of *language ideology* (Blommaert 1999b; Kroskrity 2006; Schieffelin et al. 1998; Silverstein 1979), which in many respects overlaps with Bourdieusian thought, although never appearing as a term in his writings (Blackledge & Pavlenko 2002, 123; Hanks 2005, 69; Jaffe 2009, 394; see also Bourdieu & Eagleton 1994; Thompson 1984; Vann 2011 for accounts of Bourdieu's relationship to ideology). In socially interested language studies, it is commonplace to say that language ideological issues are rarely about language only, but rather tend to stand proxy to other forms of interest (e.g., Blommaert & Rampton 2011, 8; Woolard 1998). Moreover – and partly therefore – understanding present language ideologies entails understanding the ideologies of the past (Blommaert 1999b; Blackledge & Pavlenko 2002, 127). These propositions echo both Bourdieu's view of language practices as enmeshed with other forms of cultural practices and the need for historicist approaches to grasp their significance.

Language ideology is key to study 1. The notion here seeks to pinpoint 'the cultural (or subcultural) system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interest' (Irvine 1989, 255). In emphasizing *interest*, this particular conceptualization of ideology is highly compatible with Bourdieu's project. In the study, congruently, this perspective interlocks with the notion of field, which serves to provide the arena for the production and reproduction of common beliefs and interests in a more demarcated social space, namely in the historically contingent practices of Swedish LPP. Within the confines of the field, the notion of entextualization is used broadly as a frame for understanding power among statements about English as they were reproduced interdiscursively (cf. Briggs 1993, 390). In this sense, study 1 proposes, fields also function as sites for the production of indexicalities – that is, as hotbeds in which particular values can be more or less purposely projected onto a given language that is seen as posing threats to values indexically linked to some other language – in this case, Swedish (see Silverstein 1996).

At the crossing-point of the individual, language ideology can be understood as history inscribed in bodies, and in this sense, it links into Bourdieu's notion of habitus (e.g., Hanks 2005, 69). This matter is briefly touched upon

in study 1, which suggests that the language ideologies of the field are endowed in the agents involved in debating the position of English – namely, the language planners. Embodied language ideologies are studied in greater depth in study 3, where they are seen as an incorporated facet of the researchers’ linguistic habitus. Accordingly, habitus has merits – or at least so the study suggests – in accounting for language choice in the everyday practices of Swedish academia. Here, the notion of entextualization is adopted with greater intent, essentially as a way of shifting the perspective away from monolingual text-products in English toward a study of discourse in the scientific practices that precede the finalized texts (Bauman & Briggs 1990). As study 3 shows, these practices are translingual (Canagarajah 2013a) in the sense that discourse unfolds between and across Swedish–English language boundaries. The term translingual, then, suggests affinity to a more heteroglossic ontology of language, which is sensitive to the fact that ‘communication does not neatly break down into languages’ (Makoni 2014, 80; see also Blackledge & Creese 2014). This conceptualization, however, does not entail that the resources employed in translingual practice occur in a random fashion and that discourse therefore is immensely loosely regimented (Jørgensen et al. 2011, 25). Clearly, there are imperative regularities in discourse, and, correspondingly, Swedish speakers express strong sentiments linked to the necessity of speaking Swedish in conversations involving only Swedish speakers. ‘Named languages’ thus carry significance in practice, and, as I understand it, this is not only owing to external market conditions but to embodied language ideologies as well.

In study 3, this facet of ‘language choice’ is understood as involving competence, apprehended both as the ability to use grammatically correct sentences and of knowing the situations in which the use of a given language is acceptable. From the outlook of Bourdieu’s social interest in discourse production, the traditional notion of competence has evident flaws

so long as it is not related to the capacity to employ expressions in specific situations, that is, to produce sentences *à propos*. Speakers do not acquire linguistic competence alone, but acquire also the *practical competence* to employ the possibilities offered by their mastery of grammar. (Thompson 1984, 46)

Lately, many scholars in sociolinguistics seem to have begun orienting toward this general line of thinking, which can probably also be explained by the fact that Bourdieu’s position seems to be somewhat similar to Hymes’ (1972) idea of communicative competence. Blommaert and Rampton (2011, 5), Coupland (2007, 222), and Rampton (2011, 292, 2013, 75–77) all seem to (carefully) adhere to a notion of competence based on Bourdieu’s habitus. Pursuing these ideas, study 3 explores what may be called ‘the capacity to produce expressions for a particular market’ (Thompson 1991, 18), that is,

the practical knowledge linked to producing language tacitly aligned to the power of acceptability imbued in specific situations (Thompson 1984, 7). Habitus, study 3 suggests, ‘mediates the accumulated resources biographically layered in the agent’s repertoire’ (study 3, 530).

The notion of the repertoire invoked here derives from recent attempts of re-thinking the idea of ‘knowing language.’ In their work on multicompetence, Hall et al. (2006) take a usage-based approach to so-called ‘communicative repertoires’, which they see as ‘conventionalized constellations of semiotic resources for taking action – that are shaped by the particular practices in which individuals engage’ (p. 232). Blommaert and Backus (2011, 2013) picked up on many of these insights to theorize what they termed ‘superdiverse repertoires’, defined as ‘individual, biographically organized complexes of resources’ (Blommaert & Backus, 2013, 15). Scholars like Busch (e.g., 2012, 2015), however, have taken a more phenomenological and dialogical approach to the concept. Differences set aside, common to most elaborations on the notion of repertoire is the general emphasis on life trajectories and an ensuing move away from the notion of total competencies of a language. Rather, what the notion serves to highlight is language knowledge as a patchwork of linguistic resources, reflective of life trajectories. This notion is brought to light also in study 4, which investigates a Swedish researcher’s ability to use specific registers of scientific Swedish. The study instead combines insights yielded from work on sociolinguistic repertoires with the tools and perspectives deriving from discourse analysis beyond the speech event (e.g., Agha & Wortham 2005; Scollon 2008; Wortham & Reyes 2015). Interdiscursivity is the chief concept in study 4, where it served the end of accounting for a researcher’s performance of genre and register across different discursive events. As the study argues, this perspective adds insights to the study of repertoires (see section 7.4.3).

## 6 Method, sources, material, and data

Subsection 6.1 introduces the methods employed in the studies included in the thesis, as well as the data and material these have yielded. 6.2 focuses on issues concerning interviews.

### 6.1 Studying processes and practices

It should be noted that the separation of theory from method carries no value in Bourdieu’s intellectual project, where the two are seen as co-dependent and merged in the research practice. This is not to say that elements of theory and method cannot be fleshed out and reflected upon alone in cases in which the genre urges one to do so. What it means, rather, is that buying into

the tool-kit (and, hence, a particular theoretical position) entails positioning oneself methodologically: ‘theory and method are joined to the point of fusion in the very empirical object whose elaboration they make possible’ (Wacquant 2009a, 120). For example, as a device for thinking, Bourdieu’s relational approach has methodological implications. In short, this foundational principle entails ‘not looking for intrinsic properties of individuals or groups but constructing their relational attributes’ (Swartz 2013, 22). As manifested most elaborately in study 2, this principle commonly yields two diverse strands of methods: one set aiming to foreground the historical specificities immanent in fields (disciplines), and one set exploring the same specificities in their embodied, contemporary form within those who act in these fields (researchers).

Under the rubric of ‘method’, the thesis has taken ample inspiration from Bourdieu’s hybridizing *modus operandi*, that is, his ways of joining anthropological and statistical methods, and of combining, mixing, and juxtaposing different data sources with the aim of making human action conceivable (e.g., Broady 1983, 11, 34). As Pouliot (2013, 45) notes, Bourdieu’s social theory ‘calls for the combination of various methods because not a single one of them is able, in and of itself, to capture the contrasting spaces of habitus, field and practice.’ A resultant ‘discursive montage’ (Bourdieu 1998, 2) of data is therefore manifested particularly in study 2–4, where, for example, pieces of quantitative data and interview excerpts converge in the datasets that are used. As argued in study 4, ‘scattered’ datasets often do justice to the various attempts to account for the complexity of the social practices and discursive events studied (p. 14).

As one side of this endeavor, this thesis investigates fields historically, thereby stressing process. Study 1 is a form of historical discourse analysis, carried out by re-reading accounts of English in Sweden throughout the 20th century and into the new millennium. As Blackledge (2005, 121) notes, ‘[i]n order to understand the “life” of such discourse it is necessary to identify how it connects to other discourses in the textual chain.’ The study builds on proven methodologies, which in turn render a fairly cohesive, text-based dataset, consisting of key writings that intertextually make up a ‘space of works’ (Bourdieu 1996a, 205) where agents’ position-takings on English are manifested. A similar line of historical analysis (see Gorski 2013b) is adopted in study 2, which aims to unravel points of events in the histories of disciplinary fields that pertain to their observable patterns of language use, for the most part, in publishing. Empirically, this work has entailed, firstly, adopting techniques of eliciting facts and figures on publishing language, which have been obtained using national and disciplinary bibliographies, as well as digital databases. Bibliometric techniques are used to illustrate trends in co-authorship (see however the acknowledgements in study 3, note 3). Secondly, it has entailed providing a story to the trends unraveled. This was

achieved by drawing on the ‘knowledge of the literature’ (Briggs 2007b, 574), that is, by localizing work on science and the history of ideas in Sweden, including work outlining aspects of disciplinary developments.

The other side of this endeavor has been dedicated to investigating disciplines from a practice approach. For this line of work, I have used techniques of participant observation in research meetings and teaching, but I have also attended open Ph.D. defenses and various seminars arranged for research purposes. By and large, however, it cannot be said that the knowledge this line of methodological inquiry yielded was the result of a deeper ethnographic approach. Methods, as Heller views them, are ‘practices of enquiry, shaped by the questions we ask, and by what we experience’ (2012, 24). I take this to mean that ways of finding answers stand in a relation to the questions posed; in much work throughout this thesis, I have posed questions in relation to previously produced representations and held beliefs of sociolinguistic realities. The thesis subsequently presents an ample share of primary data, such as audio recordings from research meetings (studies 3 and 4), video recordings from teaching (study 4), email correspondence (studies 3 and 4), and written texts (study 4). The largest chunk of data, however, derives from interviews drawn on in studies 2, 3, and 4. This procedure generated a messy and layered dataset that could be used to support my arguments in the studies. There is, however, an important discrepancy between the empirical material gathered and the empirical material presented as data in the studies. Firstly, I have investigated six disciplines; yet data from only four of these disciplines are reported in this thesis (linguistics and law being the ones not reported on here). Moreover, as a part of this more practice-based approach, I have employed observational procedures that encompassed what Blommaert and Dong (2010, 58) refer to as ‘collecting rubbish’, such as taking photographs and field notes. In spite of the fact that much material of this kind is not drawn on as data, these experiences clearly converge in the research practice and have accordingly informed my understanding of the social worlds investigated.

As noted, the largest and most time-consuming dataset consists of interviews. In the next section, attention will be drawn to some problems related to interviews as social events, and the importance of developing a sense about the conditions for knowledge produced in the social encounters rigged by these procedures. Nonetheless, I maintain, talking to people is a fruitful way of obtaining knowledge of the social worlds that people embody – particularly in combination with other techniques of knowledge production – in order to ‘cross-check their findings by playing off one kind of data against the other’ (Canagarajah 2005, 156). As Briggs notes:

The value of interviews thus emerges from their capacity to juxtapose diverse modes of knowledge production. Researchers draw on their spe-

cialized knowledge of research topics, other research activities ('participant observation', for example), knowledge of the literature, experience with other interviewees, and so forth. Interviewees recontextualize knowledge drawn from multiple practices and then, with varying degrees of explicitness, represent how they produce it and what makes it interesting, credible, and important. (Briggs 2007b, 574)

In total, I conducted 28 interviews with scholars from 10 different disciplines, distributed across 11 universities or research institutes. The group of informants encompasses scholars of different generations, professional positions, and genders. These interview accounts, however, were created in different ways, and, accordingly, they are used in different ways in the studies. Initially, I piloted 11 interviews with active scholars in 10 disciplines, distributed over 6 universities and 1 research institute. These initial interviews were conducted via email, and, for the most part, they served the general end of orienting the vast realm of Swedish academia. Moreover, this served as a way of selecting appropriate disciplines and appropriate informants, as well as finding relevant themes and interview questions. Based on the insights gained here, I carried out two trial interviews face-to-face (1 recorded): one with an experienced professor, and one with an up-and-coming scholar. Not least, these interviews served the end of practicing the craft of interview techniques. After this trial-like procedure, six disciplines were selected as exemplars: history, psychology, physics, law, linguistics, and computer science. First of all, all six disciplines represent relatively autonomous disciplines of Swedish academia, which is a necessary condition in order to grasp them as fields in Bourdieu's sense (e.g., Broady 1991, 270). The disciplines that were chosen position themselves differently on a number of different continuums: natural sciences–humanities (e.g., physics–history); old–new (e.g., law–computer science); nationally–internationally embedded (e.g., history–psychology), etc. In various ways, such differing conditions have relevance to publishing language. It is well known that these disciplines differ in that they produce knowledge about different kinds of objects and exhibit differences in their international orientation (see section 3.3; study 2).

In exploring these disciplinary fields, I conducted 17 face-to-face, hour-long, thoroughly prepared and semi-structured interviews with active scholars. These interviews were all recorded and transcribed. Some of these interviews, however, unfolded over topics not reported on in this thesis, or with informants from disciplines not explored within the confines of the thesis. The studies included in this thesis make use of theory-driven interviews, that is, interviews that were designed with a particular framework in mind. For example, in study 4, the interviews were based on the idea of sociolinguistic repertoires (Blommaert & Backus 2013) and were thus carried out with the aim of accounting for the informant's biographically acquired language knowledge. Here, texts written by the informant were also brought into the

social event of the interview as objects to be discussed metadiscursively (e.g., Törrönen 2002). Other interviews were designed with Bourdieu's habitus in mind (e.g., study 2). This fact has had consequences, for example, in selecting respondents, where I have been much guided by the idea of targeting interviewees on the basis of their 'point of view' in academia. In view of this, the agents interviewed were not just randomly chosen academics, but academics who, I have gathered, embodied the knowledge relevant to my studies and who, moreover, were willing to expose it. In this sense, rather than locating interviewees as particular unique individuals, they were chosen by virtue of the position they occupied in social space, in turn linked to 'access to certain observations, actions, and knowledge' (Gorden 1980, 146). For example, then, the interviewees in study 2 were chosen both in respect to their disciplinary positions (historians and psychologists, respectively) and in relation to their capital possession or position in the hierarchy of each disciplinary field (professors and doctors, respectively). In study 3, however, the latter set of positions carried no meaning; here, the scholars were chosen by virtue of the fields in which they engaged (computer scientists and physicists, respectively).

## 6.2 Interviews and reflexivity

While many of the matters of epistemic reflexivity presented in section 4 might appear to the reader as pertaining mostly to the initial stages of research processes and practices, this is really not so. On the contrary, epistemic reflexivity has its place throughout; it is designed to be continuously and systematically implemented in every moment of the research practice: 'epistemic reflexivity is deployed, not at the end of the project, *ex post*, when it comes to drafting the final research report, but *durante*, at every stage in the investigation' (Wacquant 2009a, 121–122). Reflexivity thus digs deep into the craft of the research practice: it pertains to the formulating of one's interview questions, to interviews as situated and power-laden events in themselves (Bourdieu 1996b; Briggs 1986; Slembrouck 2004), as well as to transcribing (e.g., Bucholtz 2000; Green et al. 1997; Ochs 1979; also Bourdieu 1996b, 30ff.), etc. Maton (2003) has critiqued the foundations of Bourdieu's version of reflexivity on the premise that reflexive knowledge can and should also be subjected to reflexivity. In short, there is no way of knowing when to stop being reflexive. Both Bourdieu and Bachelard are aware of this fact; as Bachelard posits, 'objective knowledge is never complete [...] since new objects never cease to provide new topics of conversation in the dialogue between the mind and things' (2002, 243). Complying with this viewpoint, it would be inaccurate and indeed unrealistic to claim that every potential aspect of this exercise has been systematically implemented to the full



extent in the work leading up to this thesis. Then again, it may be questioned whether a fully-fledged reflexive research trajectory is even possible, as there is always room for more reflexive thought (Maton 2003, 59). As noted, throughout this work, reflexivity has had purport mostly in respect to the ways I have attempted to handle my dispositions and position in relation to the field where I previously dwelled and where I had therefore placed my investments. But it has also been a relevant instrument in the production of knowledge through interviews, and below I comment on some of the insights that were gained and difficulties encountered.

It goes without saying that all methodologies have their problems. Study 2, but also studies 3 and 4, is open to some of the manifold methodological problems that arise in studies where interviews are used. Scholars who have written critically on these topics recurrently point out that as a communicative event, the interview is skewed and situated, and accordingly yields data that should be thoughtfully interpreted (e.g., Briggs 1986, 2007b; Mertz 1993; see De Fina & Perrino 2011 and Goebel 2015 for recent overviews). In consequence, while in some respects it can be advisable to think of the interview as a conversation (e.g., Blommaert & Dong 2010), analysts are often advised to keep in mind that, in actual fact, it is not an ordinary conversation. Rather, '[i]t is a deliberately created opportunity to talk about something that the interviewer is interested in and that may or may not be of interest to the respondent' (Dingwall 1997, 59). Often, the questions asked by the analyst presuppose 'certain sustainable metapragmatic starting-points', which may or may not correspond to informants' assumptions (Mertz 1993, 160). One effect of this, naturally, is that the researcher can quite easily – oblivious to the fact or not – produce an account and thereafter pick some quotes 'to illustrate a previously determined position on some personal or political issue' (Dingwall 1997, 52). These issues should be acknowledged. However, as De Fina and Perrino (2011) note, much of the literature that seeks to critically scrutinize interviews as a source of bias in social scientific research seems strongly attuned to overcoming the perceived problem of interviews as 'unnatural' contexts, which in itself is a problematic conceptualization. In my view, the issue resulting from using interviews is not primarily that the researchers carry out an analysis on a piece of data that they themselves have created – which is true, yet possible to overcome. Instead, the issue as I see it pertains to a point raised by Hymes (1981, 84), namely that '[s]ome social research seems incredibly to assume that what there is to find out can be found out by asking.' Broadly, this critical comment aims at shedding light on the methodological pitfall of believing that people have more opinions about most things than what is regularly the case, which is a stance shared by Bourdieu (Blommaert & Dong 2010, 3).

Bourdieu's position on interviews, thus, is somewhat similar: 'It is the investigator who starts the game and who sets up its rules' (Bourdieu 1996b,

19). However, Bourdieu goes further in arguing that interviews are problematic because they are linked to the inherent difficulties involved in having informants producing adequate accounts of their own practices.

Social agents do not have an innate knowledge of what they are and what they do: more precisely, they do not necessarily have access to the central causes of their discontent or their disquiet and the most spontaneous declarations can, without aiming to mislead, express quite the opposite of what they appear to say. (Bourdieu 1996b, 29)

In this quote, Bourdieu reveals his stance on reflexivity, which link to the general issues of agency raised in Bourdieu's framework (cf. section 5.1). This pertains to what Ortner (2006, 111) sees as Bourdieu's 'insistence on the inaccessibility to actors of the underlying logic of their practices.' Indeed, while Bourdieu does not posit that agents are totally unaware of what goes on around them, he maintains that they grasp it differently. As he puts it, they do not 'have in their heads the scientific truth of their practice which I am trying to extract from observation of their practice' (Bourdieu 2003, 288). Consequently, as he notes elsewhere: 'Workers know a lot: more than any intellectual, more than any sociologist. But in a sense they don't know it, they lack the instrument to grasp it, to speak about it' (Bourdieu & Eagleton 1994, 273). To many, this position is provocative. According to critics, by downplaying the informants' abilities to reflect upon their own practices, reflexivity becomes framed as the researcher's privilege only (Archer 2007, 43; Lynch 2000). It is clear that Bourdieu sees reflexivity as a key difference between habitus and a trained, scientific habitus (Brubaker 1993): 'The "empirical individual" is like everyman, he responds naïvely to what surrounds him. The "epistemic individual", on the other hand, is the product of scientific training and experience' (Grenfell 2007, 118). We can say that Bourdieu demands of the researcher to develop an eye capable of projecting an image that goes beyond what the people who are studied are capable of grasping. The problem is not necessarily that people will have nothing to say, but rather that they have not necessarily given much thought to the kind of matters that interest the sociolinguist. Thus, the question is how to deal with informants' accounts '[g]iven that one can ask anything of anyone and that almost anyone always has enough good will to give some sort of answer to any question' (Bourdieu et al. 1991, 42). For Bourdieu asking people about their point of view must be supplemented with an understanding of the point of view from which it is stated (Bourdieu 1996b, 34).

In the literature, stress is often placed upon the power asymmetry inherent in the interview situation, often in the context of ethics. Typically, statements along this line are made with a particular scenario in mind, where researchers obtain interview accounts from less privileged agents (e.g., Briggs

1986). This issue is relevant but peculiar somewhat in the work of this thesis, first and foremost since I study powerful elites who, in respect to their social position in academia, are superior to my own social rank, but who nonetheless take part in the same game that I do. To be sure, the young sociolinguist is in a position to exercise control over these interview encounters, not least since the privilege of analyzing the accounts falls upon the investigator. But, since academic scholars belong to the societal elite, most informants probably do not perceive themselves as being in a submissive position in the interview events. That said, the power immanent in the interview events was brought to bear in other important ways. In studies 3 and 4, as we shall see, the informants, namely, the researchers who were investigated, claimed to use Swedish among one another in their work practices. In discussing these topics, informant accounts could be inclined to reproduce dominant conceptions of what is acceptable, conceivable, or normal, which in turn reflect the imperatives of power hierarchies beyond interpersonal relationships (Bourdieu 1977b, 37).

One way of dealing with this intrinsic issue, as Dingwall (1997, 56) points out, is this: ‘If the interview is a social encounter, then, logically, it must be analysed in the same way as any other social encounter.’ Here reflexivity serves a device for ‘understanding and mastering these distortions’ (Bourdieu 1996b, 18). Building on such insights in his work on reflexivity and sociolinguistic interviews, Slembrouck (2004) accordingly views the interview situation as a meeting between two habitus. By this logic, the research interview is also intrinsically linked to the linguistic market in which it unfolds and the particular notion of legitimate language that applies there (Slembrouck 2004, 93). In analyzing interview accounts, therefore, it is important to add the social relation between the interviewer and the interviewee that censors discourse by making some opinions seem inexpressible or practices unacceptable (Bourdieu 1996b, 25). For these reasons, it is easy to side with Briggs (1986), who holds that, generally, interviews should be complemented with other data sources. Interviews provide accounts of the practical experience of agents, and, as such, they are ‘situated performances in and of themselves’ (Heller 2011, 44). Nevertheless, in the present cases, the observations of the researchers’ practices attest to the fact that the reported use of Swedish between Swedish speakers is not an effect of the interview situation only, since what the researchers say they do (interview accounts) appears to correspond to what they actually do (observed practices) (cf. Heller 2011, 46). Hence the advantage of combining methods.

Furthermore, having acknowledged that, it should be noted that it does not have to be a problem that informants produce answers that are filtered through the prism of their dispositions and the expectations imbued in the interview event *per se*. I would argue that this issue is to some extent dependent upon the epistemological grounding of the interview as such,

brought to bear by the theoretical frameworks employed in the interview design. A case in point is the studies that use interviews as a way of investigating habitus (i.e., 2 and 3). Here, it is typically these socially given representations that the interviews seek to disclose. In these cases, it is not generally a problem that the interview, as Dingwall (1997, 58) puts it, ‘is a situation in which respondents are required to demonstrate their competence in the role in which the interview casts them’, since, in these studies, I am more interested in their habitus than in their ‘personal’ views *per se*. That is to say, the fact that interviewees often reproduce accounts that are typical of the positioning of their group (Wortham et al. 2011) can be seen as an advantage in procedures where these interviewees are deliberately selected to speak on behalf of their fields.

## 7 The included studies

In this section, the four studies included in the thesis will be contextualized, presented, and commented on. As will be evident, I shall have more to say about some studies than others. Yet, for each study there are subsections devoted to covering i) preliminaries, ii) summaries and iii) commentaries.

### 7.1 Study 1: Language ideology and shifting representations of linguistic threats

#### 7.1.1 Preliminaries – toward a sociolinguistics of the LPP field

Bourdieu (e.g., 1987, 2000) avows that the law is the place to look for the dominant vision in a given society. As mentioned earlier, since 2009, there has been a Language Act in Sweden, which states that Swedish, as the principal language of Sweden, ‘is to be usable in all areas of society’ (*Språklag*, section 5). This vision has a history; it was put into place by the historical labor of language experts who eventually managed to anchor their discourse in the state, by producing and reproducing representations of English in Sweden (cf. section 3.4). Milani interprets this process as one of ‘[e]xtending the academic fears into the political field’ (2006, 115). Study 1 takes an interest in this labor, perceived as pertaining to a process of problematization whereby arguments ‘travel along “chains of discourse” until they gain the legitimacy of the state, and are inscribed in law’ (Blackledge 2005, vii).

The rationale for studying processes of problematization through representation is emphasized across a range of scholarly work. Fundamentally, as Mehan (1996, 274) notes, following Bakhtin, ‘we know the world through the representations we make of it’, which influences how we think about the events represented as well as how we act toward them. This matters, be-

cause, as Grillo (1985, 2) argues, ‘if there is “representation” of problems, there is also a problem of “representation”’, and that is why it is important to examine whose view is represented and the means by which it is done. Indeed, this undertaking also impinges upon a crucial theme in the work of Foucault: ‘to analyze the process of “problematization” – which means: how and why certain things (behavior, phenomena, processes) became a *problem*’ (Foucault 2001, 171). Foucault took interest in discourse as a system of representation in the sense that groups of statements essentially provide a language for representing the knowledge about a particular topic at a particular historical moment (Hall 1997, 44). To the present case, these assertions are all relevant. However, the underlying key motif for studying processes of problematization here was linked to epistemic reflexivity: ‘The first and most pressing scientific priority’, posits Bourdieu, is ‘to take as one’s object the social work of construction of the pre-constructed object’ (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992, 229, emphasis removed). Reflexivity, thus, is here enacted *by the very effort* of undertaking an opening analysis of the field of which the researcher him- or herself is the product and where previous investments have already been placed (e.g., Salö 2010). This, I presume, is why Hultgren et al. (2014, 18) comment on study 1 as pertaining to ‘(self) criticism’.

Study 1 seeks to account for the social life of a particular representation of a problem and the packing of this representation into a language notion – ‘domain loss.’ Upon entering the research practice, ‘domain loss’ was a salient ‘initial concept’ in Bachelard’s sense, and as such, a carrier of a particular language ideological load. As analysts, Bachelard posits, we must ‘*deform* our initial concepts, examine these concepts’ conditions of application, and above all incorporate *a concept’s conditions of application into the very meaning of the concept*’ (Bachelard 2002, 69). The term ‘domain loss’ arose in the Scandinavian debate in the late 1980s (Lund 1989), and soon thereafter surfaced in the Swedish discussion (Teleman 1992; see section 3.4; 3.4.1). Time-wise, on the brink of Sweden joining the European union, the launch of this idea coincided with efforts of the Swedish field of LPP to draw up and market the foundations of a coherent language politics (e.g., Svanlund & Westman 1991; Teleman & Westman 1997). In the nexus of public, academic, and LPP discourse, ‘domain loss’ soon became the *comme il faut* way of talking about a form of partial language shift confronting the Swedish language (cf. section 3.4). In a double sense, the representation became accepted by the field as self-evident. Firstly, it was accepted as a reasonable theoretical account as to how languages fall into disuse, ‘lose ground’, and ultimately die. Secondly, it was accepted as a correct description of the language situation in Sweden as such, either as a lurking threat confronting the Swedish language, or as an already descriptive fact. While it can be noted that the debate encompasses occasional accounts that endeavor to problematize ‘domain loss’ as a concept as well as the perspective it has

yielded (e.g., Hyltenstam 1999, 217; Melander 2005, 211–212), the position that ‘domain loss’ is either approaching the Swedish language or an already conceivable sociolinguistic fact must be said to have been mainstream and generally uncontested. Accordingly, in scholarly sociolinguistic work in Sweden – and, notably, on the position of Swedish in Finland – this way of representing knowledge about sociolinguistic change is vivid and commonly employed (see Melander 2013; Mickwitz 2010; Östman & Londen 2012; Stålhmar 2010). According to The Swedish Language Council, Swedish is currently, as of 2016, threatened by ‘domain loss’ in the fields of technology and natural sciences.<sup>3</sup> This degree of internal coherence is peculiar. A field is a space of conflict but also of competition, where participants who populate it struggle for the monopoly over the forms of capital effective in it (Wacquant 1992, 17). While the LPP field is imbued with internal competition, it seems as though differences in position-takings on this question seem to have been set aside in priority of a unified vie to standing firm behind the importance of defending values recognized as being of mutual interest to all. In consequence, while agents of the field might have different views on manifold matters pertaining to the Swedish language, there has been no major line of conflict between the agents over the role of Swedish in Sweden.

This coherence is peculiar also in another sense. One pertinent line of critique that can and has been leveled at ‘domain loss’ is that, as a diagnosis of a sociolinguistic macro-condition, ‘domain loss’ has limited, if any, support in the literature. As a consequence, the diagnosis itself seems to suffer from lack of conceptual clarity, poor theoretical anchorage, and ill-founded support in empirical inquiry (Christensen 2006; Dahl & Boyd 2006; Haberland 2005; Phillipson 2008, 2009; Preisler 2005, 2009; Salö 2012; Simonsen 2002). Studies that have discussed ‘domain loss’ in relation to empirical data across a range of Scandinavian sociolinguistic settings have generally been skeptical of its usefulness (Ljosland 2008; Lønnsman 2010; Madsen 2008). Ontologically, ‘domain loss’ moreover subscribes to ideas of ownership and boundedness of language in that it depicts domains as something that have a real existence, something that can be ‘had’ (Haberland 2005; Simonsen 2002). This apprehension thus interlaces with the apprehension that languages can be possessed (Blommaert 2006, 512) and therefore ‘isolated, named, counted and fetishized’ (Woolard 1998, 16). As part of a theory of language shift, ‘domain loss’ moreover alludes to a form of domino theory that, in reality, pertains to a more complex process (Dahl & Boyd 2006). Even scholars who in general adopt a critical stance to the global position of English criticize the scientific qualities and validity of this notion, for exam-

---

<sup>3</sup>‘Questions and answers about language’, URL: <http://www.sprakochfolkminnen.se/sprak/-sprakradgivning/fragor-och-svar-om-sprak.html> (accessed January 6, 2016).

ple, in that it signifies ‘a natural, agent-less process’ (Phillipson 2008, 29), or that it reflects ‘a monolingual worldview’ (Phillipson 2009, 214).

In short, then, the notion of ‘domain loss’ is not borne out by research. The question is, however, if ‘domain loss’ should even be considered to be a product of research, that is, if it is born *out of* research. It is worth pointing out that study 1 does not engage in an attempt to dismantle the notion of ‘domain loss’ from a theoretically linguistic perspective, for instance, in the same vein as Stroud (1978) engages with the scientific validity of the concept of semi-lingualism. I do agree that ‘examining assumptions about language [...] must become a crucial part of the work of critically assessing and challenging modernist projects’ (Bauman & Briggs 2003, 316–317). To be sure, as noted in the introduction, one facet of epistemic reflexivity stresses the need to bring into question folk categories and prenotions of common sense, essentially because ‘they help to *make* the reality they describe’ (Bourdieu 1998, 66). However, in light of prior attempts to pursue this task, it seems difficult to know whether criticism should be directed to the paradigm itself, or whether it is rather a matter of ‘conceptual stretching’ (Brubaker 1993, 213) throughout processes of local interpretations of it as it wallowed about in the Scandinavian discussion. For example, Haberland (2005) argues that Fishman’s conception of a domain differed from the way in which the notion has served in Scandinavian LPP.

Be that as it may, the matter at issue in study 1 is not whether ‘domain loss’ is sufficiently scientific or not, but rather the circumstances by which the notion came to be an acceptable and widely distributed representation of a sociolinguistic problem – in spite of its status as being ‘sociolinguistically suspect,’ as recently condemned by Josephson (2015, 88, my translation). One way of understanding the social life of ‘domain loss’ is to treat it not as a product of research practice, but, first and foremost, as a Scandinavian invention fashioned in LPP discourse. The task here, then, is to develop an understanding of the logic and functioning of LPP practices. To do so requires extending Foucault’s philosophy of knowledge with the sociological eye of Bourdieu, which offers the conceptual means to add specificity to this insight (see Callewaert 2006; Couzens Hoy 1999). Hence, one cannot “‘understand the meaning of an expression” without investigating the social-historical conditions in which it is produced as well as the conditions [...] in which it is received’ (Thompson 1984, 66). In a nutshell, it is an understanding of these conditions that study 1 seeks to achieve.

### 7.1.2 Summary of study 1

Study 1 undertakes what may be broadly termed a Bourdieusian historical analysis (e.g., Gorski 2013b) of the shifting ways in which English has been represented as a sociolinguistic problem in Sweden, particularly within the realm of LPP. The objective of this study is to contextualize the conceptual

history of ‘domain loss’ in Sweden, with a view to understanding the language ideologies underpinning discourses about perceived threats from English in the field of Swedish LPP. The study adopts the view of Irvine (1989) and others who emphasize that language ideologies serve the interests of particular groups (see Kroskrity 2006). From this vantage point, it is argued that Bourdieu’s notion of field provides a way of capturing context historically, held together by patterns of discursive connectivity through which the values at stake are brought to bear. Fields function as sites for the production of discourse, one aspect of which pertains to struggles over indexicalities whereby particular languages are manufactured as linked to broader values (Silverstein 1996). In this sense, fields offer a useful perspective for making sense of the ‘logics of practice’ that constitute agents’ strivings to defend Swedish in an era of rapid social change. Accordingly, following Blommaert (1999a) and his work on language ideological debates, a Foucauldian notion of discourse was here recast in the more strategy-laden perspective of Bourdieu by foregrounding discourse as a strategic resource ‘onto which people project their interests, around which they can construct alliances, on and through which they exercise power’ (ibid., 7). This perspective thus seeks to move beyond discourse-analytical accounts ‘unaware of their sources’ (Bourdieu 1988, xvi) toward one that seeks to disclose the strivings of real agents (Blommaert 1999a). Be they scholars, bureaucrats, lobbyists, or institutions, these agents have names and occupy positions in social fields, a fact that in turn provides the basis for an investigation of how discursive statements relate to such field positions.

In the study, the field’s metalinguistic discourses on English are examined historically vis-à-vis other societal discourses that have directed the politics of language. It is shown that during the last decade of the 20th century, the Swedish field of language planning experienced a somewhat drastic changeover of discourses on English by means of which focal points moved from a corpus-centered approach to language planning toward larger issues of status and power. The field’s focal point here moved from the purity of the language toward its social value. As a part of that shift, agents of the field tended to become reluctant and at times ambivalent to discourses on linguistic purity and hygiene (Cameron 1995, 2007) and generally avoided the discourse that Swedish should be kept free from linguistic material from other languages. At this point in time, this shift in representation served the aim of avoiding affiliation with current racist discourses about Sweden’s Others (cf. Dahlstedt 1976, 22 on purism as linguistic xenophobia). Here, instead, ‘domain loss’ arose to legitimize discourses about the disestablishment of the national language regime. It is noteworthy that ‘domain loss’ was entextualized at the same time as the discussion about EU membership intensified (e.g., Milani 2007b). Here, agents of the LPP field could thereby



‘draw support from external changes moving in the same direction’ (Bourdieu 1996a, 127) by arguing against the EU – but in the market of language and through the authority of their own symbolic assets. By this reasoning, study 1 depicts the safeguarding of the Swedish language in the same light as the safeguarding of the autonomy of Sweden, and an accompanying aversion among the agents for the cultural-political indexicalities of English, paired with the appraisal of Swedish as a democratic medium. In addition, during the same period of time, discourses about languages other than Swedish were established. In fact, for a while, Sweden had five official minority languages but no official majority language. Highlighting this fact in the debate allowed the discussion to center on the status of Swedish by clinging to discourses attached to the other languages (cf. Teleman 2003, 234, see below). In this sense, discourses about minority languages have directed the politics of language also with regard to the position of Swedish contra English.

Study 1 ends with a discussion in which ‘domain loss’ is depicted as an interest-laden product of the relation between agents’ habitus and the field of language planning, imposed as a part of a strategy to defend a market where the agents themselves have invested their capital (Bourdieu 1977a). In this light, it is argued that the social history of ‘domain loss’ cannot be accounted for by focusing only on discourses on English. Rather, its genesis must be contemplated in relation to other discourses ‘which cross each other’ (Foucault 1984, 127): those of EU membership, xenophobia, as well as Sweden as a multilingual country in relation to the position of Swedish. Taken together, then, the safeguarding of Swedish can be comprehended as linked to struggles in which the role of the nation-state is set in flux, opening up linguistic markets beyond its control. In this light, study 1 views ‘domain loss’ as a symbolic resource used in a strategy to insert the field’s problematization into the larger field of power.

### 7.1.3 Study 1: commentary

The results of study 1 can and should be viewed through a reflexive lens. To the present case, the insight won by carrying out this exercise is a recast of LPP as ‘a field of cultural or ideological production, a space and a game in which the social scientist himself is caught’ (Bourdieu 1985, 210). LPP is politics on the battlefield of language, and as such it is about representing things, changing things, with words:

The social world is the locus of struggles over words which owe their seriousness – and sometimes their violence – to the fact that words to a great extent make things, and that changing words, and, more generally representations [...] is already a way of changing things. Politics is, essentially, a matter of words. That’s why the struggle to know reality scientifically almost always has to begin with a struggle against words. (Bourdieu 1990a, 54)

Pielke (2007, 116) argues that it is ‘characteristic of the science and politics of the early twenty-first century to see scientists actively engaged in political debates.’ In turn, this tendency points to the important late-modern role of intellectuals as legislators (Bauman 1987). In our time, according to this argument, intellectuals cannot simply impose their visions of truth, but are forced to take a mediating role by making authoritative statements about the social order (Bauman & Briggs 2003, 308–309). Epistemic reflexivity, as noted, urges analysts to refrain from objects of knowledge – things and words – which are not the products of research practice. In reality, though, this is a difficult line to draw. To do so, as Lynch (2000, 31) notes, requires a clear understanding of the boundaries of knowledge-yielding practices. To speak with Foucault, we can rightly say that while research is one form of discursive practice, LPP is another. Yet, in viewing such discursive practices as fields, this assumption seems to beg for more attention, for, just as individuals can be a part of several fields, fields also overlap, which blurs the distinction between language research and LPP. Because of such overlap, knowledge can be yielded out of the logic of one discursive practice while speaking, as it were, in the voice of another. Indeed, at least ideally,

a ‘policy’ is a decision; ‘politics’ is bargaining, negotiation, and compromise in pursuit of desired ends; and ‘science’ is the systematic pursuit of knowledge. (Pielke 2007, 37)

However, as noted in relation to study 1, this conception seems overly innocent, since, as Pielke (2007, 124–125) acknowledges, the systematic pursuit of knowledge is often enacted as a part of the political pursuit of reaching desired policy. I propose that the case of Swedish LPP adds insight into this dilemma, since the field by some of its properties ‘follows the logic of the scientific field, but by others it follows the logic of the political field’ (Bourdieu, cited in Wacquant 1989b, 17). Characteristic of the knowledge production here is the creation of what Cibulka (1995, 118) calls ‘policy arguments’, by which he means the use of research to fit a predetermined position, aligned with a desirable policy outcome. Such knowledge can both be imported from the outer fields and filtered by virtue of the field’s internal logic or it can be produced from within the field. The difficulty here is that ‘the borderline between policy *research* and policy *argument* is razor thin’ (Cibulka 1995, 118). To Bachelard, however, the distinction between what is scientific and what is not at times seems fairly straightforward. And while Bachelard does not side with the positivist position that scientifically procured facts are value-free (e.g., Cameron et al. 1992, 6), he does share the view of figures like Popper that science should aim at objective knowledge, distinct from the knowing subject (Tiles 1985, 43, 48ff.). Bachelard, however, preferred the notion ‘objectivation’, thereby repositioning the urge for

objective truths by emphasizing that the quest for objectivity is an activity, a line of work undertaken by the scientist (Broady 1991, 347). My present-day position on this vast and deep-seated matter is that this aim is pivotal but immensely difficult, yet conceivable by adopting a reflexive posture (e.g., Bourdieu 1983, 317).

In light of scientific appraisal, ‘domain loss’, just like language notions such as semilingualism (see Stroud 2004 for a critique), comes across as being, at best, a child of spontaneous sociolinguistics, informed by pre-scientific intellectual thought, yet appealing to commonsensical ideas (Park & Wee 2012, 95). From a scientific point of view, ‘domain loss’ is an example of a representation that has ‘done more to muddle the issue than to clarify it’ (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992, 171). If the sole aim were to produce an understanding of current sociolinguistic developments, then ‘domain loss’ seems to be an inappropriate thinking-tool, which the LPP field would do well to abandon (Salö 2012). However, as the field perspective of study 1 discloses, it should not be presupposed that clarifying or understanding the sociolinguistic problem constituted the principal motifs for producing and reproducing this notion. Understanding sociolinguistic phenomena may certainly be one objective of LPP; yet, it cannot be the only – such a conclusion overlooks what Ricento (2000) calls the strategy component of LPP. As a practice, ultimately, LPP is about deliberate efforts to influence the behavior of others (Cooper 1989, 45). As study 1 suggests, the primary aim was language political, and, as politics, as part of ‘the struggle to entextualize authoritatively, and hence, in one relevant move, to fix certain metadiscursive perspectives on texts and discourse practices’ (Silverstein & Urban 1996b, 11). In other words, in the production of policy arguments, the objective, often, is not primarily one of understanding the situation, but of framing it so that language political measures come across as being warranted. For these purposes, ‘domain loss’ successfully entextualized a problematization that expressed a deviation from desired sociolinguistic conditions. In this sense, the representation was indeed successful in offering a way for talking about the linguistic problem of English in Sweden at large, in a way that made sense to many people. Hence, as study 1 asserts, ‘domain loss’ is ‘a successful representation, irrespective of its status as a scientific notion’ (p. 104).

Study 1 can be read as an attempt to shed light on the imbrications of nation-building and language policy, and ‘the complexity of linguistic imaginings of the nation’ (Mills 2015, 267). Situated in the midst of these complexities, the study of the social life of ‘domain loss’ makes points about ‘the genesis and functioning of representation’ (Bourdieu 1985, 215). Re-reading the study, I find one set of observed dynamics particularly interesting – one that I did not see as clearly when authoring the chapter. So-called minority language movements (Jaffe 2007) are known to ‘counteract language domination and dominant language ideologies by turning dominant language ide-

ologies against the group which invented them in the first place’ (p. 50; also Heller 2006, 28–29; Woolard & Schieffelin 1994, 60). Commonly, these groups seek recognition as being ‘official’ in some legal sense. As Pujolar (2007, 76) notes, minority groups commonly achieve this goal by reorienting their strategies away from seeking recognition within the state, instead reaching out to supranational legal frameworks, such as the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (see e.g., Muehlmann & Duchêne 2007). Indeed, this pattern corresponds to the Swedish case, where five national minority languages were recognized through the charter in 2000. However, the Swedish case indeed adds an interesting angle to these dynamics, since, as study 1 argues, the legal imposition of the majority language as the principal language has gone via the minority languages, in the sense that Swedish came to be piggy-backing on the position of minority languages, in order to secure legal status at the top of ‘the linguistic hierarchy of Sweden’ (see Hult 2012, 242, following Josephson 2004a, 128). Fundamentally, this strategy was achieved through the labor of minoritizing the majority, that is, by ascribing to Swedish the position of being a minority language in a European perspective (e.g., Hyltenstam 1996, 1999). Accordingly, in relation to English Swedish could be seen as potentially exhibiting traits of ‘the minority language syndrome’ (e.g., Mac Mathúna & Ó Corráin 1998). As Teleman (2003, 234) acknowledges, grasping the situation in the perspective of the minority languages was inspired by ideological currents deriving from post-colonial contexts. In so doing, agents of the field subsequently invoked into the discourse a set of taxonomic models (Martin-Jones 2007, 164ff.) created in order to establish the degree of vitality of marginalized lesser-known, and politically dominated languages, with which the position of Swedish could be juxtaposed (Salö 2012, 51; see Melander 1997; Josephson 2004b for examples).

## 7.2 Study 2: The sociolinguistics of academic publishing

### 7.2.1 Preliminaries – understanding publishing language relationally

The previously reviewed study 1 points to a process of historical labor whereby the number of domains alleged to be threatened were narrowed down over time, until research and higher education was the last outpost of the struggles of the LPP field. At the universities, it seems as though the predominance of English has come the furthest in scientific publishing (e.g., Gunnarsson & Öhman 1997; see also section 3.3) and, in LPP discourse, language choice in publishing has been a question of central concern since the 1990s (Teleman 1992). It is noteworthy, however, that one may question the usefulness of understanding the complexity of publishing practices as primarily a choice, and if so, a choice about language *per se*. It is common-

place to say that invoking the lexical item ‘choice’ imposes certain obligations, as it willy-nilly imports with it a particular epistemological stance on humans as acting subjects and their degree of control over their own linguistic behavior (Duranti 2006, 453). This well-known structure–agency dichotomy is a classic zone of conflict in the social sciences, where it is often discussed along the continuum from Sartre’s free will to Levi Strauss’ structural determinism (e.g., Paton 2007; also Bourdieu & Chartier 2015, 41). It seems clear that ‘internalist’ accounts that place ‘language choice’ solely on the part of the individuals run a clear risk of overestimating agency and what is often thought to be the free will of rational, calculating agents. Conversely, at the other ‘externalist’ end of the continuum lies the risk of overemphasizing structure as a deterministic force where individuals’ capacity to act freely is reduced to nothing. Bourdieu’s position on this matter, broadly, is that ‘[w]e can always say that individuals make choices, as long as we do not forget that they do not choose the principle of these choices’ (cited in Wacquant 1989a, 45).

As a metatheoretic postulate, study 2 argues that understanding the practice of the decider entails accounting for the conditions in which language choices are made, which includes analyzing the ways in which these conditions have arisen historically and that are therefore ‘pre-judging his judgements and so shaping his judgement’ (Bourdieu 1990b, 49–50). One of Bourdieu’s most famous studies is *Homo Academicus* (1988), an analysis of French academia as a field. The scientific field, according to Bourdieu’s work in this area, is ‘a world in which there is a struggle for legitimacy, but there is a struggle over this legitimacy’ (Bourdieu & Chartier 2015, 72). Study 2 subscribes to these ideas to compute publishing language as a question with important bearing on such struggles. Opting for this approach, it seeks to contribute to a better understanding of language use in academic publishing. Here, Bourdieu invokes the notion of habitus, agents’ dispositions, and feel for the scientific game. Yet, Bourdieu cannot be used to argue that the language of publishing can be explained only by reference to scholarly habitus. Rather, the complexity of this issue resides in the relation between socialized and interested agents and the universes of possibilities engendered throughout the history of disciplinary fields. Understanding language choice therefore entails a relational approach, that is, a research design informed by relational thinking (cf. section 5.2).

### 7.2.2 Summary of study 2

Study 2 centers on the issue of publishing language in historical and contemporary times. The study combines a historicist approach with an account of the realizations of history in contemporary academia and its dwellers. Insights from Bourdieu’s (e.g., 2004) conception of science constitute the main theoretical and methodological guiding light, and his pivotal concepts field

and habitus serve both as ‘topics and tools’ (cf. Wacquant 2009b). The main objective here is to bring empirical specificity and an in-depth, relational understanding of the ever-increasing predominance of English in publishing across contemporary Swedish academia, where research practices are progressively gearing toward transnational marketplaces. While evidence of this fact has been presented in quantitative studies (e.g., Salö 2010), study 2 seeks to add an explanatory perspective to language choice in publishing practices by uniting strands of research from the history, sociology, and language of science. In this light, study 2 presents a historical and sociological account of the practice of scientific publishing in two disciplines of Swedish academia: history and psychology. This is accomplished by adopting a Bourdieusian historical approach, which takes as its uncompromising starting point that a scientific field is invariably defined by its own history (Broady 1991, 55). To Bourdieu, every discipline, as we can perceive and examine it in the here and now, is the outcome of a ‘more or less overt struggle over the definition of the legitimate principles of division of the field’ (Bourdieu 1985, 208).

Methodologically, study 2 implements Bourdieu’s imperative advice to take two objects of study, one in the present and one in the past (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992, 234–235). Adopting this relational principle, the notion of field is employed to account for the sociologic history of disciplines, and, as a result, engenders a unified account of sociology and the long and short histories of the two disciplines. Habitus, on the other hand, is employed to uncover these histories in their embodied forms – in professors and doctors that carry the values of their disciplinary fields within them (e.g., Bourdieu 2004). In turn, this procedure brings with it two diverse strands of data. In accounts of field histories, quantitative data is meshed with recontextualizations of prior historiographic accounts, resulting in a form of ‘thick construction’<sup>4</sup> of disciplinary developments. In its contemporary, embodied form – in habitus – this history is accessible by interviewing field agents.

Results show that historical struggles have maneuvered the fields of history and psychology in different directions, in particular since the mid-20th century. Up until this point, agents of both fields published for the most part in Swedish. After World War II, however, psychology managed to break loose from its historical ties to other disciplines that had stalled the development of an experimental approach to knowledge production (e.g., Nilsson 1978). Related to central-European turbulence, the U.S. emerged at this point in time as a new intellectual hub of the international scene toward which a number of influential field-founders of Swedish psychology swiftly

---

<sup>4</sup> This term was used by L.J.D. Wacquant at the workshop ‘Thick Construction: Engaging Bourdieu’s Theories in Research Practice’, Uppsala Univ., Nov. 6, 15. See study 2, note 1.

began orienting. Since then, publishing patterns have been firmly established in the psychological field, including the use of English in publications. However, in the field of history during the first half of the 19th century, the struggles unfolded over values pertaining to national schools of thought. The outcome of these struggles did not in the same manner pave the way for an international research agenda, but rather cemented the tradition of maintaining the national paradigm in historical research. Language, as it were, was not a weapon in these struggles.

In the new millennium, new ways of managing research performance came into place within Swedish research policy (e.g., Rider et al. 2011). In Sweden as elsewhere, these transformations worked in favor of transnational science, enforced through the schemes of the neoliberal university and a metric culture surfacing in its wake. As an outcome of these struggles, universities nowadays compete to pull rank on the global ranking system (e.g., Kauppi & Erkkilä 2011). In research policy, accordingly, there has been a shift from trust-based funding to performance-based funding (Sörlin 2007). Taken together, these transformations have created an increased impetus for publishing in international indexed journals, which entails publishing in English. One argument embarked upon in the study, then, is that contemporary techniques of assessing and rewarding performance by the imposition of performance-based schemes have sociolinguistic implications: they strengthen the position of English in academic publishing. These implications, however, are not as palpably reflected across all fields. In psychology, the use of English has been the default mode of written scientific production for more than half a century. In history, however, other stakes have long prevailed, for example, the practice of publishing Swedish-language monographs. The study argues that contemporary transformations of the university field are currently setting the stage for a new form of struggle within some of the disciplinary fields it comprises – the field of history being a case in point. In one sense, the contemporary political vision of the academic field, and the tools used to enforce this vision, bring along a severe form of misrecognition of the values long-upheld in this field, since they do not recognize the value of the practices that acute the agents in the historical field (cf. Lee & Lee 2013, 225–226; Putnam 2009, 132). At the same time, however, this misrecognition opens the way for new options for newcomers, that is, junior researchers and doctoral candidates, to enter the field. Thus, the study points to the emergence of a *new scientific habitus*, molded by newcomers' desire to be relevant in the field. In history, new investment strategies seem connected to the use of English in academic publishing, which is to say that English can currently be seen as part and parcel of young challengers' attempts to gain competitive positions within the field. Currently, study 2 holds, history seems to be undergoing a process whereby English and the position it bargains for emerges as a new form of currency, a sub-form of symbolic capital

that can be strategically accumulated by the agents of the field as part of their subversion strategies (e.g., Broady 1983, 50). This is so because while publishing in English is an avowed investment strategy as a new inroad to gaining scientific authority, these new strategies devalue the capital of the dominant agents. Accordingly, the study predicts that English will continue to make inroads into the field of history over the years to come, and by virtue of this fact, change in the field is likely to follow – albeit subject to forthcoming struggles.

### 7.2.3 Study 2: commentary

Study 2 is faced with some of the fundamental problems entailed by carrying out historical analysis on academic fields. First and foremost, it is of course difficult to know for sure the ways in which historical events actually contributed to changing publishing practices. As an analyst of historical events, one can always propose that seemingly non-related outcomes are linked to each other; yet, clearly, there are myriad factors potentially involved. This line of potential criticism applies to study 1 too. In accounting for historical entanglements, it seems, we can only endeavor to produce accounts that come across as exhibiting believability among other scholars well-positioned to assess the arguments produced. At any rate, as study 2 illustrates, researchers engaged in scientific fields do seem to have the capacity to reflect upon the values circulating in their respective fields – and act accordingly. Agents of the scientific field, in other words, have a reflexive awareness of external pressures and demands (Hilgers & Mangez 2015b, 20). This would also suggest that scholars have agency to publish in whatever language they desire as long as there are possibilities for doing so. Habitus, thus, can very well encompass strategic thinking in a more calculated sense (Wacquant 1989a, 45). As Hillier and Rooksby (2005a, 22) put it, ‘strategic calculation may well be fully conscious, becoming unconscious with time as the same or similar situations are repeatedly encountered.’

It follows from the above that the line of analysis outlined in study 2 could offer some purchase in understanding contemporary fluxes in other fields, too, albeit perhaps in combination with additional methodologies. Although disciplines will be shaped by their own histories of struggle, the logic of things presented for the field of history is, I would argue, in many respects valid for other fields; that is, changing dispositions to publishing are likely to be found elsewhere in the humanities and beyond – among newcomers, in particular (e.g., Hammarfelt & de Rijcke 2014). It seems likely that the stance people take in this matter will correspond to their position in social space, and in relation to their past investments. Is it good or bad that English is used increasingly in publishing? Most likely it is a combination of the two. For the time being, my position here *pace* Heller is



that my job is first to describe and to explain, and only then decide how I feel about what I understand to be going on and what, if anything, I should do about it. In that sense, I understand my role as one of a notice of important and interesting things, a producer of accounts of them, and an interlocutor with other stakeholders about them. (Heller 2011, 11)

It is evident that the use of English in publishing has a number of advantages linked to the production of particular forms of knowledge at the forefront of research, in dialogue with those who participate there. In many, albeit not all, areas of knowledge production, the research front is transnational (cf. Bourdieu 2000, 98). This fact, thus, has little to do with English *per se*, but the question of publishing language is entangled with an array of coterminous transformations that are mainstreaming publication practices in ways that are not beneficial to all forms of knowledge production (e.g., Paasi 2005). In evaluating this development, it seems useful to re-invoke the notion of the state as speaking with a forked tongue (cf. section 3.2.2). Research policy-wise, the observed gearing toward transnational publishing markets is in line with the state's will; hence, publishing in English is a prerequisite for the much-desired internationalization of research. Yet, from the outlook of language policy, the observed development seems troublesome, since, in effect, it constricts the field of possibilities for using Swedish in academic publishing. On this latter point, scholarship and state-mandated LPP must explicate why it is a problem that English is used more and more in publishing, since, currently, we have limited knowledge about the causal effects of the observed developments. To the extent that they exist, such problems should be subjected to empirical inquiry rather as a complement to the general debate, based on anecdotes or educated assessments of likely long-term effects. On this point, then, much more research is needed.

### 7.3 Study 3: The linguistic sense of placement

#### 7.3.1 Preliminaries – assessing market conditions in practice

As study 2 as well as other studies attest, it is by now a well-known fact that English prevails in publishing across many fields of Swedish academia (see also 3.2 here). Academic publishing, though, pertains to a transnational form of communication in which the use of supranational languages has always occurred (Hyltenstam 1999, 217). However, significantly less is known about the sociolinguistic state of affairs of other practices of academic life. These questions matter, because they lie at the heart of the question of the unification of the linguistic market in Sweden (cf. Bourdieu 1977a). From the perspective of state-sanctioned LPP, that Swedish people speak Swedish to each other is an important regime of language to uphold, since it indexes a shared orientation to a set of state-organized indexicalities (Blommaert 2006,

515). For instance, we can see this position mirrored in a soothing, yet situated, comment by Hyltenstam (1999, 217), namely that Swedish begins to ‘lose domains’ only when communication between Swedish speakers within the national arena increasingly takes place in English.

From the outlook of publishing language, it could be presumed that Swedish, in some globalized scientific fields, is absent as a scientific language. As noted in section 3.4.1, more or less strong versions of this conception have been voiced in Swedish LPP discourse. This question is studied empirically in study 3. Like study 2, this study undertakes the task of understanding matters traditionally seen as pertaining to ‘language choice’. While both studies apprehend this phenomenon to be an outcome of practice, there are differences in the ways this broad phenomenon is approached. In study 2 the matter at issue pertains to language choice in publishing, where focus is placed on the space of possibilities offered to researchers who publish in particular fields. Study 3 more closely examines language choice in the sort of translanguaging practices (Canagarajah 2013a) that occur in the global contact zones of contemporary academia, in other words, the empirical realities that unfold in Swedish everyday university life.

In study 3, this situation is contemplated with the help of Bourdieusian insight. As such, the study builds on insights that bear similarities to Heller’s (1996) attempt to understand language choice, ‘the *how* of speaking’ (p. 144), through the prism of Bourdieu’s notion of legitimate language, which she expands to also encompass acceptability in multilingual settings. From this position, Heller holds that ‘[w]ho we are constrains to whom we can speak, under what circumstances, and [...] *how*’ (1996, 140). Basically, Heller’s interest is concerned with why particular sets of resources are perceived as being legitimate, while others are not, in a given social setting (p. 141). While study 3 has a similar agenda, the analytical pursuit here differs from this position in that it does not seek to account for the space that endows people’s linguistic performances with authority (Bourdieu 1977a, 659), but rather the reflexive incorporation of such authority, imbued in the linguistic habitus of the individual through historical exposure to language ideology (e.g., Hanks 2005, 69–72). That is, the study is concerned with incorporated social conditions linked to legitimate language and therefore seeks to address social and linguistic interrelationships in terms of how speakers comprehend their own discursive engagements (ibid., 69). Ultimately, however, I believe that the same issues are being explored by opting for this approach. One of the insights that the metaprinciple of ‘relational thinking’ brings with it is that ‘[s]ocial reality exists, so to speak, twice, in things and in minds, in fields and in habitus, outside and inside of agents’ (Bourdieu, quoted in Wacquant 1989a, 43).

### 7.3.2 Summary of study 3

Study 3 explores the place for Swedish in the research practices of Swedish academia. This is accomplished by adopting an approach that privileges process over product. The study takes an interest in discourse in the research practices preceding texts as finalized objects in two disciplines where English prevails in publishing: computer science and physics. Three main conceptual ideas are drawn upon: *entextualization* (e.g., Bauman & Briggs 1990), *translingual practice* (e.g., Canagarajah 2013a), and *habitus* (e.g., Bourdieu 1989). Broadly, entextualization shifts the analytical focus from product to process (e.g., Vigouroux 2009), that is, the continuous chain of practice whereby texts co-productively take shape. These practices can be seen as translingual, firstly, in the zoomed out sense that the outcome of the entextualizing process, namely, the finalized text, will be in a language that does not necessarily correspond to the discourse that feeds into its production. In this case, the texts are in English, aimed for an international readership and publishing market, but the yield of research collaborations in non-Anglophone Sweden, where languages other than English are used by the participants involved. Secondly, zooming in on the discourse in such collaborations, a translingual gaze can foreground the fact that scholars draw on whatever resources that they have at their disposal to engage in communication (e.g., Jørgensen et al. 2011). While the discourse produced in these settings unfolds ‘between and across languages’ (Canagarajah 2013b, 1), it does exhibit certain broad regularities, and to account for these, the study adopts habitus as both the topic and tool of investigation (Wacquant 2009b).

To account empirically for text trajectories, the study employs the techniques of participant observation and interviewing, but also of backtracking into the history of text-artifacts with the aim of recovering discourse in their production. In sum, then, this study draws on a broad dataset that includes interviews, email correspondence, drafts, and audio recordings from research meetings. From this outlook, the milieus studied were shown to be saturated by English, a language present in the books that are read, the papers written, the topics discussed, and the seminars attended at Swedish universities – as well as in the repertoires of many who jointly engage in the research enterprise. However, the results of study 3 show that Swedish was practiced throughout in the text production so long as it encompassed all participants’ repertoires. Due to this fact, technical and discipline-specific Swedish discourse occurs both orally (e.g., in meetings), and in writing (e.g., in email correspondence). In fact, in the interviews, the Swedish-speaking researchers pointed to an almost physical awkwardness linked to the unwarranted use of English among themselves.

Following Bourdieu (1991a), study 3 argues that these sensibilities pertain to the *linguistic sense of placement* of socialized agents, which prevents them from lapsing into what is socially perceived as unacceptable discourse

in their translingual practices. The gist of this argument can be summarized as follows: There are markets in which forms of discourse are attributed value as part of historical processes. As individuals live their lives, they move through and across these markets, and, by virtue of this fact, they invariably become sensible to these valorizations. This sense pertains both to a practical knowledge of the valorization of resources in different markets and to the valorization of their own linguistic assets in relation to the sanctions of censorships of those markets. A person's linguistic sense of placement is therefore a form of practical relational knowledge with important bearing on his or her discursive engagements, where it operates as self-censorship. Crucially, then, the imperative logic upholding Swedish as 'the natural' choice among Swedish speakers operates as built into the practices and habitus of people, where it serves as an incorporated guiding sense and bodily skill endowed on Swedish speakers. As study 3 (p. 513) summarizes: 'As long as Swedish researchers continue to see Swedish as the accepted language among Swedish speakers, Swedish will have its place as a scientific language in Sweden.'

### 7.3.3 Study 3: commentary

Adopting a critical stance to many of the foundations of Bourdieu's work, Bohman (1999, 140) has argued that human agents – not just sociologists – are 'reflexive in ways that are crucial for their ability to become aware of and change the conditions under which they act and speak.' In light of study 3, I would say that there is ample room for this insight within Bourdieu's work on language, which accordingly seems more attuned to reflexivity than Bohman appears to hold. This is so because Bourdieu's conception of language, or so it seems to me, is sensitive to questions about individuals' abilities to know the value both of their own resources and of those that circulate in the markets where they dwell. This demonstrates that people have the capacity to anticipate profit, based on a practical sense for the production and reception of linguistic expressions (Thompson 1984, 52). In my view, this insight provides the basis for a potentially powerful research program, which is to say that agents' linguistic sense of placement could be worth studying in other empirical settings. Study 3 illustrates also that Bourdieu's work on language in society do not have to be overtly macro-laden. On the contrary, Bourdieu's perspectives can be drawn on to foreground the dual existence of language ideologies – in things and in bodies (Bourdieu 2000, 181).

On study 3, however, a number of additional issues ought to be raised. Firstly, it may be discussed to what extent the Swedish revealed in the practices is 'sufficiently' scientific, so to speak, given that it is foremost put into practice in mundane communicative practices and the oral and written academic performances that emerge in such practices. This may be what one of

the physicists who were interviewed refers to as ‘informal language use’ (study 3, extract 10), where discourse is invariably offered to markets other than those of the heightened discourse of the published academic text. This circumstance raises the issue of how scientific discourse must be in order to avoid the alleged negative effects that have been foregrounded in Swedish LPP debates of recent years. Partly, albeit in another discipline, this question is addressed in study 4, which will be presented next.

Secondly, it must be stated that the collaborations studied in the two disciplines were chosen because they were made up of Swedish-speaking researchers. For the objectives of the study, these settings were purposely selected. Yet, it seems clear here from study 2 that English is used habitually in discursive exchanges involving non-Swedish speakers. It follows that the likelihood that at least one participant in an event is a non-Swedish speaker naturally increases in highly globalized settings. To exemplify this likelihood, one of the researchers involved in this study claimed that more than half of the PhD students in her department were English speakers. ‘English speakers’ here serves as a label for all people who are not Swedish speakers, since these are colleagues whose participation in different events eliminates the option of using Swedish. To this group of staff, the researcher includes virtually all the department’s post docs, and, as she puts it, ‘it is only among the old-timers that it is more common with Swedish speakers.’ It is therefore an open question as to what extent linguistic practices can exhibit change according to increased international staff mobility, in step with fluctuations in human capital in the current era of internationalization. This boils down to a point of controversy concerning the position of the Other in Swedish academia, and the question of the reproduction of the speech community (also) in globalizing contexts.

This second point requires additional comments, which dig deep into the research practice. Holmen (e.g., 2012) has rightly argued that the focus on the power balance between national languages and English in higher education invariably tends to yield accounts that are insensitive to all other languages spoken in the very same settings. As Paasi (2005, 770) similarly notes, accounts of this sort tend to reproduce binary divisions between Anglophone versus the rest of the world, accounts that ‘hide the fact that these contexts are in themselves heterogeneous and modified by power geometries.’ This argument seems valid also in respect to the internationalizing environments explored in study 3. Hence, all fellow researchers not perceived as being able to communicate in Swedish sufficiently are referred to by the informant as ‘English speakers’, while, in fact, they might be Germans, Italians, Senegalese, Japanese, etc. That is, they are grouped as English-speaking Others from the perspective of the Swedish-speaking majority. One could argue that this perception is also built into the very design of the study, where, accordingly, only forms of translingualism pertaining to Swe-

dish and English are brought to the fore; quite likely, quite a few other languages also feed into the production of English-language texts written in Sweden. Because of the questions asked in study 3, these issues were not accounted for in any elaborate way. More studies on these matters are therefore needed, and as a part of such a pursuit, it seems vital to be particularly sensitive to the manifold forms of symbolic domination enacted in this particular social institution (e.g., Heller 1995).

However, it could also be that the absence of these perspectives was rendered significant by the framework employed. The argument embarked upon in study 3 is that the language ideological imperative 'Swedish among Swedish speakers' is incorporated among the agents involved in the processes of text production studied, as long as all participants speak Swedish. If one or more participants do not speak Swedish sufficiently, English will typically be used. Clearly, there is an element of 'politeness' here, where language is a medium for inclusion. Yet, as a base line, language is also an effective means for excluding people from communication and of condemning individuals to silence. I therefore see politeness as having a limited explanatory value to account for language choice, not least in cases where individuals' whole 'social worth' is not valued highly enough to have Swedish speakers shifting into English – in spite of the physical presence of non-Swedish speaking participants. I feel confident that Bourdieu would agree that being polite hardly constitutes a core value in linguistic practice – at least not in relation to all potential participants. At the same time, however, this issue feeds into the idea of 'sharedness' in Bourdieu's work – that is, the notion of groups of individuals having values, beliefs, or dispositions in common. Here, common dispositions are seen as engendering a particular doxa in practice, ultimately because these dispositions 'are the product of an identical or similar socialization leading to the generalized incorporation of the structures of the market of symbolic goods in the form of cognitive structures in agreement with the objective structures of that market' (Bourdieu 1998, 121). On this point, it seems important to concede to parts of the critique directed toward Bourdieu's emphasis on language legitimacy in unified markets (e.g., Blommaert et al. 2005; Martin-Jones 2007; Swigart 2001; Woolard 1985). The potential risk, as I see it, is that the analyst loses the emphasis on power by invoking the idea of 'acceptability' as a force dictating discourse, since ideas about what is acceptable also have a history of construction, rooted in the era of unifying the markets, 'characterized by cultural intolerance; more generally, by nonendurance of, and impatience with all difference' (Bauman 1990, 161). This skepticism is akin to much of the general critique against Bourdieu's general conception of human action (as outlined above). It is rooted in a fact that should be acknowledged, namely that Bourdieu's theorizing, at least to a large extent, builds on stable

societies where the idea of shared dispositions makes sense in a way that might not be the case in the globalizing realities of contemporary social life (e.g., Archer 2007). As Bohman (1999, 147) argues, ‘[t]he more pluralistic a society is the less likely it is that its integration can be achieved pre-reflectively in common dispositions, even in sub-groups’ (1999, 147). What it points to, arguably, is that many of Bourdieu’s perspectives cannot be straightforwardly employed without ample consideration, and, often, adjustment. Accordingly, there is now interesting scholarly work on habitus in the 21st century (e.g., Adams 2006; Hillier & Rooksby 2005b, 10ff., 2005c; Sweetman 2003). Hilgers and Mangez (2015b, 18), for example, argue that ‘because agents are rarely socialized in one single universe, they often have a “cleft habitus”.’

Additionally, and related somewhat, as a part of the whole, there is one point at which study 3 is liable to criticism from a relational point of view. In study 3, habitus is employed to account for social reality in its embodied forms. However, following Bourdieu, social reality also has a mode of existence outside of agents, in fields and markets (e.g., Bourdieu 1990a, 190–191, 2000, 181; Wacquant 1989a, 43f.). It can be argued that this ‘outside’ existence of social reality has not been investigated. We can say that the study presupposes that there is a market (Silverstein 1996, 299), and that the sustained existence of this market serves as the backdrop for explaining agents’ practices of inculcation. From a relational point of view, this explanation would have been strengthened had there have been a study that, in its own right, focused on the unification of this market as a sociohistorical process of price formation, one ‘by which a unified and asymmetrically structured linguistic market was formed’ (Thompson 1984, 44, emphasis removed). To my knowledge, such a study focusing on the Swedish linguistic market has yet to be written. In my view, Gal and Irvine (1995) provide a viable conceptual pathway for understanding such processes, historically permeated with misrecognition of difference (p. 972), which homogenizes forms of communication – not least through inculcation of legitimate language in schools (e.g., Heller 1996; Karrebæk 2013) or labor markets, access to which often entails knowledge in the state language (Williams 2010, 197). Future analysts would need to ground such a pursuit in ‘the modern “nationalization” of the state, i.e. from the bid of the modern state to linguistic, cultural and ideological unification of the population which inhabits the territory under its jurisdiction’ (Bauman 1990, 160). Here, the analyst is likely to encounter a history involving the ‘institutionalized maintenance of certain valued linguistic practices’ (Silverstein 1996, 285), as a way of imposing legitimate Swedish as a unifying emblem of nation-statehood and thus as part and parcel of the process whereby Swedish came to be construed as ‘the bearer of Swedish culture’ (Milani 2007b, 174) as a way of explaining the position of Swedish as ‘the natural common language’ also in globalizing

settings (e.g., study 3, p. 520). As noted in study 4, which will be reviewed next, it is ultimately an outcome of the political dimensions of language use that given languages come to dominate particular key practices of a society.

## 7.4 Study 4: Performance of unprecedented genres

### 7.4.1 Preliminaries – knowing language, performing language

Like study 3, study 4 is driven by the spirit to bring specificity to the question of English and Swedish in academia. Study 4 delves deeper into the question about the place for Swedish in Swedish academia, here more precisely concerning the extent to which Swedish is a ‘usable’ language there. ‘Usable’ here refers to the employment of this term in the Swedish Language Act, which states that Swedish ‘is to be usable in all areas of society’ (*Språklag* 2009, section 5). This phrasing has a history of its own in the preparatory work preceding the act. It was designed to encompass the meaning of the language political aim of having Swedish ‘complete and society bearing’, as coined in early language political texts (e.g., *Mål i mun* 2002; Svenska språknämnden 1998; Teleman & Westman 1997). This aim of maintaining Swedish ‘complete’ is utterly a question of pan-functionality, that is, of having the language capable of being used in all areas where there is a need to use it (Melander 2005, 195). ‘Society bearing,’ or ‘essential to society’ as it is often translated, is more linked to the position of the language as the state-mandated official language, used in legislation and other public contexts (e.g., *Declaration on a Nordic Language Policy* 2006). The emphasis of Swedish as ‘serving and uniting our society’ (*Mål i mun* 2002, official English translation p. 1), moreover taps into cultural heritage, and of having a language – in this case Swedish – keeping together the Swedish language society (see Milani 2007b). The two terms have been commonly used as a pair, and as such, as a way of setting the objectives toward which ‘domain loss’ poses a threat (study 1, 95). In subsequent policy documents, however, the meaning of this two-folded aim was thought to be encompassed in the less technical phrasing ‘usable in all areas of society’ (*Bästa språket* 2005, 16; *Språk för alla* 2008, 17; *Värna språken* 2008, 216).

Few would argue against the idea that universities play an important role in expanding competence over prestige registers of a language (cf. Agha 2005a, 51, 2007). This, however, is a complicated question, insofar as it taps into a range of other questions. On closer inspection, the idea of usability encompasses at least two interrelated aspects. Firstly, at an abstract, collective level, the language ‘itself’ must embrace sufficient resources, such as terminology or socio-historically merged patterns of discursive formations, such as genres and registers. This view, notably, pertains to matters of ‘expanding the effective meaning potential of a language’ (Halliday 2006, 354).



From this vantage point, Swedish can be envisioned as ‘the set-theoretic union of all of its registers’ (Silverstein 1998, 412). Secondly, there needs to be people to whom the linguistic resources at hand in the language are recognizable. These are reflexive processes: individuals’ abilities to make use of these resources reconnect to the first aspect, in that registers, essentially, are products of activity (Agha 2007, 80ff.; Karlander 2015). In relation to this language political aim, two interrelated problems have been pointed out; that is, two broad senses in which Swedish might not be usable. As noted in section 3.4, firstly, there is the fear that the Swedish language might not – now or in some future – have the semiotic resources to entextualize complicated academic thought. To my knowledge, it has never been asserted that Swedish on the whole is unusable in Swedish academic life. The matter at hand instead concerns specialized registers and genres, or ‘discourse patterns’ (Gunnarsson 2001b; Melander 2001). Secondly, to the extent that discursive formations of language resources do exist to a satisfying degree, there might not – again, now or in some future – be individuals who have the competence to draw on these resources, due to lack of ability among Swedish researchers to render their expertise sufficiently well in Swedish. Study 4 seeks to scrutinize these concerns in light of empirical data, and it does so in a disciplinary field where the dominance of English seems complete in publishing: computer science.

#### 7.4.2 Summary of study 4

Study 4 investigates the sociolinguistic repertoire and writing practices of a Swedish computer science researcher, anonymized as Kim Lind, and his first-time performance of two scientific texts in Swedish: a thesis abstract and a scientific report. Analytically, the study focuses on the ways in which resources biographically merged in his *sociolinguistic repertoire* (e.g., Blommaert & Backus 2013) come into play in the performances of two scientific genres into which the registers of computerese Swedish are fitted.

Established in Sweden in the 1960s, computer science in Sweden is a new scientific field that has seen no changeover from Swedish to English, since the discipline was introduced in English. Drawing on Agha’s (e.g., 2007) notion of *registers*, the study argues that, as a consequence, written computerese Swedish has no historical anchorage in the social practices of this discipline. To computer scientists who perchance endeavor to use computerese Swedish in writing, texts-to-text relationships cannot be drawn from as models of action, at least not in any straightforward sense. In the article, these texts are comprehended as belonging to ‘unprecedented genres’, a term evoked to capture the peculiar two-sided situation whereby a researcher, without much prior experience with similar tasks, faces the challenge of writing texts in discourse genres (Hanks 1987) where Swedish has almost never been used. The study argues that such a scenario pertains to a form of

microcosm in which the usability of Swedish in computer science can be put to the test, that is, for situating ‘having a language usable’ in practice.

On the general outline of a Swedish computer scientist’s sociolinguistic repertoire, study 4 begins by accounting for the language knowledge of the study’s participant, Kim Lind. Drawing on interviews with Lind, the study identifies on the one hand highly specialized skills in academic genres and scientific registers of English, and on the other, a broad range of experiences using Swedish as a result of Kim’s past and present linguistic encounters across social life – in and outside academia. Having obtained this biographical set of information, the study probes into Lind’s writing practices. The dataset drawn on here includes observational data, consisting of field notes, soundscape, and video recordings, which were obtained from teaching and research meetings. Moreover, the dataset includes documented text revisions, as well as metadiscursive feedback comments and certain documents that had an important supportive function in Kim’s writing practices. In analyzing these data, *interdiscursivity* (e.g., Silverstein 2005) is the key theoretical idea, serving as it does as a lens to foreground construed connectivity between different discursive events – across modes and language boundaries. In the study, this idea serves to link Kim’s writing practices not necessarily to other texts but to other forms of events using discourse. In this vein, this notion allows the analyst to pay attention to forms of connectivity that are established across different time-and-space-bound events of using language: across modes (e.g., oral–written), languages (e.g., English–Swedish), or genres (e.g., scientific talk–thesis abstract). Following this idea, the results of study 4 in summary are the following: Kim Lind lacks experience in writing scientific Swedish and neither does he seem to have a clear sense of the target genre. Lacking the option of drawing from experience with Swedish scientific texts, study 4 shows how Kim construes type and token interdiscursive connectivities (e.g., Silverstein 2005) from iconic Swedish and English texts and from prior discursive events in which academic Swedish is used orally. We encounter here a number of particular register shibboleths, which index that the register is in use (Silverstein 2003, 212). The study concludes that Kim Lind manages to write the two texts in computerese Swedish by virtue of drawing on the knowledge won through other discursive encounters. This outcome suggests that the resources comprising an individual’s repertoire are significantly transposable across languages, modes, and genres, when they are enacted in new discursive events. However, as the study argues, this does not really mean that Swedish by all standards is usable; rather, it brings into question what this language political aim can or should entail.

### 7.4.3 Study 4: commentary

Interdiscursivity insights may be useful to studies that deal with genres. Whereas intertextuality, text-to-text interrelationships, has long been a common theme in genre studies, the notion of interdiscursivity has not been commonly employed (Pérez-Llantada 2015, 16). Doing so could prove to have many virtues; as Slembrouck (2011, 160) notes, genres are ‘traditionally thought of as contained by a societally-defined community of practice or a language community.’ The idea of unprecedented genres, one could argue, challenges this view of genres as more or less immobile across situational contexts; on the contrary, it suggests that the devices drawn on in their performance operate across modes and language boundaries.

Theoretically, study 4 attempts to make a contribution first and foremost to currently ongoing discussions about sociolinguistic repertoires (e.g., Blommaert & Backus 2011; Busch 2015, 2012; Hall et al. 2006). With interdiscursivity as a tool, the study seeks to shed new light on the non-bounded organization of repertoires, a line of thinking that might offer some purchase for future attempts to understand language knowledge. As Agha notes:

We know that anyone who effectively engages in a given discursive encounter has participated in others before it and thus brings to the current encounter a biographically specific discursive history that, in many respects, shapes the individual’s socialized ability to use and construe utterances. (Agha 2005b, 1)

As Busch (2015, 14) ventures to highlight, the repertoire ‘is not determined solely by the linguistic resources we have, but sometimes by those we do not have, and these can become noticeable in a given situation as a gap’. Although generally aligned with these conclusions, study 4 even argues that people do not ‘have’ resources *per se*, but that the repertoire rather encompasses potential semiotic resources in the form of former practices that do not become resources until they are reenacted in new discursive events. In grasping linguistic performance in such new events, the notion of interdiscursivity is helpful, in that it ‘helps us to transcend the limits of the bounded speech event’ (Bauman 2005, 146). Commonly, however, in our view, linguistic anthropologists tend to draw on this idea as a way of pinpointing inanimate relations between discursive events or formations. Hence, as Silverstein (2005, 7) notes, events of using language can be interdiscursive ‘if they seem to form a set of some kind’, thus exhibiting likeness. While partly adhering to this view, study 4 sought to more distinctly situate the construal of interdiscursivity at the scale of human practice. Rather than pointing to properties in the relation between events, formations, and texts *per se*, interdiscursivity was here employed to highlight the construction of that relationship in practice, by people (Briggs & Bauman 1992, 163; also Irvine 2005, 72). In this orientation, study 4 was much guided by Scollon’s (e.g., 2008)

work on discourse itineraries, which is deeply committed to studying what people do with language. The research agenda was realized much due to the research interests and expertise brought to the study by the involvement of the second author, L. Hanell, Stockholm University. Hanell was not actively involved in drawing up the study design or its data collection, but contributed extensively in crafting the theoretical framework employed, as well as in analyzing the data. The actual writing up of the study was done for the most part by me, albeit in continuous dialogue with Hanell.

In addition to theoretical contributions, study 4 seeks to add empirical specificity to the question of Swedish and English in research, particularly concerning the idea of the Swedish language being ‘usable’. In conversation with Swedish and Scandinavian LPP, it may be seen as an invitation to discuss the implications of this language political aim. Clearly, this matter is dependent upon what this objective is considered to entail; we know for certain that Swedish is not usable in journals that only accept articles in English. To continue, it goes without saying that nobody knows all there is to know in a language, and surely, not all language users need to master Swedish to the same extent in order for the language to be usable. But in light of study 4, it may be speculated whether the fact that Kim Lind – one single individual – did manage to use Swedish renders the language usable. If it is true, as study 4 asserts, that LPP practices lack a solid appreciation for the meaning of this aim, then there is no way of knowing when and if the aim is not fulfilled. How, then, to evaluate the extent to which Swedish is ‘usable’? Teleman and Westman (1997), who I believe were the first to launch this principle, spoke about ‘fully-fledged Swedish’ in relation to the aim of maintaining the language ‘complete.’ They argued that one implication of this aim was that specialists in the sciences should be able to talk and write about their fields in Swedish ‘without trivializing the content’ (p. 14, my translations). Commenting on the notion of ‘usable’, Salö and Josephson (2014, 310) hold that if the need tentatively arises, a researcher should be able to write up a scientific report – even if such a need almost never occurs. Hence, at least from the perspective of state-sanctioned LPP, having Swedish usable is a question of ‘linguistic readiness’ (study 4, p. 25). Then again, it cannot be the case that all agents should have these sorts of latent linguistic skills, since that would exclude people who do not speak any Swedish whatsoever. On this issue, questions remain. In my view, study 4 does not prove that Swedish is usable so much as it brings the meaning of this phrasing from the universe of the undiscussed into the universe of discourse (cf. Bourdieu 1977b, 168). As I would argue, though, one insight offered by study 4 is that science is not ‘above’ or secluded from society along any sharp dividing lines. A researcher, then, is not exclusively part of some isolated large-scale ‘domain of science’ but is simultaneously active in a range

of practices that are embedded within one another. To a considerable extent, resources are transposable across such seemingly distinct practices. This fact is presumably of interest to the question of language usability.

## 8 Discussion

### 8.1 Moral panics?

In a web article, Deborah Cameron commented on the alarming reactions to English in Danish academia as a case of moral panics (Agovic 2010). As laid out in work from the 1970s, moral panic arises in a society, when, for example, a condition is discovered and rapidly comes to be seen as ‘a threat to societal values and interests’ (Cohen 1972, 9), accompanied by a strong premonition by so-called ‘moral entrepreneurs’ that the observed condition is likely to worsen – unless appropriate measures are taken. Typically, however, the term ‘moral panic’ assumes that the concern expressed is ‘out of proportion to the nature of the threat, that it is, in fact, considerably greater than that which a sober empirical evaluation could support’ (Goode & Ben-Yehuda 1994, 158). The framework of moral panics has also been applied to societal concerns about language (e.g., Cameron 1995; see Johnson 1999 for an overview). Drawing on this notion, Cameron seeks to stress that the fear of English in Danish academia is exaggerated and, moreover, underpinned by nostalgia for a supposed ‘golden age’ that existed prior to globalizing influxes (Agovic 2010). While traits of this interpretative model seem to apply fairly well to the Swedish case and concerns about ‘domain loss’ raised there (cf. study 1), I have not drawn on the framework of moral panics in this thesis. The reason for the decision to not do so pertains to the problem of disproportionality inherent in the framework of moral panics (e.g., Johnson 1999, 19ff.). Commentators have argued that the framework in and of itself presupposes that the concerns raised are more substantial than what is reasonable to believe, which makes moral panics a ‘polemical rather than an analytical concept’ (Waddington 1986, 258, cited in Johnson 1999, 20). This problem becomes particularly acute in cases where the problems pointed out reside in a future that cannot presently be investigated; hence, there is no way of knowing if the concerns are out of proportion (Goode & Ben-Yehuda 1994, 158; P. Jenkins 1992, 3).

In the Swedish debate on English in academia, authoritative statements have been adduced to the debate in a mixture of future probable problems and accounts of actual sociolinguistic conditions. For this reason, they are often hard to scrutinize, and, if necessary, refute. Besides, the claims can easily be defended by saying that they in fact point to potential problems in some unforeseen future, the unfolding of which no one can know for sure. To be sure, none of the studies included in this thesis can claim to foresee

the future and, while claims that are based on present sociolinguistic conditions can be scrutinized, concerns about the unfolding of these events remain to be refuted empirically. This is to say that some concerns that are expressed could be shown to have some truth to them – only time will tell. But, on the other hand,

[b]ecause the truth of the social world is the object of struggles in the social world and in the sociological world which is committed to producing the truths of the social world, the struggle for the truth of the social world is necessarily endless. (Bourdieu 2004, 115)

In reproducing this quote, I seek merely to take seriously the conditions of knowledge production and reception. Concerning the latter, I realize that the results of this thesis, in synthesis, can be read through different interpretive lenses. Concerning the former, a few comments will be made below.

## 8.2 Notes on the conditions of knowledge production

Since this thesis, and study 2 in particular, presents research on research, as well as on other practices of knowledge production, the possibilities for meta-reflexive commentary are manifold. For instance, I have suggested in this thesis that LPP is imbued with multiple objectives. In relation to this claim, the question may be raised as to what extent research too is an enterprise with multiple interests. Bourdieu stresses time and again that epistemic reflexivity invites the analyst to turn the tools used for analyzing others against oneself, the aim of which is to appropriate control over one's own knowledge production. Scientific objectification, he holds, 'is not complete unless it includes the point of view of the objectivizer and the interests he may have in objectivation' (Bourdieu 2003, 284). It can be noted on this point that in Bourdieu's study *Homo Academicus*, French academia is only the apparent object of inquiry; at some deeper meta-level, this study fulfills the secondary purpose of reflexive return, engendered by the very attempt to objectivize one's own universe (Bourdieu 1988, 1, 2003, 284; Wacquant 1989a, 32–33). Thus, to objectivize the position of the self on the battlefield of cultural production is to develop a meta-dimension of the world, ultimately with an eye toward understanding one's own investment strategies that guide one's research strategies. Hence, 'the harshest and most cruel analyses are written with the knowledge and an acute awareness of the fact that they apply to he who is writing them' (Wacquant 1989b, 3).

The insights won by exploring the principles of the research game of other fields clearly has bearing on the game in which I engage – one of which I am a newcomer. Research is a practice whereby people and groups conduct a struggle over symbolic and material assets (Broady 1990, 40). Here, the core of relational reasoning forces the analyst to see that the

knowledge produced within the confines of one's research products – for example, this thesis – is born out of the interaction between a socially inculcated habitus and a position within the scientific field (Thorpe 2015, 119). As study 2 shows, acquiring a scientific habitus is not just a matter of intellectual development; it pertains additionally to the ability to anticipate the forthcoming of the game, and the strategic adaptation to a field imbued with fierce competition. Hence, 'insights and a sense of the game – a habitus – develop with experience' (Hiller & Rooksby 2005c, 23). From a reflexive point of view, acknowledging this fact means grasping all practices – including one's own – as interested practices, 'oriented (not necessarily consciously) toward the accumulation, legitimation, perpetuation, and reproduction of particular forms of power or "capital"' (Brubaker 1993, 222). The nub of the matter is that there is an important double meaning of the notion of 'interest'. Researchers are of course driven by ample curiosity; in this sense they have come to be interested in a particular social phenomenon or research topic. But the production of knowledge on that object *per se* is avowed investment strategies, pursued in order to yield profit in the exchange of capital: it can buy entrance to the prestigious journals of the field, which may be valuable in the competition for academic positions, scientific and financial resources, etc. Sociolinguists, like other scholars, 'compete for a range of ideal stakes in the form of academic recognition, prestige, titles, and others, as well as more material forms including research grants, funding opportunities, and greater financial remuneration' (Thorpe 2015, 116).

Applied to the work comprising this thesis, there are points to be made here. By this logic, criticizing 'domain loss' can and should be seen as an investment strategy ensued by 'bringing what is undiscussed into the universe of discourse and hence criticism' (Thompson 1984, 49). Typically, undertakings of this kind raise the stakes, since they can be perceived as being part of a subversive strategy, launched to decrease the value of the investments made by previous generations in the field (Broady 1990, 34). However, fields change and so do their importances. One might argue, then, that some 20 years after the coining of 'domain loss', it was 'safe', so to speak, to make 'domain loss' into a quarry of critical sociolinguistic inquiry. To many agents of the field, this was an obsolete language notion that had already served the aim of accomplishing language political aims. Thus, it was possible to undermine 'domain loss' as a valid representation of a problem without questioning that the game of safeguarding Swedish is worth the candle. Hence, 'newcomers must, also when they develop heterodox, heretical strategies, by underpinning the belief in the value of the stakes contribute so that the game can continue' (Broady 1983, 73, my translation).

The underlying rationale behind studies 3 and 4 was to 'pierce the screen of dominant discourse' (Wacquant 2009a, 111). This striving is important, yet, somewhat problematic. As I would argue, it is crucial not to confuse the

dominant discourse of the field with the dominant discourse at large. Interestingly, scholars who endeavor to scrutinize the role of English in Swedish higher education commonly claim a form of underdog identity and commonly frame their projects as being up against the brute force of dominant discourse. That is, from the position of the analyst, the anti-English position might be falsely perceived as one of hegemonic prevalence in Swedish society at large, while it in another perspective represents the voice of a relatively marginal field – in addition, arguably, thwarted by the interests infused in research policy. The argument I seek to advance here is that in addressing previous biases, there lurks the risk of ‘bending the stick too much’ (Bourdieu & Eagleton 1994, 276). By actively resisting to reproduce what is perceived by the analyst to be the mainstream position in a particular matter, the researcher faces the risk of taking an uncritically critical stance, so that criticizing existing problematizations turns into polemics, or problem denial. This peril seems particularly pressing in the act of publishing one’s findings. In ‘creating a research space’, as Swales (1990) calls one of the rhetorical moves of the research article genre, analysts run an evident risk of erasing the complexity and nuances in previous ways of framing the issue, as a way of ascribing originality to one’s own account in its marketing in the academic marketplace.

The dominant discourse referred to above encompasses a wide array of statements produced throughout the debate about the sociolinguistic conditions of academia. Many of these claims have already been reviewed; yet, as a part of their role in the thesis as a whole, it seems apt to address their sociological nature more thoroughly. We can take as an example the assertion that Swedish is not used as a scientific language in much of national academia (e.g., Gunnarsson & Öhman 1997; Höglin 2002). What was generally meant by this – arguably – is that English is used extensively, not only in scientific publishing, but also at conferences, in teaching, seminars, and other academic practices. It seems reasonable to believe at the same time that few professional linguists would have been ready to argue that no Swedish whatsoever occurs in the English-dominated disciplines. As a crucial peculiarity of the field, however, claims of this sort were never forcefully questioned, since the field was joined in the common conviction that language policy measures had to be taken (e.g., Salö 2012). Literally reproduced, therefore, this representation of the problem traveled intertextually into some key texts of Swedish LPP (e.g., *Mål i mun* 2002), which is to say, in Grillo’s terms, that the representation of the problem was ‘taken into the institutional system through which policies are formulated and implemented’ (Grillo 1985, 2; cf. also Blackledge 2005, VII).

Taking into account the ‘social-historical conditions of possibility’ (Wacquant 1989a, 32) of the knowledge production on language in society,



it should be acknowledged that at the time of these studies (e.g., Gunnarsson & Öhman 1997, with data from 1994), the question of English was as of yet not featured on the agenda in Sweden or elsewhere in Scandinavia. Also among language planners, the question about the position of English in Sweden was new (Josephson 2002, 82), and many descriptions of the language situation thus owe much of their existence and characteristics to the interpretative scheme provided by the discourses of that time. As Bachelard notes, '[w]e ought not to be surprised at the ingenuous response to the first descriptions of an unknown world' (Bachelard 2002, 224). As such, these descriptions of empirical reality should not primarily be understood as products of scientific inquiry, but rather as the situated outcome of struggles of LPP (cf. study 1; Salö 2012). Subsequently, it may be argued that many of these assertions that were produced first and foremost were aimed at launching a debate about the rapidly changing sociolinguistic conditions in Sweden, and in representing the sociolinguistic realities of Swedish academia as they did, they nourished either-or-accounts that were easily translated into language politics. On this point, I believe that Melander and Thelander (2006b) are right in saying that measures taken to protect the Swedish language are part and parcel of a precaution strategy; that is, no one knew for sure what the sociolinguistic implications of the impact from English would be, and on that point, prevention seemed better than cure. Struggles to achieve these conditions, of course, lie at the very heart of language politics, and consequently pertain to the backbone objectives of LPP practices, which, after all, are about 'how things ought to be', not about what they are (Canagarajah 2005, 153). By the standards of LPP practice, then, this strategy was achieved without placing much emphasis on a principle commonly stressed by linguistic ethnographers, namely that 'the contexts for communication should be investigated rather than assumed' (Rampton 2007, 585). Driven by the spirit of this remark, the position taken in studies 3 and 4 is that it is nevertheless meaningful to expose these claims and representations to critical, empirical scrutiny as a way of advancing knowledge. Hence, as Bachelard posits, '[t]ruth is the daughter of debate and not that of sympathy' (cited in Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992, 177, note 132). Per this motto, the following comments are relevant:

The understanding that Swedish is absent as a scientific language across entire fields of university life seems to suggest either that Swedish researchers choose English in all their interactions, including those with other Swedish speakers, or, to the extent that Swedish is chosen, that it is not scientific Swedish. However, as studies 3 and 4 both show, this generalization overlooks discourse in research practices in which Swedish researchers use scientific Swedish in research meetings, in technical e-mail correspondence, and in other research practices. Likewise, the expressed fears related to the possibility of Swedish not being 'usable' rest upon the assumption that only

English is used for scientific purposes, and, accordingly, that the researchers' repertoires are structured by historical participation in monolingual practices of English only. This premise seems at odds with the empirical realities as they are unearthed within the work of this thesis. Whether widespread or not, the assumption that scientific Swedish is not utilized altogether is an overstatement, which as such can be interpreted as a piece of knowledge that was rendered overstated as it was transposed into ongoing LPP struggles to defend Swedish by politicizing the role of English in Sweden at large. Through such processes, in 'simplifying the field of linguistic practices' (Gal & Irvine 1995, 974) the place of scientific Swedish in everyday research practices were rendered invisible.

## 9 Key findings and concluding remarks

This thesis comprises a sociolinguistics of the social worlds of Swedish academic life, where practices and processes are brought to the fore. As a whole, it seeks to add empirical insights and an in-depth understanding to the question of Swedish and English in the globalizing marketplace of Swedish academia. In the broader discussion on contemporary transformations of academia in Sweden and beyond, the contribution of this thesis is to advance the frontiers of knowledge about language as a form of capital that is at stake. On the grounds of the studies included in this thesis, along with its summarizing chapter, the key findings presented are the following.

One oft-noted sociolinguistic consequence of globalizing processes is that the value of national languages tends to decrease in transnational communication such as that of science and research, where English currently prevails. Since the early 1990s, the debate about the position of English in Sweden has been linked to a range of foreseeable issues about language development and maintenance, competence, democratic effects, and social cohesion. As study 1 shows, this debate has been largely directed by other questions, such as the position of minority languages as well as the sociolinguistic consequences of an integrated Europe. It has revolved largely around the notion of 'domain loss', which is a language notion not yielded out of research but by the struggles of individuals and institutions of Swedish LPP, jointly committed to defending Swedish in an era in which the role of the nation-state is perceived as being challenged. Understanding 'domain loss' entails understanding that Swedish LPP is a field where the pursuit at stake is to keep the market unified through the means of the Swedish language as a reaction to globalizing processes. Here, 'domain loss' can be seen as being part and parcel of a strategy to anchor discourses on the threat from English in the state, and in this engagement, agents of the field concurrently defend the market in which their investments are placed.

Within the realms of the state, the position of English is most saliently manifested in academic publishing, which is the topic of study 2. Publishing in contemporary Swedish academia exhibits a number of issues, all of which are linked to broad and profound transformations of university life. Publishing practices in particular are regimented by forces that currently work in the favor of English. Yet, this is not so in a direct sense, but is rather coterminous with a more far-reaching process whereby universities and states increasingly compete, and where more importance is attached to journal publications in peer-reviewed journals, most of which only accept articles written in English. In light of these developments, study 2 can be read as an account of the ways in which neo-liberal forces orient scientific practices in a way that cast fields in the same mold, irrespective of the differences between them. Language is one aspect of such homogenization, insofar as policy makers are heralding a push for academics to adopt a more global perspective, thereby subjugating all fields to one dominant language regime. To scholars in most disciplines, thus, if you want to play the research game, you have to increasingly aim for the international league, and here English – and even, at times, good English – is currently a prerequisite. These global tendencies of our time thereby orient the publishing practices also of those who compete nationally and therefore have effects on scholars in fields traditionally dominated by other publishing practices. Here, English offers a new way of competing for those who currently seek to advance in the fields, since the drift towards globalizing knowledge changes the valorization of scientific capital field-internally. This development is congruent with the desires of current research policy but incongruent with current language policy. As of yet, though, we have little knowledge about the sociolinguistic consequences to which these developments may lead.

In relation to this broad vision, at any rate, a different view is projected by zooming in to the locus of practice to explore the sociolinguistic tension engendered throughout processes whereby scholars produce knowledge aimed for global publishing markets. This is what study 3 endeavors to do. It is here shown that it seems to be chiefly in the scientific texts of the English-dominated fields where the use of Swedish does not occur, and where the field of possibilities for using Swedish is slim. Thus, while it can be inferred from statistics on publishing in Sweden that English holds the predominant position in the finalizing phase of scientific writing practices in many disciplines, that Swedish is categorically not used as a scientific language cannot be. On the contrary, technical and discipline-specific Swedish is used both orally and in writing in the everyday professional lives of Swedish-speaking researchers. Because they have incorporated the conditions of the linguistic markets in which they have dwelled, they often find it awkward and inconceivable to use English when among only Swedish speakers. According to their linguistic sense of placement, using Swedish is to conform to market

conditions imbued in specific situations. As evident in study 4, the fact that Swedish is used across a range of scientific practices also seems relevant in light of the language political objective of having Swedish usable in situations where there are reasons to use Swedish. Even in cases in which Swedish has almost never had a presence in technical writing practices, it may well be possible to use Swedish when the need for doing so occurs. As a consequence, in spite of transnational transformations of university life, the Swedish language continues to expand its scientific registers, in fact also into hitherto unprecedented language practices. The gist of the argument embarked upon here is that publishing and everyday linguistic exchanges, then, are oriented to different markets that impose different forms of censorship on oral and written discourse, which is to say that texts, and the processes by which they are produced, need not be subject to regimentation by the same sets of ideologies. Language is a form of capital, and as such, it is attributed value in relation to linguistic markets. Those who use language in Swedish academia do so in a social context where different sets of market conditions converge, each setting the price to linguistic products. From this outlook, Swedish academia can be envisioned as a sociolinguistic arena where several linguistic markets congregate. What we get, then, is a tension between practices within which linguistic behavior conforms by the state-endorsed language ideology, on one side, and, on the other, practices oriented toward a marketplace at a transnational scale, thus unreachable to the regimental control of the state – albeit sanctioned with the blessing of the very same state.

The fact that languages other than English are used in extextualizing processes challenges the idea about the utter dominance of English as a language of science. By virtue of these findings, many LPP accounts pertaining to the sociolinguistics of Swedish academia must be said to have overstated the dominance of English, and, by the same token, overelaborated its implications for the Swedish language and its speakers: several central statements on English as a sociolinguistic problem yielded throughout these struggles are neither born out of research, nor borne out by research. Having said that, this insight should not be used to belittle the authority attached to English in the globalizing markets of academia today. As study 2 shows, English is part and parcel of a process that is currently making inroads into a number of core practices of academic life, which changes scholars' dispositions linked to what they do and what they should do. What is more, English is the language linked to the discursive practice of intellectual labor, which is attributed the most value in the university field of this day and age, viz. academic publishing (Putnam 2009). In many ways, then, where English as a medium plays a part these flows are mainstreaming, even homogenizing, publication practices in ways that may not be equally beneficial to all forms

of knowledge production (Paasi 2005). Neglecting this fact would mean ‘forgetting to address the asymmetrical power relations and penetrations engendered by such flows’ (Jacquemet 2005, 261). On these matters, however, there is much need for further research – to be sure, the benefits of using English are, at the same time, manifold.

The thesis seeks to demonstrate some of the perspectives that Bourdieu can contribute within common strivings to understanding language in society. These, as I have argued, are manifold, but on my own reading, the key proposition of this thesis is the impetus for implementing Bourdieu’s notion of epistemic reflexivity in the research practice, since it offers researchers the means to see the point from which they see what they see, and thereby grasp the knowledge they produce (Bourdieu 1989, 19). I have argued that writing up a thesis can potentially equate to a process of acquiring a late-life, professional habitus: a scientific habitus. This process involves learning a craft and acquiring academic forms of carriage – there is, after all, a research game, and that game unfolds whether one is aware of it or not. But, as I have argued, acquiring a scientific habitus also involves breaking with prior dispositions, such as those that have been acquired through inculcation across the lifespan. Throughout the work that led up to this thesis, I have worked in pursuit of producing, on the one hand, knowledge – namely, accounts of linguistic exchanges played out in academia, and the parts played by Swedish and English therein. But, on the other hand, I have maintained the aim of accompanying this knowledge with a form of metaknowledge, that is, a second-order knowledge that is aware of its own conditions of production, including the point of view from which it is stated. This epistemological stance was a prerequisite because of the position I had occupied in social space, and it was amplified further by the explicit ambition of engaging in two conversations: one with contemporary language studies, one with Swedish LPP. As I have attempted to show, for Bourdieu, the construction of scientific knowledge begins with a break with the preconstructed object, as a form of ‘radical doubt’ about the commonplace representations it brings to bear (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992, 235). Adopting this device, then, entails a rupture with previous viewpoints, ultimately with the goal of producing a better sociolinguistic understanding of the objects we endeavor to explore – in this case languages and linguistic exchanges in Swedish academia. Criticism in this sense advances knowledge, and on this point, I concur with the Bachelardian standpoint that unfounded assumptions are epistemological obstacles (Broady 1991, 365). Clearly, though, this enterprise is attuned to what Wacquant (2009b, 140) calls *intellectual courage*: ‘to pursue the big picture, to dig deep into the details, to ask the hard questions, even when this entails ruffling a few social and academic feathers along the way.’

For a long time, the topic of English in Swedish academia has been addressed from the view of common sense – but from a particular view of

common sense, viz. that of Swedish LPP (see Teleman 2003, 251). At its heart, therefore, the thesis contributes to an understanding of what LPP is and how it functions. In particular, the notion of field offers an interpretive frame in which people's strivings can make sense and where language ideological labor can accordingly be grasped scientifically. To these ends, the notion of field invites the analyst to 'interpret the meaning of linguistic expressions *in relation to* the social and historical conditions in which they are produced and received' (Thompson 1984, 66, emphasis added). I argue that without a concept such as field, the representations of Swedish LPP would run the risk of being perceived and even portrayed as the outcome of unsuccessful research. This thesis does not concur with such a conclusion. As Blommaert (2005b, 43) has noted, '[i]f we want to explain the way in which people make sense socially, in real environments, we need to understand the contexts in which such sense-making practices develop.' Contrary to the idea of poor scholarship, the notion of field adds a useful lens through which to research language ideological debates, where stakes and interests are brought to the fore, while at the same time acknowledging that discourse production on English is not necessarily deliberately orchestrated. This allows us to analyze the debate on English not only as being oddly provincial with weak connections to international modes of thinking, but additionally as being wired to networks of ideas circulating in the language sciences, as well as enmeshed in broader societal contexts in which these debates play out. Most importantly, understanding the principles of others' knowledge production is key to understanding one's own, for example concerning languages and linguistic exchanges in the globalizing markets of Swedish academia.

## Sammanfattning på svenska

Denna sammanläggningsavhandling beforskar frågan om svenska och engelska på vetenskapens språkmarknader, men också de diskurser som omgärdar denna fråga – i synnerhet inom svensk språkvård. Avhandlingen består av kappa och fyra arbeten, vilka förenar språkvetenskapliga perspektiv med grepp och begrepp från flera andra forskningsfält, t.ex. sociologi, historia, ide- och lärdomshistoria och forskningspolitik. Sammantaget utgör Pierre Bourdieus perspektiv det huvudsakliga teoretiska ledmotivet (om hans sociolingvistiska synsätt i svensk översättning, se Bourdieu 1991b ss. 111–126, 135–151; om hans vetenskapliga projekt allmänt, se Broady 1991). I delarbetena samsas emellertid hans forskningsprinciper och nyckelbegrepp med en flora konceptuella verktyg hämtade från lingvistisk antropologi och sociolingvistik. Som extensioner till Bourdieus sociologi tjänar dessa mer specifikt för studiet av olika språkliga fenomen, varav flertalet vävs in i de genomgångar av respektive studie som följer. Först en kortfattad bakgrund.

En av avhandlingens ramar är maktbalansen mellan svenska och engelska inom universitetsvärldens samhällsområde. Stridigheter om vetenskapens språk har alltid funnits, inte minst på grund av att vetenskapen varit föremål för strider om vilken nytta den ska göra. Denna kamp framträder inte minst i 1700-talets språkideologiska latindebatt, varefter svenskan i takt med tiden plockade marknadsandelar som språk för vetenskapliga ändamål – med draghjälp från tidens skiftande strömningar (se t.ex. Lindberg 1984). Under 1900-talet vände dessa strömningar på nytt, i samklang med engelskans tillblivelse som världsspråk. I Sverige, åtminstone inom svensk språkvård, observerades effekterna av denna process runt åren kring 1990, vilket gav näring åt frågan om svenskans position och värde. Inom ramen för denna kontext blev vetenskapens språk sedermera en stridsfråga, och med den utvecklingen föddes tanken att svenskan behöver värnas på ett flertal fronter. Här återaktualiserades alltså frågan om vetenskapens språk, där engelska nu föreföll dominera i det närmaste fullständigt i en rad vetenskapsområden och akademiska nyckelpraktiker (Gunnarsson & Öhman 1997). Med udden åtminstone delvis riktad mot detta faktum fick Sverige en särskild språklag år 2009, som fastslår att svenska är huvudspråk i Sverige, och att det som sådant ska ”kunna användas inom alla samhällsområden” (*Språklag* 2009 § 4–5). Engelska i vetenskapen är numera otvivelaktigt en av svensk språkvårds viktigaste frågor, och har så varit under den senaste 25-årsperioden.

I den process som ovan kortfattat skisserats har en hel del kunskap producerats, inte minst i form av representationer av engelska som ett problem (t.ex. *Mål i mun* 2002; Salö 2010; Svenska språknämnden 2004). Denna kunskap har varit knuten till språkvårdens intressen och hjärtefrågor. Diskussionen här har många gånger förts som om vetenskapens grundtillstånd är att vara nationellt förbunden. Med denna utgångspunkt har de tendenser man kunnat observera sett sig som förluster för svenska språket. Med denna avhandling försöker jag bana väg för nya sätt att diskutera denna viktiga fråga. Jag gör det genom att erbjuda en samling synsätt och verktyg med vilka språksituationen bättre kan förstås. Enligt min mening har frågan länge saknat socialteoretisk skärpa och empirisk specificitet – i någon mån gäller det också denna avhandling, men förhoppningen är att fältet härmed gjort ett framsteg i förståelsen av frågans sammansatta karaktär. Genom detta åtagande rör avhandlingen till stora delar kunskapsproduktionens villkor mer allmänt, vilket jag menar kan vara av intresse och till nytta för sociolingvistisk forskning. Här som annars gäller det att försöka se på frågan ”nyktert”, med bibehållen kontroll över de språkideologier forskaren själv förkroppsligar. Det är en krävande hållning att anamma i forskningspraktiken, men redskapet som lanseras i avhandlingen för detta ändamål är ”epistemisk reflexivitet” (t.ex. Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992). I korthet innebär det att skapa en blick över och en förståelse för den punkt varifrån man betraktar sitt forskningsobjekt, vilket ofta innebär att bryta med synsätt, idéer och

representationer man har med sig från andra sociala världar än de som utgörs av vetenskapen (Järvinen 1998 ger en fyllig sammanfattning på svenska; se också Broady 1991 och kappans avsnitt 4). I vad som följer summeras de studier som avhandlingen bygger på.

Studie 1 handlar om domänförlustbegreppets sociologiska tillkomsthistoria. Det är ett slags historisk diskursanalys i bourdieusk tappning, som särskilt betonar intressedriven produktion och reproduktion av språkideologi (se Blommaert 1999b; även Irvine 1989 och Kroskrity 2006). Studien analyserar skrivna texter varav merparten producerats inom ramen för svensk språkvård, en verksamhet som förstås som ett fält i Bourdieus mening: en social arena befolkad av agenter som delar givna angelägenheter. Domänförlust saknar merparten av de kvaliteter som kan sägas göra begrepp vetenskapliga, men inte desto mindre har begreppet applicerats flitigt inom den skandinaviska språkpolitiska debatten under de senaste decennierna (se Simonsen 2002). Begreppet har också figurerat i ett flertal centrala språkpolitiska dokument (t.ex. *Mål i mun* 2002) och vidare satt avtryck i lagtexten (*Språklag* 2009). Studie 1 visar att begreppet under 1990-talet rätt framgångsrikt tjänstgjorde i språkvårdens ansatser att flytta bort fokus från lånord och språkliga renlighetsfrågor (det osvenska i svenskan), vilka alltför lätt kunde kopplas samman med xenofob diskurs (de osvenska i Sverige). I stället kom den professionella metaspråkliga diskursen inom språkvårdens fält att handla om hur svenskan förlorade sin position och sitt värde i stora segment av samhället: politiken, storföretagen, vetenskapen, etc. (se Svenska språknämnden 2004). Med EU-medlemskap för dörren konstruerades här svenska som ett språk indexikalt förbunden med den svenska välfärdsstaten och dess samhällsvision, vilket engelskans intåg ansågs söndra. Språklagstiftning växte fram som ett verktyg för värnandet av svenskan. Frågan kunde i någon mening åka snålskjuts på minoritetsspråkens kamp för erkännande (jfr Teleman 2003, 234), vilket åstadkoms genom framställningar av svenskan som ett minoritetsspråk i ett globalt perspektiv (t.ex. Hyltenstam 1999). I ljuset av denna analys framställer studie 1 domänförlust som ett språkideologiskt begrepp som i allt väsentligt tjänat syftet att bevara språkmarknaden enad (t.ex. Bourdieu 1977a; Salö 2012).

Oaktat domänförlustbegreppets status som ”sociolingvistiskt tvivelaktigt” (Josephson 2015, 88) råder inget tvivel om att svenskan har ringa värde i den transnationella kommunikation som karaktäriserar globala kunskapsmarknader, och som i ökande grad fungerar genom engelska. Vetenskaplig publicering exemplifierar ett slags språklig praktik där forskare från allt fler discipliner orienterar sig mot internationella publiceringsmarknader på sätt som i väsentliga delar avnationaliserar vetenskapen (Sörlin 1994). I sökandet efter en bättre förståelse av denna fråga handlar studie 2 om publiceringsspråk i de långa tidslinjernas perspektiv, förenat med nedslag i nutida vetenskapliga



publiceringspraktiker och den forskningspolitiska ram som orienterar dessa. Fokus ligger på två disciplinära fält: historia och psykologi. Perspektiven här är i hög grad idé- och lärdomshistoriska, men också vetenskapssociologiska och forskningspolitiska. I fråga om metoder används i huvudsak historisk analys och intervjuer. Studien visar att båda disciplinerna var nationellt präglade fram till mitten av 1900-talet. Noga räknat var det också här som psykologi blev ett fält i mer autonom mening i och med att man nu frigjorde sig från sina band till andra discipliner, så som pedagogik (t.ex. Nilsson 1978). Strax efter andra världskrigets slut började ett flertal framgångsrika forskare inom psykologi orientera sig mot USA som intellektuell nod, som därmed ersatte den position det vid tiden krigshärjade Tyskland tidigare haft. Engelska blev härmed fältets huvudsakliga publiceringsspråk. I historieämnet pågick vid samma tid stridigheter mellan olika skolbildningar, och här blev språk inte något vapen. Som ett led i skapandet av det historiska fältets autonomi kom i stället läsekretsen att vidgas, så att konsumtionsfältet också kom att innefatta en intresserad allmänhet, vilket förstärkte fältets nationella prägel. Mot 1900-talets slut och in på det nya millenniet möttes de två fälten av ett forskningspolitiskt landskap som i väsentliga delar måste karaktäriseras som nytt. Här hade neoliberala tongångar fått fotfäste i universitetsfältet, och med detta kom införseln av utvärderingstekniker inriktade på att uppmuntra vissa former av akademiskt beteende och hålla tillbaka andra (se t.ex. *Resurser för kvalitet* 2007). De två fälten var här byggda på sinsemellan skilda former av autonomi. Det redan utblickande psykologiska fältet stördes därmed marginellt av den nya tidens influenser; här fanns redan en hög grad av internationell aktivitet och konkurrenstänkande. För det historiska fältet medförde mötet med den nya tidens marknadsmekanismer mer turbulens – här fanns en djupt rotad tradition av att producera kunskap som knappast svarade mot moderna forskningsbyråkraters föreställningar om nytta, genomslag och excellens.

Avhandlingen sällar sig till de arbeten som visat på engelskans starka ställning i publicering (t.ex. Gunnarsson & Öhman 1997; Melander 2004; Salö & Josephson 2014). Den visar också på betydande rörelse på detta område, då historiker – främst pretendenter till fältet – förefaller att i allt högre utsträckning rikta sina publiceringspraktiker mot globala marknader. Det är en utveckling som åtminstone delvis ska förklaras av nyligen implementerade incitamentsstrukturer inom universitetsfältet, där publikationer i internationellt ansedda forum ”lönar sig” i några olika bemärkelser av detta uttryck (se Hammarfelt & de Rijcke 2014). Men utöver extern inverkan finns en annan form av logik som verkar i engelskans favör, nämligen att nya publiceringsstrategier i sig själv ger möjligheten att investera annorlunda (se Broady 1990). I ett djupnationaliserat fält som historia, där monografin på svenska sedan länge varit hårdvalutan för professionellt avancemang, kan fältets nykomlingar satsa på engelska, och därmed ta fasta på en allmän,

utomdisciplinär utveckling som verkar i deras favör. Samma process devalverar etablerade agents tillgångar, och skapar en spänning i fältet som starkast manifesteras sig mellan nykomlingar och dominanta spelare.

Språkförhållandena i publicering kan vid första anblick ge intrycket att svenska inte används särskilt mycket som vetenskapligt språk (t.ex. *Mål i mun* 2002, 82). Men så binär är inte den empiriska verkligheten. Studie 3 handlar om språk i nutida vetenskap – inte i publikationer utan i de vetenskapliga praktiker som föregår en viss typ av publikationer, nämligen samförfattade texter på engelska. Studien riktar uppmärksamheten mot entextualiseringsprocesser (se Bauman & Briggs 1990; Silverstein & Urban 1996a; 1996b; Vigouroux 2009). Vetenskapliga texters tillblivelse är invävd i språkanvändning: forskare håller forskningsmöten, skriver mejl och för samtal – här de- och rekontextualiseras diskurs för att slutligen ta formen av en text, en artefakt, oftast skriven på engelska. Studien visar att entextualiseringsprocesser karaktäriseras av translingvala praktiker (Canagarajah 2013a), ett begrepp som betonar det faktum att kommunikation inte med nödvändighet följer språkgränser. Snarare använder människor de språkliga resurser som de har till förfogande i sina språkliga utbyten. Detta till trots uppvisar diskurs i translingvala miljöer (typiskt) vissa regelbundenheter, i så måtto att människor förefaller vara benägna att använda vissa språk i vissa situationer. Bourdieus begrepp habitus anlitas här för att greppa dessa regelbundenheter. Empiriskt undersöker studien texters tillkomsthistoria inom datavetenskap och fysik. Den förra disciplinen studeras med hjälp av observationer vid forskningsmöten; den senare studeras genom retroaktiva analyser av e-postkorrespondens. I båda disciplinerna kompletteras dessa tekniker med intervjuer. Resultaten visar följande. I de processer som leder till texter på engelska samexisterar bruk av engelska med teknisk och disciplinspecifik svenska. Dock är svenska det språk som används mellan svensktalande forskare, vilka ser det som helt främmande att opåkallat tala engelska sinsemellan. Denna trögrörliga regelbundenhet ska förstås med ett socialt kompetensbegrepp, där tonvikten ligger vid individens inkorporering av språkideologier som språkliga marknadsvillkor över tid. ”Den språkliga place-ringskänslan” (Bourdieu 1991a, 1991b) sätter fingret på hur människor s.a.s. ”vet sin plats” rent språkligt, därför att de har en biografiskt införlivad känsla för värdet av sina språkliga resurser i relation till vad som värderas på olika marknader. Denna vetenskap används reflexivt för att förutse vad som utgör legitimt språk i framtida språkliga praktiker.

Studie 4, samförfattad med L. Hanell, knyter återigen an till kompetens och diskursfenomen. Den handlar om svenska som ett användbart skriftspråk för vetenskapliga ändamål. Utgångspunkten är språklagens ordalydelse om att svenska ”ska kunna användas inom alla samhällsområden” (*Språklag* 2009 § 5). Formuleringen faller tillbaka på diskussionen om svenska som

”komplett’ språk”, vilken bland annat bygger på målsättningen att svensk-språkiga forskare ska kunna tala om sin expertis på svenska ”utan att trivialisera ämnets innehåll” (Teleman & Westman 1997, 14, kursiv borttagen). Många har befarat eller hävdats att det inte är möjligt (t.ex. Gunnarsson 2001b; Westman 1996). Studien undersöker detta empiriskt, delvis som ett sätt att väcka frågan om det språkpolitiska målets egentliga innebörd. Studien fokuserar på en svensk datavetare, Kim Lind (vårt alias), mer precis på hans sociolingvistiska repertoar och skrivpraktiker. Begreppet repertoar (vanligen med framförställd specificering såsom kommunikativ, sociolingvistisk eller superdivers) är frukten av sentida försök att omteoretisera språklig kompetens, där tonvikten ligger vid individens biografiska tillägnande av språkliga resurser (t.ex. Blommaert & Backus 2011; Busch 2012; Hall et al. 2006). Repertoarer reflekterar människors livserfarenheter av språk. Kim Lind har använt svenska i en räkka sammanhang inom och utanför universitetsvärlden, i både tal och skrift. Han har dock marginell erfarenhet av att producera diskurs inom datavetarsvenskans skriftliga register (t.ex. Agha 2007) och diskursgenrer (t.ex. Hanks 1987). Detta är emellertid inte en svårighet enbart på individnivå, eftersom svenska på det hela taget inte praktiserats i skrift sedan disciplinen uppkom på 1960-talet. Som vi tolkar det står Kim inför uppgiften att skriva i ”exempellösa” eller ”obeskådade” genrer [unprecedented genres], en glosa vi inför i artikeln för att fånga utmaningen det innebär att använda språk inom en praktik utan historiska förlagor. Inte desto mindre skriver Kim två texter på vetenskaps-svenska. Framgången förklaras för det första av att forskare förstås inte bara vistas i en enda ”vetenskaplig domän” utan också i en räkka andra sammanhang där språk konsumeras och produceras. För det andra inrymmer också forskares vardag i sig heterogena språkliga praktiker (jfr studie 3), vilka återspeglas så väl i forskares repertoarer som svenskans registerbildning (’enregisterment’; se Agha 2007). Artikeln visar att kunskap vunen i andra sammanhang kan recenteras in i nya språkpraktiker överskridande såväl språkgränser (engelska–svenska) som modalitetsgränser (muntligt–skriftligt). Den som använder språk i en genre utan förlagor, så som en vetenskaplig rapport på datavetarsvenska, kan exempelvis dra nytta av vetenskapssvenska från andra discipliner, genrekunskap i skriven datavetarengelska eller erfarenhet från muntlig datavetarsvenska. Interdiskursivitet (t.ex. Silverstein 2005) är det huvudsakliga redskapet för att förstå hur Kim gör bruk av andra språkliga erfarenheter som genom livsförloppet lagrats i hans repertoar. Studien ger därmed ett exempel på svenskans användbarhet inom en högst internationaliserad disciplin. Men i första hand väcker studien frågan om vad det innebär att svenska ska kunna användas inom detta samhällsområde.

Sammantaget kan sägas att universitetsvärlden innefattar intressanta sociolingvistiska skådeplatser där flera olika språkregimer sammanstrålar. Engelskans särställning gäller i första hand i skrift – i publicering, d.v.s. den

i nuläget högst värderade vetenskapliga praktiken. I forskningspraktiken i övrigt råder andra språkliga villkor, och flera av de empiriska verkligheter som kan avtäckas där talar emot föreställningar om svenskans frånvaro som vetenskapligt språk och forskares oförmåga att använda svenska i vetenskapliga sammanhang. Att svenska används i forskningspraktiken torde kunna vara betryggande för bedömare som oroar sig för vetenskaps-svenskans ställning. Detta empiriska fynd ska emellertid inte tas som intäkt för att vetenskapens språkmarknader inte ska synas kritiskt. Engelskans värde ökar stadigt på vetenskapens publiceringsmarknader, medan de marknader som verkar genom svenska förefaller krympa. Det går att skönja ett slags likriktning av vetenskapliga publiceringspraktiker där bruket av engelska är en av flera komponenter – tidskriftsartikelns särställning är en annan (t.ex. Hicks 2004; Paasi 2005). Denna uniformism gör sig gällande oaktat den diversitet som råder bland disciplinära fält och deras avnämare. Vi vet rätt lite om följderna av denna utveckling – frågan borde därför göras till föremål för djuplodande forskning utifrån ett antal skilda perspektiv.

## References

- Adams, M. 2006. Hybridizing habitus and reflexivity: Towards an understanding of contemporary identity? *Sociology* 40(3): 511–528.
- Agha, A. 2005a. Voice, footing, enregisterment. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 15(1): 38–59.
- Agha, A. 2005b. Introduction: Semiosis across encounters. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 15(1): 1–5.
- Agha, A. 2007. *Language and Social Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Agha, A. & Wortham, S., eds. 2005. Discourse Across Speech Events: Intertextuality and Interdiscursivity in Social Life. Special issue, *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 15(1).
- Agovic, A. 2010. ‘Moral panic’ over Danish language loss. *University Post*, Nov. 15. Copenhagen: Univ. of Copenhagen.
- Ahmad, E. 2003. Knowledge, place, and power. A critique of globalization. In Mirsepaasi, A., Basu, A. & Weaver, F., eds. *Localizing Knowledge in a Globalizing World. Recasting the Area Studies Debate*. New York: Syracuse Univ. Press. 216–229.
- Airey, J. 2015. From stimulated recall to disciplinary literacy: Summarizing ten years of research into teaching and learning in English. In Dimova, S., Hultgren, A-K. & Jensen, C., eds. *English-Medium Instruction in European Higher Education*. Berlin: de Gruyter. 157–176.
- Airey, J., Lauridsen, K., Räsänen, A. Salö, L. & Schwach, V. 2015. The expansion of English-medium instruction in the Nordic Countries. Can top-down university language policies encourage bottom-up disciplinary literacy goals? *Higher Education*. Published online Oct. 23.

- Albright, J. & Luke, A., eds. 2008. *Pierre Bourdieu and Literacy Education*. New York: Taylor and Francis.
- Appadurai, A. 1990. Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. *Theory, Culture & Society* 7: 295–310.
- Archer, M. S. 2007. *Making Our Way through the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Bachelard, G. 2002. *The Formation of the Scientific Mind. A Contribution to a Psychoanalysis of Objective Knowledge*. Manchester: Clinamen.
- Bästa språket – en samlad svensk språkpolitik*. 2005. Prop. 2005/06:2. Stockholm: Ministry of Education and Culture.
- Bauman, R. 1992. Genre. In Bauman, R., ed. *Folklore, Cultural Performances, and Popular Entertainments. A Communications-centered Handbook*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press. 51–59.
- Bauman, R. 2005. Commentary: Indirect indexicality, identity, performance: Dialogic observations. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 15(1): 145–150.
- Bauman, R. & Briggs, C.L. 1990. Poetics and performance as critical perspectives on language and social life. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19: 59–88.
- Bauman, R. & Briggs, C.L. 2000. Language philosophy as language ideology: John Locke and Johann Gottfried Herder. In Kroskrity, P.V., ed. *Regimes of Language. Ideologies, Politics, and Identities*. Santa Fe: SAR. 139–204.
- Bauman, R. & Briggs, C.L. 2003. *Voices of Modernity. Language Ideologies and the Politics of Inequality*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Bauman, Z. 1987. *Legislators and Interpreters. On Modernity, Post-Modernity and Intellectuals*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bauman, Z. 1990. Modernity and ambivalence. *Theory, Culture & Society* 7: 143–169.
- Baynham, M. & Prinsloo, M. 2009. *The Future of Literacy Studies*. New York: Palgrave.
- Beck, U. 2000. *What is Globalization?* Cambridge: Polity.
- Berg, E.C., Hult, F.M. & King, K.A. 2001. Shaping the climate for language shift? English in Sweden's elite domains. *World Englishes* 20(3): 305–319.
- Bisong, J. 1995. Language choice and cultural imperialism: A Nigerian perspective. *ELT Journal* 49(2): 122–132.
- Björkman, B. 2013. *English as an Academic Lingua Franca. An Investigation of Form and Communicative Effectiveness*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Björkman, B. 2014. Language ideology or language practice? An analysis of language policy documents at Swedish universities. *Multilingua* 33(3/4): 335–365.
- Björkman, B. 2015. Attitudes towards English in university language policy documents in Sweden. In Linn, A., Bermel, N., Ferguson, G. & Hadjidemetriou, C., eds. *English in Europe: Opportunity or Threat? Volume 1: Attitudes towards English in Europe*. Berlin: de Gruyter. 115–137.
- Blackledge, A. 2005. *Discourse and Power in a Multilingual World*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Blackledge, A. & Creese, A., eds. 2014. *Heteroglossia as Practice and Pedagogy*. New York: Springer.
- Blackledge, A. & Pavlenko, A. 2002. Introduction. *Multilingua* 21: 121–140.

- Block, D. 2008. On the appropriateness of the metaphor of loss. In Tan, P.K.W. & Rubdy, R., eds. *Language as Commodity. Global Structures, Local Marketplaces*. London: Continuum. 187–203.
- Block, D. 2012. Unpicking agency in sociolinguistic research with migrants. In Gardner, S. & Martin-Jones, M., eds. *Multilingualism, Discourse and Ethnography*. New York: Routledge. 47–59.
- Blommaert, J. 1996. Language planning as a discourse on language and society: The linguistic ideology of a scholarly tradition. *Language Problems and Language Planning* 20(3): 199–222.
- Blommaert, J. 1999a. The debate is open. In Blommaert, J., ed. *Language Ideological Debates*. Berlin: de Gruyter. 1–38.
- Blommaert, J., ed. 1999b. *Language Ideological Debates*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Blommaert, J. 2005a. Bourdieu the ethnographer. The ethnographic grounding of habitus and voice. *The Translator* 11(2): 219–236.
- Blommaert, J. 2005b. *Discourse. A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Blommaert, J. 2006. Language ideology. In Brown, K., ed. *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Elsevier. 510–522.
- Blommaert, J. 2007. Sociolinguistics and discourse analysis: Orders of indexicality and polycentricity. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses* 2(2): 115–130.
- Blommaert, J. 2008. *Grassroots Literacy. Writing, Identity and Voice in Central Africa*. New York: Routledge.
- Blommaert, J. 2010. *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Blommaert, J. 2014. *State Ideology and Language in Tanzania*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press.
- Blommaert, J. 2015. Pierre Bourdieu and language in society. In Östman, J.O. & Verschueren, J., eds. *Handbook of Pragmatics* 19. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Blommaert, J. & Backus, A. 2011. Repertoires revisited: ‘Knowing language’ in superdiversity. *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies* 67: 1–26.
- Blommaert, J. & Backus, A. 2013. Superdiverse repertoires and the individual. In de Saint-Georges, I., Weber, J.J., eds. *Multilingualism and Multimodality. Current Challenges for Educational Studies*. Rotterdam: Sense. 11–32.
- Blommaert, J. Collins, J. & Slembrouck, S. 2005. Spaces of multilingualism. *Language & Communication* 25: 197–216.
- Blommaert, J. & Dong, J. 2010. *Ethnographic Fieldwork. A Beginner’s Guide*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Blommaert, J. & Rampton, B. 2011. Language and superdiversity. *Diversities* 13(2): 1–21.
- Bohman, J. 1999. Practical reason and cultural constraint: Agency in Bourdieu’s theory of practice. In Shusterman, R., ed. *Bourdieu. A Critical Reader*. Malden: Blackwell. 129–152.
- Bolton, K. & Kuteeva, M. 2012. English as an academic language at a Swedish university: Parallel language use and the ‘threat’ of English. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 33(5): 429–447.

- Bolton, K. & Meierkord, C. 2013. English in contemporary Sweden: Perceptions, policies, and narrated practices. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 17(1): 93–117.
- Börjesson, M. 2005. *Transnationella utbildningsstrategier vid svenska lärosäten och bland svenska studenter i Paris och New York*. Uppsala: Uppsala Univ.
- Bourdieu, P. 1977a. The economics of linguistic exchanges. *Social Science Information* 16(6): 645–668.
- Bourdieu, P. 1977b. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Bourdieu, P. 1981. Men and machines. In Knorr-Cetina, K. & Cicourel, A.V., eds. *Advances in Social Theory and Methodology. Toward an Integration of Micro- and Macro-Strategies*. Boston: Routledge. 305–317.
- Bourdieu, P. 1983. The field of cultural production, or: the economic world reversed. *Poetic* 12: 311–356.
- Bourdieu, P. 1985. The social space and the genesis of groups. *Social Science Information* 24(2): 195–220.
- Bourdieu, P. 1987. The force of law: Toward a sociology of the juridical field. *The Hasting Law Journal* 38: 814–853.
- Bourdieu, P. 1988. *Homo Academicus*. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press.
- Bourdieu, P. 1989. Social space and symbolic power. *Sociological Theory* 7(1): 14–25.
- Bourdieu, P. 1990a. *In Other Words. Essays Towards a Reflexive Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bourdieu, P. 1990b. *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press.
- Bourdieu, P. 1991a. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bourdieu, P. 1991b. *Kultur och kritik. Anföranden av Pierre Bourdieu*. Gothenburg: Daidalos.
- Bourdieu, P. 1993a. *Sociology in Question*. London: Sage.
- Bourdieu, P. 1993b. Concluding remarks: For a sociogenetic understanding of intellectual works. In Calhoun, C., LiPuma, E. & Postone, M., eds. *Bourdieu. Critical Perspectives*. Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago Press. 263–275.
- Bourdieu, P. 1996a. *The Rules of Art*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bourdieu, P. 1996b. Understanding. *Theory, Culture & Society* 13(2): 17–37.
- Bourdieu, P. 1998. *Practical Reason*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bourdieu, P. 2000. *Pascalian Meditations*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bourdieu, P. 2002. Habitus. In Hillier, J. & Rooksby, E., eds. *Habitus: A Sense of Place*. Burlington: Ashgate. 27–34.
- Bourdieu, P. 2003. Participant objectivation. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 9: 281–294.
- Bourdieu, P. 2004. *Science of Science and Reflexivity*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bourdieu, P. 2007. *Sketch for a Self-Analysis*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bourdieu, P. 2010a. The myth of ‘globalization’ and the European welfare state. In Sapiro, G., ed. *Sociology is a Martial Art. Political Writings by Pierre Bourdieu*. New York: The New Press. 108–120.
- Bourdieu, P. 2010b. *Distinction*. New York: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. 2014. *On the State. Lectures at the Collège de France 1989–1992*. Cambridge: Polity.

- Bourdieu, P., Chamboredon, J.C. & Passeron, J.C. 1991. *The Craft of Sociology. Epistemological Preliminaries*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Bourdieu, P. & Chartier, R. 2015. *The Sociologist and the Historian*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bourdieu, P. & Eagleton, T. 1994. Doxa and common life: An interview. In Žižek, S., ed. *Mapping Ideology*. London: Verso. 265–277.
- Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J.C. 1977. *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L.J.D. 1992. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Boyd, S. 1999. Transatlantic connections. Attitudes towards (Anglo-American) English in Sweden in the 1990s. In Blanck, D. & Jegebäck, P., eds. *Migration och mångfald. Essäer om kulturkontakt och minoritetsfrågor tillägnade Harald Runblom*. Uppsala: Uppsala Univ. 233–248.
- Briggs, C. 1986. *Learning How to Ask. A Sociolinguistic Appraisal of the Role of the Interview in Social Science Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Briggs, C. 1993. Metadiscursive practices and scholarly authority in folkloristics. *Journal of American Folklore* 106(422): 387–434.
- Briggs, C. 2007a. Introduction: Aaron V. Cicourel and the emergence of critical perspectives on social scientific inquiry. *Text & Talk* 27(5/6): 585–593.
- Briggs, C. 2007b. Anthropology, interviewing, and communicability in contemporary society. *Current Anthropology* 48(4): 551–580.
- Briggs, C.L. & Bauman, R. 1992. Genre, intertextuality, and social power. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 2(2): 131–172.
- Broadly, D. 1983. *Dispositioner och positioner. Ett ledmotiv i Pierre Bourdieus sociologi*. Stockholm: UHÄ.
- Broadly, D. 1990. Intellektuella vill tänka annorlunda. In Årman, J., ed. *Att tänka annorlunda*. Stockholm: Symposion. 21–44.
- Broadly, D. 1991. *Sociologi och epistemologi. Om Pierre Bourdieus författarskap och den historiska epistemologin*. Stockholm: HLS.
- Brubaker, R. 1993. Social theory as habitus. In Calhoun, C., LiPuma, E. & Postone, M., eds. *Bourdieu. Critical Perspectives*. Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago Press. 212–234.
- Bucholtz, M. 2000. The politics of transcription. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32: 1439–1465.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. Forth. Embodied sociolinguistics. In Coupland, N., ed. *Sociolinguistics: Theoretical Debates*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Burawoy, M. 2012. Sociology as a combat sport. In Burawoy, M. & von Holdt, K. *Conversations with Bourdieu. The Johannesburg Moment*. Johannesburg: Wits Univ. Press. 9–24.
- Busch, B. 2012. The Linguistic Repertoire Revisited. *Applied Linguistics* 33(5): 503–523.
- Busch, B. 2015. Linguistic repertoire and sprachleben. The lived experience of language. *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies* 148: 2–16.
- Cabau, B. 2009. The irresistible rise and hegemony of a linguistic fortress: English teaching in Sweden. *International Multilingual Research Journal* 3: 134–152.



- Cabau, B. 2011. Language policy in Swedish higher education. A contextualized perspective. *European Journal of Language Policy* 3(1): 37–60.
- Calhoun, C. 1993. Habitus, field, and capital: The question of historical specificity. In Calhoun, C., LiPuma, E. & Postone, M., eds. *Bourdieu. Critical Perspectives*. Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago Press. 61–88.
- Callewaert, S. 2006. Bourdieu, critic of Foucault. The case of empirical social science against double-game philosophy. *Theory, Culture & Society* 23(6): 73–98.
- Cameron, D. 1990. Demythologizing sociolinguistics: Why language does not reflect society. In Joseph, J.E. & Taylor, T.J., eds. *Ideologies of Language*. New York: Routledge. 79–93.
- Cameron, D. 1995. *Verbal Hygiene*. New York: Routledge.
- Cameron, D. 2007. Language endangerment and verbal hygiene: History, morality and politics. In Duchêne, A. & Heller, M., eds. *Discourses of endangerment: Ideology and Interest in the Defence of Languages*. London: Continuum. 268–285.
- Cameron, D., Frazer, E., Harvey, P., Rampton, M.B.H. & Richardson, K. 1992. *Researching Language. Issues of Power and Method*. New York: Routledge.
- Canagarajah, S. 2005. Ethnographic methods in language policy. In Ricento, T., ed. *An Introduction to Language Policy*. Malden: Wiley. 153–169.
- Canagarajah, S. 2013a. *Translingual Practice. Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. London: Routledge.
- Canagarajah, S. 2013b. Introduction. In Canagarajah, S., ed. *Literacy as Translingual Practice: Between Communities and Classrooms*. London: Routledge. 1–11.
- Christensen, M. 2006. *Danske universiteters udbud af engelsksproget undervisning. En undersøgelse af et felt i hastig udvikling*. Copenhagen: Univ. of Copenhagen.
- Cibulka, J.G. 1995. Policy analysis and the study of the politics of education. In Scribner, J.D. & Layton, D.H., eds. *The Study of Educational Politics. The 1994 Commemorative Yearbook of the Politics of Education Association (1969–1994)*. Washington D.C.: The Falmer Press. 105–125.
- Cohen, S. 1972. *Folk Devils and Moral Panics: The Creation of the Mods and Rockers*. Oxford: Martin Robertson.
- Collins, J., Slembrouck, S. & Baynham, M., eds. 2009. *Globalization and Languages in Contact. Scale, Migration, and Communicative Practices*. New York: Continuum.
- Cooper, R. 1989. *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Coulmas, F. 2005. Changing language regimes in globalizing environments. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 175/176: 3–15.
- Coupland, N. 2003. Introduction: Sociolinguistics and globalisation. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7(4): 465–472.
- Coupland, N. 2007. *Style. Language Variation and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Couzens Hoy, D. 1999. Critical resistance: Foucault and Bourdieu. In Weiss, G. & Fern Haber, H., eds. *Perspectives on Embodiment: The Intersections of Nature and Culture*. New York: Routledge. 3–21.

- Crawford, E., Sinn, T. & Sörlin, S. 1993. The nationalization and denationalization of the sciences: An introductory essay. In Crawford, E., Sinn, T. & Sörlin, S., eds. *Denationalizing Science. The Contexts of International Scientific Practice*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. 1–42.
- Crossley, N. 2001. The phenomenological habitus and its construction. *Theory and Society* 30: 81–120.
- Currie, J. & Vidovich, L. 2009. The changing nature of academic work. In Tight, M., Mok, K.H., Huisman, J. & Morphew, C.C., eds. *The Routledge International Handbook of Higher Education*. New York: Routledge. 441–452.
- Dahl, Ö. & Boyd, S. 2006. Grundlöst om språkdöd. *Språkvård* 4: 36–40.
- Dalberg, T. 2013. Engelskans utbredning i den svenska högskolan. En kartläggning av engelskspråkiga benämningar av program och kurser i svensk högre utbildning 1993–2009. *SEC Research Reports* 52. Uppsala: Uppsala Univ.
- Dahlstedt, K.H. 1976. Societal ideology and language cultivation: The case of Swedish. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 10: 17–50.
- De Fina, A. & Perrino, S. 2011. Introduction: Interviews vs. ‘natural’ contexts: A false dilemma. *Language in Society* 40: 1–11.
- Declaration on a Nordic Language Policy*. 2006. ANP 2007:746. Copenhagen: Nordic Council of Ministers.
- Dépelteau, F. & Powell, C., eds. 2013. *Applying Relational Sociology. Relations, Networks, and Society*. New York: Palgrave.
- Dingwall, R. 1997. Accounts, interviews and observations. In Miller, G. & Dingwall, R., eds. *Context and Method in Qualitative Research*. London: Sage. 52–65.
- Duranti, A. 1997. *Linguistic Anthropology*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Duranti, A. 2003. Language as culture in U.S. anthropology. Three paradigms. *Current Anthropology* 44(3): 323–346.
- Duranti, A. 2006. Agency in language. In Duranti, A., ed. *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. Malden: Blackwell. 451–473.
- Duranti, A. 2009. Linguistic anthropology: History, ideas, and issues. In Duranti, A. ed. *Linguistic Anthropology. A Reader*. Malden: Wiley. 1–59.
- Duranti, A. 2013. Linguistic anthropology: The study of language as a non-neutral medium. In Mesthrie, R., ed. *The Cambridge Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press. 28–46.
- Ehn, B., Frykman, J. & Löfgren, O. 1993. *Försvenskningen av Sverige. Det nationellas förvandlingar*. Stockholm: Natur och Kultur.
- Fairclough, N. 2006. *Language and Globalization*. New York: Routledge.
- Falk, M. 2001. *Domänförluster i svenskan*. Copenhagen: The Nordic Council of Ministers.
- Farnell, B. 2000. Getting out of the habitus: An alternative model of dynamically embodied social action. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 6: 397–418.
- Fishman, J.A. 1965. Who speaks what language to whom and when? *La Linguistique* 1(2): 67–88.
- Fishman, J.A. 1972. *The Sociology of Language. An interdisciplinary social science approach to language in society*. Rowley: Newbury House.

- Fishman, J.A. 1991. *Reversing Language Shift*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Förordning med instruktion för Institutet för språk och folkminnen. 2007. SFS 2007:1181. Stockholm: Ministry of Culture.
- Foucault, M. 1984. The order of discourse. In Shapiro, M.J., ed. *Language and Politics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 108–138.
- Foucault, M. 2001. *Fearless Speech*. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).
- Gafaranga, J. 2007. *Talk in Two Languages*. New York: Palgrave.
- Gal, S. 2006. Linguistic Anthropology. In Brown, K., ed. *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Elsevier. 171–185.
- Gal, S. & Irvine, J.T. 1995. The boundaries of languages and disciplines: How ideologies construct difference. *Social Research* 62(4): 967–1001.
- Goebel, Z. 2015. Establishing believability in interviews. *Tilburg papers in Culture Studies* 140.
- Goethe, J.W. 1853. *Goethe's Opinions on the World, Mankind, Literature, Science, and Art*. London: John Parker and Son.
- Goode, E. & Ben-Yehuda, N. 1994. Moral panics: Culture, politics, and social construction. *Annual Review of Sociology* 20: 149–171.
- Goodman, J.E. 2003. The proverbial Bourdieu: Habitus and the politics of representation in the ethnography of Kabylia. *American Anthropologist* 105(4): 782–793.
- Gorden, R.L. 1980. *Interviewing. Strategy, Techniques and Tactics*. Georgetown: The Dorsey Press.
- Gordin, M.D. 2015. *Scientific Babel: How Science Was Done Before and After Global English*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Gorski, P.S. 2013a. Nation-ization struggles. A Bourdieusian theory of nationalism. In Gorski, P.S., ed. *Bourdieu and Historical Analysis*. Durham: Duke Univ. Press. 242–265.
- Gorski, P.S., ed. 2013b. *Bourdieu and Historical Analysis*. Durham: Duke Univ. Press.
- Graddol, D. 2012. *The impact of macro socioeconomic trends on the future of the English language*. Stockholm: Stockholm Univ.
- Green, J., Franquiz, M. & Dixon, C. 1997. The myth of the objective transcript: Transcribing as a situated act. *Tesol Quarterly* 31(1): 172–176.
- Gregersen, F. 2012. Inledning: Globaliseringens udfordringer med særligt hensyn til universitetsinstitutionerne. *Nordand* 7(2): 5–19.
- Grenfell, M. 2007. *Pierre Bourdieu. Education and Training*. London: Continuum.
- Grenfell, M., ed. 2011. *Bourdieu, Language, and Linguistics*. London: Continuum.
- Grenfell, M., Bloome, D., Hardy, C. Pahl, K. Rowsell, J. & Street, B. 2012. *Language, Ethnography, and Education. Bridging New Literacy Studies and Bourdieu*. New York: Routledge.
- Grillo, R. 1985. *Ideologies and Institutions in Urban France: The representation of Immigrants*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Grin, F. 2015. Managing languages in academia: Pointers from education economics and language economics. In Stickel, G. & Robustelli, C., eds. *Language Use in University Teaching and Research*. Berlin: Peter Lang. 99–118.
- Gumperz, J.J. & Cook-Gumperz, J. 2008. Studying language, culture, and society: Sociolinguistics or linguistic anthropology? *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 12(4): 532–545.

- Gunnarsson, B.L. 1999. Svenska, English eller Deutsch – om språksituationen vid de svenska universiteten. *Språkvård* 4: 11–22.
- Gunnarsson, B.L. 2001a. Swedish, English, French or German – the language situation at Swedish universities. In: Ammon, U., ed. *The Dominance of English as a Language of Science. Effects on Other Languages and Language Communities*. Berlin: de Gruyter. 229–316.
- Gunnarsson, B.L. 2001b. Swedish tomorrow – A product of the linguistic dominance of English? In Boyd, S. & Huss, L., eds. *Managing Multilingualism in a European Nation-State*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 51–69.
- Gunnarsson, B.L. 2005. Anglo-amerikansk påverkan på språket – ett hot eller en naturlig förändring? In Alhaug, G., Mørck, E. & Pedersen, A.K., eds. *Mot rikare mål å trå. Festschrift til Tove Bull*. Oslo: Novus. 218–228.
- Gunnarsson, B.L. & Öhman, K. 1997. Det internationaliserade universitetet. En studie av bruket av engelska och andra främmande språk vid Uppsala universitet. *TeFa* 16. Uppsala: Uppsala Univ.
- Haberland, H. 2005. Domains and domain loss. In Preisler, B., Fabricius, A., Haberland, H., Kjærbeck, S. & Risager, K., eds. *The Consequences of Mobility*. Roskilde: Roskilde Univ. 227–237.
- Haberland, H. 2009. English – the language of globalism? *Rask* 30: 17–45.
- Hall, S. 1997. The work of representation. In Hall, S., ed. *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London: Sage. 13–64.
- Hall, J.K., Cheng, A. & Carlson, M.T. 2006. Reconceptualizing multicompetence as theory of language knowledge. *Applied Linguistics* 27(2): 220–240.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 2006. Written language, standard language, global language. In Kachru, B.B., Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C.L., eds. *The Handbook of World Englishes*. Malden: Blackwell. 351–365.
- Hammarfelt, B. & de Rijcke, S. 2014. Accountability in context: Effects of research evaluation systems on publication practices, disciplinary norms, and individual working routines in the faculty of Arts at Uppsala University. *Research Evaluation*: 1–15. Published online Dec. 10.
- Hanks, W.F. 1987. Discourse genres in a theory of practice. *American Ethnologist* 14(4): 668–692.
- Hanks, W.F. 1996. *Language and Communicative Practices*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Hanks, W.F. 2005. Pierre Bourdieu and the practices of language. *The Annual Review of Anthropology* 34: 67–83.
- Hannerz, U. 1990. Cosmopolitans and locals in world culture. *Theory, Culture & Society* 7: 237–251.
- Harrison, G. 2009. Language politics, linguistic capital and bilingual practioners in social work. *British Journal of Social Work* 39: 1082–1100.
- Heller, M. 1995. Language choice, social institutions, and symbolic domination. *Language in Society* 24: 373–405.
- Heller, M. 1996. Legitimate language in a multilingual school. *Linguistics and Education* 8: 139–157.
- Heller, M. 2006. *Linguistic Minorities and Modernity*. London: Continuum.
- Heller, M., ed. 2007a. *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*. New York: Palgrave.

- Heller, M. 2007b. Bilingualism as ideology and practice. In Heller, M., ed. *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*. New York: Palgrave. 1–22.
- Heller, M. 2008. Language and the nation-state: Challenges to sociolinguistic theory and practice. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 12(4): 504–524.
- Heller, M. 2011. *Paths to Post-Nationalism. A Critical Ethnography of Language and Identity*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Heller, M. 2012. Rethinking sociolinguistic ethnography. From community and identity to process and practice. In Gardner, S. & Martin-Jones, M., eds. *Multilingualism, Discourse and Ethnography*. New York: Routledge. 24–33.
- Heller, M. & Duchêne, A., eds. 2007. *Discourses of Endangerment. Ideology and Interest in the Defence of Languages*. London: Continuum.
- Heller, M. & Martin-Jones, M. 2001. Introduction: Symbolic domination, education, and linguistic difference. In Heller, M. & Martin-Jones, M., eds. *Voices of Authority. Education and Linguistic Difference*. London: Ablex. 1–28.
- Hepp, R.D. 2006. The relational thinking of Pierre Bourdieu. *The American Journal of Semiotics* 22(1–4): 55–68.
- Hicks, D. 2004. The four literatures of social science. In Moed, H.F., Gläzel, W. & Schmoch, U., eds. *Handbook of Quantitative Science and Technology Research*. New York: Kluwer. 473–496.
- Hilgers, M. 2009. Habitus, freedom, and reflexivity. *Theory & Psychology* 19(6): 728–755.
- Hilgers, M. & Mangez, E., eds. 2015a. *Bourdieu's Theory of Social Fields. Concepts and Applications*. New York: Routledge.
- Hilgers, M. & Mangez, E. 2015b. Introduction to Pierre Bourdieu's theory of social fields. In Hilgers, M., & Mangez, E, eds. *Bourdieu's Theory of Social Fields. Concepts and Applications*. New York: Routledge. 1–36.
- Hill, J. 2002. 'Expert rhetorics' in advocacy for endangered languages: Who is listening, and what do they hear? *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 12(2): 119–133.
- Hillier, J. & Rooksby, E. 2005a. Introduction to first edition. In: Hillier, J. & Rooksby, E., eds. *Habitus: A Sense of Place*. Burlington: Ashgate. 19–42.
- Hillier, J. & Rooksby, E. 2005b. Introduction to second edition: Committed scholarship. In: Hillier, J. & Rooksby, E., eds. *Habitus: A Sense of Place*. Burlington: Ashgate. 3–18.
- Hillier, J. & Rooksby, E., eds. 2005c. *Habitus: A Sense of Place*. Burlington: Ashgate.
- Hobsbawm, E.J. 1990. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780. Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Hobsbawm, E.J. 1994. *The Age of Extremes. A History of the World, 1914–1991*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Höglin, R. 2002. *Engelska språket som hot och tillgång i Norden*. Copenhagen: The Nordic Council of Ministers.
- Högskoleverket. 2008. *En högskola i världen – internationalisering för kvalitet*. Stockholm: Swedish National Agency for Higher Education.
- Holm, P., Jarrick, A. & Scott, D. 2015. *Humanities World Report 2015*. New York: Palgrave.

- Holmen, A. 2012. Efterord: Parallelsproglighet og flersprogethed på nordiske universiteter. *Nordand* 7(2): 161–169.
- Hult, F.M. 2004. Planning for multilingualism and minority language rights in Sweden. *Language Policy* 3: 181–201.
- Hult, F.M. 2005. A case of prestige and status planning: Swedish and English in Sweden. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 6(1): 73–79.
- Hult, F.M. 2012. English as transcultural language in Swedish policy and debate. *TESOL Quarterly* 46(2): 230–257.
- Hult, F.M. & Källkvist, M. 2015. Global flows in local language planning: Articulating parallel language use in Swedish university policies. *Current Issues in Language Planning*. Published online Nov. 27.
- Hultgren, A.K., Gregersen, F. & Thøgersen, J. 2014. English at Nordic universities. Ideologies and practices. In Hultgren, A.K., Gregersen, F. & Thøgersen, J., eds. *English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and Practices*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 2–25.
- Hyltenstam, K. 1996. Svenskan, ett minoritetsspråk i Europa – och världen? *Svenskans beskrivning* 21: 9–33.
- Hyltenstam, K. 1999. Svenskan i minoritetsspråksperspektiv. In Hyltenstam, K. ed. *Sveriges sju inhemska språk. Ett minoritetsspråksperspektiv*. Lund: Studentlitteratur. 205–240.
- Hyltenstam, K. 2004. Engelskan, skolans språkundervisning och svensk språkpolitik. In *Engelskan i Sverige. Språkval i utbildning, arbete och kulturliv*. Stockholm: Norstedts. 36–110.
- Hymes, D. 1972. On communicative competence. In: Pride, J.B. & Holmes, J., eds. *Sociolinguistics. Selected Readings*. London: Penguin. 269–293.
- Hymes, D. 1981. *'In Vain I Tried to Tell You.'* *Essays in Native American Ethnopoetics*. Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press.
- Irvine, J.T. 1989. When talk isn't cheap: Language and political economy. *American Ethnologist* 16(2): 248–267.
- Irvine, J.T. 2005. Commentary: Knots and tears in the interdiscursive fabric. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 15(1): 72–80.
- Jacquemet, M. 2005. Transidiomatic practices: Language and power in the age of globalization. *Language & Communication* 25: 257–277.
- Jaffe, A. 2007. Minority language movements. In Heller, M., ed. *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*. New York: Palgrave. 50–70.
- Jaffe, A. 2009. The production and reproduction of language ideologies in practice. In Coupland, N. & Jaworski, A., eds. *The New Sociolinguistics Reader*. New York: Palgrave. 390–404.
- Jansson, E. 2008. Språkstrategier vid nordiska lärosäten. In Jansson, E., ed. *Vetenskapsengelska – med svensk kvalitet?* Stockholm: The Swedish Language Council. 63–79.
- Järvinen, M. 1998. Om Bourdieus reflexiva sociologi. *Sociologisk forskning* 2: 5–19.
- Jenkins, P. 1992. *Intimate Enemies: Moral Panics in Contemporary Great Britain*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Jenkins, R. 1992. *Pierre Bourdieu*. New York: Routledge.

- Jenkins, R. 2000. Pierre Bourdieu and the reproduction of determinism. In Robbins, D., ed. *Pierre Bourdieu II*. London: SAGE. 148–163.
- Johnson, S. 1999. From linguistic molehills to social mountains? Introducing moral panics about language. *CLSL Working Paper* 105. Lancaster: Lancaster Univ.
- Jørgensen, J.N. 2008. Polylingual languaging around and among children and adolescents. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 5(3): 161–176.
- Jørgensen, J.N., Karrebæk, M. S., Madsen, L.M. & Møller, J.S. 2011. Polylinguaging in superdiversity. *Diversities* 13(2): 23–37.
- Josephson, O. 2002. Rätt tid för språkpolitik. In Höglin, R. *Engelska språket som hot och tillgång i Norden*. Copenhagen: The Nordic Council of Ministers. 79–84.
- Josephson, O. 2004a. "Ju". *Ifrågasatta självklarheter om svenskan, engelskan och alla andra spark i Sverige*. Stockholm: Norstedts.
- Josephson, O. 2004b. Engelskan i 2000-talets Sverige. In *Engelskan i Sverige. Språkval i utbildning, arbete och kulturliv*. Stockholm: Norstedts. 7–24.
- Josephson, O. 2014. The Swedish Language Council and English as a lingua franca. *Sociolinguistica* 28(1): 105–122.
- Josephson, O. 2015. Tankarna bakom Deklaration om nordisk språkpolitik. *Sprog i Norden*: 85–96.
- Källkvist, M. & Hult, F.M. 2014. Discursive mechanisms and human agency in language policy formation: Negotiating bilingualism and parallel language use at a Swedish university. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 19(1): 1–17. Published online Sep. 15.
- Kaplan, R.B. 2001. English – the accidental language of science? In Ammon, U, ed. *The Dominance of English as a Language of Science. Effects on Other Languages and Language Communities*. Berlin: de Gruyter. 3–26.
- Karlander, D. 2015. Register and artefact: Enregistering authenticity in an engagement with Övdalsk descriptive texts. *Language & Communication* 45: 12–26.
- Karrebæk, M. S. 2013. 'Don't speak like that to her!': Linguistic minority children's socialization into an ideology of monolingualism. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 17(3): 355–375.
- Kauppi, N. 2000. Scientific practice and epistemological *a priori*: Durkheim, Mauss, Lévi-Strauss, Bourdieu. In Robbins, D., ed. *Pierre Bourdieu I*. London: Sage. 229–243.
- Kauppi, N. & Erkkilä, T. 2011. The struggle over global higher education: Actors, institutions, and practices. *International Political Sociology* 5: 314–326.
- Kennedy, M. D. 2015. *Globalizing Knowledge. Intellectuals, Universities, and Publics in Transformation*. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press.
- Kiselman, C., Halldin, S., Danielsson, U., Carlson, K., Mattson, A. & Rutberg, M. 2005. Svenska språket dör ut på landets universitet. *Dagens Nyheter*. June 17, 6.
- Kramsch, C. 2012. Authenticity and legitimacy in multilingual SLA. *Critical Multilingualism Studies* 1(1): 107–128.
- Krauss, M. 1992. The world's languages in crisis. *Language* 68: 4–10.
- Kroskrity, P.V., ed. 2000. *Regimes of Language. Ideologies, Politics, and Identities*. Santa Fe: SAR.
- Kroskrity, P.V. 2006. Language ideologies. In Duranti, A., ed. *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. Malden: Blackwell. 496–517.
- Krull, W. 2005. Exporting the Humboldtian university. *Minerva* 43: 99–102.

- Kuteeva, M., ed. 2011. Special issue on academic English in parallel-language and ELF settings. *Ibérica* 22.
- Kuteeva, M. 2015. Academic English as ‘nobody’s land’. The research and publishing practices of Swedish academics. In Pló Alastroé, R. & Pérez-Llantada, C., eds. *English as a Scientific Language and Research Language*. Berlin: de Gruyter. 261–280.
- Kuteeva, M. & Airey, J. 2014. Disciplinary differences in the use of English in higher education: Reflections on recent language policy developments. *Higher Education* 67(5): 533–549.
- Kuteeva, M. & McGrath, L. 2014. Taming Tyrannosaurus Rex: English use in the research and publication practices of humanities scholars in Sweden. *Multilingua* 33(3–4): 365–387.
- Latour, B. 1987. *Science in Action*. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Lee, H. & Lee, K. 2013. Publish (in international indexed journals) or perish: Neo-liberal ideology in a Korean university. *Language Policy* 12: 215–230.
- Lillis, T. 2013. *The Sociolinguistics of Writing*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Lillis, T. & Curry, M.J. 2010. *Academic Writing in a Global Context. The Politics and Practices of Publishing in English*. New York: Routledge.
- Lindberg, B. 1984. *De lärdes modersmål. Latin, humanism och vetenskap i 1700-talets Sverige*. Gothenburg: Univ. Of Gothenburg.
- Lindgren, B., ed. 2007. *Nämnd, inte glömd. Historik över Nämnden för språkvård och Svenska språknämnden 1944–2007*. Stockholm: The Swedish Language Council.
- Linn, A. & Oakes, L. 2007. Language policies for a global era: The changing face of language politics in Scandinavia. In Fandrych, C. & Salverda, R., eds. *Standard, Variation and Language Change in Germanic Languages*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr. 59–90.
- Lizardo, O. 2008. Comment of John Goldthorpe/5. Three cheers for unoriginality. *Sociologica* 1: 1–15.
- Ljosland, R. 2008. *Lingua franca, prestisjespråk og forestilt fellesskap. Om engelsk som akademisk språk i Norge: et kasusstudium i bred kontekst*. Trondheim: Norwegian Univ. of Science and Technology.
- Löfgren, O. 1992. Modernizing the nation – nationalizing modernity. *Etnološka tribina* 22 (15): 91–115.
- Lønsmann, D. 2010. *English as a Corporate Language: Language Choice and Language Ideologies in an International Company in Denmark*. Roskilde: Roskilde Univ.
- Lund, J. 1989. *Okay? Amerikansk påvirkning af dansk spog*. Copenhagen: Association of Teachers of Danish [Dansklærerforeningen].
- Lynch, M. 2000. Against reflexivity as an academic virtue and source of privileged knowledge. *Theory, Culture & Society* 17(3): 26–54.
- Mac Mathúna, S. & Ó Corráin, A. 1998. Introduction. The minority language syndrome. In Ó Corráin, A. & Mac Mathúna, S., eds. *Minority Languages in Scandinavia, Britain and Ireland*. Uppsala: Uppsala Univ. 11–19.



- Madsen, M. 2008. *'Der vil altid være brug for dansk'*. En undersøgelse af 11 naturvidenskabelige forskeres grunde til at vælge henholdsvis dansk og engelsk i deres arbejde. Copenhagen: Univ. of Copenhagen.
- Makoni, S. 2014. 'The Lord is my shock absorber': A sociohistorical integrationist approach to mid-twentieth-century literacy practices in Ghana. In Blackledge, A., & Creese, A., eds. *Heteroglossia as Practice and Pedagogy*. New York: Springer. 75–98.
- Mål i mun. Förslag till handlingsprogram för svenska språket*. 2002. SOU 2002:27. Stockholm: Ministry of Culture.
- Martin-Jones, M. 1989. Language, power and linguistic minorities: The need for an alternative approach to bilingualism, language maintenance and shift. In Grillo, R., ed. *Social Anthropology and the Politics of Language*. New York: Routledge. 106–125.
- Martin-Jones, M. 2007. Bilingualism, education and the regulation of access to language resources. In Heller, M., ed. *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*. New York: Palgrave. 161–182.
- Maton, K. 2003. Pierre Bourdieu and epistemic conditions of social scientific knowledge. *Space & Culture* 6(1): 52–65.
- Mauthner, N.S. & Doucet, A. 2003. Reflexive accounts and accounts of reflexivity in qualitative data analysis. *Sociology* 37(3): 413–431.
- May, S. 2011. Language policy. In Grenfell, M., ed. *Bourdieu, Language and Linguistics*. London: Continuum. 147–169.
- McGrath, L. 2014. Parallel language use in academic and outreach publication: A case study of policy and practice. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 13: 5–16.
- Mehan, H. 1996. The construction of an LD student: A case study in the politics of representation. In Silverstein, M. & Urban, G., eds. *Natural Histories of Discourse*. Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago Press. 253–276.
- Melander, B. 1997. De små språken i den europeiska gemenskapen. *Språk och stil* 7: 91–113.
- Melander, B. 2001. Swedish, English and the European Union. In Boyd, S. & Huss, L., eds. *Managing Multilingualism in a European Nation-State*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 13–31.
- Melander, B. 2004. Engelska och svenska vid Uppsala universitet – en uppföljning. In Bäcklund, I., Börestam, U., Melander Marttala, U. & Näslund, H., eds. *Text i arbete/Text at Work. Festskrift till Britt-Louise Gunnarsson den 12 januari 2005*. Uppsala: Uppsala Univ. 135–143.
- Melander, B. 2005. Ett komplett och samhällsbärande språk. Hur ser man på svenskan i Sverige? *Svenskans beskrivning* 27: 193–213.
- Melander, B. 2006. Funktion eller kultur – vad ska svensk språkpolitik syfta till? *Språk i Norden* 2006: 43–55.
- Melander, B. 2007. Språkpolitik och språkvård. In Sundgren, E., ed. *Sociolingvistik*. Stockholm: Liber. 310–335.
- Melander, B. 2011. Makten över språket i svensk språkpolitik. In Müssener, H. & Jegeback, P., eds. *Språket, makten och härligheten*. Uppsala: Uppsala Univ.
- Melander, B. 2013. Språkpolitik och språkvård. In Sundgren, E., ed. *Sociolingvistik*. Stockholm: Liber. 325–352.

- Melander, B. & Thelander, M. 2006a. Så tar man livet av ett språk. *Språkvård* 2: 39–42.
- Melander, B. & Thelander, M. 2006b. Försiktighet ändå bäst. *Språkvård* 4: 41–43.
- Mertz, E. 1993. Learning what to ask: Metapragmatic factors and methodological reification. In Lucy, J.A., ed. *Reflexive Language. Reported Speech and Metapragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press. 159–174.
- Mežek, Š. 2013. *Advanced Second-Language Reading and Vocabulary Learning in the Parallel-Language University*. Stockholm: Stockholm Univ.
- Mickwitz, Å. 2010. *Anpassning i språkkontakt. Morfologisk och ortografisk anpassning av engelska lånord i svenska*. Helsinki: Univ. of Helsinki.
- Milani, T.M. 2006. Language planning and national identity in Sweden: A performativity approach. In Mar-Molinero, C. & Stevenson, P., eds. *Language Ideologies, Policies and Practices*. New York: Palgrave. 104–117.
- Milani, T.M. 2007a. *Debating Swedish. Language Politics and Ideology in Contemporary Sweden*. Stockholm: Stockholm Univ.
- Milani, T.M. 2007b. Voices of endangerment: A language ideological debate on the Swedish language. In Duchêne, A. & Heller, M., eds. *Discourses of Endangerment: Ideology and Interest in the Defence of Languages*. London: Continuum. 169–196.
- Milani, T.M. & Johnson, S. 2008. Language politics and legitimation crisis in Sweden. A Habermasian approach. *Language Problems & Language Planning* 32(1): 1–22.
- Mills, D. 2015. Review of Hultgren, A.-K., Gregersen, F. & Thøgersen, J., eds. *English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and Practices*. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 25(2): 265–268.
- Milroy, J. 1992. *Language Variation and Change*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Mohr, J.W. 2013. Bourdieu's relational method in theory and practice: From fields and capitals to networks and institutions (and back again). In Dépelteau, F. & Powell, C., eds. *Applying Relational Sociology. Relations, Networks, and Society*. New York: Palgrave. 101–135.
- Muelmann, S. & Duchêne, A. 2007. Beyond the nation-state: International agencies as new sites of discourses on bilingualism. In Heller, M., ed. *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*. New York: Palgrave. 96–110.
- Mufwene, S.S. 2004. Language birth and death. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 33: 201–222.
- Negretti, R. & Garcia-Yeste, M. 2015. 'Lunch keeps people apart': The role of English for social interaction in a multilingual academic workplace. *Multilingua* 34(1): 93–118.
- Nilsson, I. 1978. *Själen i laboratoriet. Vetenskapsideal och människosyn i den experimentella psykologins framväxt*. Lund: Doxa.
- Nyström Höög, C. 2008. Sila mygg och svälja kameler? Om svenska attityder till hot mot svenskan. *Svenskan i Finland* 10: 9–21.
- Oakes, L. 2001. *Language and National Identity. Comparing France and Sweden*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Oakes, L. 2005. From internationalization to globalization. Language and the nationalist revival in Sweden. *Language Problems & Language Planning* 29(2): 151–176.
- Ochs, E. 1979. Transcription as theory. In Ochs, E. & Schieffelin, B.B., eds. *Developmental Pragmatics*. New York: Academic Press. 43–71.
- O'Dell, T. 1997. *Culture Unbound. Americanization and Everyday Life in Sweden*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press.
- Olsson, A. & Sheridan, V. 2012. A case study of Swedish scholars' experiences with and perceptions of the use of English in academic publishing. *Written Communication* 29(1): 33–54.
- Ortner, S.B. 2006. *Anthropology and Social Theory. Culture, Power, and the Acting Subject*. Durham: Duke Univ. Press.
- Östman, J.-O. & Londen, M. 2012. Ambivalens och ansvar: domänförlust som implicit process vid ett tvåspråkigt universitet. *Nordand* 7(2): 113–141.
- Paasi, A. 2005. Globalisation, academic capitalism, and the uneven geographies of international journal publishing spaces. *Environment and Planning A* 37: 769–789.
- Park, J.S.Y. & Wee, L. 2012. *Markets of English. Linguistic Capital and Language Policy in a Globalizing World*. New York: Routledge.
- Paton, K. 2007. Conceptualising 'choice': A review of the theoretical literature. *Non-Participation in HE Project Series Working Paper 5*. Southampton: Univ. of Southampton.
- Pennycook, A. 2007. *Global Englishes and Transcultural Flows*. New York: Routledge.
- Pennycook, A. 2010. *Language as a Local Practice*. New York: Routledge.
- Pérez-Milans, M. 2015. Language and identity in linguistic ethnography. *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies* 158: 2–16.
- Pérez-Llantada, C. 2015. Genres in the forefront, languages in the background: The scope of genre analysis in language-related scenarios. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 19: 10–21.
- Phillipson, R. 2008. The linguistic imperialism of neoliberal empire. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies* 5(1): 1–43.
- Phillipson, R. 2009. *Linguistic Imperialism Continued*. New York: Routledge.
- Pielke, R. A. 2007. *The Honest Broker. Making Sense of Science in Policy and Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Pouliot, V. 2013. Methodology. Putting practice theory into practice. In Adler-Nissen, R., ed. *Bourdieu in International Relations. Rethinking key concepts in IR*. New York: Routledge. 45–58.
- Powell, C. & Dépelteau, F., eds. 2013. *Conceptualizing Relational Sociology. Ontological and Theoretical Issues*. New York: Palgrave.
- Pratt, M.L. 1991. Arts of the contact zone. *Profession*: 33–40.
- Preisler, B. 2005. Deconstructing 'the domain of science' as a sociolinguistic entity in EFL societies: The relationship between English and Danish in higher education and research. In Preisler, B., Fabricius, A., Haberland, H., Kjærbeck, S. & Risager, K., eds. *The Consequences of Mobility*. Roskilde: Roskilde Univ. 238–248.

- Preisler, B. 2009. Complementary languages. The national language and English as working languages in European universities. *Angles on the English-Speaking World* 9: 10–28.
- Pujolar, J. 2007. Bilingualism and the nation-state in the post-national era. In Heller, M., ed. *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*. New York: Palgrave. 71–95.
- Putnam, L.L. 2009. Symbolic capital and academic fields. An alternative discourse on journal rankings. *Management Communication Quarterly* 23(1): 127–134.
- Rampton, B. 2007. Neo-Hymesian linguistic ethnography in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 11(5): 584–607.
- Rampton, B. 2011. From ‘Multi-ethnic adolescent heteroglossia’ to ‘Contemporary urban vernaculars’. *Language & Communication* 31: 276–294.
- Rampton, B. 2013. From ‘Youth Language’ to contemporary urban vernaculars. In Deppermann, A., ed. *Das Deutsch der Migranten*. Berlin: de Gruyter. 59–80.
- Resurser för kvalitet*. 2007. SOU 2007:81. Stockholm: Ministry of Education.
- Ricento, T. 2000. Historical and theoretical perspectives in language policy and planning. In Ricento, T. ed. *Ideology, Politics and Language Policies: Focus on English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 9–24.
- Rider, S., Hasselberg, Y. & Waluszewski, A, eds. 2013. *Transformations in Research, Higher Education and the Academic Market. The Breakdown of Scientific Thought*. New York: Springer.
- Ross, A. & Ahmadi, A. 2006. *Gaston Bachelard (1884–1962) and Georges Canguilhem (1904–1995): Epistemology in France*. In Wolfreys, J., ed. *Modern European Criticism and Theory: A Critical Guide*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press. 90–97.
- Ruth, A. 1984. The second new nation: The mythology of modern Sweden. *Daedalus* 113(2): 53–96.
- Sallabank, J. 2009. Book review of Duchêne, A. and Heller, M., eds. *Discourses of endangerment: Ideology and interest in the defence of languages*. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 13(1): 106–134.
- Salö, L. 2009. Vad heter ”glottophagy” på svenska? *Klarspråk* 4: 3.
- Salö, L. 2010. *Engelska eller svenska? En kartläggning av språksituationen inom högre utbildning och forskning*. Stockholm: The Swedish Language Council.
- Salö, L. 2012. Domänförlust som språkideologisk representation. *Språkvårdens diskurser om engelska i Sverige*. *Nordand* 7(2): 21–59.
- Salö, L. & Josephson, O. 2014. Landrapport Sverige. Parallellspråkighet vid svenska universitet och högskolor. In Gregersen, F. ed. *Hvor parallelt. Om parallellspråkighet på Nordens universitet*. Copenhagen: The Nordic Council of Ministers. 261–322.
- Schieffelin, B.B., Woolard, K.A. & Kroskrity, P.V., eds. 1998. *Language Ideologies. Practice and Theory*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Scollon, R. 2008. Discourse Itineraries. Nine Processes of Resemiotization. In Bhatia, V.K., Flowerdew, J. & Jones, R.H., eds. *Advances in Discourse Studies*. New York: Routledge. 233–244.
- Shaw, P. & McMillion, A. 2011. Components of success in academic reading tasks for Swedish students. *Ibérica* 22: 141–162.

- Shibamoto-Smith, J. S. & Chand, V. 2013. Linguistic Anthropology. In Bayley, R., Cameron, R. & Lucas, C., eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press. 31–47.
- Simonsen, D.F. 2002. Å velge bort norsk. Om begrepene ‘domene’ og ‘domenetap’ anvendt på skandinaviske land. *Norsklæraren* 2: 5–17.
- Silverstein, M. 1979. Language structure and linguistic ideology. In Clyne, P.R., Hanks, W.F., Hofbauer, C.L., eds. *The Elements. A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society. 193–247.
- Silverstein, M. 1996. Monoglot ‘standard’ in America: Standardization and metaphors of linguistic hegemony. In Brenneis, D. & Macaulay, R.K.S., eds. *The Matrix of Language. Contemporary Linguistic Anthropology*. Boulder: Westview. 284–306.
- Silverstein, M. 1998. Contemporary transformations of local linguistic communities. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 27: 401–426.
- Silverstein, M. 2003. Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language & Communication* 23: 193–229.
- Silverstein, M. 2005. Axes of evals: Token versus type interdiscursivity. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 15 (1): 6–22.
- Silverstein, M. & Urban, G., eds. 1996a. *Natural Histories of Discourse*. Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Silverstein, M. & Urban, G. 1996b. The natural history of discourse. In Silverstein, M. & Urban, G., eds. *Natural Histories of Discourse*. Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago Press. 1–17.
- Slembrouck, S. 2004. Reflexivity and the research interview. Habitus and social class in parents’ accounts of children in public care. *Critical Discourse Studies* 1(1): 91–112.
- Slembrouck, S. 2011. Globalization theory and migration. In Wodak, R., Johnstone, B. & Kerswill, P. *The SAGE Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. London: SAGE. 153–164.
- Söderlundh, H. 2010. *Internationella universitetet – lokala språkval. Om bruket av talad svenska i engelskspråkiga kursmiljöer*. Uppsala: Uppsala Univ.
- Sörlin, S. 1989. Scientific travel – the Linnean tradition. In Frängsmyr, ed. *Science in Sweden. The Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences 1739–1989*. Canton: Science History Publications. 96–123.
- Sörlin, S. 1994. *De lärda republiken. Om vetenskapens internationella tendenser*. Stockholm: Liber.
- Sörlin, S. 2007. Funding diversity. Performance-based funding regimes as drivers of differentiation in higher education systems. *Higher Education Policy* 20: 413–440.
- Spotti, M. 2011. Modernist language ideologies, indexicalities and identities: Looking at the multilingual classroom through a post-Fishmanian lens. *Applied Linguistics Review* 2(2): 29–50.
- Språk för alla – förslag till språklag*. 2008. Prop. 2008/09:153. Stockholm: Ministry of Culture.
- Språklag*. 2009. SFS 2009:600. Stockholm: Ministry of Culture.
- Stålhammar, M. 2010. *Engelskan i svenskan. Åttahundra år av lånade ord och språkliga influenser*. Stockholm: Norstedts.

- Stroud, C. 1978. The concept of semilingualism. *Working Papers in Linguistics* 16.
- Stroud, C. 2002. Framing Bourdieu socioculturally: Alternative forms of linguistic legitimacy in postcolonial Mozambique. *Multilingua* 21: 247–273.
- Stroud, C. 2004. Rinkeby Swedish and semilingualism in language ideological debates: A Bourdieuean perspective. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 8(2): 196–214.
- Stroud, C. & Wee, L. 2011. *Style, Identity and Literacy. English in Singapore*. Bristol. Multilingual Matters.
- Susen, S. 2013. Bourdieusian reflections on language: Unavoidable conditions of the real speech situation. *Social Epistemology* 27(3–4): 199–246.
- Svanlund, J. & Westman, M. 1991. Svenskans ställning vid europeisk integration. *Språkvård* 4: 9–12.
- Svantesson, E. 2006. Språkexperter räds svengelskan. *Dagens Nyheter*. Oct. 21, 14.
- Svenska språknämnden. 1998. *Förslag till handlingsprogram för att främja svenska språket*. Stockholm: The Swedish Language Council.
- Svenska språknämnden. 2004. *Engelskan i Sverige. Språkval i utbildning, arbete och kulturliv*. Stockholm: Norstedts.
- de Swaan, A. 2001. *Words of the World. The Global Language System*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Swales, J.M. 1990. *Genre Analysis. English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Swartz, D. 1997. *Culture and Power. The Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu*. Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Swartz, D. 2013. Metaprinciples for sociological research in a Bourdieusian perspective. In Gorski, P.S., ed. *Bourdieu and Historical Analysis*. Durham: Duke Univ. Press. 19–35.
- Sweetman, P. 2003. Twenty-first dis-ease? Habitual reflexivity or the reflexive habitus. *The Sociological Review* 51(4): 528–549.
- Swigart, L. 2001. The limits of legitimacy: Language ideology and shift in contemporary Senegal. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 10(1): 90–130.
- Teleman, U. 1989. Det nordiska språksamarbetet. Idéer och framtidsuppgifter. *Språk i Norden*: 14–32.
- Teleman, U. 1992. Det svenska riksspråkets utsikter i ett integrerat Europa. *Språkvård* 4: 7–17.
- Teleman, U. 2003. *Tradis och funkis. Svensk språkvård och språkpolitik efter 1800*. Stockholm: Norstedts.
- Teleman, U. 2005. Language cultivation and language planning II: Swedish. In Bandle, O., ed. *The Nordic Languages. An International Handbook of the History of the North Germanic Languages 2*. Berlin: de Gruyter. 1970–1983.
- Teleman, U. 2007. På väg mot nya uppgifter. In Lindgren, B., ed. *Nämnd, inte glömd. Historik över Nämnden för språkvård och Svenska språknämnden 1944–2007*. Stockholm: The Swedish Language Council. 65–76.
- Teleman, U. & Westman, M. 1997. Behöver vi en nationell språkpolitik? *Språkvård* 2: 5–16.
- Thøgersen, J., Josephson, O., Londen, M. och Salö, L. 2014. Engelsk som undervisningsprog på nordiske universiteter – hvordan gør man? In Gregersen, F. ed.,

- Hvor parallelt. Om parallellspråkighet på Nordens universitet.* Copenhagen, Denmark: The Nordic Council of Ministers. 55–115.
- Thompson, J.B. 1984. *Studies in the Theory of Ideology*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.
- Thompson, J.B. 1991. Editor's introduction. In Bourdieu, P. *Language & Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity. 1–31.
- Thorpe, C. 2013. Critical strategies for implementing a relational sociological paradigm: Elias, Bourdieu, and uncivilized sociological theoretical struggles. In Powell, C. & Dépelteau, F., eds. *Conceptualizing Relational Sociology. Ontological and Theoretical Issues*. New York: Palgrave. 105–122.
- Tiles, M. 1985. *Bachelard: Science and Objectivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Törrönen, J. 2002. Semiotic theory on qualitative interviewing using stimulus texts. *Qualitative Research* 2(3): 343–362.
- Vandenberghe, F. 1999. 'The real is relational': An epistemological analysis of Pierre Bourdieu's generative structuralism. *Sociological Theory* 17(1): 32–67.
- Vann, R.E. 2011. Language and ideology. In Grenfell, M., ed. *Bourdieu, Language and Linguistics*. London: Continuum. 97–120.
- Värna språken – förslag till språklag. 2008. SOU 2008:26. Stockholm: Ministry of Culture.
- Vigouroux, C.B. 2009. The making of a scription: A case study on authority and authorship. *Text & Talk* 29(5): 615–637.
- Wacquant, L.J.D. 1989a Towards a reflexive sociology: A workshop with Pierre Bourdieu. *Sociological Theory* 7(1): 26–63.
- Wacquant, L.J.D. 1989b. For a socio-analysis of intellectuals. On Homo Academicus. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology* 34: 1–29.
- Wacquant, L.J.D. 1992. Toward a social praxeology: The structure and logic of Bourdieu's sociology. In Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L.J.D. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago Press. 1–59.
- Wacquant, L.J.D. 1993. Bourdieu in America: Notes on the transatlantic importation of social theory. In Calhoun, C., LiPuma, E. & Postone, M., eds. *Bourdieu. Critical Perspectives*. Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago Press. 235–262.
- Wacquant, L.J.D. 2004. *Body & Soul. Notebooks of an Apprentice Boxer*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Wacquant, L.J.D. 2009a. The body, the ghetto and the penal state. *Qualitative Sociology* 32: 101–129.
- Wacquant, L.J.D. 2009b. Habitus as topic and tool. Reflections on becoming a prizefighter. In Puddephatt, A.J., Shaffir, W. & Kleinknecht, S.W., eds. *Ethnographies Revisited. Constructing Theory in the Field*. New York: Routledge. 137–151.
- Waddington, P.A.J. 1986. Mugging as a moral panic: A question of proportion. *British Journal of Sociology* 37(2): 245–259.
- Webb, J., Schirato, T. & Danaher, G. 2002. *Understanding Bourdieu*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Westman, M. 1996. Har svenska språket en framtid? In Moberg, L. & Westman, M., eds. *Svenskan i tusen år. Glimtar ur svenska språkets utveckling*. Stockholm: Norstedts. 182–194.

- Widmalm, S. 2013. Innovation and control: Performative research policy in Sweden. In Rider, S., Hasselberg, Y. & Waluszewski, A, eds. *Transformations in Research, Higher Education and the Academic Market. The Breakdown of Scientific Thought*. New York: Springer. 39–52.
- Williams, G. 1992. *Sociolinguistics. A Sociological Critique*. New York: Routledge.
- Williams, G. 2010. *The Knowledge Economy, Language and Culture*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Woolard, K. A. 1985. Language variation and cultural hegemony: Toward an integration of sociolinguistic and social theory. *American Ethnologist* 12(4): 738–748.
- Woolard, K. A. 1998. Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In Schieffelin, B.B., Woolard, K.A. & Kroskrity, P.V., eds. *Language Ideologies. Practice and Theory*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press. 3–47.
- Woolard, K.A. & Schieffelin, B.B. 1994. Language ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23: 55–82.
- Wortham, S. & Reyes, A. 2015. *Discourse Analysis Beyond the Speech Event*. New York: Routledge.
- Wortham, S., Mortimer, K., Lee, K., Allard, E. & While, K.D. 2011. Interviews as interactional data. *Language in Society* 40: 39–50.