

## WestminsterResearch

<http://www.westminster.ac.uk/research/westminsterresearch>

### **Parallel languages in the history of language ideology in Norway and the lesson for Nordic higher education**

**Andrew Linn**

This is a preliminary version of a book chapter published in *English in Nordic Universities: Ideologies and practices*. Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company, Pages 27-52. Reproduced with permission of the publisher.

The definitive, published, version of record is available in the e-book here:  
<https://benjamins.com/#catalog/books/wlp.5/main>

---

The WestminsterResearch online digital archive at the University of Westminster aims to make the research output of the University available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the authors and/or copyright owners.

---

Whilst further distribution of specific materials from within this archive is forbidden, you may freely distribute the URL of WestminsterResearch:  
<http://westminsterresearch.wmin.ac.uk/>

In case of abuse or copyright appearing without permission e-mail  
[repository@westminster.ac.uk](mailto:repository@westminster.ac.uk)

**Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Pages 27-52.**

**Parallel languages in the history of language ideology in Norway and the lesson for Nordic higher education**

Andrew R. Linn

**Abstract**

This chapter compares recent policy on the use of English and Norwegian in Higher Education with earlier policies on the relationship between the two standard varieties of Norwegian, and it charts how and why English became a policy issue in Norway. Based on the experience of over a century of language planning, a highly interventionist approach is today being avoided and language policies in the universities of Norway seek to nurture a situation where English and Norwegian may be used productively side-by-side. However, there remain serious practical challenges to be overcome. This paper also builds on a previous analysis (Linn 2010b) of the metalanguage of Nordic language policy and seeks to clarify the use of the term 'parallelingualism'.

**1 Introduction**

The main goal of this chapter is to consider recent debate and policy development on the use of English in Higher Education in Norway in the light of this country's long history of intervention in language matters. For well over a century the Norwegian language authorities (see e.g. Faarlund, 1997; Hellevik & Lundebj, 1964; Mæhle, Lundebj & Grønvik, 1987) have been handling a situation in which two language varieties, Bokmål and Nynorsk, both standardised and officially recognised varieties of Norwegian, have co-existed and been used in parallel. Thus the experience

**Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Pages 27-52.**

of parallel language use, as experienced and hotly debated today in the context of Norwegian vs. English, is nothing new in Norway, and this inevitably leads us to ask what that experience can teach us as we address the specific challenge of languages being used in parallel in 21<sup>st</sup>-century universities. The two cases of parallel languages under consideration here are not completely parallel, if that makes sense. In the Norwegian-internal case it is two varieties of the same language that have been planned while in modern universities it is two different languages. However, in both cases the language varieties in question are for all practical purposes mutually comprehensible to Norwegians and so exist side by side as genuine choices to be made by users and controlled by policy makers. In the Norwegian-internal case the highest profile intervention (see section 2) has involved the *corpus* of the language (the actual forms used) while in today's Higher Education context it is the *status* of the languages (how they are used) which is the primary (though not only) issue. However, both cases involve official intervention in the language practices of language users, politically motivated intervention with which users may or may not agree. It is our contention, therefore, and with certain caveats, that the two cases have sufficient in common to allow us to ask pertinent questions about the nature and effectiveness of ideologically driven intervention in people's language practices.

It is evident throughout this volume that both the concepts and the terminology used in the language ideological debates (cf. Blommaert, 1999) surrounding Nordic universities can be unclear and inconsistently employed, and I have addressed three of the most tricky of the "keywords" elsewhere (Linn, 2010b, pp. 121-125). A second goal in the present chapter

**Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Pages 27-52.**

is to try to establish a little bit more clarity and consistency, at least for the purposes of my own exposition, and it is of course up to other scholars to decide themselves whether or not this is a practice they themselves also find helpful. As is noted in the introduction to this volume, “parallelingualism” is a relatively recent coinage to reflect a relatively recent piece of language policy, probably first being used in 2002 and rapidly gaining currency across the Nordic language area. In Norwegian language debate, definitions of what this concept means in practice, how it is operationalised, have been quite varied. At one end of the spectrum we find, for example, the definition given in the 2008 government paper on the language (*Mål og mening: Ein heilskapleg norsk språkpolitikk* [MOM], 2008) which does not seek any form of positive discrimination in favour of one language or another but rather describes a context where two language varieties coexist, where “one commits to both English and the national language, such that they are used in parallel”<sup>i</sup> (MOM, 2008, p. 98). In fact here the concept is explicitly designed as an instrument of peace to “break down the strong front” between pro-English and anti-English lobbyists. At the other end of the spectrum we find a more interventionist version of the policy on using the two languages in parallel, and this is exemplified by the Language Council report (*Norsk i Hundre!* [NIH], 2005) which inspired the government paper from which we have just quoted. In this earlier document, where key concepts are listed, we read that:

Parallelingualism is a fundamental notion in this document. We will use it of domains where two or more languages are in use, and where one language, in our case Norwegian, will *always be the*

## Published in

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

## Pages 27-52.

*preferred language choice* when it is not necessary to use a foreign language. (In chapter 7, 16 on culture and the media, we just take the first characteristic as the basis, namely that two languages are used in parallel.)<sup>ii</sup> (NIH, 2005, pp. 15-16) (my emphasis)

There are two somewhat different uses of the notion of *parallelingualism* here, the one which describes a situation in which two or more language varieties coexist and where they are mutually comprehensible and available in practice to all members of the relevant language community (otherwise we would have a bilingual or multilingual situation), and the other in which some sort of policy is developed to influence their relative status. Two different uses of the same term is something any science seeks to avoid, and to have a language situation and a language-political process both described as *parallelingualism* is something scholars working on language policy in Nordic universities should also seek to avoid.

Happily Norwegian has two terms, which MOM (2008, p. 98) treats as synonyms. In Nynorsk, for example, these are *parallellspråklegheit* ('*parallelingualism*') (e.g. "UiS har også stadig meir internasjonal aktivitet. Derfor er det viktig å sikre parallellspråklegheit mellom norsk og andre språk"<sup>iii</sup>) alongside *parallellspråksbruk* ('*parallel language use*'), the latter term being generally preferred (e.g. in the 2008 government paper) as being more native-like in its structure, but both terms appear abundantly in official documents across the web. It is therefore our suggestion that we take the linguistic resources available to us here and reserve the term *parallel language use* to describe those situations where two or more languages exist side by side (as in Nordic universities) and limit the term

**Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Pages 27-52.**

*parallelingualism* to refer to the ideology or practice of intervention, of language management (in the sense of Spolsky, 2009). As noted earlier, this terminological distinction might not suit everyone, but we will find it valuable in presenting the case made in the following paper.

The present study is based on scrutiny of a historical series of language policy documents, ranging from the 1966 survey of the language situation in Norway (*Innstilling om språksaken fra Komitéen til å vurdere språksituasjonen* [IOS], 1966) to the government paper of 2008, which we have already mentioned, and most importantly for present purposes, the policies on language in Higher Education elaborated by the University of Oslo (Hveem, Andersen, Hoen, Krengele & Gupta, 2006), the University of Bergen (Sandøy, Fløysand, Klock, Lærum, Murison & Østbye, 2007) and the Norwegian Association of Higher Education Institutions (Jahr et al. 2006), this last being a national, sector-wide statement on which more recent specific institutional guidelines are based. In section 2 we take a historical journey through Norwegian language planning in order to understand the currents which have influenced what we might call the Norwegian approach to language management before considering in section 3 what the results of that history have been. In section 4 we will seek to understand how English became a key issue in Norwegian language policy as the political spotlight shifted away from internal language planning at the national level to external language planning addressing the status of Norwegian as part of an international language ecology (see e.g. Denison, 1982). Finally in section 5 we conclude our historical journey by addressing the response to *parallel language use* in modern Norwegian academia in the light of this country's experience of *parallelingualism*.

**Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Pages 27-52.**

**2 Language planning in Norway**

Language has been a key ideological battleground in Norway for a century and a half, and terms like *strid* 'struggle, battle' have become a normal part of the metalanguage, even appearing in book titles (e.g. Hanssen & Wiggen, 1973; Skard, 1963). It was to describe the dramatic Norwegian experience that the Norwegian-American sociolinguist, Einar Haugen (1906-1994), first employed in print the term *language planning*. Once the first models of language planning had been set out in the 1960s (cf. Haugen, 1966a, 1966b; Kloss, 1969), still widely adhered to and taken as a basis for the analysis of language management today (e.g. Ljosland (this volume)), the activity of language planning came to be associated in the literature with the challenges faced by developing nations (e.g. Fishman, Ferguson & Das Gupta, 1968; Rubin & Jernudd, 1971), so it may strike linguists today as surprising that the "textbook case" of language planning was in fact a Nordic one. But in the mid-nineteenth century Norway was indeed a developing nation, and establishing an independent linguistic identity was an imperative in the process of national awakening, of the establishment of that set of political and cultural norms which had come to symbolise a "modern" nation (Giddens, 1991). In the political fall-out following the Napoleonic Wars (see Glenthøj, 2012), Norway had been passed from political union (in reality a colonial hegemony) with Denmark to a somewhat more equal union with Sweden. The union with Sweden remained in force until 1905, but emancipation from Denmark in 1814

**Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Pages 27-52.**

resulted in a constitution and a much greater degree of autonomy such that Norwegian independence is conventionally taken to date from that year. A university was established in Norway in 1811 (Det Kongelige Frederiks Universitet in Christiania (Oslo)) (Collett, 1999). The language situation at the university was not, however, a focus for the language planning described by Haugen or for the particular ideological turmoil which long characterised Norwegian language debate. Language practices in the university system have only been a serious topic for debate and policy development since the turn of the present century, inspired in Norway at least by the turn in language politics away from debate about planning the corpus of Norwegian to debate about protecting Norwegian and planning its status (see section 4 below). Because Norway has a long history of official intervention in language matters, it is relevant to understand current debates about English in Higher Education in that context, so we will now briefly summarise the century of political intervention in language as described by Haugen, before going on in section 3 to consider what lessons this “avalanche” (Haugen, 1966b, p. 1) of opinion and policy can teach the language policy makers of today about the implementation of workable language measures.

In the immediate aftermath of independence from Denmark there was no official plan to address what written / standard / official variety of the language should be used within Norway, and the subsequent history of intervention in the language has to a large extent been about resolving that lack of control at the outset. Two principal lines of reform evolved democratically, from the bottom up, as the realisations of two private projects. It was only later, when language in due course became official



**Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Pages 27-52.**

business, and essentially private projects had to be reconceptualised as standard language varieties, that conflicts inevitably emerged. In 1814, then, Norwegians spoke their dialects, and those who were literate wrote and read standard Danish, a variety on the Nordic linguistic continuum lexically and grammatically rather remote from many of the spoken dialects. Literacy outside the towns was surprisingly widespread with concentrations of significant literary activity in certain provincial regions, most notably Sunnmøre in western Norway (cf. Apelseth, 1996). Several proposals to address the need for an independent standard for an independent nation were advanced and indeed pursued (e.g. Jan Prahls (1833-1921) *Ny Hungrvekja* project of 1858 (see Krokvik, 1993)), but two programmes were pursued more extensively than the others. These were on the one hand a radical Norwegianisation of the inherited Danish, advocated and exemplified by the teacher, Knud Knudsen (1812-1895), and on the other the construction of a wholly new standard variety, based on the analysis of dialect forms and with reference to Old Norwegian, proposed by Ivar Aasen (1813-1896). (Aasen has been hailed as a central figure in the 19<sup>th</sup>-century Norwegian march towards modernity, and the bicentenary of his birth was the object of celebration in Norway in 2013, providing one of the rationales for designating 2013 *Språkåret* 'the year of language', a 19-million kroner (approx. €2.3 million) year-long celebration of all things linguistic in Norway. Knudsen does not share that star status, although his bicentenary was at least marked in 2012 by a special issue of the Language Council's journal, *Språknytt*.) Once these two projects had become established and recognised as the principal vehicles for reform, the Norwegian *questione della lingua* became enshrined as a bipolar one,

**Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Pages 27-52.**

an *either-or*, and it is how best to manage the “either” and the “or” in both language ideology and practice which has dominated language political debate up to the present and with which the debate on language use in Higher Education is still grappling today, as we shall see in section 5 below.

On 12 May 1885 parliament resolved that the two written varieties should be afforded equal status. These two varieties have undergone various name changes over the decades, which can prove confusing to Norwegians and non-Norwegians alike. The form advocated by Knudsen was called by him ‘our common written language’ [vort almindelige Skrift- og Bogsprog] and was otherwise known as Dano-Norwegian and now *Bokmål*, and Aasen’s ‘Norwegian folk language’ [det norske Folkesprog] was also known as Landsmaal, later becoming *Nynorsk*. The 1885 resolution resulted in a parallel language situation *avant la lettre*. The two varieties existed side by side within the same language ecology, and could be used freely in a variety of contexts, thus an ecology in which there are two written languages to choose between within the same domains is well established in Norway (see Haberland, 2005; Jónsson, Laurén, Myking & Picht, 2013, and elsewhere in this volume for a problematisation of the notion of *domain*). At this stage neither variety possessed an agreed standard, and Haugen’s saga of language planning got underway because of the need to make practical sense of the 1885 resolution (see also Linn, 2010a, section 2). This resolution was, as Lars Vikør rightly observes, in effect about parity between two linguistic *movements* rather than parity between two distinct language varieties (Vikør, 1990, p. 87), and the same might well be said about the situation today where a parallel language

**Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Pages 27-52.**

policy in universities is the linguistic reflex of ideological conflict between the internationalisation movement and the preservationist movement.

Just after the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century both varieties were subject to revision in the name of greater standardisation, Landsmaal in 1901 and Dano-Norwegian in 1907. This democratic parallel language use, whereby Norwegians had two varieties to choose between, began to shift with the reform of 1917 (Haugen, 1966b, pp. 84 ff.). From now on, the agenda was about managing the problem that had arisen prior to official intervention, the problem (although not everyone sees it that way (e.g. Trudgill, 2006)) of two mutually comprehensible written standards serving the same small language community. The co-existence of two standards was, in Haugen's words, "pre-eminently a sociopolitical problem, with roots that reach down into the heart of Norwegian life" (1966b, p. 3). After 1917 the plan was increasingly to reform the two varieties in each other's direction in the hope that one day in the future they would converge as one single 'Common Norwegian' [Samnorsk], although it was the failure to spot those trailing roots that ultimately tripped this process up. The Samnorsk agenda remained in force in the 1938 reform too, an agenda formally directed after 1952 by a national Language Commission [språknemnd]. The language planning of the 1950s and specifically the appearance of 'the textbook standard' [læreboknormalen] in 1959 generated widespread objection, particularly but not uniquely from the pressure groups lobbying against changes to Bokmål. These were years in which language planners came into direct conflict with the will of ordinary language users, where the voice "from above" sought to shout down the voice "from below" (see Linn, 2010b for a discussion of this notion of *voice* in language political

## Published in

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

## Pages 27-52.

debate). In the laconic terms of Rambø (1999, p. 40), “the language-political situation which developed in Norway in the 1950s and 1960s was filled with great conflict”. The disconnect between ideology and practice observed throughout the present volume can be observed in this earlier Norwegian language planning situation. To return to the distinction we sought to make in the introduction to this paper, a situation of *parallel language use* had given way to one of *parallelingualism*, direct intervention in the parallel language situation through the manipulation of the two languages in question. Norwegians, at least the more articulate and active, supported by some well organised associations (notably the Riksmål Association [Riksmålsforbundet] (see Langslet, 1999)) had demonstrated very clearly that their language choices could not in a democratic context be managed via the instrumental resolution of a theoretical problem. Language practice is more complex and more socially rooted than the simple expedient of planning either corpus or status would tolerate.

### 3 The Norwegian lesson

So the Norwegian lesson, at least at the point at which Haugen came to describe and interrogate it, appeared to be that language planning could not simply take two language varieties and seek to control their use in the name of a policy, that practice would not yield to ideology. Hultgren (2014), following Mortensen (2014), further notes the invariably “modest effect of language policy on the linguistic behaviour of individuals”. With the bitter rancour of the 1950s ringing in his ears, the minister for church

**Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Pages 27-52.**

and culture, Helge Sivertsen (1913-1986), established a committee to “assess the language situation and where appropriate to advance proposals for legislation and other initiatives to serve to unite forces in the protection and development of the Norwegian language”<sup>iv</sup> (royal decree of January 1964, quoted in the 1966 report on the language situation (IOS, p. 3)). The committee came to be known informally as either the Vogt Committee, after its chair, Rector of the University of Oslo, Hans Vogt (1903-1986), or even more informally as the Language Peace Committee, since its aim was to break down some of the battle lines drawn between the various camps, between language radicals and language conservatives, in short “to replace bitter polemic with ‘ongoing dialogue’ [løpende dialog]” (IOS, p. 9). It should be noted that the conflict, the opposition, was not between Nynorsk and Bokmål and their users *per se* but rather about the contested relationship between them and what some felt to be an infringement of the democratic right to use language freely—language planning is never primarily about language! Writing in 1966, the conservative Riksmål Association expressed the situation in precisely these terms:

We refer to the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights, Article 2, which equates amongst other things language and religion as values which constitute the personality of the individual and sets boundaries for the intervention of the state (Riksmålsforbundet, 1966, p. 8).

## Published in

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

## Pages 27-52.

The Vogt Committee reported in appropriately irenic terms, putting forward six primary proposals. The most significant of these in terms of language planning was proposal 6, recommending the replacement of the unloved Language Commission by a 'Council for Language Protection and Language Cultivation' [Råd for språkvern og språkdyrking] (IOS, p. 53). The rhetoric of *protection* permeates the report of the Vogt Committee, and *vern* 'protection' and *dyrking* 'cultivation' are key features of the *voice* of this document, of the voice of a new era in Norwegian language politics. But if the old conflict between Nynorsk and Bokmål was to be replaced by a protection agenda and a body with the mandate of protecting Norwegian, what or whom is the language to be protected from? Significantly IOS doesn't tell us, doesn't mention the enemy, but, given the focus of the current book, I don't think it will come as a surprise! What is more interesting though is why, in the wake of the Language Peace of 1966, the notion of the protection of Norwegian, of a new external enemy and of new language conflict came to the fore in language policy debate. We will return to this in the next section, but first we need to consider the outcome of the language-political strategies of the 1950s so that we might go on to consider to what extent this lesson can inform contemporary debate on the role of English in Higher Education in Norway.

After considerable discussion within and outside parliament (Rambø 1999, pp. 44-48), plans were set in place to effect the replacement of the old language agency with the new, and the mandate for a new Language Council (*Norsk språkråd* soon emerged as the preferred name) passed unhindered through the parliamentary stages, such that legislation for the new Language Council [*Lov om norsk språkråd* [LNS], 1971] was approved

**Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Pages 27-52.**

on 9 June 1971, and the symbolically renamed agency began its work on 1 February 1972. The final version of the new council's mandate is worth noting. The opening statement of the mandate for the old Language Commission ran as follows:

The Norwegian Language Commission is an advisory body. Based on scientific research it will give the authorities and the general public advice and guidance in language questions and in this work *promote rapprochement between the two written languages on the basis of the Norwegian folk language*<sup>v</sup> (Hellevik & Lundebj, 1964, p. 39). (my emphasis)

This was the most contentious statement in the rhetoric of language politics at that time, clearly signalling the policy goal of uniting the two varieties on some debatable common ground ("on the basis of the Norwegian folk language"). The relevant paragraph in the new mandate of June 1971 ran instead as follows:

[The Norwegian Language Council] shall follow the development of written and spoken Norwegian and on this basis *promote cooperation in the cultivation and standardisation of our two language forms* and support developments which in the longer term bring the language forms closer together<sup>vi</sup> (LNS, 1971, §1b). (my emphasis)

**Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Pages 27-52.**

Unification, manipulation of the corpus to change the status, is not entirely off the agenda, or at least the door is left open for it by reference to cooperation, but any reference to the contentious linguistic category of *folk language* as the grounds for unification has gone. This new version of the so-called “Samnorsk paragraph” would continue to dog language politics and continue to provide grounds for the voice from below to rail against the voice from above until it was formally rescinded in 2002 just in time for the most recent reincarnation of the Language Council in 2004.

I have elsewhere discussed the subsequent rapid and complete rejection of the Samnorsk policy via a series of practical shifts in the process of language reform (e.g. Linn & Oakes, 2007). These moves were given ideological status in the form of the 1997 parliamentary report on ‘Language Use in Public Service’ [Målbruk i offentleg teneste [MOT]], which contained the following statement about the status of the two written varieties:

Instead of emphasising developments intended to draw the language varieties together, language cultivation work will rather be bound up with the question of how Bokmål and Nynorsk shall be able to develop as well as possible *autonomously*<sup>vii</sup> (Målbruk i offentleg teneste. Stortingsmelding nr 13 [MOT], 1997, §2.4.2). (my emphasis)

We need to move on to consider the changing status of English in Norwegian language politics before we turn to Higher Education policy in particular, but we can summarise the show so far as follows:



**Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Pages 27-52.**

- Before corpus planning began in Norway there were two (unstandardised) written varieties whose programmes had officially equal status in a situation of *parallel language use*
- Language planning involved increasing intervention in the corpus of both Dano-Norwegian / Bokmål and Landsmaal / Nynorsk which sprung from a policy (Samnorsk) on their relative status
- This policy (explicitly stated in the 1971 “Samnorsk paragraph”) to manipulate the structural relationship between the two varieties was unpopular and resulted in widespread objection and an increasingly non-credible language policy scene
- That policy was gradually weakened and then discarded in a return to parallel language use where the status of the two varieties is assured via a policy of protection and cultivation.

**4 English takes centre stage**

Without any gasp of surprise we can now reveal that the battleground for Norwegian language policy development has moved from the language-internal struggle to language-external lines drawn between Norwegian as a whole on the one hand and English on the other. As with the issue of Samnorsk in the older language-internal struggle, the battle is not between the English and Norwegian languages as such. The rhetoric may treat the languages as combatants (e.g. Lomheim, 2004), but there is no meaningful sense in which languages as inventories of sounds and forms can be

**Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Pages 27-52.**

engaged in a contest with each other. The battle is rather one of ideologies and practices for dominance of the so-called *domains* in which they are utilised (see Jónsson et al., 2013, Ch. 4 for more discussion).

The 2008 government paper on the language situation, *Mål og mening, Ein heilskapleg norsk språkpolitikk* [MOM], is a substantial survey of the whole landscape of language use in Norway, running to over 260 pages. It is ideologically driven and, despite the completeness of the survey indicated by both the title ('A complete Norwegian language policy') and the length of the document, the absolutely central concern is protection of Norwegian from the threat from English. This is spelled out just a few pages into the survey:

In our country [hos oss] the Norwegian language seems already to have lost something of its position as the natural language for use in several areas which are important for maintaining and further developing a full service [fullverdig] national language in a highly specialised society.

When English gains continually greater access, to the detriment of Norwegian, we are faced with the danger of so-called domain loss [domenetap], i.e. that Norwegian language is pushed aside and is no longer in use within a particular area of society. To the extent that this situation spreads [smittar] from one domain of society to another, a full service Norwegian language can be threatened (MOM, 2008, p. 15).<sup>viii</sup>

**Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Pages 27-52.**

There is much that could be said about how this is expressed, but suffice it to say that there is a specialist discourse being deployed here, and it is infused with a very clear set of images. Here the image is of English as a sort of virus spreading through the language. However, this was not a new discourse for the new millennium. A steadily growing voice of objection to and anxiety about English had been audible since the mid 1960s, in fact since precisely the moment when language politics was repositioned by the Vogt Committee. IOS in 1966 may not have mentioned the enemy, but the enemy was being talked about elsewhere, and it wasn't long before English as a threat, a disease even, became a recognised trope in language ideological debate.

At the time when Aasen and Knudsen were developing their reformed versions of Norwegian in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century, English was little known or studied in Norway. There had been a teacher of English at the University since 1822, but, until the final third of the century, English, like other modern foreign languages, was little more than a practical skill to be acquired alongside more serious studies (Sandved, 1998, pp. 11-33). It certainly didn't constitute any threat to the status of the vernacular, and indeed German was the preferred language of science, of wider communication. When the first professor of English in Norway, Johan Storm (1836-1920), translated his major work on English philology (Storm, 1881) into an international language for an international audience, there was no question that the international language should be German, despite the fact that he was himself a specialist in English and Romance languages. Storm had not been able to study modern foreign languages as a student at Det Kongelige Frederiks Universitet, and consequently he was

**Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Pages 27-52.**

self-taught. As a result of the new 1869 legislation on the school curriculum, which allowed for the teaching of the modern subjects in the schools, Storm became first a researcher and then in 1871 Professor of English and Romance Philology. Under Storm Norway became a leading centre for the scholarly investigation of the English language, and Sandved (1998, p. 120) describes the University as “a European powerhouse within this part of ‘the new philology’”. English grew steadily in popularity as a university subject such that, by the time of the Second World War, over 14% of students at the University were taking the linguistic-historical line which included English, compared to 21% of students studying medicine and just over 2% theology (Sandved, 1998, p. 322). Knowledge of English was an opportunity and politically unproblematic, and, thanks to Storm, the scientific reputation of Norway as a centre for the study of English and of practical excellence in English stood high.

The first formal critique of English in Norway, the first formal construction of new language-political poles, as far as I have been able to tell, came in 1963 from the Director of the Language Commission, Alf Hellevik (1909-2001), as the published version of a talk given at the 1959 annual general meeting of the Language Commission. It is noteworthy that the head of the beleaguered national language agency was redrawing the battle-lines at precisely this point in language policy history. Hellevik remarks in his opening words that there was general consternation in Norway about the “language invasion from Anglo-American” (Hellevik, 1963, n.p.) and that he has published his talk as a response to that. Hellevik’s discussion is limited to examples of loans of various sorts. Even in more recent and more heated debates about the damage that English

**Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Pages 27-52.**

might inflict on the health of Norwegian, it is recognised that loan words or ‘imported words’ [importord] (Sandøy, 1997) are not *per se* a threat to the health of the language; it is rather domain loss which is held up as the focus of language planning. Nonetheless, Hellevik views the “loan word problem” of the early 1960s as just the thin end of the wedge, fearing that “the influence from English will grow and not decrease”. The essence of the argument here, however, is not fundamentally about imported words but about language political alliances. In the light of the traditional stand-off between Bokmål in one corner and Nynorsk in the other, Hellevik notes hopefully that “the problem is common to both languages [Bokmål and Nynorsk] and should form a particularly good basis for peaceful cooperation”. Much of his article is taken up with comparing the situation in other Nordic countries, both at the level of the amount of Anglo-American borrowings and at the level of strategic initiatives to counter them, and Hellevik concludes thus:

So is there hope of getting general commitment to more active language care in this area? I think so. There is a strong indication that we have here a particular opportunity to arouse understanding of and interest in the value of active care for language both on a national and pan-Nordic basis. (Hellevik, 1963: n.p.)<sup>ix</sup>

So just at the point when the credibility of Norwegian language planning was at its lowest ebb, Hellevik sought to turn things around by positioning Norwegians of all language-political colours shoulder-to-shoulder with the Nordic community against a common “invasion”.

**Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Pages 27-52.**

The seed sown by Hellevik orally in 1959, and then in print in 1963, bore fruit. A key discussion point at the 1964 annual meeting of the Language Commission was the threat posed by loans from English and from Swedish. More significantly still in 1972, at the meeting where the Language Commission formally handed over the baton to the new Language Council, this approach was advocated as a more acceptable language policy focus for the new official language body. It is interesting to note that 1972 was the year in which the referendum on EEC membership was held in Norway, and it is not unusual in language planning to find protectionist language policies mirroring protectionist policies in the wider political sphere:

Especially with regard to the flood of loans from English-American, it is clear that careful and balanced care of the language [språkrøkt] will be met with a positive response from a majority of language users irrespective of what view they have on other language questions.<sup>x</sup> (Hellevik, 1979, p. 175)

During the 1980s there was a steady flow of articles in the Language Council's in-house journal critical towards the presence of English in the Norwegian language ecosystem (e.g. Bjørnsen, 1983; Hansen, 1982; Lind, 1988). By 1989 the editor of *Språknytt* was writing of "den engelske syken" ('English sickness'), another name for rickets, but an official recognition here of the prevalent language policy discourse which describes English in Norway in terms of disease and infection.

**Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Pages 27-52.**

This has been rather a long historical journey but an important one to travel. Objection in Norwegian language planning to the inappropriate use of English is nothing new but rather it has been steadily developing over the course of the past half century such that it has become natural to write of loss and the need for protection. In the spirit of the anthropomorphic terminology of historical linguistics, English is somehow a virus killing off healthy Norwegian limbs and not just a language form chosen by many Norwegians as part of their broader language repertoire.

**5 The Voice of Higher Education policy**

Ljosland (this volume) notes the influence of the 2005 Language Council paper, *Norsk i Hundre!* [NIH] (2005) as a galvanising force in language policy making within the Higher Education sector in Norway. Following the appearance of NIH several policy statements appeared in HE contexts. The universities of Oslo and Bergen established their own internal committees to report on the institutions' language environment and to make recommendations in response to the language policy steer provided by NIH. Additionally, the Norwegian Association of Higher Education Institutions [Universitets- og høøgskolerådet] produced its own report and guidelines for the sector more broadly, which further individual institutions have themselves drawn upon subsequently. The Oslo and Bergen reports are full reports, whereas those institutions drawing on the national guidelines have typically preferred simply to list guidelines as bullet points (e.g. the University of Tromsø and The Norwegian University of Science and

**Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Pages 27-52.**

Technology).<sup>xi</sup>,<sup>xii</sup> (Interestingly, Sweden by contrast has not witnessed a national language policy for Higher Education.) We will now comment briefly on each of the Oslo and Bergen documents to get a general sense of their voice and an overarching picture of language planning across the sector before looking more closely at the national guidelines.

One of the chapters of NIH (chapter 6) is dedicated to the question of language within Higher Education and to research, and this chapter opens with a direct statement of the challenge posed by the use of English: “The university and college sector is one of the domains in which it cannot be taken for granted that Norwegian will be in use alongside English in the future” (NIH, 2005, p. 70). It is indeed the case that Higher Education in Norway, as elsewhere in the Nordic countries, is exposed to the use of English on both key fronts: as the primary language of scientific publication internationally, and as the *de facto* language of teaching delivery for an internationally mobile student body—around 10% of the student population in Norway is from overseas (Kristoffersen, Kristiansen & Røyneland, 2013, p. 33). On the face of it the combined and entirely reasonable internationalist ambitions of increased international research standing and increased numbers of overseas students are in direct conflict with the protectionist maintenance of the vernacular. Two contrasting language agendas exist in parallel. NIH notes (2005, p. 82) that the “principal language policy problem in Higher Education is to find the right balance”, and that is absolutely the challenge facing language planning in the university sector. To this end NIH (2005, p. 83) advances five proposals, which can be summarised as follows:



**Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Pages 27-52.**

1. Legislation is required to ensure that the HE sector honours its responsibility for the development and use of Norwegian technical language [N.B. this is now (from 2009) enshrined in law].
2. Teaching at the entry level will be delivered in Norwegian.
3. Support for the publication of Norwegian-language textbooks must be strengthened.
4. All students on a Norwegian-language programme must be required to write at least one substantial piece in Norwegian in the course of their studies, and a rule should be introduced that doctoral dissertations in other languages should be accompanied by a comprehensive Norwegian summary.
5. Institutions should offer a practical language service [språkvasktjeneste] to ensure appropriate quality in both English and Norwegian texts.<sup>xiii</sup>

*Mål og mening* [MOM] is differently structured, around principles rather than institutions, which means that policy for Higher Education is rather more diffuse, and interestingly, as a function of its structure which seeks to present the language situation in the round and not as something only relevant to particular domains, the Higher Education sector does not appear to receive as much attention as might have been expected. MOM passes responsibility for developing policy in this area to the sector itself and applauds the work of the Norwegian Association of Higher Education Institutions (MOM, 2008, p. 110). More interestingly, MOM does seek to give a clear *definition* of parallel language use as what it calls first '*the answer*' [svaret] to domain loss and then on the same page (MOM, 2008, p.

**Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Pages 27-52.**

98) “‘an answer’ [eit svar] to ongoing domain loss processes”, and we referred to this in section 1 above:

[...] a systematic juxtaposition of two or more languages in an academic context, as a sort of general language policy principle with deep historical roots. The idea is that one commits to both English and the national language such that they are used in parallel.<sup>xiv</sup>  
(MOM, 2008, p. 98)

Any positive discrimination as far as MOM is concerned lies not in the definition itself but in the context of the domain in question. Thus it appears that the government recommendation concerning language policy in Higher Education is in step with current Norwegian thinking on language-internal parallelism, where language varieties, whether in their corpus or their status, are free to develop autonomously.

The first of the institutional policies to appear was the University of Oslo’s report with a title which took a humorous slant on the title of the Language Council’s report which inspired it, *In the next hundred years: The University of Oslo and language in the age of internationalization*. The Oslo report is unusual in this genre for being written in Bokmål—the Bergen statement and the national guidelines are both in Nynorsk, the lesser used and consequently more politically marked of the two standard varieties. The author of *Mål og mening* informed the present author that it too was written in Nynorsk simply because it was the turn of Nynorsk to be used in a parliamentary report. However, language choices are always political and nowhere more so than in Norway, and the overwhelming use of Nynorsk in

**Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Pages 27-52.**

the presentation of language policy is very much a characteristic feature of the voice of 21<sup>st</sup>-century language planning. The use of (international) English and (nationally dominant) Bokmål says something quite distinctive (intentionally or not) about how the University of Oslo positions itself as a national and international institution.

The University of Bergen report is entitled *Både i pose og sekk* which might be translated into English as 'Having your cake and eating it'. It is based on the insight that the question of English in Higher Education is not about enforced choice but about maintaining the two mediums for academic discourse in parallel. It is more of a scholarly disquisition on the subject than the other reports, due primarily to the fact that the chair of the committee which prepared it, Helge Sandøy, is personally and professionally highly engaged with the sociolinguistic issues at stake. In common with the other reports and through reference to them (Bergen came a year later than Oslo and the Universitets- og Høgskolerådet) it contains a series of recommendations which stem from an underlying vision for the language situation which is most desirable within the institution, and this runs as follows:

Norwegian is the main language of the University of Bergen. In other words, the language of teaching, administration and day to day activity is usually Norwegian. The University also places great emphasis on good contact with international research, something which requires that some activity has to take place in one of the larger international languages, most often English. To be both active in international research and to maintain responsibility with

**Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Pages 27-52.**

respect to Norwegian society, the University's goal is to develop as much parallelingual practice as possible. The choice of language has to be governed by its purpose and not by political prestige. Good language will be practised both in Norwegian and in foreign languages (Sandøy et al., 2007, p. 23).<sup>xv</sup>

This is a model of parallel language policy. However, Samnorsk also seemed to its proponents to be a model of good sense, to be democratic and practical. Before that, back in 1885, political parity seemed like the best expedient for the language problem. Unfortunately language practice does not exist in a vacuum. Ljosland (this volume) has investigated the parallelingual reality of researchers working in a Norwegian university, and, where people have even heard of these policies, reality is much more complex than theory, and suddenly the "Norwegian lesson" comes into force. Sandøy et al. (2007, p. 23) sound a note of realism where they write, "parallelingual practice requires consciousness, desire and resources [medvett, vilje og resursar]", and, unless it is enforced as part of normal good research practice or indeed of research ethics, researchers and teachers are simply going to have things to worry about that seem more important than language choices. Indeed, as Kristoffersen et al. (2013, p. 5) point out, it seems that "despite good beginnings in the years 2007-2010, little has subsequently been done to transform the goals into concrete practice"<sup>xvi</sup>, especially with regard to the active pursuit of parallelingualism (Kristoffersen et al., 2013, p. 6).

*The Proposal for a Language Policy for Universities and Colleges in Norway [Framlegg til ein språkpolitikk for universitet og høgskolar i Noreg]* (Jahr et

**Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Pages 27-52.**

al., 2006) includes a list of practical measures for “how the principle of parallelingualism can be realised in practice” (Jahr et al., 2006, p. 5). These are listed in full in translation in Appendix 1 and are the basis for the guidelines adopted by other institutions, although, as we have just noted in the 2013 report by Kristoffersen and colleagues, little appears to be being done at this stage to implement these ideals. One of the most striking features of the voice of *Proposal for a Language Policy for Universities and Colleges in Norway* is that of *opposition* or *contrast* and their resolution, having both the “either” and the “or”. The challenge of maintaining this balance emerges most forcefully when the points are taken together in the conclusion (Jahr et al., 2006, p. 23). Here we read, for example:

In the formation of a language-political strategy the situation *between Norwegian and English* will be the clearest challenge. The cultural-political responsibility for a good Norwegian professional language must always be *balanced up* against active participation in the international scientific community. *Both* a national *and* an international professional language are needed [...] *At the same time* it is just as important that PhD students [...] *Norwegian as well as overseas students and researchers, peers at home and abroad and not least the general public.*<sup>xvii</sup> (my emphases)

This is the rhetoric of balance, of recognising that there are conflicting ideologies and principles in play and that a monolingual future cannot be achieved through engineering of language practices. The acknowledgement of all this vested interest and of all these parallel forces

**Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Pages 27-52.**

which can't simply be elided in one common parallelingualist policy, one common practice, is a clear recognition of both the spirit of 1885 and the spirit of Vogt. The final sentence of Jahr et al. (2006, p. 23) is however the crucial one:

The most important step in language-political strategy development does not [...] lie in this report, but in the next stage: How the individual institutions and professional communities grasp and work with the language-political challenges in practice.<sup>xviii</sup>

The Norwegian lesson demonstrated what the response was likely to be, and Kristoffersen et al. suggest that a lack of appetite for more direct intervention is indeed the case when it comes to stated policies in the Norwegian Higher Education sector, that parallel language use (practice) appears to be resisting a call for parallelingualist (ideological) intervention.

**6 Back to the future or lesson learned?**

So Norway has much to teach the other Nordic countries about how to manage situations where forms of language exist side-by-side, and the same is doubtless true of other Nordic countries which have experienced the coexistence of languages in parallel, e.g. Swedish and Finnish in Finland and Icelandic and Danish on Iceland. The story of the fight for recognition for the autochthonous minority languages (e.g. Lane, 2011) is another chapter, but the ideology of *Bokmål + Nynorsk = Samnorsk* is the

**Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Pages 27-52.**

interesting one in our context since it gave way to the case of *Norwegian + English = Parallelingualism*. From our brief survey of language policy documents for Higher Education it does seem that the painful lesson taught by the former equation has been learned when it comes to resolving the latter. The nurturing of a condition where languages may productively be used together appears to be the thrust of language policy in the universities of Norway.

But two big practical challenges lie in front of the warm words. The first of these is the reality that English and Norwegian are not neatly compartmentalised, any more than Bokmål and Nynorsk are (Sandøy, 2009). There is a continuum, or rather a repertoire available to Norwegian students and researchers, and indeed to all those who are able to use both languages, which in practice is used without regard to the traditional language boundaries. English and Norwegian, standard and non-standard, combine in the spoken and written repertoires of Norwegians in a way which may undermine this rigid parallelingual ideology, based as it is on the nationalist model of languages being discrete entities rather than of language practice being a more fluid process (Heller & Duchêne, 2012). The other big challenge remains the implementation of any form of language management in a democracy. The point made somewhat querulously by the Riksmål Association about intervention in language practices being an infringement of human rights is a fair one. The enormity of this challenge is expressed by two of the leading scholars of language planning, and we will end with their words:

## Published in

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

## Pages 27-52.

...neither total reason nor total irrationality are in the offing and particularism and globalisation cohabit in a sometime antagonistic as well as in a sometime cooperative marriage (Fishman, 2001, p. 480).

because so much of language management produces questionable results [...] is this not an area (like religious belief) better left to individual free choice? Does not the greater success of totalitarian states, willing to back language management policies with police enforcement and population transfer, than democracies wondering how to harmonize communicative efficiency with freedom and how to fit linguistic minorities into workable governments, suggest that the enterprise is basically undesirable (Spolsky, 2009, pp. 260-261).

## 7 References

- Apelseth, A. (1996). *Mellom tradisjon og innovasjon: Utgangspunkta for Ivar Aasens tidlege målstrev* [Between tradition and innovation: The starting points for Ivar Aasen's early language struggle]. Oslo: Ivar Aasen-året 1996.
- Bjørnsen, B. (1983). Språket vårt [Our language]. *Språknytt*, 11(1), 13-14.
- Blommaert, J. (1999). The debate is open. In: J. Blommaert (Ed.), *Language ideological debates* (pp 1-38). Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Collett, J. P. (1999). *Historien om universitetet i Oslo* [History of the University of Oslo]. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.



**Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Pages 27-52.**

Denison, N. (1982). A linguistic ecology for Europe?. *Folia Linguistica*, 16(1-4), 5-16.

Fishman, J. A. (2001). *Can threatened languages be saved? Reversing language shift, revisited: A 21st century perspective.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Fishman, J. A., Ferguson, C. & Das Gupta, J. (Eds.). (1968). *Language problems of developing nations.* London: John Wiley.

Faarlund, J. T. (Ed.). (1997). *Norsk språkråd 25 år [Norwegian language council 25 years].* *Språknytt*, 1997(2).

Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Glenthøj, R. (2012). *Skilsmissen: dansk og norsk identitet før og efter 1814 [The divorce: Danish and Norwegian identity before and after 1814].* Odense: Syddansk Universitetsforlag.

Haberland, H. (2005). Domains and domain loss. In B. Preisler, A. Fabricius, H. Haberland, S. Kjærbeck & K. Risager (Eds.), *The Consequences of Mobility* (pp. 227-237). Roskilde: Roskilde University, Department of Language and Culture. Retrieved November 11, 2013, from <http://rudar.ruc.dk/bitstream/1800/8701/1/Haberland.pdf>.

Hansen, E. (1982). Engelske ord i norske aviser [English words in Norwegian newspapers]. *Språknytt*, 10(4), 8-10.

Hanssen, E. & Wiggen, G. (Eds.). (1973). *Målstrid er klassekamp [Language battle is class war].* Oslo: Pax forlag.

Haugen, E. (1966a). Linguistics and language planning. In W. Bright (Ed.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 50-71). The Hague: Mouton.

## Published in

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

## Pages 27-52.

- Haugen, E. (1966b). *Language conflict and language planning: The case of modern Norwegian*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Hellevik, A. (1963). *Lånord-problemet. To foredrag i Norsk språknemnd med eit tillegg [The loan word problem. Two lectures in the Norwegian language commission with an appendix]*. Småskrifter 2. Oslo: Norsk språknemnd. Retrieved March 28, 2013, from [http://www.sprakradet.no/Toppmeny/Om-oss/Historikk1/Norsk\\_spraaknemnd/Laanord-problemet](http://www.sprakradet.no/Toppmeny/Om-oss/Historikk1/Norsk_spraaknemnd/Laanord-problemet).
- Hellevik, A. (1979). *Språkrøkt og språkstyring: Eit utval av artiklar [Language care and language control: A selection of articles]*. Oslo: Det Norske Samlaget.
- Hellevik, A. & Lundeby, E. (1964). *Skriftspråk i utvikling: Tiårsskrift for norsk språknemnd 1952-1962 [Written languages under development: Decennial publication for the Norwegian language commission 1952-1962]*. Oslo: J. W. Cappelens forlag.
- Hultgren, A. K. (in press). Whose parallellingualism? Overt and covert ideologies in Danish university language policies. *Multilingua*.
- Hveem, H., Andersen, P. T., Hoen, R. E., Kregel, U. & Gupta, R. (2006). *Snart to hundre. Universitetet i Oslo og språket i internasjonaliseringens tidsalder. Innstilling fra Utvalget for språkpolitikk ved UiO, 27. mars 2006. [In the Next Hundred Years: The University of Oslo and Language in the Age of Internationalization. Recommendation of the Committee on Language Policy at the University of Oslo, 27 March 2006]*. Oslo: Universitetet i Oslo. [Retrieved February 3, 2014, from <http://www.uio.no/for->

## Published in

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

## Pages 27-52.

ansatte/arbeidsstotte/profil/sprak/retningslinjer/hveem-utvalgets-innstilling-2006.pdf ]

*Innstilling om språksaken fra Komitéen til å vurdere språksituasjonen m.v. oppnevnt ved kongelig resolusjon 31. Januar 1964 [IOS]. (1966).*  
Oslo: Det kongelige kirke- og undervisningsdepartement.

Jahr, E. H., Haugland, K., Nesse, A., Veia Salvanes, A. G., Sandøy, H., Særheim, I., Walløe, L. (2006). *Framlegg til ein språkpolitikk for universitet og høgskolar i Noreg [Proposal for a language policy for universities and colleges in Norway]*. Oslo: Universitets- og høgskolerådet.

Jónsson, S., Laurén, C., Myking, J. & Picht, H. (2013). *Parallellspråk og domene: Nordisk språkplanlegging på 2000-tallet, med særlig vekt på forsknings- og utdanningssektoren [Parallel languages and domains: Nordic language planning in the 21st century, with particular emphasis on the research and education sectors]*. Oslo: Novus forlag.

Kloss, H. (1969). *Research possibilities on group bilingualism: A report.*  
Quebec: International Center for Research on Bilingualism.

Kristoffersen, G., Kristiansen, M. & Røyneland, U. (2013). *Landrapport Norge: Språkpolitiske grunnlagsdokumenter, internasjonalisering og parallellspråklighet i teori og praksis ved norske universitet og høgskoler [Country brief on Norway: Foundational language policy documents, internationalisation and parallelingualism in theory and practice at Norwegian universities and colleges]*. Retrieved September 18, 2013, from

**Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Pages 27-52.**

[http://nordiskparallelsprogsnet.blogs.ku.dk/files/2013/04/Landraport-Norge\\_01.04.131.pdf](http://nordiskparallelsprogsnet.blogs.ku.dk/files/2013/04/Landraport-Norge_01.04.131.pdf).

Krokvik, J. (1993). *Ny Hungrvekja og Jan Prah! [Ny Hungrvekja and Jan Prah!]*. Bergen: Norsk Bokreidingslag.

Lane, P. (2011). The birth of the Kven language in Norway: emancipation through state recognition. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 209, 57-74.

Langslet, L. R. (1999). *I kamp for norsk kultur: Riksmålsbevegelsens historie gjennom 100 år [The battle for Norwegian culture: The Riksmål movement's history through 100 years]*. Oslo: Riksmålsforbundet.

Lind, Å. (1988). Engelsk i norsk—eller norsk i engelsk [English in Norwegian—or Norwegian in English]. *Språknytt*, 16(4), 3-4.

Linn, A. R. (2010a). Can parallelingualism save Norwegian from extinction? *Multilingua*, 29(3/4), 289-305.

Linn, A. R. (2010b). Voices from above—voices from below. Who is talking and who is listening in Norwegian language politics? *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 11(2), 114-129.

Linn, A. R. & Oakes, L. (2007). Language policies for a global era: the changing face of language politics in Scandinavia. In C. Fandrych, & R. Salverda (Eds.), *Standard, Variation und Sprachwandel in germanischen Sprachen [Standard, Variation and Language Change in Germanic Languages]* (pp. 59-90). Tübingen: Narr.

*Lov om Norsk språkråd [LNS] [Legislation on the Norwegian language council]*. (1971). Oslo: Kirkedepartementet.

**Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Pages 27-52.**

Lomheim, S. (2004, March 10). Språket på spel [Language at stake].

*Dagbladet.no Kultur.* Retrieved March 28, 2013, from

<http://www.dagbladet.no/kultur/2004/03/10/392984.html>.

Mortensen, J. (2014). Language policy from below: Language choice in student project groups in a multilingual university setting. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 35(4), 425-442..

Mæhle, L., Lundeby, E. & Grønvik, O. (Eds.). (1987). *Fornyng og tradisjon: Språkvern og språkrøkt 1972-1988 [Innovation and tradition: Language protection and language care 1972-1988]*. Oslo: Norsk språkråd / J. W. Cappelens forlag.

*Mål og mening: Ein heilskapleg norsk språkpolitikk [Language and meaning: a complete Norwegian language policy]*. *Stortingsmelding nr. 35 (2007-2008) [MOM]*. (2008). Oslo: Det kongelige kultur- og kyrkjedepartement. Retrieved March 28, 2013, from <http://www.regjeringen.no/nn/dep/kud/dokument/proposisjonar-og-meldingar/stortingsmeldingar/2007-2008/stmeld-nr-35-2007-2008-.html?id=519923>.

*Målbruk i offentleg teneste [Language use in public service]*.

*Stortingsmelding nr 13 (1997-98) [MOT]*. (1997). Oslo:

Kulturdepartementet. Retrieved 3 February, 2014, from,

<http://www.regjeringen.no/nb/dep/kud/dok/regpubl/stmeld/1997-1998/stmeld-nr-13-1997-98-.html?id=191413>.

*Norsk i hundre! Norsk som nasjonalspråk i globaliseringens tidsalder. Et forslag til strategi [Norwegian at full speed! Norwegian as a national language in the age of globalisation. A suggestion for strategy]*. [NIH]. (2005). Oslo: Språkrådet. Retrieved March 28,

## Published in

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

## Pages 27-52.

2013, from

[http://www.sprakradet.no/upload/9832/norsk\\_i\\_hundre.pdf](http://www.sprakradet.no/upload/9832/norsk_i_hundre.pdf) .

Rambø, G.-R. (1999). *Bokmålsreformen i 1981—med særlig vekt på*

*Særutvalgets arbeid [The Bokmål reform of 1981—with particular emphasis on the work of the special committee]*. Kristiansand S:

Høgskolen i Agder.

Riksmålsforbundet (1966). *Om Vogt-komiteéns instilling [On the report of the Vogt committee]*. Oslo: Riksmålsforbundet.

Rubin, J. & Jernudd, B. (Eds.). (1971). *Can language be planned?*

*Sociolinguistic theory and practice for developing nations*. Honolulu, East-West Center: Hawaii University Press.

Sandved, A. O. (1998). *Fra «kremmersprog» til verdensspråk: Engelsk som universitetsfag i Norge 1850-1943 [From 'grocer's language' to world language: English as a university subject in Norway 1850-1943]*. Oslo: Forum for universitetshistorie.

Sandøy, H. (1997). *Lånte fjører eller bunad? Om norsk skrivemåte av importord [Borrowed feathers or traditional costume? On the Norwegian spelling of imported words]*. Oslo: Norsk språkråd.

Sandøy, H. (2009). Standardspråk—kultur og ukultur [Standard languages—culture and its opposites]. In H. Omdal & R. Røsstad (Eds.), *Språknormering—i tide og utide?* (pp. 215-228). Oslo: Novus forlag.

Sandøy, H., Fløysand, L., Klock, K., Lærum, O. D., Murison, R. & Østbye, H. (2007). *Både i pose og sekk: Framlegg til språkpolitikk for Universitetet i Bergen [Having your cake and eating it: Proposal for a language policy for the University of Bergen]*. Bergen: Universitetet i Bergen.

**Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Pages 27-52.**

Skard, S. (1963). *Målstrid og massekultur: tankar til ettertanke [Language battle and mass culture: thoughts for consideration]*. Oslo: Det Norske Samlaget.

Spolsky, B. (2009). *Language management*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Storm, J. (1881). *Englische Philologie. Anleitung zum wissenschaftlichen Studium der englischen Sprache. Vom Verfasser für das deutsche Publikum bearbeitet. I: Die lebende Sprache [English Philology...]*. Heilbronn: Verlag von Gebr. Henninger.

Trudgill, P. (2006). Norwegian as a normal language. Retrieved March 28, 2013, from [http://www.sprakradet.no/Toppmeny/Om-oss/English-and-other-languages/English/Norwegian\\_as\\_a\\_Normal\\_Language/](http://www.sprakradet.no/Toppmeny/Om-oss/English-and-other-languages/English/Norwegian_as_a_Normal_Language/)

Vikør, L. S. (1990). Liner i nyare norsk språkhistorie [Lines in recent Norwegian language history]. *Eigenproduksjon*, 37, 1-116.

---

**Appendix 1*****Proposal for a Language Policy for Universities and Colleges in Norway*****Summary of the report's proposals**

The central functions of universities and colleges are teaching, research and dissemination, and public engagement. The report is structured in relation to these areas, with particular emphasis placed on teaching and research. In addition it is also necessary to say something about administration and information.

**Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Pages 27-52.**

**Overarching language policy guidelines**

- ❖ The sector has an important responsibility for the development and use of Norwegian technical language within all disciplines, and institutions should therefore develop language strategies.
- ❖ Institutions should develop language strategies which ensure parallelingualism, i.e. Norwegian as the national technical language and English as the international technical language.
- ❖ Institutions should develop reflection around democracy, dissemination and language use.

**Teaching**

- ❖ The language of teaching at universities and colleges will normally be Norwegian. To achieve the practical end of developing competence in English amongst Norwegian-speaking students or the integration of overseas students, the language of teaching may also be English.
- ❖ The language of teaching should be Norwegian during the first years of study. From the third year onwards there should be an opportunity for the use of English.
- ❖ The Scandinavian languages—Norwegian, Swedish and Danish—should be regarded as equally valid as languages of teaching.
- ❖ In developing a language policy strategy, the purpose of the studies should be taken into account. At a general level there should be no distinction between different types of discipline or professional / non-professional studies. In all types of study the language policy should be subjugated to the cultural policy responsibility of universities and



**Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Pages 27-52.**

colleges to maintain Norwegian technical language and dissemination through Norwegian.

- ❖ Language competence as part of the learning outcomes should be included in the national qualifications framework and in institutional plans.
- ❖ Dedicated technical term groups should be established in the university and college sector with appropriate administrative and financial backing. These groups should also have the job of maintaining Norwegian technical terminology and of defining Norwegian terms in relation to international terminology.
- ❖ Support for the publication of Norwegian higher education textbooks should be maintained and strengthened.
- ❖ Exam answers should normally be written in Norwegian, but on some courses those students who wish to do so should have the opportunity to choose to answer in English. Students should not be required to write answers in English on courses where this is not part of the particular character or aim of the course.
- ❖ With regard to new appointments to posts which involve teaching, there should be requirements regarding language skills, for example that the appointee must master Norwegian or another Scandinavian language orally and in writing or achieve this competence in the course of a two year period, and that the appointee must furthermore be prepared to provide teaching in English.
- ❖ Institutional frameworks should be established in the form of courses and access to systematic supervision to strengthen the linguistic competence of Scandinavian-speaking staff who teach in English.

## **Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren,

Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

## **Pages 27-52.**

Courses in Norwegian should also be set up for academic staff without sufficient capacity to be able to teach in Norwegian.

- ❖ Courses in academic writing, where the intention is to develop the students' skills in the use of language, text and genre, should be part of the subject provision in institutions.
- ❖ More advanced students should be familiar with and able to use technical language in English and possibly other languages.
- ❖ Support courses should be provided for students who need to develop their competence in English technical language.
- ❖ Overseas students should have the offer of courses in Norwegian language, culture and society, appropriate to the length of their stay.

## **Research**

- ❖ Discipline communities should work actively to raise awareness with regard to the choice of language of publication.
- ❖ Professional considerations and the chance of communication with relevant national and international discipline communities should be the basis for the choice of language of publication.
- ❖ Norwegian should therefore still be a relevant language for scientific publication in some disciplines.
- ❖ In most disciplines, however, English or another international language should be the principal language of scientific publication.
- ❖ Institutional language requirements should be developed pragmatically, such that they advance Norwegian where appropriate and an international language where appropriate.

## **Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren,

Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

## **Pages 27-52.**

- ❖ Institutions should work concertedly to clarify to staff that evaluation under the reward system for scientific publication is not based on language but on quality and communication in a language the international field uses and understands.
- ❖ Doctoral dissertations written in Norwegian shall have a full summary of 5-10% of the length of the dissertation in an international language.
- ❖ Doctoral dissertations written in an international language shall have a full summary of 5-10% of the length of the dissertation in Norwegian.
- ❖ Institutions should offer a language checking service for manuscripts, especially directed towards manuscripts in international languages.

## **Dissemination and public engagement**

- ❖ Dissemination to the general public should take place in that language which is most appropriate to the audience being addressed.  
Dissemination to the Norwegian and Nordic public should take place in Norwegian, while dissemination to particular groups within Norway or to the international public should take place in English or another international language.

## **Administration and information**

- ❖ The language of administration should continue to be Norwegian.
- ❖ The web pages of universities and colleges should contain readily accessible information in English in addition to the Norwegian pages.
- ❖ Both Norwegian language varieties should be clearly visible at the colleges and the universities through the written texts in various media and forms of presentation. At least 25% of written texts in the various

## Published in

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren,

Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

## Pages 27-52.

areas of administration internally and externally should be in that language form the institution uses least.

- ❖ Alternative practices to achieve the goal of parity between the Norwegian language forms can be tried out to the extent that it is in line with the intention of genuine parity between the language forms.
- ❖ The work of the Norwegian Association of Higher Education Institutions in developing and coordinating the terminology of academic administration should continue.

(Jahr et al., 2006, pp. 5-7; trans. ARL)

---

<sup>i</sup> All translations from the Norwegian are by the author. The original versions of the longer quotations will be provided in endnotes.

<sup>ii</sup> *Parallellspråklighet er et grunnleggende begrep i dette dokumentet. Det vil vi bruke om domener der to eller flere språk er i bruk, og der ett språk, i vårt tilfelle norsk, alltid vil være det foretrukne språkvalget når det ikke er nødvendig å bruke et fremmedspråk. (I kapittel 7, 16 om kultur og medier, legger vi bare det første kjennetegnet til grunn, nemlig at to språk brukes parallelt.)*

<sup>iii</sup> [http://www.uhr.no/documents/Spr\\_kpolitiske\\_retningslinjer\\_ved\\_UiS\\_1.pdf](http://www.uhr.no/documents/Spr_kpolitiske_retningslinjer_ved_UiS_1.pdf) - accessed 11 November 2013.

<sup>iv</sup> *vurdere språksituasjonen og i tilfelle koma med framlegg til lovreglar og andre tiltak som kan tene til å samle krefter om å verne og utvikle norsk språk.*

<sup>v</sup> *Norsk språknemnd er eit rådgjevande organ. På grunnlag av vitskapleg gransking skal ho gje styremaktene og ålmenta råd og rettleiing i språkspørsmål og i dette arbeidet fremja tilnærming mellom dei to skriftmåla på norsk folkemåls grunn.*

<sup>vi</sup> *...skal følge utviklingen av norsk skriftspråk og talespråk og på dette grunnlag fremme samarbeid i dyrkingen og normeringen av våre to målformer og støtte opp om utviklingstendenser som på lengre sikt fører målformene nærmere sammen.*

<sup>vii</sup> *i staden for å leggje vekt på utviklingstendensar som på sikt kan føre dei to målformene saman, blir måldyrkingsarbeidet snarare knytt til spørsmålet om korleis bokmål og nynorsk kvar for seg skal kunne utvikle seg best mogleg.*

<sup>viii</sup> *Hos oss synest norsk språk allereie å ha mist noko av posisjonen sin som det naturlege bruksspråket på ein del område som er viktige for å halda ved lag og vidareutvikla eit fullverdig nasjonalspråk i eit sterkt spesialisert samfunn.*

*Når engelsk vinn stadig sterkare innpass til fortrenghet for norsk, står vi overfor faren for såkalla domenetap, dvs. at norsk språk blir trengt til sides og ikkje lenger er i bruk innanfor*

## Published in

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren,

Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

## Pages 27-52.

---

*eit bestemt samfunnsområde. I den grad denne tilstanden smittar frå eitt samfunnsdomene til eit anna, kan eit fullverdig norsk språk vera truga.*

<sup>ix</sup> *Er det så von om å få allmenn tilslutning til ei meir aktiv språkrøkt på dette området? Det trur eg det er. Mykje tyder på at vi her har eit særskilt høve til å vekkje forståing og interesse for verdet av ei aktiv språkrøkt både på nasjonalt og nordisk grunnlag.*

<sup>x</sup> *Særleg når det gjeld flaumen av lån frå engelsk-amerikansk, er det tydeleg at ei nøktern og avbalansert språkrøkt vil bli møtt med positiv reaksjon frå eit fleirtal av språkbrukarane uavhengig av kva syn dei har på andre målpørsmål.*

<sup>xi</sup>

[http://uit.no/ansatte/organisasjon/artikkel?p\\_document\\_id=65917&p\\_dimension\\_id=88200&p\\_menu=42427&p\\_lang=2](http://uit.no/ansatte/organisasjon/artikkel?p_document_id=65917&p_dimension_id=88200&p_menu=42427&p_lang=2)

<sup>xii</sup> <http://www.ntnu.no/sprakpolitiske-retningslinjer>

<sup>xiii</sup> 1. *Det må tas inn som egen bestemmelse i lov om universiteter og høyskoler at sektoren har et viktig ansvar for at norsk fagspråk skal utvikles og brukes innenfor alle fagmiljøer, i tillegg til engelsk og eventuelle andre språk. Loven må kreve at institusjonene utarbeider språkstrategier som blant annet spesifiserer hvordan målet skal nås.*

2. *Begynnerundervisning skal skje på norsk. Engelsk innføres gradvis når den norske terminologien er etablert.*

3. *Støtten til utgivelse av lærebøker på norsk for høyere utdanning må videreføres og styrkes.*

4. *Passiv beherskelse av norsk fagterminologi er ikke tilstrekkelig. Alle studenter i norskspråklige studieforløp må pålegges å skrive minst én lengre fagtekst på norsk i løpet av studiet. På doktorgradsnivå må det innføres en regel som krever et fylldig sammendrag på norsk dersom avhandlingen er skrevet på et annet språk.*

5. *Institusjonene bør tilby en språkvasktjeneste for manuskripter på engelsk. I formidlingssammenheng bør en ha en tilsvarende tjeneste for norske tekster.*

<sup>xiv</sup> *...ei systematisk sidestilling av to eller flere språk i akademisk sammenheng, som eit slags generelt språkpolitisk prinsipp med lange historiske røtter. Tanken er at ein vil satsa på både engelsk og nasjonalspråket, slik at dei blir nytta parallelt.*

<sup>xv</sup> *Norsk er hovudspråket til Universitetet i Bergen. Det vil seie at undervisningsspråket, administrasjonsspråket og det daglege arbeidsspråket til vanleg er norsk. Universitetet legg også stor vekt på god kontakt med internasjonal forskning, noko som krev at delar av verksemda må skje på eit av dei større internasjonale språka, oftast engelsk. For både å vere aktiv i internasjonal forskning og å ta i vare ansvaret overfor det norske samfunnet har Universitetet som mål å utvikle mest mogleg parallellspråkleg praksis. Valet av språk bør vere formålsretta og ikkje styrt av politisk prestisje. Det skal praktiserast godt språk både på norsk og på framandspråk.*

<sup>xvi</sup> *...til tross for gode begynnelse i årene 2007-2010, er lite senere blitt gjort for å sette målene om i konkret praksis.*

<sup>xvii</sup> *I utforminga av ein språkpolitisk strategi vil tilhøvet mellom norsk og engelsk vere den mest tydelege utfordringa. Ein må heile tida balansere det kulturpolitiske ansvaret for eit godt norsk fagspråk opp mot det å vere aktive deltakarar i det internasjonale vitenskapssamfunnet. Ein treng både eit nasjonalt fagspråk og eit internasjonalt fagspråk [...] Samstundes er det like viktig at særleg ph.d.-studentane [...] norske så vel som utanlandske studentar og forskarar, fagfellar i inn- og utland og ikkje minst allmennheita.*

**Published in**

*English in Nordic Universities. Ideologies and practices.* Edited by Anna Kristina Hultgren,

Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen. © 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

**Pages 27-52.**

---

<sup>xviii</sup> *Det viktigaste trinnet i det språkpolitiske strategiarbeidet ligg [...] ikkje i denne rapporten, men i det neste steget: Korleis dei einiskilde institusjonane og fagmiljøa i praksis tar tak i og arbeider med dei språkpolitiske utfordringane.*