

Analysing the Consequences of Academic Mobility and Migration

Analysing the Consequences
of Academic Mobility and Migration

Edited by

Fred Dervin

**CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS**

P U B L I S H I N G

Analysing the Consequences of Academic Mobility and Migration,
Edited by Fred Dervin

This book first published 2011

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2011 by Fred Dervin and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-2978-1, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-2978-6

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
<i>Fred Dervin</i>	

Part I. Language, Identity and the ‘Intercultural’

Chapter One	13
Cosmopolitan Language Policies	

Karen Risager

Chapter Two	29
The Influence of European Student Mobility on European	

Identity and Subsequent Migration Behaviour

Christof Van Mol

Chapter Three	51
Discourse of Bi-national Exchange Students: Constructing Dual	

Identifications

Dina Strong

Chapter Four	67
The Experience and Long-Term Impact of Study Abroad by Europeans	

in an African Context

Jim Coleman and Tony Chafer

Chapter Five	97
Virtual Academic Mobility: Online Preparation and Support	

for the Intercultural Experience

Robert O’Dowd

Part II. The Professional and Educational Impacts of Academic Mobility and Migration

Chapter Six	115
How to Explain the Transnational Occupational Mobility of Former International Students? Suggestions for a Change in Research and Theoretical Perspectives	
<i>Sören Carlson</i>	
Chapter Seven.....	131
Mobile Learning Communities: Lessons for and from Academic Mobility, the Knowledge Economy and Sustainability	
<i>Patrick A. Danaher and Geoff R. Danaher</i>	
Chapter Eight.....	147
European Occupational Travellers: Synergies, Tensions and Competences in Bridging Academic and Occupational Mobility	
<i>Patrick A. Danaher and Emilio A. Anteliz</i>	
Chapter Nine.....	163
The Consequences of Mobility: Careers and Work Practice of Portuguese Researchers with a Foreign PhD	
<i>Ana Delicado</i>	
List of Contributors	181

INTRODUCTION

FRED DERVIN

In an article entitled *Towards Academic Mobility*, published in *The Manchester Guardian* on 16th July 1953, Dr Bashir Ahmad, the then Vice-Chancellor of the University of the Punjab, is quoted as having said at the Seventh Quinquennial Congress of the Universities of the Commonwealth: “The need for exchange between universities was never so important as it is to-day”. Little did he know that his argument would become the motto of nearly every institution of higher education in the early 21st Century. Actually, today it might sound merely rhetorical to say that Academic Mobility is needed as it is often presented as having become “systematic, dense, multiple and trans-national” (Kim 2010).

Academic Mobility leaves few people indifferent. Individuals, policymakers, institutions, the media, etc. all have their opinions about its pros and cons. As such it can be lauded—sometimes even fetishized (Robertson 2010)—and/or disapproved of before, during and after it is experienced. Yet Academic Mobility is now here to stay—*volens nolens*—as it has become part of the “complex interdependencies between, and social consequences, of the diverse mobilities” that characterise our era (Urry 2010: 348). Academic Mobility also contributes to the transformation of the ‘social as society’ into ‘the social as mobility’ (ibid.).

The figures seem to talk for themselves to describe the “success” and “generalisation” of contemporary Academic Mobility: according to the latest statistics provided by the Unesco the number of international students rose by more than 75% between 2000 and 2009. The number is expected to rise by 3.7 million by 2015 (Bhandari & Blumenthal 2011).

New markets are also emerging. For example, China is said to want to attract 500,000 international students in the near future, while according to BBC News (March 2011) “the entire overseas student population in China could once have travelled in a minibus. In the early 50s it consisted of 20 east Europeans”.

Has the figure of the medieval “wandering scholar” (Pietsch 2010) thus become a postmodern reality for those involved in higher education? The widespread consensus is that most countries and world regions are

now witnessing Academic Mobility. If that is the case, what does it do to those who move? What are its short-term and long-term impacts? Do different types of mobility lead to different consequences? How do we analyse them?

Myths about Academic Mobility

Many myths are associated with postmodern mobility (Maffesoli 1997). Policies, research and ‘common sense’ discourses on the present-day mobility of students, trainees, researchers, lecturers and administrative staff have led to the creation of numerous new myths. I propose to defuse some of them before tackling the consequences of Academic Mobility—so that we know what we are talking about and the problems we might encounter in studying them.

In a volume that I co-edited with Mike Byram (Byram & Dervin 2008), Anthony Welch proposes the following list of myths: 1. Academic Mobility is not a modern phenomenon, 2. It is not limited to the “West”, 3. It is not always a matter of choice, 4. It does not mean that it is only students who travel, 5. It does not lack a gender dimension, 6. It is not neutral (cultural, economic and political dimensions), 7. “A brain drain of the highly skilled does not necessarily represent an unrecoverable loss to the originating country”. While reading this list, it comes to mind that there has actually been little research on e.g. mobility outside the “West”, “forced” Academic Mobility (economic migrants, refugees) or female Academic Mobility. The consequences Academic Mobility has on these individuals are practically unknown.

Many other misconceptions can be uncovered.

The overly enthusiastic idea that the academia as a whole is mobile is one of them. It is important to bear in mind that millions of students and staff worldwide are and will remain extremely ‘immobile’ during their studies/careers—either because they cannot afford it or because they do not want to travel/live abroad. Furthermore Academic Mobility is still very much “conditioned and constrained by the regional and international political and economic relations of power” (Kim 2009: 387). For example, it is relatively easy for a European citizen to study in another European country—either as an exchange or a degree student—while it might be extremely difficult for the same individual to register for a PhD in the USA or Japan. But this is an “easy” case compared to the plight of illegal academic ‘movers’.

Finally we tend to forget that Academic Mobility always involves moving objects, images, information and “wastes” (Urry 2010: 348) across

global academic networks and flows—it is not just about Humans. Again hardly any study has been conducted on these elements.

It is easy to see that by dispelling these few myths—the reader will surely be aware of many more—we are ‘complexifying’ our understanding of what we know and what we need to do to analyse the consequences of Academic Mobility.

Towards Glocal Academic Mobility and Migration

Even though the increase in research on Academic Mobility gives the impression that a whole new field of study has emerged and blossomed over the past 10 years (Byram & Dervin 2008), there remain a lot of questions to be asked about the ‘essence’ of Academic Mobility. The question *What do we really mean by Academic Mobility?* is one of them.

To begin with we need to bear in mind that many mobile academics work/study in another country/other countries and have never actually worked or studied in their own country. As a consequence, I suggest we start using the label “Academic Mobility and Migration”. I believe that *Academic Migration* should not be confused with Academic Mobility but become a ‘research companion’—which can serve for comparative purposes. This is an important point as ‘permanent’ foreign staff and students often get placed mistakenly in the ‘wrong box’—that of ‘mere’ foreigners.

Should we call Academic Mobility and Migration international, transnational, global, etc.? Kim (2010) argues that this question is misplaced as these adjectives describe increasingly interrelated phenomena. The ‘borrowing’ of the European Bologna Process is a good example of that trend (ibid.). Besides is it still worth differentiating it from ‘intra-national’ academic mobility in our times of gloCality, where the local cannot escape being transformed by the global and vice versa? For J. Urry (2010: 361): “there is a parallel irreversible process of globalization-deepening-localization-deepening-globalization and so on. Both are bound together through a dynamic relationship, as huge flows of resources move backwards and forwards between the global and the local. Neither the global nor the local can exist without the other. They develop in a symbiotic, irreversible and unstable set of relationships, in which each gets transformed through billions of world-wide iterations”. Should we then talk about glocal Academic Mobility and Migration?

Some words about people involved in Academic Mobility and Migration are also appropriate here. On the one hand, I feel that we should not confuse the numerous categories of mobile academics: exchange

students vs. international degree students (cf. Dervin 2009); for staff: academic intellectuals (theoretical skills), academic experts (“researchers”) or manager-academics (management skills) (Kim 2010: 579). It is also good to remember that “some researchers are mobile some of the time, whilst for others, travel has become a routine part of their life: going backwards and forwards they are constantly mobile around the world” (Fahey & Kenway 2010: 568).

On the other hand, it is important to compare the experiences of people in different “umbrella categories” such as *students* and *staff* (researchers, lecturers, etc.). Such themes as sociality, language learning and teaching, economic and environmental impacts, the ‘intercultural’ can be potentially examined across categories.

Finally, new categories of ‘mobile’ students and staff have multiplied recently and we need more systematic empirical studies on them. For instance, there is little research on the virtual Academic Mobility of staff and students. The same goes for students and staff involved in programs provided by foreign universities in their own country (cf. e.g. Paris-Sorbonne University Abu Dhabi or Middlesex University-Dubai Campus).

Analysing the Consequences of Glocal Academic Mobility and Migration

There are different ways to approach the consequences of Mobility.

A common way of doing it is to study its financial impact. Neoliberal globalization has accompanied contemporary Academic Mobility and Migration through allowing e.g. the marketization of Higher Education (and “talent wars” Fahey & Kenway 2010), relaxed immigration policies and the creation of new power relations between countries and regions. As a direct consequence, “spaces” have now become competitors. International rankings such as the *Times Higher Education World University Rankings* contribute to this phenomenon, and lead to e.g. the “branding” of institutions to “attract” new customers (e.g. the label “*UCL: The Global University*” now substitutes *University College London* in the UK).

A lot of discussion concerning financial aspects has taken place recently in the media. In an increasing number of countries Academic Mobility and Migration is seen as a way to finance “local” education. In a recent letter to the British newspaper *the Observer*¹ sixteen university vice-chancellors insisted that “International students coming to

¹ <http://www.guardian.co.uk/theobserver/2011/mar/05/letters-international-student-cuts>

universities contribute over £5bn each year to the UK economy through tuition fees and off-campus expenditure”. This letter was written in reaction to a recent decision to cut the number of student visas in England. While reading the letter, one might easily get the impression that international students are often seen as mere “cash cows”. Yet the letter also mentions that “International students bring extensive cultural and political benefits to the UK. When they return to their countries at the end of their studies, they become cultural and economic ambassadors for the UK”. Kim (2009) has noted that the second argument is never actually the main motivation for accepting students from abroad. She argues that the same goes for international staff (*ibid.*).

In this volume we are not so much interested in financial issues. Instead, the authors emphasise personal/social and professional/educational aspects of Academic Mobility and Migration. They are all interested in how to analyse such phenomena from a variety of disciplinary orientations including sociology, language education, linguistics, engineering and education. The authors all have specific objectives and agendas in their chapters: some examine *underexplored issues and populations* such as language policies in globalised higher education (Risager), virtual academic mobility (O’Dowd), long-term impacts of mobility from the “North” to the “South” (Coleman & Chafer), researchers with a foreign degree returning to their home country (Delicado); while others seek to question and propose new ways of analysing Academic Mobility and Migration (Carlson; Danaher & Danaher; Danaher & Anteliz). The concept of identity, though largely studied in various contexts of Academic Mobility, is also included in two chapters with contrasting methods of study (van Mol, Strong). They cast new light on this important issue.

The book is divided into two parts: 1. Language, Identity and the Intercultural and 2. The Professional and Educational Impacts of Academic Mobility and Migration.

1. Language, Identity and the Intercultural

In the opening chapter, **Karen Risager** deals with languages and the “glocalization” of higher education. Starting from the claim that universities must be positioned in the global linguistic landscape—and not just bask in the light of English (as a *lingua franca*)—, the chapter presents some examples of cosmopolitan language policies. These policies recognize the multiple language resources of student populations today and involve both a rethinking at the institutional level—policies and practices of the university—and at the individual level—the life-projects

and practices of individual (transnational) students. Risager asserts that the overall learning aim of a cosmopolitan university education would be life-long continuity and integration of knowledge and experience, linking academic life with education *before* entering university studies and with professional life *after* university studies. The chapter also provides examples of cosmopolitan thinking by outlining language policies and practices at the interdisciplinary programme *Cultural Encounters* at Roskilde University, to which the author is attached. It is hard not to think of the consequences of these language policies on identity here. This ‘loudest talk in town’ (Z. Bauman 2004: 17) is the red thread in the next two chapters.

Chapter 2, by **Christof van Mol**, studies European identity in student mobility. In his study, van Mol also explores the effects of mobility on subsequent migration behaviour in 16 European countries. The author notes that one of the main principles of mobility programmes in Europe today is to allow the emergence of European citizens in addition to a sense of European identity. A non-parametric analysis of his data (questionnaires) reveals that participation in a study programme abroad primarily strengthens the cultural component of a European identity, rather than a civic one. Moreover, the chapter challenges existing theories on the influence of student mobility on subsequent migration behaviour. Interestingly, many of the surveyed mobile students already have migration intentions before they participate in international exchange programmes.

The next chapter approaches the concept of identity from a different methodological angle. **Dina Strong** is interested in gaining insight into the ways binational Erasmus exchange students in Latvia construct identifications. Following Wodak’s (1995) Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA) to Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), the author tries to integrate the students’ complex personal histories, while analyzing and interpreting the multiple layers of their discourses. Her results show that the students’ struggle to construct their identifications, asserting their national “in-betweenness” and their being “neither nor a stranger” in either countries, being always torn between two social, national, geographical, cultural and linguistic spaces.

In the next chapter, **Jim Coleman** and **Tony Chafer** examine the very-much underexplored issue of the lasting effects of study abroad. The study involves students who had undertaken a work placement in Francophone Africa as part of a UK degree in French since the mid-1980s. Using a questionnaire, the following issues are explored: gender, ethnicity, religion, accommodation, language use and gain, links with home, social

networks, learning outcomes and subsequent employment. According to the authors, their findings echo earlier studies, others are context-specific, but the enduring impact of study abroad on attitudes and employment is amply confirmed.

The first part ends with a chapter on virtual academic mobility, in which **Robert O'Dowd** argues that online intercultural exchange has the potential of supporting and enhancing traditional physical mobility programmes by bringing students into contact with members of the target culture before they actually leave for their period abroad. Based on a survey, the chapter demonstrates that online intercultural exchange remains a relatively peripheral 'add-on' activity in most institutions and is not yet considered an integral component of traditional student mobility programmes. The author also reviews current models of intercultural exchange in foreign language education and explores how telecollaboration can be more fully exploited both as a tool for the preparation for periods of study abroad and as a tool for supporting students during their periods of academic mobility in the target culture. An example of good practice which reflects a more effective 'integrated' approach to virtual and physical academic mobility ends the chapter. With the development of Web 2.0 technologies and e.g. easily accessible webinars (live online seminars through e.g. Elluminate or Adobe Connect) in the academia, it is easy to see how relevant O'Dowd's chapter is for analysing the consequences of this type of mobility.

2. The Professional and Educational Impacts of Academic Mobility and Migration

Four chapters compose the second part of the volume, which focuses on the professional and educational impacts of academic mobility and migration. The first three chapters are, in a way, exploratory.

The first chapter asks the question: *How to explain the transnational occupational mobility of former international students?* The author, **Sören Carlson**, stimulates researchers to look through new glasses at the relationship between student and transnational occupational mobility. He first asks the question of which kind of student mobility researchers should focus on. Carlson proposes that, contrary to the dominant approach taken in existing research on student mobility, we should concentrate on those students who pursue a whole degree course at a foreign university and graduate there, instead of those who only go abroad for a limited time and return to their home university. The author also takes a critical look at two current theoretical approaches which try to explain how student mobility

might be linked to transnational occupational mobility. A few suggestions on specific issues which still have to be dealt with in order to reach a more comprehensive understanding of how student and transnational occupational mobility are related to each other are proposed at the end of the chapter.

In a similar vein to the previous contribution, **Patrick A. Danaher** and **Geoff R. Danaher** take a very special position regarding Academic Mobility and Migration by articulating possible lessons for conceptualising and interrogating Academic Mobility and Migration by drawing on contemporary thinking about the knowledge economy and sustainability. In turn, the paper also explores how current understandings of academic mobility can contribute to challenging and extending the comprehension of those issues. The chapter's principal finding is that concepts associated with the knowledge economy and sustainability are helpful in extending our current understandings of the manifestations and effects of academic mobility in different contexts. The authors also argue that constructing Academic Mobility and Migration through the lens of mobile learning communities adds to the depth and richness of contemporary conceptualisations of the knowledge economy and sustainability.

In the next chapter, **Patrick A. Danaher** & **Emilio A. Anteliz** open up a new direction in analysing Academic Mobility and Migration by proposing to bridge Academic and Occupational Mobility, through the example of European Travellers. The two authors demonstrate that the competences of the mobile person can be understood as themselves exhibiting a fundamental mobility across different kinds of physical and social space, each with a specific set of norms, expectations and affordances. At the same time, that mobility is socially situated and politicised, and is often constrained when moving between the academic and occupational domains. For Danaher & Anteliz, these implications reveal that in seeking to bridge academic and occupational mobility educators, policy-makers and researchers can learn much from European Travellers and their multiple itineraries.

Chapter 9, written by **Ana Delicado**, sets out to analyse the impacts that postgraduate mobility has on career prospects and work practices of researchers. Based on a study on the international mobility of Portuguese scientists, it explores the career opportunities and constraints that researchers face after obtaining a PhD in a foreign institution. Career paths and perceptions of both expatriate (those remaining abroad) and returnee (those who come back to the home country) scientists are examined, as well as the changes in research practices brought about by being trained in different national contexts.

Acknowledgements: The editor would like to thank the following scholars for reviewing the chapters: Louise Ackers (Liverpool University, UK), Michiel Baas (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands), Susanne Ehrenreich (Ludwig-Maximilian-University of Munich, Germany), Elise Langan (Macon State College, USA), Aspasia Nanaki (University of Nantes, France), Vassiliki Papatsiba (University of Sheffield, UK), Marie-Claire Patron (Bond University, Australia), Minna Söderqvist (Aalto University School of Economics, Helsinki, Finland), Gertrud Tarp (Roskilde University, Denmark) and Alain Wolf (University of East Anglia, UK). Thanks are also due to Tuukka Peltonen for allowing us to reproduce his work *Summernight* on the cover of this volume.

Bibliography

- Bhandari, R. & P. Blumenthal 2011. *International students and global mobility in higher education*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dervin, F. 2008. *Métamorphoses identitaires en situation de mobilité*. Turku: Humanoria
- . 2009. "Impediments to engulfment into Finnish society: Exchange students' representations on their experiences in Finland". *Research on Finnish Society*. Vol. 2, pp. 19-27
- Fahey, J. & J. Kenway 2010. Introduction: International academic mobility: problematic and possible paradigms. *Discourse: Studies in the cultural politics of education*. Vol. 31, No. 5, pp. 563-575.
- Khosravi, S. 2010. *Illegal Traveller*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kim, T. 2009. Transnational academic mobility, internationalization and interculturality in higher education. *Intercultural education*. Vol. 20, No. 5, 395-405.
- . 2010. Transnational academic mobility, knowledge, and identity capital. *Discourse: Studies in the cultural politics of education*. Vol. 31, No. 5, pp. 577-591.
- Maffesoli, M. 1997. *Vagabondages*. Paris: Le Livre de Poche.
- Pietsch, T. 2010. Wandering Scholars? Academic mobility and the British World, 1850-1940. *Journal of Historical Geography*. 36, pp. 377-387.
- Robertson, S. 2010. Critical response to Special Section: international academic mobility. *Discourse: Studies in the cultural politics of education*. Vol. 31, No. 5, 641-647.
- Urry, J. 2010. Mobile Sociology. *The British Journal of Sociology*. pp. 347-366.
- Welch, A. 2008. Myths and Modes of Mobility: the Changing Face of Academic Mobility in the Global Era. In M. Byram & F. Dervin (eds.).

Students, Staff and Academic Mobility in Higher Education.
Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 292-311.

PART I.

LANGUAGE, IDENTITY AND THE 'INTERCULTURAL'

CHAPTER ONE

COSMOPOLITAN LANGUAGE POLICIES

KAREN RISAGER

Introduction

Universities are parts of world society. One should not only see them as national institutions of higher education that prepare the national population to occupy posts in their own country. They are also, and increasingly so, institutions of transnational society that must prepare people for posts in all corners of the earth. Therefore universities must become aware of linguistic, linguacultural and discursive diversity in the world and within the institutions. Universities are not only sites of potentially great linguistic diversity in terms of national or local languages used on campus. They also embrace a very broad horizon of linguacultures by virtue of the different life trajectories of each and every person. Furthermore they are centres of circulation of a number of knowledge discourses that are to some extent related to the selection of languages and associated linguacultures. How can universities take up the challenge of this diversity in their language policies, especially those related to teaching and learning?

Languages: Global Flows and Local Complexity

Global Linguistic Flows

Before going into the question of universities and their language policies, I would like to make a brief outline of the view of language that informs the argument. Language is primarily seen as language practices (oral or written) going on in all kinds of social networks at various levels from the micro-level of interpersonal interaction to macro-levels of mass-communication. Taking the notion of social networks as a point of departure, one can study how specific languages are used and how they

spread all over the world. The French language, for example, is used in many kinds of social networks in francophone countries. But it is also used in other places in the world. French is a world language in the sense that speakers of French live in practically every country and region in the world—as tourists, students, immigrants, business people, diplomats, doctors, journalists, scientists, sportsmen, etc. So languages such as French (i.e. people using French) spread all over the world, across cultural contexts and discourse communities. The same can be said of a large number of other languages. With social anthropologist Ulf Hannerz (1992), who has theorized the phenomenon of transnational and global cultural flows, one can speak of transnational and global linguistic flows.

The global flows of languages are not only brought about by transnational migration and tourism bringing speakers of specific languages around the world. They are also brought about by foreign and second language learning giving people access to new language networks of potential global range. And transnational media further enable transnational communication between language users far apart.

The flows of a large number of languages across national borders create local complexity in all countries, especially in the big cities with a multitude of linguistic minorities, new immigrants and other types of travellers, for instance students. In a country like Denmark, for example, about 120 languages are spoken as first languages, existing together in a socially structured landscape characterized by hierarchizations and identity politics.

Linguistic landscapes could also be called *linguascapes*, which is a term modelled over the theory of anthropologist Arjun Appadurai, who conceptualizes the world as a number of global landscapes flowing in relation to one another. He distinguishes between five different “scapes”: ethnoscapescapes, financerscapes, technoscapes, ideoscapes and mediascapes (Appadurai 1996). Ethnoscapes are the changing landscapes of ethnicities in the world. The concept of linguascape would have some similarity with the concept of ethnoscape, but they are not coterminous. Languages used as first languages may follow migrations as people carry their first languages with them. But the fact that people can learn languages later in life, as second and foreign languages, suggests that linguascapes do not have the same profiles as ethnoscapes.

Linguacultures

Language choice has cultural implications because language carries culture, i.e. meaning. I would like to refer to the concept of linguaculture

(or *linguaculture*). This concept has been developed by linguistic anthropologist Michael Agar (1992), and I have developed it further in my own work (Risager 2006, Risager 2007). I use it as a concept that offers an opportunity to theorize disconnections and reconnections between on the one hand a language and its *linguacultures*, on the other hand the rest of culture, as a result of migration and other kinds of mobility. Language users travel from place to place, across cultural contexts and discourse communities, but they carry *linguaculture* with them (this is also suggested in the alternative wording: “culture in language”). The *linguaculture* of a language is the various kinds of meanings carried and produced by that language, primarily its semantics and pragmatics. There are dimensions of culture that are bound to specific languages, and dimensions that are not, for instance musical traditions or architectural styles. There may of course be historical links between such cultural phenomena and the language in question, but the point is that the phenomena are not dependent on that specific language.

We all have our personal *linguaculture*, which cannot be separated from our personal life history and its wider social context. In the process of learning our first language or languages, we develop as social and cultural beings and learn to express ourselves and interpret the world. Therefore *linguaculture* is always to some extent different from individual to individual, characterized by a specific emotional and cognitive constitution, a specific perspective and a specific horizon of understanding. For example, the meaning of such notions as “work” and “leisure”, or “state” and “nation”, may be quite different even within the same professional group or the same family, all speaking the “same” language. We carry our *linguaculture* with us when we learn another language later in life. Personal connotations to words and phrases will be transferred to their (more or less direct) translations, and a kind of language mixture will result, where the foreign language is supplied with *linguacultural* matter from the first language.

Discourses of Knowledge

Language choice may also have wider cultural implications in terms of the discourses given access to. First it must be said though that while *linguaculture* is related to one or more specific languages, discourse is not necessarily so. If we conceptualize discourse primarily in relation to its content, in the sense that discourse deals with a certain subject matter from a certain perspective, as in the theory of critical discourse analysis developed by Fairclough (1992), then it is clear that discourses may spread

across languages. For example, discourses on Christianity spread all over the world. The subject matter of Christianity is not bound to any one language, although some languages are more specialized than others as to the verbalisation of topics related to Christianity. Discourses on mathematics, linguistics, learning and any other science, may flow from one language network to another, by processes of translation and other kinds of transformation, and they are influenced by changing linguacultures. For example: discourses on education will have different connotations in English-language discourse (*education*) than in German-language discourse (*Bildung*).

But all in all very little is actually translated, so many discourses circulate in language communities without ever being translated or otherwise transmitted to the outside world, even though they may be of great interest to others. For example: What is discussed in Brazilian forestry (in Portuguese or languages other than English)? In Arabic art history? In Chinese social philosophy or medicine? In Indian popular industry (in Hindi or languages other than English)?

Language Policies in Higher Education

Cosmopolitan Language Policies in Combination with Cosmopolitan Education Policies

The current trend of internationalization policies is to favour an extended or even exclusive use of English for international purposes, presupposing that this is a necessity on the global educational market where universities compete for transnationally mobile students. And given this contemporary neoliberalist condition, it is undoubtedly important to focus on the use of English and other institutionally authorized working language(s) in oral and written communication. But by implementing English-only policies, universities make themselves blind to actual linguistic and linguacultural diversity and potentially also discursive diversity. When they maintain this limitation, perhaps softened with a vague reference to “other international languages” or “other foreign languages”, their language policies are too narrow. In my view, we should explore the concept of cosmopolitanism in order to widen the scope of language policies in internationalization and make room for the inclusion of more linguacultures and more knowledge discourses from different parts of the world.

The concept of cosmopolitanism has a long and controversial history, but in this place I will focus on the theory developed by sociologist Ulrich

Beck, who in a number of works has written about globalization and the need to overcome what he calls methodological nationalism, i.e. the tendency to frame all sociological thinking and methodology in national terms as if the nation was a container of everything (Beck 2000). In the book *Cosmopolitan Vision* (Beck 2004), he develops his ideas on cosmopolitanization as a social process and on the cosmopolitan outlook as a methodological perspective on the world. He states that the concept of cosmopolitanism has left the realm of philosophical castles in the air and has entered reality because of the combined effect of all the social processes that cut cross national boundaries: transnational mobility, flows of communication, the rise of transnational organizations, ecological crises, etc. The human condition has become cosmopolitan, and we are witnessing a real cosmopolitanization of people's life worlds and institutions.

This forces us to develop a cosmopolitan outlook, which is among other things a sense of the global and a sense of boundarilessness. I would propose that a concept of cosmopolitan language policy takes its point of departure in this idea: I would define a cosmopolitan language policy as *a policy of awareness, recognition and inclusion of actual linguistic diversity*. As stated above, an inclusive language policy would make room for the inclusion of more linguacultures and more knowledge discourses from different parts of the world and thus potentially raise the global outlook and quality of research and education.

Cosmopolitanism at universities has much wider educational perspectives than language policies, of course. It would also mean a policy of awareness, recognition and inclusion of actual ethnic and cultural diversity in general. At this place I will take up the emphasis on transnational migration: Universities should be seen as sites of transnational education and learning, where students arrive from many corners of the earth, complete their studies, and leave again for their further career somewhere in the world, maybe in their country of origin. So universities should not be blind to the transitional character of learning processes, where students arrive with quite long educational experiences and lots of knowledge resources, and where they study with their own future life-projects in mind. The overall educational aim—and challenge—of a cosmopolitan university education should therefore be life-long continuity and integration of experience and knowledge, linking academic life with education before entering university studies and with professional life after university studies.

In this picture, languages become relevant because students arrive with many different language resources that might be exploited in learning.

Two kinds of situations may be distinguished: 1. The situation where students exploit their foreign language resources, not only English, but also other languages learnt in school or elsewhere. And 2. the situation where students exploit their first and second languages, which is often relevant for students who come from abroad. Why not include some activities in Chinese for students who have Chinese as their first or second language? By using Chinese in some activities with students from China, there can be made links to their previous studies in China, and there can be made links to their possible later professional life in China, where Chinese will often be the most useful language for professional communication with non-academics.

First or Second Language?

It should be born in mind that the notions of first and second language may cover very diverse situations: Students coming from diglossic societies, such as the Arabic-speaking countries, may have learnt a regional oral language as a first language from their parents and have learnt standard written Arabic as their second language in school. Or students coming from an African francophone country may have learnt a regional language as a first language and French as their second language in school. Or students from a country like Turkey may have learnt Kurdish as their first language and Turkish as their second language in school. For these types of students, their second language would typically be their primary academic language.

In the case of first languages, one may refer to studies confirming that learning by way of your first language may be more cognitively efficient (Thomas & Collier 2002, Skutnabb-Kangas 2000). On the other hand, for the above-mentioned types of university students, the use of their first language in academic learning would not be the natural choice if the language in question has not been used and developed as an academic language at all (for example regional Arabic vernaculars). For those students, their second language, especially if it has been learnt from an early age, would normally be a more natural choice and presumably also rewarding in the learning process. Whether a first or second language is chosen, the task of including it somehow in learning would often be a challenge for students because they have the task of developing the relevant knowledge discourse in another language, maybe without immediate examples to draw on.

Thus, a bilingual policy of parallel languages, English and the local (national) language, will not do when we consider the students coming

from abroad. If we want to include them, it would require a policy of *multiple parallelism* addressing different language groups: for example, for students speaking Chinese (as first or second language): English, Chinese and (possibly) the local language; for students speaking Spanish: English, Spanish and (possibly) the local language; for students speaking Polish: English, Polish and (possibly) the local language, etc. One can say that the simple bilingual policy of English and the national language is partly tied to a national paradigm of educational thinking: For the country's own nationals it is a bilingual policy, but for other nationalities it is a monolingual English policy. A policy of *multiple parallelism*, on the other hand, would address the actual transnational learning processes of a more or less diverse student population.

Analyzing the Global Linguascope

Multilingualism at the Global Level

Applied linguist David Graddol has been working with issues concerning the future of English (Graddol 1997). On the basis of economic and demographic statistics, and projections for the next 4-5 decades, he states that several of the regional languages will challenge English as big languages in the years to come. With the current dramatic changes of the world order we will see the development of a multipolar world with rising economic powers like China, India, Brazil and Russia and their regional neighbours, and the world order of languages will presumably be affected by this development. Graddol thinks that it is unlikely that any other language will overtake the dominant role of English, but that we will see a transition from an English *monopoly* to an *oligopoly* with English and a restricted number of other big languages.

Thus Graddol constructs the possible hierarchical situation of the world's languages in 2050 like this, based on economic and demographic developments and taking also into account potential language shift, mainly from local vernacular languages that are abandoned (ibid.: 59):

- the big languages: Chinese, Hindi/Urdu, English, Spanish and Arabic
- regional languages (the languages of major trade blocks): Arabic, Malay, Chinese, English, Russian and Spanish
- national languages: Around 90 languages serve over 220 states
- local languages: The remainder of the world's 1,000 or less languages with varying degrees of official recognition.

I would add that with the economic development of the rising economic powers, we can expect their middle classes to grow, which will have many cultural implications such as increasing use of their national languages not only in national and regional, but also in transnational communication on the Internet and in other media, increasing cultural consumption expressed in their languages, not least in the booming film industries, and an increasing number of translations to and from these languages (interlingual communication), representing many genres of texts, fictional, scientific and other.

We can see that today, some years after the publication of Graddol's study, more and more languages are present on the Internet, as more and more people are using it as an instrument of everyday communication. The biggest languages on the Internet p.t. (Internet World Stats, 2009, but statistics change quickly) are English, Chinese and Spanish, and the fastest growing languages on the Internet are Arabic, Russian and Chinese. Wikipedia has articles in 264 languages (2009).

It should be noted that in the transnational perspective presented above, in which languages are seen as language practices flowing around the world in social networks, none of these languages can be considered only local national languages. They are (also) global by virtue of their widespread transnational use.

How should universities react to the global linguascape and its prospective development? I am not suggesting that universities should try to institutionalize a large number of languages as working languages in teaching. But as I shall argue below, there are many other ways in which universities can make themselves aware of, recognize and include languages. On the basis of the above investigation by Graddol, I would suggest that any university in the world should somehow recognize the presence of an increasing number of big languages in transnational and interlingual communication, and among them, beside *English*, at least *Chinese*, *Spanish* and *Arabic*.

Multilingualism at the Regional Level

To this we must add the regional level. If we take Denmark as an example, universities in Denmark are situated in a multilingual Europe comprising over 200 languages including indigenous and immigrant languages. In Europe English is becoming the main regional language of transnational civil society, English and French are regional languages by virtue of their roles as working languages in the EU, and German, French and English are among the most important national languages. Important

neighbouring languages in relation to Denmark are (at least) Swedish, Norwegian, German, Polish and Russian. Universities in Denmark should somehow recognize these languages, among them, beside *English* and *Danish*, at least *French*, *German*, *Polish*, *Russian*, *Swedish* and *Norwegian*.

Multilingualism at the State Level

Taking the Kingdom of Denmark as an example (i.e. Denmark, the Faroe Islands and Greenland), this is a *de facto* multilingual state. In Denmark, the national language Danish is spoken by almost all inhabitants as first or second language (5.5 mill.). Beside Danish, there are a large number of other languages, some 120 in total (Risager 2006), comprising immigrant languages of different sizes. The biggest of all these languages are Arabic (about 70,000 speakers), Turkish (60,000), Bosnian/Serbian/Croatian (45,000), and Kurdish (40,000). To these should be added a language with a special status: German as an especially supported minority language in Southern Denmark.

On the Faroe Islands, a self-determining part of the Kingdom of Denmark, the national language Faroese is spoken (48,000), together with Danish and some immigrant languages. And in Greenland (*Kalaallit Nunaat*), which has just obtained the status of self-determination, the national language Greenlandic (*Kalaallisut*) is spoken (50,000), together with Danish and some immigrant languages.

Generally speaking, English has a very high status in Denmark. About 80% of the total population has some knowledge of English, ranging from elementary to advanced level (Preisler 1999), i.e. about 4.4 mill.

On this background, I would suggest that universities in Denmark should be aware of, and somehow recognize, these languages, among them, beside *Danish* and *English*, at least *Arabic*, *Turkish* and *German*, plus *Faroese* and *Kalaallisut*. Arabic, Turkish and German in order to indicate the inclusion of linguistic minorities in Denmark, Faroese and Kalaallisut in order to indicate the inclusion of the languages of subordinate territories in the Kingdom of Denmark.

Multilingualism at the Institutional Level

Taking Roskilde University as an example, most of the teaching staff speaks Danish and English (more or less well), either as first, second or foreign language. And the teachers in the subjects German and French naturally speak these languages. But there has not been any interest from

the university's side to investigate the language resources of its staff, although they may be very varied.

Among students, there are both ethnic Danes, students from linguistic minorities in Denmark, students from the Faroe Islands and Kalaallit Nunaat, and students from a large number of countries around the world. But there are no statistics concerning the language resources of the students across subjects. The only thing I know is that there are many students from China at the university; they form the largest language group.

I would suggest that Roskilde University should be aware of, and somehow recognize, beside *Danish* and *English*, at least *Chinese*. The first step in building an awareness of the linguistic diversity of the university (at one point in time) would of course be to carry out an investigation of this.

Roskilde University as a Cosmopolitan University— as regards Languages

Taken together, all these considerations of prioritization of languages can be summed up in the following list of 14 languages that should be recognized by Roskilde University, for quite different reasons. This is not a closed list, but a minimum:

- Danish—for state/national and institutional reasons
- English—for global, regional, state and institutional reasons
- Chinese—for global and institutional reasons
- Arabic—for global and state reasons
- Spanish—for global reasons
- German—for regional and state reasons
- French—for regional reasons
- Russian—for regional reasons
- Polish—for regional reasons
- Swedish—for regional reasons
- Norwegian—for regional reasons
- Turkish—for state reasons
- Faroese—for state reasons
- Kalaallisut—for state reasons.

How could that be done? The following sections describe some steps in the direction of a cosmopolitan language policy for one of the subjects at Roskilde University.

Language Policy at Cultural Encounters, Roskilde

Cultural Encounters

Cultural Encounters (in Danish: *Kultur- og Sprogødestudier*) is a Master's programme that deals with cultural studies and postcolonial studies with a focus on (intersections between) sociocultural parameters such as ethnicity, nationality, language, religion, class, race, gender and age. It deals with identity construction and policy making in multicultural and multilingual society, and with transnational and Diaspora studies.

Students typically start their university studies in a two-year broad interdisciplinary programme within the humanities or the social sciences, and then in their third year they enter Cultural Encounters (in combination with another subject of their own choice). Cultural Encounters encompasses three semesters in all, i.e. 1½ year. Studies are organized partly as problem-based project work in groups, partly as course work and the writing of individual essays. The teachers of Cultural Encounters have different disciplinary backgrounds such as anthropology, cultural sociology, sociolinguistics, postcolonial literature, sociology of religion, and minority studies.

There are about 500 students (autumn 2009) at the programme, and about 30 of these are international students coming from many different countries in the world. The programme is organized so that a division of students in “Danish students” and “international students” is avoided as much as possible. All students can in principle mix and attend courses and do projects together, as the study programme is very flexible.

The general working languages of Cultural Encounters are Danish and English. Almost all courses can be attended in both Danish and English, and e-mail messages to all students are either in both Danish and English, or only in English.

Since its start in 2000, Cultural Encounters has had what we call a pluralistic language policy that encourages students to explore their language resources as much and as widely as possible. It comprises both obligatory and optional elements. This policy has been implemented in the following way.

Descriptions of the Programme on the Web

From the start of the programme, we wanted to make its multilingual nature visible. Therefore we had short descriptions (half a page) of Cultural Encounters in several languages on the website. The languages

chosen at that time were those known by the working group that created the programme: Danish, German, Spanish, French, Italian and English.

In 2005 a longer description (13 pages) was put on the web in the following languages: Arabic, Danish, English, French, German, Spanish and Turkish. Within the limits of our financial resources for translation, we chose languages that would address some large linguistic minorities in Denmark (Arabic and Turkish) and significant language areas abroad as well.

In 2008 a somewhat shorter description (1 page) of Intercultural Studies, which is the research group attached to Cultural Encounters, was put on the web in Arabic, Danish, Chinese, English, French, German, Spanish, Turkish and Urdu. Within the limits of our financial resources at that time, we chose these languages in order to address even more large language areas in the world, as Chinese and Urdu were added.

The languages selected here are still only 8 out of the 14 languages listed above (but it adds Urdu).

An Investigation of Language Resources

From the start we had been aware that our teachers and students had knowledge of a great many languages, and in order to document this, we conducted an investigation in 2005. It was a web-questionnaire asking informants to self-report on their knowledge of languages, ranging from advanced level in all four linguistic skills to a rudimentary level (knowledge of a few words).

We found that among the 15 teachers we had at the moment, 19 languages were known at some level or other, at least at a level where he/she could make a cursory reading of a text: Arabic, Danish, Dutch, English, Esperanto, Farsi, French, German, Greek, Hebrew, Italian, Japanese, Kurdish, Latin, Norwegian, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish and Swedish.

Among the students that answered the questionnaire (109 in total), 52 different languages were reported as known, and among them were 20 deemed to be at an advanced level for all four skills: Danish, English, Spanish, Norwegian, Portuguese, Russian, Swahili, Kikuyu, German, French, Italian, Icelandic, Japanese, Polish, Serbo-Croatian, Slovene, Chinese (Mandarin), Croatian, Korean, Mongolian. We did not ask them what was their mother tongue, as this concept is contested and may be misunderstood. On an average, each student mentioned 6.49 languages, so they had quite wide linguistic resources. The investigation has been published in Haberland & Risager 2008.