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Abstract
Preisler introduces the Danish debate concerning the influence of English on Danish language and language use, and – drawing on previous research – describes what he sees as the two ‘sides’ in the debate: (1) the ‘followers,’ i.e. the vast majority of the population whose attitude to English is simply instrumental, and who embrace the influence of English as a manifestation of internationalization; (2) ‘the concerned,’ a small but influential minority whose views on the influence of English are more critical, and who represent the cultural elite. He then takes a quick detour into postmodernism, deconstructing the concepts of ‘Language’ and ‘Domain,’ and redefining the latter as ‘practice’ in an ethnographic sense. Taking a closer look at the relationship between English and Danish within one particular ‘domain,’ the ‘domain of science,’ where English is often thought to have won out, he shows that this is really two domains (i.e. practices): the domain of university research, and that of university teaching. Only in the domain of university teaching does it make sense to talk about a potential ‘domain loss’ for Danish, whereas Preisler concludes that, within the domain of university research, English and Danish are functionally distributed, and that this does not in itself affect the status of Danish within Danish society.

1. Introduction

The empirical basis of this chapter is a sociolinguistic situation in Denmark, but the developments that it describes apply – to a greater or lesser, but certainly increasing, degree – to many other countries where English is a foreign language. In spite of the fact that, according to some fundamental criteria, English must still be considered a foreign rather than a second language in Denmark, the Danish general public is constantly exposed to the English language as they go through their everyday lives. Code switching to English is the rule rather than the exception, and

---

1 I am indebted to Hartmut Haberland for his helpful comments on an earlier version of this manuscript. He is not, of course, to blame for any weaknesses that remain.

2 I use the term ‘code switching’ to refer to a bilingual speaker/writer’s casual alternation between at least two languages (or features from these languages) during a verbal encounter with another bilingual person. Such alternation typically involves the substitution of lexical items and idiomatic expressions, but may in principle affect any level of linguistic description including sentences and beyond (as when two speakers switch languages according to topic).
words and messages in English abound everywhere: on the job, in leisure time activities, on the street, in the supermarket, on the Internet, in the printed media and on radio and TV. The English language has become the symbol of globalization. However, in the wake of increasing internationalization in trade, politics, education and mass culture follows a corresponding tendency toward localization, with a growing interest in the values of the local society, in regional and national characteristics, and in one of the most important symbols of modern nationhood, the national language. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that the growing presence of the English language in Denmark has given rise to a public debate – as it has in other English-as-a-Foreign-Language (EFL) countries – on the possible consequences of the influence of English, and on the relevance of introducing language policies to protect (or ‘strengthen’) the national language. The Danish language debate is introduced in section 2 below. In Section 3, I describe the majority in the debate, the ‘followers,’ to whom the English language is merely a useful instrument of international communication, and who therefore do not see the increase in the use of English in Danish society as in any way problematic. The most voluble ‘followers’ are the representatives of the export industry and international big business. In Section 4, I discuss the more critical views of ‘the concerned,’ a small but influential cultural elite made up of teachers of Danish at various levels, newspaper editors, writers and other groups with a purist attitude toward the Danish language. I then take a closer look at the relationship between English and Danish within the ‘domain of science,’ deconstructing the concepts of ‘Language’ (Section 5) and ‘Domain’ (Section 6), and redefining the ‘domain’ as a ‘community of practice.’ I argue that the ‘domain of science’ consists of (at least) two separate domains, i.e. the domain of university research, where English and Danish are functionally distributed according to the ethnic composition of research networks within this domain (Section 7); and the domain of university teaching (Section 8), where official language policies stipulating the use of English, to facilitate international cooperation and exchange, are increasingly being superimposed on entire educational programs, affecting the long-term status of Danish as a language viable for use in the formal transmission of knowledge (Section 9).

2. The language debate in Denmark

In 1998, concern for the national language had reached a level that induced the Danish Language Council to arrange a conference in Copenhagen on the growing influence of English on Danish.\(^3\) The main worry was the host of English loan words that were making their way into the Danish vocabulary, but also the status of the Danish language as such, in terms of its continued ability to function across the whole range of public domains characteristic of a nation.

As in other European countries – France, for example – most of those who expressed concern for the national language were representatives of the cultural and educational elite. My own large-scale investigation into attitudes toward English in the general population, published in Danish (Preisler, 1999a), shows that the English language is highly prestigious in Denmark, as is a degree of Danish-English bilingualism in the individual. English is seen primarily as a key to participation in the internationalization process. If we were to characterize briefly the attitude of the average Dane toward the influence of the English language in Denmark, we could do so with reference to a particular contribution to the Danish language-policy debate, an article written by Erik Hansen, Iver Kjær and Jørn Lund (2000), entitled ‘Styrk sproget’ (‘strengthen the language’). Here we find a list of attitude

\(^3\) At ‘Schæffergården,’ on March 21, 1998.
stereotypes supposed to cover the whole range of typical reactions to the English language in Denmark: some Danes are frightened, some are in doubt as to how they should react, some are unconcerned, some are ignorant of any problem, some think they have all the answers, some are followers accepting the development uncritically, and some oppose it. My own investigation tends to place the average Dane among the ‘followers.’ They are described thus:

Medløberen synes, at vi skal ruste os til den nye sproglige verdensorden, lade være med at klynke og sørge for at placere engelsk stærkere i skolen og uddannelserne, ja helst introducere det i børnehaveklassen og vuggestuerne. At sprog er andet end kommunikation, er ikke gået op for medløberen (Hansen et al., 2000).

‘The follower thinks we should prepare ourselves for the new linguistic world order, stop whining, and see to it that English is strengthened as a subject in the Danish schools and educational system, preferably introducing it into kindergarten and day nurseries. It has not occurred to the follower that language is more than communication.’

3. The ‘followers’

It is the attitude of the ‘follower’ that prompts the Danish business community and politicians to believe that schoolchildren cannot learn English early enough. Most recently the Danish parliament has decided that the teaching of EFL is now to start in the third grade, where previously English was introduced in the fourth grade. Although there is no evidence that this in itself will result in the children being more English proficient when they leave school than they are now at school leaving age, this does not worry the ‘follower’: to the ‘follower,’ the new law signals a readiness on the part of the government to meet the needs of the business community, which today also means the needs of internationalization.

And the ‘followers’ constitute a vast majority in Denmark: the high status of EFL as a school subject is based on the awareness that, in an internationalized world, Danes have to be able to communicate with non-Danes, and that the English language is the most widely used language of international communication. Though only one out of four Danes thinks the children should have as many hours of EFL in school as they have of Danish, my investigation shows that more than one third of all Danish adults would accept a suggestion that other classes besides English classes be conducted in English, e.g. geography classes.

The predominantly positive attitude toward the presence of English in Danish society was reflected in the following gradient from the same investigation (first presented in English in Preisler, 1999b):^4

AGREE
‘The presence of the English language in Danish society is...
 a. ...a practical consequence of increased internationalization’ 92 %
 b. ...useful because it helps improve people’s English’ 89 %
 c. ...useful because it broadens people’s cultural horizon’ 69 %

^4 For each statement the options were (1) ‘I agree very much,’ (2) ‘I agree with some reservations,’ (3) ‘I disagree to some extent,’ (4) ‘I strongly disagree,’ (5) ‘I don’t know.’ The summary is a count of (1) and (2) lumped together.
d. ...a threat to the Danish language’  
   e. ...a threat to Danish culture’  
   f. ...a craze not to be taken seriously’

These figures confirm the predominant ‘follower’ attitude in the Danish population, with its huge emphasis on the *instrumental* functions of the English language, as the key to participation in the internationalization process, though more than two thirds of respondents also expected the presence of the English language in Danish society to ‘broaden their cultural horizon.’

4. The concerned

In Denmark, those expressing concern for the Danish language in the newspapers – e.g. in letters to the editor, or feature articles contributed by non-journalists (usually people with some professional interest in the language debate) are often representatives of the educational or cultural elite. It is hardly surprising to find, therefore, that the percentage of those who are, to a varying degree, worried about – or critical of – the influence of English tends to be a little higher among people with a postgraduate education than the rest. This group numbers 50 respondents out of a total of 856 respondents constituting a random sample of the Danish adult population.

For example, although Danes with a postgraduate education do not believe any more than the rest of the population that English constitutes a threat to Danish language or culture – and even do not differ significantly with regard to the percentage who agree that school subjects like geography should be taught in English – only 12 % of Danes with a postgraduate education agree that EFL should be given the same numbers of hours in the schools as (mother-tongue) Danish, against 29 % in the rest of the population (p < 0.05).

Looking at people’s attitudes toward the use of English in texts targeted at the Danish public, e.g. ads and commercials, we find that, whereas the average Dane is either ‘indifferent’ or thinks it makes the text ‘exciting’ to read/listen to, Danes with a postgraduate education find it much less ‘exciting,’ in fact almost one third of respondents with a postgraduate education find the use of English in such texts ‘affected,’ a category which in the rest of the population is picked only by one out of ten (p < 0.05).

Language attitudes can also be expressed more subtly. Most Danes believe that ‘the use of English (in Denmark) reflects the need for a world language.’ However, of those with a postgraduate education, 53 % choose the category ‘influence from the USA’ to explain the use of English in Denmark, against only 36 % in the rest of the population (p < 0.1). Asked whether they would like to *live* in the USA, they tend to give a negative answer more often than the average for the population, and so the impression remains that Danes with a postgraduate education are slightly more critical of the English influence than the rest.

Conversely, one might try to measure the relative importance of value symbols associated with Danish language and/or culture. This was the aim behind the statement, in the questionnaire, that ‘it is important that Danish authors be subsidized by the State.’ Whereas 85 % of people with a

---

5 This is a tendency only – the percentage difference is not statistically significant.
postgraduate education expressed (varying degrees of) agreement, rather than disagreement, with this claim, the corresponding figure for the rest of the respondents was only 59 % (p < 0.01).

All in all, people with a postgraduate education – the educational and cultural elite – appear to be ‘followers’ to a slightly lesser extent than the rest of the Danish population, and of course, all things considered, finding a somewhat more reflective attitude on the part of precisely this group could hardly be unexpected. Some of these distinguished individuals may even have invested part of their professional prestige in mastering the written norm of Standard Danish, be they university teachers, newspaper editors, writers, government administrators, attorneys, or whatever. This would perhaps tend to make them particularly wary of the impact of English on Danish, which they might see – not as a threat to the Danish language as such but – as a potential threat to this particular norm, hence to their own professional identity. Their very professions guarantee them a disproportionate amount of space in the public media, which is why some of them have been moderately successful in catching the attention of Danish politicians, of whom they demand a language policy (which Denmark has never had before).

What are they worried about? Well, some of them still believe the influence from English constitutes a process of – not just change but – deterioration of the Danish language code. This fear is as persistent as it is absurd, though the debate seems to have put it to rest for the moment. The prevailing attitude now seems to be that the vitality of a language depends precisely on its ability to integrate and absorb input from other languages.

The other worry, real or imagined, is the possibility that the Danish language will lose some of its functional domains to English. Corporate business, advertising, transport, information technology and youth culture are among the internationalized domains frequently mentioned as being in the danger zone. They also include higher education and scientific/scholarly research. ‘Domain loss,’ too, leads to a qualitative, not just a quantitative, reduction of the language: a language cannot develop its vocabulary in domains where it is not used. If English were the only language used in higher education and research, this would seriously impair the function of Danish as a vehicle of new scientific and scholarly knowledge.

5. Deconstructing ‘The Language’

I was recently a member of an ad hoc committee appointed by the Danish Rectors’ Conference for the purpose of producing a proposal for a Danish language policy for the universities. In the following I’ll deal with some of the issues discussed in the committee’s report, but before going any further, let’s look a little more closely at (1) the concept of ‘language,’ and (2) the concept of language ‘domain.’

Initially, it is important to remember that the abstractions we make when we discuss complicated issues have only one purpose: to make things look simpler than they are. Thus, in our minds, the Language (with a capital L) acquires a life of its own which has no objective reality. According to the metaphors we use about the Language, it is a physical object, which we would like to preserve unchanged, but which will ‘deteriorate’ if we do not ‘protect’ it. Or the Language is a belligerent power, which can ‘win’ or ‘lose’ domains.

However, in the real world there are only the users of a language, diverse as they are in respect of linguistic competence and attitudes toward their own language and that of others; and the actual use
of the language in concrete situations, i.e. the (written and spoken) texts of the language, which are as multitudinous and diverse. The Language (with a capital L) is a construct whose ‘objective’ existence is limited to the dictionary and the grammar book, and even here it represents an arbitrary choice among many possible related models.

Deconstructing the Language in this way (to use postmodernist terminology), we realize that – whereas it does not really make sense to say that the Language can deteriorate, there is nothing illogical in claiming that the linguistic competence of users of the language can deteriorate. On the contrary, it is a well-known fact that linguistic competence which is not exercised on a regular basis will deteriorate. This is true whether we are talking about people who, leaving the region where they grew up, forget the dialect of their childhood, or people who can no longer speak French, which they learned in school, because they did not have enough opportunities to practice it after they left school. In other words, if Danish scientists and scholars were to use only English in their research and research environments, for years, this would affect their ability to convey their research results in comprehensible, precise and idiomatic Danish. To the extent that Danish researchers conceptualize in English, to the exclusion of Danish, their ability to communicate their achievements to the Danish public, e.g. in the form of textbooks suitable for different levels of the Danish school system, will be impaired.

6. Deconstructing the ‘Domain’ concept

As to the concept of ‘domain loss,’ the worst-case scenario is that more and more internationalized domains in the public sphere might be ‘lost’ in favor of the English language, which would turn Danish into the low-status language of a diglossic society, spoken only at home and in informal situations among family and friends. However, the domain concept, too, could do with a little deconstruction before we can employ it in a language-policy discussion. Joshua Fishman (1972) originally distinguished, with Greenfield, five domains: family, friendship, religion, work and education. According to Fishman,

Domains are defined … in terms of institutional contexts or socio-ecological co-occurrences. They attempt to designate the major clusters of interaction situations that occur in particular multilingual settings. Domains enable us to understand that language choice and topic, appropriate though they may be for analyses of individual behavior at the level of face-to-face verbal encounters, are … related to widespread socio-cultural norms and expectations (1972:19; Fishman’s italics).

Fishman’s definition stresses the ‘co-occurrences’ and ‘major clusters’ of interaction situations that enable us to identify a domain, and I would agree that in terms of a structural description, there would often be a high degree of correlation between a cluster of ‘congruent situations’ (1972:22) and language choice and topic (though, at the level of generality where only five societal domains are distinguished, the relationship between socio-cultural norms and expectations, on the one hand, and the language choice and topics of individual speech encounters, on the other, must be very indirect indeed). However, when it comes to investigating a concept such as ‘domain loss,’ in relation to the influence of English on EFL societies, a structural description is not particularly useful or interesting. The problem is that even though particular clusters of ‘congruent situations’ may be characterized by particular language choices, these language choices are not necessarily related to any (or the same) ‘widespread socio-cultural norms and expectations.’ In fact, as I will
point out in the following, they may be related to particular patterns of linguistic competence at the level of individual verbal encounters.

According to my own definition, a domain is an area of social practice that can be identified on the basis of the nature and special characteristics of the practice, its localization in time and place, and its domain-specific role relationships.

7. The ‘Domain of Science’

Delimiting relevant domains is obviously difficult. For example, in a recent survey of the status of the Danish language by Pia Jarvad (2001), higher education and research are lumped together as the domain of ‘science,’ and Jarvad claims that English has already taken over as the language of this domain (2001:19). Yet it emerges that it is only in the natural sciences that publications in English predominate. In the social sciences only between one third and half of the research is published in English, and English is even less prominent in the published research of the humanities and other areas where the object of study frequently involves Danish language and culture.

My own field happens to be the English language. But even English-scholars recognize that as a university subject in Denmark, the study of English is invariably influenced by its Danish EFL context. Among other things, this means that some research on English language and literature is published in Danish. In rare cases, Danish research on the English language may even be published in a third language, as when two years ago an article of mine, on the influence of English on Danish, appeared in German (Preisler, 2001). Courses are taught in English – so as to strengthen the students’ English proficiency – though Danish is used in Danish-English and English-Danish translation. Student project groups are supervised in English, but the group will hardly continue speaking English after their supervisor has left the meeting. Of course, if even one member of the group is non-Danish, the language will be English throughout.

Communication between Danish researchers in the field of English is in Danish, not English. For example, researchers in the field of English from Danish universities hold an annual conference to discuss developments in the field. At the plenary sessions of this conference, the language spoken is Danish, because all tenured foreign personnel are expected to at least be able to understand Danish. The foreigners’ own contributions may be in English, but the responses are often in Danish, and the discussion tends to quickly slip back into Danish. In the bar in the evening, on the other hand, where conversation takes place in small groups, the language, typically, will be English if even one person in the group is less fluent in Danish than in English.

Ordinarily at work, when a few Danish English-scholars hold an informal meeting, or email each other, the language is Danish regardless of the topic. If a person joins the conversation who is not fluent in Danish, they will switch to English.6 If the mother tongue of one of these colleagues is English, though he or she speaks Danish fluently, the topic will determine the choice of language: If the topic relates to the content of their teaching or research, the language will be English. However, if the topic is some administrative matter which relates specifically to Danish universities or the Danish educational system, the language will automatically be Danish.

---

6 I use the word switch here in a non-technical sense, i.e. this phenomenon is not ‘code switching.’
In other words, the choice of language does not, even in the English Department, follow as a matter of course. And I have no doubt that the choice of language is at least as complex in the other scholarly and scientific branches of the university. The debate on the ‘invasion’ of English in internationalized domains has been dominated by a one-to-one perception of the relationship between domain and language, according to which the two languages cannot coexist peacefully within the same domain. Once a domain has been ‘conquered’ by English, this means that the domain itself defines the choice of language – the domain will by convention require that its practices be conducted in English.

However, it is not the domain as such that requires the choice of English in the research environment. Rather, the choice of language is determined by the relationship between participants in the social networks existing within this environment: If all the members of a network have Danish as their mother tongue or are expected to know Danish, then – everything else being equal – they will speak or write with each other in Danish. How many technical terms in English slip into the Danish discourse is, of course, irrelevant. Such code switching to English does not constitute speaking or writing ‘in English’ (on the contrary, the use of English words and expressions in the Danish scientific register may be a manifestation of the continued, spontaneous renewal of the ‘language of science’ that a Danish language policy would seek to ensure, comparable to the way the language of science used to seamlessly absorb German, French and Latin elements in earlier periods of the history of Danish). If one or more of the actual or potential participants in the communication cannot be expected to know Danish – including the readership of an international scientific or scholarly journal – the language chosen will be one that the majority of participants would be familiar with, usually English. If the participants have different mother tongues, while in fact mastering each other’s languages, the factor determining which language will be chosen could be e.g. the topic, the situational context and/or the relationship between participants.

8. University teaching and the (required) use of English

The domain of university research, as we saw, is characterized by its many international social networks, i.e. many networks employing English as a lingua franca. In this, it is not essentially different from most internationalized domains. For example, although in the domain of corporate business English is often the declared ‘corporate language’ of corporations in Denmark, it is – according to Jarvad (2001) – a myth that English is the only language spoken or written in these corporations. The choice of language depends on the nature of social networks and communicative situations. Even in the domain of advertising, the frequent use of English depends on the individual product and expected target group.

In fact, there are few domains in Danish society where convention or an explicit rule dictates that all communication be in English. I can think of only three. One is air traffic control: communication between cockpit and control tower has to be in English, regardless of whether both pilot and controller are mother-tongue speakers of Danish. Another is rock music: certain genres require lyrics in English, even if both band and audience are Danish. The third is so closely related to university research that most people (including many scholars) do not distinguish between them in discussions of language policy. This is the domain of higher education – more specifically, those educational programs where study regulations specify that the language of instruction is English, regardless of students’ mother tongue.
It is in the domain of internationalized education – particularly higher education – that stipulations to the effect that the language of instruction be English could turn out to be a problem, affecting the status of the national language. The pressure on institutions of higher education to create educational programs in English is tremendous. The reason being, of course, that no university can participate in the international exchange of students and teachers without offering at least some of its educational components in a language that exchange students and professors can be expected to know. However, to the extent that the English language is institutionalized as the language of higher education, in Denmark, this will gradually create the impression that the Danish language is less well suited as the language of higher education, and as time passes this impression will eventually be correct. In turn, graduates who have received their education in the English language will unfortunately be less well suited for jobs and professions in Denmark. Not least because the quality of this education, too, could be impaired if Danish-mother-tongue professors of history, philosophy or literature were to teach only in the English language.

Educational programs completely in English are being introduced (1995, for instance, saw the establishment of a medical program taught completely in English). But even though there are now, necessarily, some restrictions on the use of Danish in an increasingly mobile academic community, it is still possible to ensure that Danish retain its status as a language of higher education in all fields. A minimal requirement is that at least some central components of each educational program be offered in a Danish as well as an English version. Unfortunately, my own experience on a language-policy committee (see above) dominated by university politicians is that this is precisely where the battle will have to be fought: to the extent that programs are offered in English, universities will be inclined to abandon the Danish version, because offering both is twice as expensive. Thus the fate of Danish as a language usable for higher education will depend on whether or not Danish politicians are willing to pay the price!

9. Conclusion: university research and the functional distribution of English and Danish

I have argued that the language policy problems involved in university teaching and university research, respectively, are so different that ‘higher education and research’ should not be regarded as one domain in sociolinguistics, however informal the definition of ‘domain.’ Educational programs, apart from constituting distinctive social practices and role relationships, are defined within a national political context, with reference to national needs. The natural choice of language for teaching in Denmark, everything else being equal, is Danish, and so international student and teacher mobility is by definition a threat to the viability of Danish as the language of instruction in higher education. University research, on the other hand, knows of no national boundaries (at least not in a post-cold-war era), taking place in transnational networks within which the language of communication is negotiated among the participants themselves. This language, for historical reasons, will often be English. By the same token, research results have to be published in a language that an international target group can be expected to understand. It is hardly reasonable, therefore, to regard Danish researchers’ internationally published research as representing a potential ‘domain’ for the Danish language, which has been ‘lost’ to English.

The domain of university research, in fact, constitutes an interface between the local and the international. In this interface there is a need for communicating locally with other Danish researchers and, not least, with the local society that finances the research, and which can expect in return to be able to both understand and use the research. And there is a need for international communication with scientists and scholars in other countries, to ensure that the quality of the
research is second to none on a world scale. This makes for a natural division of labor between Danish and other languages (particularly English) in this domain, based on the endeavor to ensure optimal communication: Danish is likely to be the preferred language in local networks dominated by native speakers of Danish. English will be the preferred language, in Denmark, in transnational networks with a known, or potential, element of participants who do not know each other’s mother tongues.

Language, as was implied at the beginning of this chapter, is more than communication, and the ‘division of labor’ between Danish and English is perhaps not as clear-cut in the real world as it is in theory. The English language is a value symbol in Denmark, associated with the practices of Anglo-American youth subcultures on the one hand, and the prestige of education and success on the other, cp. the distinction between ‘English from Below’ and ‘English from Above’ in Preisler (1999a, 1999b). It is quite possible that English is sometimes chosen mechanically for its symbolic value or even required by the university or department by way of signaling a policy of internationalization, regardless of whether the particular thesis or article is likely to be published internationally. The relationship between language of publication, on the part of the Danish researcher, and factors such as academic identity and target-group consciousness no doubt merits closer sociolinguistic scrutiny. However, the consequences of an ‘unwarranted’ choice of English – and its significance from the point of view of language policy – would seem to be limited. Research written in English which is not published internationally is unlikely to reach beyond a very narrow circle of Danish academics. Furthermore, as the overt justification for writing an academic report in English inevitably rests on communicative criteria, anyway (i.e. English is chosen ‘just in case’ an international audience might exist), this means that the idea of the division of labor between Danish and English is present even here, and that the choice of English in such cases would not necessarily affect the status of Danish.

According to some, the ‘division of labor’ between Danish and English (i.e. the functional distribution of the two languages) within the field of research and research dissemination amounts to a diglossic situation: Danish is for ‘home use,’ whereas English represents the Danes’ face to the world. However, in a typical diglossic society the choice of language is determined by the domain as such, and the high or low status of the domain rubs off on the language. Within the domain of scientific research, on the other hand, the choice of English, Danish or any other language is determined by the competence of the actual or expected members of the network. The status of the Danish language does not suffer from Danish researchers publishing their international articles in English, because – given the nature of the network – Danish is not an option. The status of Danish as a language of scholarship and science suffers only if Danish researchers neglect to publish locally-oriented research in Danish at the same time (for Danish journals, textbooks etc.) – including popularized research for the Danish general public – because this is where Danish can and should continue to develop its scientific and scholarly register. To a much greater extent than is the case today, scientific and scholarly research should be made accessible for different media aimed at a wide variety of local target groups. And not only should the flow of ‘de-professionalized’ information be stimulated in this way, for the benefit of non-specialist audiences. The interdisciplinary sharing of research results within the local research environments, too, constitutes a natural context for the use and further development of the national language.
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