LANGUAGE CHOICE AND IDEOLOGIES BETWEEN DANES AND SWEDES
in service encounters in Malmö, Sweden
Declaration of Authorship
(To be placed at page 2 in the assignment)

Identification

Title of assignment: Language choice and language ideologies between Danes and Swedes
Study programme: MCO, Multicultural Communication in Organisations
Course: Master's Thesis
Type of Exam (e.g. Home assignment or Bachelor Project): Master's Thesis

Social Security No. or Student ID: Name of author(s):

190391-**** Simone Angelika Holck Lohman

Number of pages:

According to the exam regulations for this particular exam, the assignment must be of a maximum of 80 pages (Insert max. number of pages) exclusive front page, bibliography and appendices. Appendices are not included in the assessment.

Each individual page of the assignment may not comprise more than 2,275 characters (incl. spaces) on average. (E.g. similar to 35 lines of 65 characters). All pages must have a margin of min. 3 cm in top and bottom and min. 2 cm to each of the sides. The font must be of a minimum of 11 pitch. Tables, diagrams, illustrations etc. are not included in the number of characters, but will not justify exceeding the maximum number of pages.

Code of conduct:

Undersigned author hereby declare:
- that I/we individually or together with the group members listed above have written and completed this assignment.
- that I/we have indicated all quotes with quotation-marks and provided references to their sources.
- that the assignment complies with all regulations stated above regarding size and form.

Date: 15.03.2015 Signature(s): Simone Lohman
0. Abstract

The Scandinavian languages Danish and Swedish are so closely related that they are generally considered mutually intelligible. Thus, one can assume that the language choice is straightforward and, therefore, deserves a minimal amount of attention within organizations. However, Danes and Swedes who communicate face other options than speaking their native languages together. Furthermore, they can apply different accommodation strategies to enhance understanding and successful communication. As such, this thesis seeks to investigate to what extent Danish and Swedish interlocutors use their own language (thus, using receptive multilingualism) versus an alternative language, such as English, as well as which accommodation strategies are used most and why. The study investigates Danes and Swedes in service encounters in Malmö, Sweden, in a shoe shop (Ecco) and a clothing shop (Filippa K).

This thesis includes an introduction to communication accommodation theory, which assumes that speakers and listeners seek to adapt to each other in order to enhance understanding and successful communication. Correlations between speaker’s practices and ideologies show that language choice is governed by language ideologies and that the hierarchy of preferences is as follows: 1) receptive multilingualism, i.e. speaking native languages (Danish and Swedish) 2) speaking native languages but combining with additional accommodation strategies such as codeswitching, and 3) speaking English. In order to be able to compare language choice with the underlying ideologies that govern Danes and Swedes’ language choices, the study takes an ethnographic approach and data is gathered through participant observation and informal interviews. The Swedish participants are the shop assistants in the two shops, while the Danish participants are customers visiting the shops in Malmö.
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1. Introduction

This thesis seeks to investigate language choice between Danes and Swedes and the ideologies that govern these language choices (language ideologies); i.e. what language Danes and Swedes choose when communicating and why they make that choice. As an extension of this, the objective is to account for potential accommodation strategies interlocutors apply in order to enhance successful communication. Interlocutors might switch languages completely (e.g. to English) or just smaller units or words (making use of codeswitching). Another option, however, is to keep speaking the respective native languages. In this context I introduce receptive multilingualism and Lingua Receptiva (LaRa), which refer to “a complementary communicative mode for multilingual settings in which interlocutors each use their own language – or a language variety they are comfortable with – and rely on receptive skills in the language of the other for comprehension” (ten Thije, 2013).

This study seeks to investigate; first, what language Danes and Swedes choose to use in customer service encounters when talking to each other; and second, why they make these choices. What determines whether Swedes and Danes respectively use English or their mother tongue when talking to someone with the opposite nationality? That leads me to the following sub-questions:

- To what extent do interlocutors make use of receptive multilingualism and why?
- To what extent do interlocutors make use of an alternative language and why?
- Which of the different accommodation strategies are used most and why?

The study will include observations of service encounters in Malmö, Sweden, in a shoe shop (Ecco) and a clothing shop (Filippa K). The objective of the observation is to see what people do in practice. Interviews with customers and shop assistants will provide insights into their interpretation of the situation and thus shed light on their language ideologies. Including both observations and interviews will also allow for the researcher to investigate the gap between or overlap of ideologies and practice when it comes to language choice and accommodation strategies. Some questions are asked to see how different factors (such as dialect, region where informant grew up, etc.) influence the results and perceptions.

This is study is relevant in a business context because it investigates service encounters. These service encounters are not only about providing service for the customer, they are also about selling a product. Successful communication is a criterion to fulfill both those goals. In a more international perspective, English is often viewed as the first and perhaps only option when people with different native languages wish to talk with each other. Especially so in a globalized (Western) world where many speak some level of English and everyone is expected to be able to communicate with each

---

1 When I refer to Danes I mean people who have Danish as their native language/mother tongue and in the
other through English (as a lingua franca). I find it important to investigate the alternatives to this seemingly over-powering language choice. Some languages are so closely related that English might not even be necessary. Braunmüller (2002) argues that people in Europe are not aware of the possibilities for using alternative modes of communication; such as speaking your native language while your language partner does the same even though he or she does not have the same native language as you do. In order to find out how successful such “alternative” communication might be in the future, it is important to find out how well it works now and how people perceive this type of communication.

Even though this study is qualitative and thus takes a closer look at one specific social situation (namely service encounters between Danes and Swedes in Malmö) the study can help us understand more about how people communicate face to face. In a globalized world, language choice and successful multicultural communication is more important than ever and as such I argue that the findings in this study will help reveal some of the secrets in multicultural communication and pave new ways for mutual intelligibility between different languages, cultures and businesses.
2. Literature review/Theoretical framework

Communication Accommodation Theory

Since the theoretical framework for the analysis of this study and previous literature on the topic is so closely related, I have decided to combine the two chapters for coherence and a clearer overview. First, I will account for communication accommodation theory, which serves as the theoretical basis for this study. Later, I will build on this theory by introducing previous literature that relates to both communication accommodation theory and my topic.

Communication accommodation theory (CAT) is a “theoretical framework for a comparative idiolectology” (Giles and Powesland. 1997: 232). It is based on the assumption that when people interact and communicate, they adjust the way they speak (i.e. their idiolect) and act to accommodate to their interlocutor. The theory builds on the initial Speech Accommodation Theory, which, as the name indicates, only focused on linguistic factors. Communication Accommodation Theory, however, has expanded to include all communication factors, such as speech pace, gestures, and vocal patterns. Hehl & MacDonald (2012: 266) define CAT as: “a theory that describes the psychological, social and linguistic behaviors that people exhibit when communicating with each other”. To sum up, the theory seeks to investigate a more comprehensive and extensive explanation for how speakers adapt their language, how listeners perceive adaptations (or lack thereof) and how these two concepts are connected. Or as Giles and Powesland put it: “it is hoped that through the elaboration of this theory the two areas of speaker evaluation and speech diversity can be conceptually linked” (1997: 233). This link is exactly what lacks in research on Danish-Swedish interaction.

Accommodation and its practices and strategies are complex as this quote by Giles and Coupland illustrates:

“At one level, accommodation is to be seen as a multiply-organized and conceptually complex set of alternatives, regularly available to communicators in face-to-face talk. (...)

At another level, accommodation strategies can characterize wholesale realignments of patterns of code- or language selection, though again related to constellations of underlying beliefs, attitudes and sociostructural conditions” (1991: 61).

In short, what they say is that there is a relation between the choices speakers make when it comes to accommodation strategies and the underlying ideologies as the ideologies govern the strategies. Speakers act as they do for reasons I seek to investigate in this study. Giles and Coupland (1991) speak of levels where the one level is what we see and hear (the practice) and the other level is what we do not have immediate access to as it is in people’s minds. Also, many may not even have

---

2 Idiolect = “the way in which a particular person uses language” (Longman’s Dictionary of Contemporary English)
thought about their opinion on the issue before asked in the study and as such they may not even be aware of why they do what they do.

One study showed that "the choice between the participle ending /ing/ and the /in/ variant, appear to be related to sex, class, personality and mood of the speaker, the formality of the conversation and to the specific verb spoken..." (Giles and Powesland 1997 quoting Fischer 1958: 232). The same might be the case for language choice and accommodation strategies. These features of course only relate to the speaker but the listener also seems to have a great impact on how the speaker uses language:

"An individual’s speech patterns are in part dependent on the person to whom he is talking, the topic of the discourse and the setting in which it takes place" (Giles and Powesland, 1997: 232)

Giles and Powesland (1997: 234) set up a frame for the impact interlocutors’ wish for social approval has on conversations. The frame is based on the assumption that a) interlocutors seek social approval from their conversation partner and b) speakers will seek to accommodate in ways they think will be approved by the listener:

"There is a dyad consisting of speakers A and B

Assume that A wished to gain B’s approval

A then

1. Samples B’s speech and

   (i) draws inferences as to the personality characteristics of B (or at least the characteristics which B wishes to project as being his)
   (ii) assumes that B values and approves of such characteristics
   (iii) assumes that B will approve of him (A) to the extent that he (A) displays similar characteristics

2. Chooses from his speech-repertoire patterns of speech which project characteristics of which B is assumed to approve.

   The effort of this decision process is that A produces speech similar – or at least more similar than his normal speech would be – to the speech of B.

   There is therefore speech convergence. If B at the same time goes through a similar process there is mutual convergence” (Giles and Powesland. 1997: 234)

Thus, Giles and Powesland introduce the notion convergence, which will be described in further detail later. They argue that convergence enhances comprehension: “the more the sender reflects the receiver’s own mode of communication, the more easily will his message be understood” (Giles and Powesland. 1997: 234). They base all of the above on the assumption that similarities attract each other:
“the essence of the theory of accommodation lies in the social psychological research on similarity-attraction. This work suggests that an individual can induce another to evaluate him more favorably by reducing dissimilarities between them. The process of speech accommodation operates on this principle and as such may be a reflection of an individual’s desire for social approval” (Giles and Powesland. 1997: 233)

In the context of Danish-Swedish service encounters in Malmö, interlocutors are also expected to accommodate each other’s language. If for example a speaker of Swedish hears a Dane accommodate by using a Swedish word (codeswitching), they are likely to accommodate more themselves (i.e. converge).

Giles and Coupland’s Communication Accommodation Theory model is an attempt to integrate and align different understandings of what it means to be accommodative. In connection to this, they stress the importance of reward. As the speaker has to make an effort and potentially change a lot of things in their speech this effort has to be worthwhile. Thus, Giles and Powesland introduce the notion “reward” as a factor of the extent to which a speaker will adjust her communication. Although the concept is complex and difficult to grasp, a reward could be social approval, but there could also be other reasons for accommodating. A quite simple one would be the desire to "increase comprehensibility" or "causing the sender to be perceived more favorably” (Giles and Powesland. 1997. 234). In a service situation where the shop assistants’ ultimate goal is to sell a product, increasing comprehensibility seems like a plausible reason. If customers and shop assistants do not understand each other, the consequence might be that the shop loses out on a potential sale. If however, customer and sales assistant understand each other the customer can also benefit from increased understanding, as it will help them get proper guidance and information about products they are about to buy. Perhaps especially so in shops where they sell high-quality shoes and garments with a higher retail price.

Although Giles and Powesland speak of both "increasing comprehensibility” and “causing the sender to be perceived more favorably” as separate reasons to accommodate, they also argue that these two reasons are both aspects wanting of or perhaps means of getting social approval, and as such they are entangled. In a study by Bourhis (1984) of French and English speakers in Montreal, Canada, it was found that “… the more effort in convergence a speaker was perceived to have made, the more favorably the speaker was evaluated, and the more the listener would converge in return” (Coupland. 2010: 22). In a Danish-Swedish context that could mean that the more a Dane uses Swedish words, slows their speech etc., the more the Swede will adapt their speech as well and vice versa.
Convergence and divergence
As introduced in Giles and Powesland’s (1997) dyad form, another name for accommodation is convergence. The opposite of this is divergence, which is moving further away from the communicative style of the listener, i.e. the speaker distancing herself from the listener: “Divergence was the term conceived to refer to the way in which speakers accentuate speech and non-verbal differences between themselves and others” (Giles and Coupland, 1991: 65). Both divergence and convergence can take many forms, both verbal and non-verbal. Speakers can also choose to neither make use of convergence nor of divergence, but instead keep to their personal idiolect without any changes. Convergence can be defined as “a strategy whereby individuals adapt to each other’s communicative behaviors in terms of a wide range of linguistic/prosodic/non-vocal features including speech rate, pausal phenomena and utterance length, phonological variants, smiling, gaze and so on” (Giles and Coupland, 1991: 63). Most of these features are observable to some extent. Speech rate is usually measured in words per minute but in this study, I will not be able to record all conversations and so I will only be able to account for my perception of informants’ (change in) speech rate.

Many things affect speakers’ tendency to accommodate. While Giles and Coupland argue that “convergent communicative acts reduce interpersonal differences” (1991: 64), they also argue that different people have different tendencies to be aware of or make use of this advantage in conversation: “variability in the extent and frequency of convergence is also apparent, corresponding to sociodemographic variables such as age” (1991: 64). That age plays a role in how speakers with differing mother tongues choose to communicate is supported by a study by Sağın-Şimşek and König (2011), who found that speakers of Azerbaijani and Turkish were more likely to accommodate to each other by using their own native language in the conversation, the older they were. Another factor which influences a speaker’s level of convergence is where they are on the extrovert-introvert spectrum: “extroverts, as well as cognitively more complex communicators, who are high on construct differentiation, are more listener-adaptive than introvert and low differentiators” (Giles and Coupland, 1991: 64). Many shop assistants can be expected to be rather extrovert since an important element of their job is to converse with strangers on a daily basis. Therefore, it is likely that they will have a strong tendency to accommodate to their customers. The customers probably make up a more diverse group when it comes to being intro- or extrovert. Thus, it is more difficult to predict their convergence behavior in the given situation.

There is often a difference between how speakers actually accommodate and how the listener perceives an utterance. In that regard, Giles and Coupland (1991) speak of “perceptual divergence”, which is when the listener perceives the speaker as diverging even though this may not be the case. They provide an example from Belgium with speakers of Flemish and French: “it was found that
when the speaker demeaned Flemish people in an ethnically threatening question, listeners rated him as sounding more Francophone” (Giles and Coupland. 1991: 66). In a Danish-Swedish context, this might also happen but in a service encounter an “ethnically threatening question” is unlikely to come up, as conversation mostly evolves around products and polite phrases.

When characterizing convergence versus divergence there are numerous distinctions to consider. First, there is upward versus downward distinction. This has to do with how prestigious a certain dialect is and how people choose to adapt according to that prestige. One example would be a dialect from Stockholm versus a variety of Scanian. Schüppert and Gooskens argue that “the fact that Sweden enjoys a higher status in Scandinavia than Denmark might cause a bias in the willingness to understand the neighboring language. In other words, Danish adults may be more willing to understand Swedish than the other way around, and therefore perform better in perception tasks” (Schüppert & Gooskens. 2011: 338). This bias in the willingness to understand each other’s languages is explained in the following way:

“Within Scandinavia, Sweden has been the country with the biggest population and the most prosperous industry for a long time. Therefore, within Scandinavia, Sweden is often called storebror (in English, literally, ‘big brother’), indicating that Norwegians and Danes generally regard Sweden as more influential and more dominant than their own country” (Schüppert & Gooskens. 2011: 338).

This may be reflected in the gathered data. The concept of upward or downward distinction works for both divergence and convergence.

Second, there is the full versus partial versus hyper-/cross-over type of convergence. Convergence can appear in only some features of language and not in others. Speakers do not necessarily converge in all aspects. That also means that convergence and divergence can appear in the same conversation = they are not “necessarily mutually exclusive phenomena”. In a Danish-Swedish context, it might be the case that a speaker tries to converge in his pronunciation but he still diverges in other areas, i.e. choice of words.

Third, an important factor is to what extent speakers choose to accommodate. This can either be symmetrical or asymmetrical. If the speakers do not adapt to the same extent the accommodation is referred to as asymmetrical. Clearly, many things influence this factor, one such thing being gender. Mulad et al. (1988: 331) found that “in mixed-sex dyads, it appears that both genders adopted a linguistic style more like that of their out-group partner than they would have maintained with an in-group partner” (Giles and Coupland. 1991: 68).

Fourth, there is the subjective versus objective distinction. Giles and Coupland put it this way: “Because our perceptions of speech styles are dependent on various social and cognitive biases, speak-
ers believed to be relatively competent may be heard to be more standard-accented than they actually are” (1991: 69). In a Danish-Swedish service encounter context this is also highly relevant as the listener's perception of the speaker and their dialect, etc., will influence how well they understand each other.

Giles and Coupland further argue that “through convergence, a speaker’s attractiveness, perceived supportiveness, intelligibility, and interpersonal involvement in the eyes of the recipient are also liable to be increased” (1991: 72). And also that “convergence may plausibly be considered a reflection of an individual’s desire for social approval: if people recognize positive cognitive, affective and behavioral outcomes to follow from convergence, this is sufficient for us to consider that an approval motive may often trigger it” (1991: 72). They follow up on this argument by adding that the more a speaker feels the need for social approval the more they will converge. In Danish-Swedish service encounter interaction, it is uncertain how much interlocutors seek social approval. On the one hand, Schüppert and Gooskens (2011) found that Swedish is more highly valued than Danish. Therefore, it can be argued that Danes might seek social approval from the Swedes and thus seek to make more use of convergence. On the other hand, a service encounter is not necessarily the typical situation for someone to seek social approval as the encounter is short and the interlocutors are unlikely to meet again any time soon, unless the customer is a regular, in which case the social situation would be very different from what I am investigating, but that is exactly why the element of perception is added to this study. In the situations observed in this study, none of the interlocutors knew each other beforehand and none of the Danish customers came to the shops on a regular basis. If they did come back, these revisits were more sporadic.

It is very evident that the way interlocutors perceive accommodation is very important in how they respond themselves, i.e. whether they converge or diverge and to what extent. Giles and Coupland introduce the concept of perceptual convergence: “This sense of a reduced linguistic barrier between oneself and another, termed ‘perceptual convergence’, no doubt facilitates the convergence process itself” (1991: 73). It is likely that salespeople converge more to customers than the other way around because of power. The sales clerk is often more dependent on the customer to make a purchase than the customer is to make the purchase.

In the same way that convergence can trigger social approval, divergence can strongly indicate the opposite. If informants in this study choose not to converge, but diverge instead it is very likely to be perceived negatively by the listener. For a shop assistant that does this (intentionally or not) it might result in a loss of a potential sale and a disappointed customer. Giles and Powesland argue that “in everyday life, we are often unaware of the background information surrounding an accommodative or nonaccommodative act” (1997: 235). Exactly because interlocutors are unaware of
the implications of their accommodative acts, it is important to investigate their significance. This will be done by linking practice and ideology, i.e. what people actually do when they communicate versus what they think they do and how they perceive communication.

In the following section, the objective is to provide an overview of previous research on the topics that this study touches upon: a) language choice and accommodation strategies, b) Danish-Swedish encounters and intelligibility, and c) language ideologies. In connection with a), the review will briefly account for *receptive multilingualism, codeswitching, English as a lingua franca* and *language ideologies*. Furthermore, I seek to position my own study within these fields.

### 2.1. Language choice and accommodation strategies

Many theories have been proposed to explain what happens when interlocutors with differing mother tongues communicate. In this section, I will account for the strategies interlocutors can make use of to enhance successful communication between people with differing mother tongues. These strategies are known as *accommodation strategies*. This review will focus on the two primary options interlocutors with Danish and Swedish mother tongues face when speaking with each other: 1) Use native languages (*receptive multilingualism*) and 2) switching to a lingua franca, in this case English. In the first case, the interlocutors can adopt a number of different accommodation strategies. In the following, I seek to define, discuss, and compare the above-mentioned concepts in connection with the way Danes and Swedes can be expected to speak with each other.

#### 2.1.1. Receptive multilingualism

Braunmüller (2013: 215) gives an overview of the historical path of intercultural and multilingual communication: “Communication was some kind of bargaining of the best ways how to come to terms with each other”. Before modern day technology, people had to learn on the go to communicate with each other; either between different native languages or (distant) dialects. They had to find “mutual strategies of accommodation”. He further specifies: “Based on their vernaculars, they enlarged their (receptive) vocabulary, elaborated their linguistic diasystems (...) and made extensively and successfully use of them...” (2013: 215). In situations where the languages spoken are typologically similar, interlocutors may choose to speak their mother tongues. Gooskens state that Danish and Swedish are exactly such languages: “The Scandinavian languages, Danish, Norwegian and Swedish, are an example of languages which are so closely related that they are mutually intelligible” (2007: 445). This phenomenon is referred to as Receptive Multilingualism (RM) or Lingua Receptiva (LaRa). I will account for the similarities and differences between these two concepts below.
Ten Thije et al. define Receptive Multilingualism (RM) as “a mode of intercultural communication in which interactants employ a language and/or a language variety different from their partner’s and still understand each other without the help of any additional lingua franca” (2011: 245). So receptive multilingualism in its purest form is when none of the interlocutors make use of other languages than their mother tongue/native language. Rehbein et al. (2013) build on this concept by introducing the notion *lingua receptiva*. This concept refers not only to the act of intercultural communication with mutual understanding but also includes the processes that build this mutual understanding. Thus, lingua receptiva (LaRa) is defined as “the ensemble of those linguistic, mental, interactional and intercultural competences which are creatively activated when listeners are receiving linguistic actions in their passive language or variety” (Rehbein et al. 2013: 246). As opposed to RM, LaRa does not exclude the use of a lingua franca and so this notion could for example be used if one of the Danish/Swedish interlocutors spoke their mother tongue and the other English. *Passive language* as introduced by Ten Thije (2011) is language that is understood by the interlocutor but not spoken. Ten Thije et al.’s passive language builds on Braunmüller’s mention of “receptive vocabulary”. As interlocutors we often understand many more words than we use ourselves – even in our own language.

In line with Ten Thije, Braunmüller defines receptive multilingualism as “a form of mutual, unmediated communication between different dialects and languages. Unmediated means that no lingua franca is used” (2013: 215). To sum up, Braunmüller argues that before written language became the norm, people were used to hear and understand other people speaking a variety of languages and dialects. Today, nationalism is the norm in Europe. People are less accustomed to varieties of the same language. On the basis of that, Braunmüller argues that receptive multilingualism “has big unexploited covert potential, especially between speakers of linguistically related nations, but without a common peaceful history”. This project aims to investigate to what extent receptive multilingualism is the chosen form of communication when Danes and Swedes talk with each other. According to Braunmüller it is not used very often, and he lists a number of hindrances for the successful use of receptive multilingualism in modern Europe. He mentions “the general lacking awareness of this possibility” and “the missing flexibility of interlocutors in oral communication due to the dominance of standardized languages in almost all domains” as two of the hindrances (Braunmüller 2013: 221). In this project, Braunmüller’s hindrances may serve as guidance to explore the underlying reasons for why native speakers of Danish and Swedish choose whatever means of communication they do.

Braunmüller’s (2013) explanations indicate that dialects play a role in comprehensibility. After all, an important distinction between dialects is pronunciation. Sağın-Şimşek and König also establish
that “differences in pronunciation seem to be the main reason for incomprehensibilities” (2011: 326). This explanation is also presented by Schüppert and Gooskens who investigated the role of extra-linguistic factors in receptive bilingualism with a specific focus on Danish and Swedish preschoolers. They found out that “Danes have fewer problems decoding spoken Swedish than Swedes have decoding spoken Danish” (2011: 333). They present a number of explanations in addition to pronunciation, one of them being willingness. These factors may help uncover the reasons for choice of language for Danes as well as Swedes when they speak with each other and also explain if there is a difference in how Danes and Swedes perceive language choice.

Gooskens (2007) also deals with receptive multilingualism but uses the term “seismicommunication”. She argues that some languages are so similar (when it comes to grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation) that speakers of one of the languages can easily understand the other language. She states that “speakers of such languages are able to communicate with each other without a lingua franca or without one speaker using the language of the other” (Gooskens 2007: 445) and, as mentioned earlier, she further argues that the Scandinavian languages Danish, Norwegian and Swedish are exactly such languages. Based on that she assumes that receptive multilingualism (or semicommunication in Gooskens’ terms) is the usual manner of communication between native speakers of Danish, Swedish and Norwegian. However, the use of receptive multilingualism is not always that simple and straightforward. According to Gooskens, the intelligibility of closely related languages depend on three factors:

1) the listener’s attitude towards the language
2) the listener’s contact with the language and other language experience
3) linguistic distance to the listener’s language

(2007: 446)

This project mainly deals with extra-linguistic factors and so; only the first two of Gooskens’ three factors will be touched upon. Gooskens argues, “... listeners from different parts of the country may have different linguistic and extra-linguistic backgrounds that may influence their understanding of the neighboring languages” (2007: 254). She also found “large differences in intelligibility depending on test language and the places where the listeners live” (2007: 254). Thus, it can be expected that Copenhageners understand more Swedish than people who live in Aarhus. This factor should of course be taken into account for this project.

Studies on bilingual interaction are quite diverse. Receptive multilingualism is investigated between many different settings and most of all between different languages. The Swiss army makes use of it, but even here English is sometimes the go-to solution when communication falls through. The phenomenon has also been investigated within immigrant families where the parent(s) speaks
one language (their mother tongue) and the child responds in the language of the country they live
in (Herkenrath 2012). Sağın-Şimşek and König (2011) investigated intelligibility of Azerbaijani to
Turkish speakers. Their findings show that it is generally easier for older speakers (app. 60 years
of age and above) to have successful communication with the help of receptive multilingualism
than for younger speakers. It is likely that this is also the case for Danish-Swedish interaction, i.e.
that receptive multilingualism is more common in older generations.

2.1.2. Codeswitching

Another accommodation strategy is to make use of codeswitching. One of the attributes of
codeswitching is that it “involves at least two languages used in the same conversation. Of these
languages, one is the ML,” the language which sets the morphosyntactic frame for codeswitching
utterance.” (Myers-Scotton 1992: 19). Omoniyi defines codeswitching as “the copresence of ele-
ments from two or more languages in a stretch of discourse” (2005: 729). Based on this definition it
is considered codeswitching both when Danes and Swedes switch to their neighboring language
and when they switch to English.

Borrowing is a concept similar to codeswitching and the two can be confusing to tell apart. Myers-
Scotton (1992) seeks to explain the two concepts but differentiating them seems rather difficult
and she concludes, “a continuum of relationships exists between borrowing and all forms of CS ma-
terial so that codeswitching and borrowing are not distinct phenomena...” (p. 21). To sum up, a bor-
rrowed word is one used more frequently. It is well integrated in the vocabulary. Codeswitching is
more sporadic and the words used are not always the same. In connection with codeswitching, Au-
er (2005) introduces the notion of social identity, which he describes as “a useful mediating concept
between language and social structure”. He builds this on the notion “acts of identity” and says that
they can be “achieved through switching” (2005: 405). Auer’s discussion of codeswitching primari-
ly deals with what he calls “real bilingualism”, e.g. a mother and a daughter speaking both Chinese
and English with each other. If the native language is assumed to be the language that carries social
identity for the Danes and Swedes in this study, then none of the interlocutors or their conversation
can be defined as bilingual. The use of codeswitching, however, can be seen as what Auer refers to
as ‘acts of identity’ (2005: 405). If that is the case, acts of identity may occur when Danes include
Swedish words in their speech and vice versa.

2.1.3. English as a lingua franca

When people with differing mother tongues (such as Danes and Swedes) wish to speak with each
other they may choose to conduct the conversation in a third language that both interlocutors
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speak relatively well. That language is referred to as a *lingua franca*. Using English as a *lingua franca* (ELF) is a very common way of communicating and for Danes and Swedes the most likely option would be to use English since many are relatively good at English. In fact, Sweden and Denmark come in on a first and third place, respectively, on the EF English Proficiency Index. Firth defines ELF as “a ‘contact language’ between persons who share neither a common native tongue nor a common (national) culture, and for whom English is the chosen *foreign* language of communication” (1996: 240). Clearly, Danes and Swedes share neither a common native tongue nor national culture. Assuming that English is generally the language where the two peoples have the highest proficiency when it comes to foreign languages, it seems fair to assume that they will use English if they choose to not communicate in their respective mother tongues. Thus, English would be their *lingua franca* in a service encounter context. Little research has been conducted on ELF in Scandinavia but the phenomenon has been investigated in many other bi-/multilingual settings. In multilingual Switzerland, the use of English as a *Lingua Franca* is sometimes used and even necessary (Berthele & Wittlin, 2013, p.190). In a Danish-Swedish context it seems fair to assume that ELF is a potential strategy for interlocutors to use to enhance communication and understanding.

Choosing to speak English instead of your native language is of course a language choice, but I also argue that it can be viewed as an accommodation strategy. If communication through receptive multilingualism is not working, one of the interlocutors might switch to English to enhance communication. If the goal is for the communicators to have as little miscommunication as possible and understand as much as possible, choosing a common foreign language might be a help for both interlocutors. If an interlocutor switches language to help the listener, I argue that the choice is not only a language choice but also an accommodation strategy to reduce the gap between the two interlocutors.

2.2. Danish-Swedish encounters and intelligibility

Since the Scandinavian languages (Danish, Norwegian and Swedish) are so closely related, studies on mutual intelligibility between them have been thorough. The studies are all based on the assumption that Danes and Swedes (as well as Norwegians) make use of receptive multilingualism when they speak with each other because the languages are mutually intelligible (Schüppert & Gooskens 2011). As mentioned earlier, their study on Danish and Swedish preschoolers also concludes that “Danes have fewer problems decoding spoken Swedish than Swedes have decoding spoken Danish” (Schüppert & Gooskens 2011: 333). The study tested the intelligibility for preschoolers to see if the intelligibility was different for adults. If one language were “easier” than the
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other it would show here, because the children had not yet had a chance to be exposed to the other language in the same way that adults did. The article quickly goes through linguistic factors that influence Danish-Swedish language intelligibility but what is more interesting is the extra-linguistic factors, such as status of the countries in Scandinavia: “the fact that Sweden enjoys a higher status in Scandinavia than Denmark might cause a bias in the willingness to understand the neighboring language. In other words, Danish adults may be more willing to understand Swedish than the other way around, and therefore perform better in perception tasks” (Schüppert and Gooskens, 2011: 338). They further point out that the causal relationship between intelligibility and attitude has not been investigated and so; it shall be interesting to see whether this concept of “willingness” also plays a role in the mutual intelligibility between informants in this study. They argue, “it is possible that a positive attitude enhances intelligibility, but it might also be the case that higher intelligibility of a given language results in a more positive attitude towards that language” (Schüppert and Gooskens 2011: 338).

Although this study does not investigate the lexical aspects of mutual intelligibility between Danes and Swedes, I find it interesting to mention that one of the two has an advantage in the interaction: “...it can be assumed that a Dane has advantages when decoding the Swedish word because the final consonant is still written in Danish. On the other hand, a Swede has less support from the Swedish orthography when he or she hears the Danish pronunciation without the final consonant, as this form is found neither in spoken nor in written Swedish” (Schüppert and Gooskens 2011: 339).

Like most studies on aspects of receptive multilingualism (in this case intelligibility), Schüppert and Gooskens' study was experimental and as such it did not deal with real-life situations. Delsing and Lundin Åkesson (2005) used questionnaires in their study of intelligibility between Danes, Swedes and Norwegians. Among other things, they found that Danes were better at understanding their neighboring languages (Norwegian and Swedish) than the Swedes. They took an experimental approach, but my study does exactly the opposite as I will take a practical approach and find examples in the real world through observations. The observation method will be described in detail later.

This specific scenario was chosen because previous research on receptive multilingualism and language choice has mainly focused on language comprehensibility in an experimental setting (Sağın-Şimşek and König 2011, Schüppert and Gooskens 2012, and others) or in settings where the interactants knew each other beforehand (Ridell 2008). The customer service encounter has been investigated before (Schau 2007) but not in a Scandinavian context and only in relation to codeswitching. The effect of receptive multilingualism in encounters between Danes and Swedes is thoroughly accounted for in Ridell’s thesis (2008), which is very relatable to this study, but in her study the interactants already knew each other because the communication under investigation was in private
homes and between elderly people and their caretakers. In Ridell’s study the customers (the pensioners) are Danish and the service providers (the caretakers) are Swedish. In my study, the customers are also Danish and the service providers Swedish. Furthermore, the encounters can be viewed as service encounters where the caretaker provides a service to the pensioner. If you look at it from these perspectives, Ridell’s study is similar to one conducted here but there are several crucial points on which they differ. All the encounters in Ridell’s study took place in Denmark while this study will only take place in Sweden. Thus, the three major differences between the two studies are 1) the country where the encounters take place 2) that the Danish setting is a private home (where the customer/pensioner is on home ground) while the Swedish setting is in a public shop (where the service provider is on home ground) and 3) in Ridell’s study (2008) the interlocutors knew each other beforehand. To sum up, what makes my study stand out is the practical aspect where I make observations instead of experimental studies, and the link between practice and ideologies.

2.3. Language ideologies

Language choice and language use in general (e.g. codeswitching) is governed by underlying language ideologies. Irvine defines them as: “conceptualizations about languages, speakers, and discursive practices” (2012: para. 1). That many factors shape and influence these ideologies becomes evident in Kroskrity’s definition of the concept. He defines language ideologies as the “beliefs, feelings, and conceptions about language structure and use, which often index the political economic interests of individual speakers, ethnic and other interest groups, and nation-states” (2010: 192). Thus, it becomes evident that culture has significant influence on the formation of language ideologies. To explain the notion in other words: how we choose (consciously or unconsciously) to speak (e.g. in terms of accommodation strategies or language choice) is governed by our own beliefs, feelings and conceptions about the world and the conversation and society we are currently engaged in. Kroskrity explains that there are three main planks of the language ideologies approach (or as he calls them: attributes of language ideologies). These are: positionality, multiplicity, and awareness, and they will be explained below in relation to this study.

Positionality refers to the fact that all language ideologies are complex and can always be interpreted in a different way. That is also why the term is always plural:

“Language ideologies are inherently plural: because they are positioned, there is always another position—another perspective from which the world of discursive practice is differently viewed” (Irvine 2012: para. 1).
It also means that language ideologies are shaped and constructed by the social or cultural group the interlocutors belong to:

"the understanding that language ideologies represent the perception of language and discourse that is constructed in the interest, or from the perspective, of an economically positional social or cultural group" (Kroskrity 2010: 192).

Thus, the language ideologies that Danes and Swedes have (and perhaps share) about their own and each other's languages as well as the interplay between them is governed by the cultural setting in which the languages and the interaction takes place. The fact that Denmark and Sweden share a long history of both positives and negatives is one factor that might influence the informants' language ideologies. In order to study language ideologies the researcher must "explore the nexus of language, culture, and politics". In this study I do so by trying to bridge the gap between practice and perception in communication between Danes and Swedes in service encounters.

Language ideologies are often connected with deeper structures in society and so, research within the field and literature on the topic often deals with societal inequality and the like. In this regard, Kroskrity explains the "standard language ideology" as introduced by Rosina Lippi Green (1997):

"a bias toward an abstracted, idealized, homogenous spoken language which is imposed and maintained by dominant bloc institutions and which names as its model the written language, but which is drawn primarily from the speech of the upper middle class" (Kroskrity 2016: 99)

This theory posed that all societies have a standard language which is the one that is accepted as the general norm, while other types or variations of the language are discarded as incorrect or not living up to the standard of the written language. In a Danish-Swedish context, it is fair to assume that language ideologies will reveal which language choice (and perhaps accommodation strategies) is the standard one. For example, if choosing receptive multilingualism proves to be the norm, other choices will not be considered as acceptable. Kroskrity explains that this phenomenon (also) has to do with interlocutors' perception of the world:

"Members' notions of what is 'true', 'morally good', or 'aesthetically pleasing' about a language and discourse are grounded in social experiences and often demonstrably tied to their political economic interests. These notions often underlie attempts to use language as the site at which to promote, protect, and legitimate those interests" (Kroskrity 2016: 98)

Positionality of language ideologies is closely linked with the attribute of *multiplicity*, because of the many factors that influence them:
“Language ideologies are profitably conceived as multiple because of the plurality of social meaningful social division (class, gender, clan, elites, generations, and so on) within sociocultural groups that can produce divergent perspectives expressed as indices of group membership” (Kroskrity 2016: 99)

In this study, these aspects are of less importance, as the group of informants is relatively homogenous. Age, gender and region of origin are the only categories that might play a role in the construction of language ideologies by these informants.

The final attribute is speakers’ awareness. Kroskrity argues, “... that members may display varying degrees of awareness of local language ideologies” (2016: 101). In this particular study I seek to account for two aspects of this: 1) the language ideologies that become evident through people’s actions, i.e. ideologies of practice, and 2) language ideologies that are explicitly articulated by the informants. Kroskrity further argues that: “research suggests a correlational relationship between high levels of discursive consciousness, or taken-for-granted beliefs and feelings about language, and relatively unchallenged, highly naturalized, dominant ideologies” (2016: 101). In this study it shall be interesting to find out if there are any of these dominant ideologies and if so, what they are exactly and where they come from. Kraft and Lønsmann (In press) deal with language ideologies in a business context. In this study, only the Swedish shop assistant can define the situation as a business context. For them the conversations are work-related but for the Danish customers they are not.

To sum up on this review, what really sets this study apart from previous research is the element of “perception”. One thing is what people do and how they actually communicate. How people (in this case Danes and Swedes) perceive communication between them is different. The correlation between the two is what my study contributes.
3. Methodology

In this section, I will describe the methodological framework both for the data gathering process and the analysis. First, I give a general introduction to ethnographic fieldwork and which parts I have chosen to use in my data gathering. In this respect I seek to map out the advantages and disadvantages for the chosen approach. Second, I will introduce conversation analysis as the method for analyzing the collected data.

3.1. Ethnographic Fieldwork

Ethnography is a method for fieldwork that has its source in anthropology (Blommaert, 2006). However, unlike traditional anthropological approaches, ethnography does not only seek to investigate cultures that are foreign or distant to the researcher. Instead, the researcher engages in different levels of participation in a given social situation under investigation. Spradley defines ethnographic fieldwork as “the search for patterns of a culture and their relationships as conceptualized by informants” (Spradley 1979: 93). Thus, the researcher is a fundamental part of the data collection and serves as an instrument. The researcher is part of the social situation and should as such use herself to gather data, i.e. take part in the situation, be part of the scene, engage in conversation and try to blend in as much as possible. The more the researcher becomes a natural part of the social situation, the more she can take advantage of her position. If she blends in, informants are likely to be more comfortable and “act normal”. That allows for more realistic and thus accurate observations. A thorough description of my role as an “instrument” in the data gathering process will be introduced later in this chapter.

3.1.1. The Ethnographic Research Cycle

Ethnographic research is, ideally, a cyclical process with repetition. The repetitive process is referred to as the Ethnographic Research Cycle (Spradley 1980). Before starting the cyclical process, the researcher must select an ethnographic project. The objective of this project is to investigate language choice in communication between native speakers of Danish and Swedish. That is also the ethnographic project. This step will surely not be repeated as it defines the scope of the project and repeating it would lead to choosing a new topic. The scope of the project might, however, be edited slightly as the data collecting progresses and the analysis is carried out. The cyclical part of the process entails the following four steps: 1) Asking ethnographic questions, 2) Collecting ethnographic data, 3) Making an ethnographic record, and 4) Analyzing ethnographic data. When those four steps have been repeated to satisfaction, the researcher can begin the final step: Writing an ethnography. The final step, however, is not always relevant and largely depends on the extent of the re-
search and amount of gathered data. For this particular study, it is deemed sufficient to rely on the results from the analysis without writing a full ethnography. Below I seek to describe the different steps in further detail with relation to the scope of this specific research project.

1) Asking ethnographic questions
After selecting a research project, the researcher begins to ask ethnographic questions. These questions are asked to guide the data collection based on the RQ and the general scope of the project. Thus, the initial ethnographic questions are not directed at the informants and are not meant to be answered in interviews. Instead, they are of a more general sort to help the researcher focus on the topic. In this project, I asked myself the broad questions before I started to gather data. I assumed that Danes and Swedes would both engage in either receptive multilingualism or English as a lingua franca and that there would be elements of codeswitching. Based on these assumptions, I asked the following questions:
- How well do the Danish and Swedish informants seem to understand each other when speaking their respective mother tongues?
- To what extent is English used in conversations between Danes and Swedes?
- To what extent is codeswitching between the two languages used?

The scope of my project also shifts the focus away from other areas that might be interesting in a bilingual/cultural setting. As an example, I did not look at body language, but instead tried to focus on the oral parts of the interaction, including what was said in what way and later how the interaction was perceived.

2) Collecting ethnographic data
This step consisted of combining participant observations with short interviews inspired by ethnography. These parts will be discussed in greater detail below.

3.1.2. Participant Observation
Spradley (1980) sets out to determine the role of the participant observer by comparing it to that of an ordinary participant, i.e. a person who is naturally part of the social situation being researched. He outlines six differences that will be described below.

1. Dual purpose
The participant observer has two purposes in the social situation that she is observing. First, she is to engage in activities appropriate to the situation and second, to observe the activities, people,
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and physical aspects of the situation” (Spradley 1980: 54). The ordinary participant, however, only
has one purpose when taking part in the social situation, and that is “to engage in the appropriate
activities” (Spradley 1980: 54). Thus, the difference between the roles the two take are that the par-
ticipant observer observes, of course, but also engages in some activities that supports the role as a
researcher. The participant observer is part of the situation (and should take this into account) but
must still attempt to see it all from outside; observing every little detail in the social situation rele-
vant to the ethnographic project. In this project, the observer will do so by being present in the
shops and try to blend in as much as possible, e.g. by staying close to the shop assistants. Staying
close to the counter will also make it seem more like the observer belongs in the room.

2. Explicit awareness
When we do things we often do them without being aware of our actions. In order to not have our
brains overloaded with information we focus only on the task at hand and leave out other infor-
mation and details. In order to become a successful participant observer, however, we must in-
crease our awareness and notice things that we usually ignore. The observer does, of course, also
have this habit: “Increasing your awareness does not come easily, for you must overcome years of
selective inattention” (Spradley 1980: 55) but must seek to eliminate it: “Participant observation
requires the ethnographer to increase his or her awareness, to raise the level of attention, to tune in
things usually tuned out” (Spradley 1980: 56). In this study, I have the advantage that I am not usu-
ally a shop assistant and never have been. This might make it easier for me to observe all the things
they do and say. I am often a customer but not acting as one in this situation may help me see things
from above.

3. Wide-angle lens
Closely related to the increased sense of awareness of the social situation, Spradley (1980) intro-
duces the concept “the wide-angle lens”. In addition to increasing sense of awareness, the partici-
pant observer must also look at “a much broader spectrum of information”. The observer must not
only look at the social interaction they are interested in, they must also take in what is going on
around the specific social situation. The research question will of course still be guiding the data
gathering, so the social situation will be assessed as widely as possible within the scope of the pro-
ject. So for example, when this researcher is investigating language choice between Danes and
Swedes in a customer-clerk interaction in a shoe shop in Sweden, they will not only look at the bits
of conversation between clerk and customer but try to take in everything that is going on in the
shop at that time: who else is in the shop, what are people wearing, etc.
4. The Insider/Outsider Experience

The ordinary participant will only ever be inside the social situation. They will not try to observe the social situation but merely fulfill their role in it: “The participant observer (...) will experience being both insider and outsider simultaneously” (Spradley 1980: 57). In this study, I as an observer, will probably not have both roles much of the time when gathering ethnographic data. One way to do it would be to not reveal that I am bilingual and speak both Danish and Swedish. I will not be able to wear this mask in front of the shop assistants as they have asked to be informed about my topic and what I am researching. If customers approach me, I can easily respond in Swedish without revealing that I am in fact Danish, but I will probably still have to let them know that I do not work in the shop, which will reveal that I am not a genuine or natural part of the social situation. Balancing the insider/outsider perspective is difficult but necessary: “Doing ethnographic fieldwork involves alternating between the insider and outsider experience, and having both simultaneously” (Spradley 1980: 57).

5. Introspection

Introspection is the art of using yourself as an instrument in ethnographic research. By involving yourself in the research you should be able to gather data that you would otherwise not have been able to: “Introspection may not seem "objective", but it is a tool all of us use to understand new situations and to gain skill at following cultural rules” (Spradley 1980: 57). Observing Danish-Swedish service encounters a situation where this comes in handy is the same as mentioned above: if customers think I work in the shop, they will not act differently than they would have if they knew why I was really there. When it comes to the shop assistants I will try to help out when possible so they see me more as a colleague than as a nuisance.

6. Record Keeping

One of the most distinct differences between the ordinary participant and the participant observer is that the observer will make “a detailed record of both objective observations and subjective feelings” (Spradley 1980: 58). Keeping your subjective opinion out of the descriptions and staying completely objective is extremely difficult if not impossible, but being in an unfamiliar situation might prove to be an advantage: “If you select an unfamiliar social situation you can build on this common experience. Because you feel like a stranger, because you don’t know the tacit rules for behavior, you will fall naturally into the role of participant observer” (Spradley 1980: 53). When I observe the Danish-Swedish service encounters this is both possible and not. I do know the rules for behavior in service encounters in general but not in these specific shops. Also, I have never taken the role of shop assistant.
3.1.3. Types of participation

All participant observers and social situations are different. The degree of involvement the researcher applies to the social situation determines the type of participation. Participation should be seen as a continuum ranging from Nonparticipation (no involvement) to Complete Participation (high involvement).

**Nonparticipation** is when the observer has "... no involvement with the people or activities studied. It is entirely possible to collect data by observation alone" (Spradley 1980: 59). An example of this could be a study of television programs. In this case, the observer would have no contact with the participants whatsoever. Seeing that this particular study took place where I as the observer was part of the physical scene, nonparticipation was not an option.

**Passive Participation** is when "the ethnographer engaged in passive participation is present at the scene of action but does not participate or interact with other people to any great extent" (Spradley 1980: 59). In this type of observation, the ethnographer seeks to take the role as a "bystander", which means she is part of the scene but does not communicate with anyone. This was the level of participation I was originally aiming for in this study. However, it proved to be very difficult to blend in and not be noticed. Both shops I observed in were relatively small and so, first of all, I was hard to be ignored. Second, I stood close to the counter, as that was where most conversation and interaction between shop assistant and customer was likely to take place. (That meant that quite a few customers thought I was a shop assistant too and asked me questions regarding products, prices, etc.)

**Moderate Participation** is "... when the ethnographer seeks to maintain a balance between being an insider and an outsider, between participation and observation" (Spradley 1980: 60). If I pretend to be part of the scene, people are expected to be more talkative and relaxed. Many customers might ask me about products and the like, which would indicate that they think of me as a shop assistant myself. Luckily, most of the time, the actual shop assistants had time to take over and all I had to do was to refer the customer to one of them. In some cases, I had to reveal myself by saying that I did not work in the shop but that did not seem to bother them. After all, many of the customers that came to me with a request were Swedes and so I did not need them for my study.

The next level of participation is **Active Participation**. Spradley describes it like this:

"The active participant seeks to *do* what other people are doing, not merely to gain acceptance, but to more fully learn the cultural rules for behavior" (1980: 61)

This would have been extremely difficult for me as I did not only study one type of participant; I studied both the Swedish shop assistants and the Danish customers. I could not have been an active participant for both at the same time and I would probably also have been biased, as I am Danish and not Swedish.
The final level is called *Complete Participation*: “The highest level of involvement for ethnographers probably comes when they study a situation in which they are already ordinary participants” (Spradley, 1980, p. 61). This would only have been possible for me, had I come to the shop as a customer *prior* to asking the shops if they would participate in my study. That would allow for me to act as an ordinary participant. Had I been a shop assistant in one of the shops, I could also have participated on this level. It is however very difficult as it becomes increasingly difficult to stay objective:

“the more you know about a situation as an ordinary participant, the more difficult it is to study it as an ethnographer (...) The less familiar you are with a social situation, the more you are able to see the tacit cultural rules at work” (Spradley, 1980, p. 61).

Very few participant observation studies are at either end of the continuum and few are also solely linked to one “level”. The same goes for this study where I shifted between passive and moderate participation, as described earlier.

*My role as an “instrument” in the data gathering process*

First, I find it important to clarify my language skills and my relation to Denmark and Sweden. I was born and raised in Denmark by Danish parents, who have always spoken to me in Danish. My mother, however, is originally from Sweden. Thus, she speaks both Danish and Swedish fluently. She only uses her Swedish skills when we visit Sweden or when she talks to her mother and siblings who are all Swedish. My grandmother (mother’s mother) is Swedish and has always spoken Swedish to my brothers and me. Therefore, I have learned Swedish and I now speak both Danish and Swedish. I have a larger vocabulary in Danish than in Swedish, since I grew up in Denmark, but my passive Swedish vocabulary is quite elaborated. I can follow and participate in most conversations, understand Swedish TV/radio, and read books and magazines. My pronunciation in Swedish is flawless and being around Swedes, I have never been suspected to not be Swedish. My dialect seems to be a little hard to pinpoint. One friend told me I sounded like I was from Blekinge, which might have some truth to it as my grandmother’s father was from there but I have never met him. One thing is certain though: I do not speak Scanian. Of course, on an overall level, my Danish skills are better than my Swedish skills but for the purpose of this study my level of Swedish is more than sufficient. The only challenge will be the Scanian dialect, which is not always easy to understand. My grandmother lives in Scania and I have visited her there many times, so I am used to hearing Scanian and it usually works out – sometimes repetition is necessary. The fact that I can speak with all the informants in their native languages makes it easier for them to talk to me, which gives me an advantage when I want to hear their opinion. I spent more time
with the shop assistants than with the customers. That gave me the chance to talk about other things than what was directly related to this study and so I became closer with them.

3.2. Making an ethnographic record

Making an ethnographic record is a crucial step in gathering ethnographic data. It is on this record that the researcher will later base their analysis. The important thing is to gather as much data as possible to account for the social situation under study and it can consist of almost anything that helps the ethnographer remember what happened in the situation: "An ethnographic record consists of field notes, tape recordings, pictures, artifacts, and anything else that documents the social situation under study" (Spradley 1980: 63).

During this study I began by doing participant observation in a clothing shop and later a shoe shop in Malmö, Sweden. The shops will be described in detail later. I noted down as much as I could about the shops, the shop assistants, their routines, customers, etc. Later, I also interviewed customers as well as sales people. I also made drawings of overviews of the shop I was in to be able to document where and how customers entered the shop. I knew I was not going to need everything I documented but in ethnography it is important to keep an open mind and not only focus on the things you think you need for your research (Spradley 1980). As soon as the researcher starts making the ethnographic he or she also begins interpreting what is being observed:

"... the moment you begin writing down what you see and hear, you automatically encode things in language" (Spradley 1980: 64).

Spradley argues that "the central question faced by every ethnographer when taking fieldnotes is what language shall be used in making an ethnographic record?" (1980: 65). In my study, I used a mix of Danish, English and Swedish. Danish and Swedish because those were the languages I encountered during the data gathering, and English because that is usually my working language when I do research. To facilitate the research process, I tried to map out the different language variations in the study and came up with the following: The investigator’s native language, the language of shop assistants, and the language of customers. I also soon found that there were different dialects in play. For Danish, I noticed two types of dialects; those that were from the greater Copenhagen area and those that were from Jutland. For Swedish, the two regional dialects I noticed were from Scania and Stockholm.

Spradley introduces three principles that are important to keep in mind when making an ethnographic record: a) the language identification principle, b) the verbatim principle, and c) the concrete principle. The purpose of these principles is to create a more accurate ethnographic record and one that will facilitate ethnographic analysis.
The language identification principle is to “identify the language used for each field note entry”. More simply stated this principle is introduced to identify the informants through their language so that the researcher can tell them apart later in the data gathering and for the analysis. Spradley further states that: “The goal is to have an ethnographic record that reflects the same differences in language usages as the actual field situation” (Spradley 1980: 65).

The verbatim principle is about writing informants utterances down word for word whenever possible. If the researcher does not write down the utterances as close to what was actually uttered as possible, he or she has already interpreted the data. For the first data gathering session, I was not allowed by the staff to use the recorder I had brought. Thus, I was forced to write down as much as I could while the informants spoke. Some had to be noted down after I had spoken to them and some of it is not verbatim.

Finally, the concrete principle is about being as concrete and specific as possible to get as many specific details in the description as possible – preferably all the details. The overall goal is to compile a clear and manageable record that follows all of the three principles.

There are also different steps to writing the actual notes. First, the ethnographer writes a condensed account. Preferably the recording takes place during every period of fieldwork to get as many details as possible. Second, the ethnographer makes an expanded account; simply put the goal is to expand the condensed version with as many details as possible. This should be done as soon as possible after the field session. It can also be done during the session if natural breaks occur. A great example of this process is when I talked to the shop assistant, Sandra, on my first day as an observer in Filippa K, Malmö. She was not comfortable being recorded, so I had to write down as many details as I could during my interview with her. When she had a customer, I would “fill in the blanks” and expand the description as much as I could. Then we could talk again. Finally, the ethnographer should write up a fieldwork journal in which she reflects on her experience doing fieldwork. “Like a diary, this journal will contain a record of experiences, ideas, fears, mistakes, confusions, breakthroughs, and problems that arise during fieldwork” (71).

Spradley’s suggestions take basis in much more lengthy studies where the ethnographer has more time to go through the various steps than what was the case in this one. Due to the scope and timeline of this project, I had to choose what was relevant for the study, i.e. what I needed to do to gather the needed data and answer my research question.

On top of the participant observation, I also conducted short informal interviews with the shop assistants and customers. The interviews were semi-structured as I had interview guides (see figure
1), but I kept mending them and adapting them to the observations I made as a part of the ethnographic research cycle. I chose to add this method to the observation to get an insight into the perceptions the informants had of Danish-Swedish communication, and more important; to find out about the underlying language ideologies the informants carried. This choice is supported by Kroskrity, who mentions participant observation and informal interviewing as means to account for these ideologies:

“Those who do language ideological research have used a wide variety of conventional methods: participant observation, formal and informal interviewing, life history, person-centered ethnography, conversational analysis, historical linguistics, and textual analysis. Since researchers read language ideologies both from actual practice and from speakers’ metalinguistic and metadiscursive responses in interviews, many researchers will collect data using two or more of the above methods” (Kroskrity 2016: 103)

He also mentions conversation analysis, which I will describe further under “method of analysis”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 1. Example of interview guide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Which language do you usually choose when talking to a Dane/Swede?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Which language do you think one should choose when speaking with a Dane/Swede?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 What would make you choose an alternative language?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 What is the most difficult thing about Danish/Swedish?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 What do you think Danes/Swedes find the most difficult about your native language?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 To what extent do you try to adapt your language when you speak to a Dane/Swede?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3. Writing an ethnography

The final product that should come out of ethnographic participant observation is an ethnography. Spradley defines an ethnography as “a description of a culture, an ethnography, is produced from an ethnographic record of the events of a society within a given period of time, the ‘events of the society’ including, of course, informants’ responses to the ethnographer, his queries, tests, and apparatus” (Spradley quoting Frake (1964b: 111): 63). The ethnographer is a type of translator in that she needs to convey the meaning and attributes of a certain culture. In this study, the ethnography
will not be written in the traditional sense where the researcher compiles the results of the analysis in a text to describe the culture and social situation investigation. Instead, the analysis and the consecutive discussion will provide the points that are usually found in the ethnography.
3.4. Method of Analysis

3.4.1. Conversation Analysis

For the qualitative data I have gathered in this study, I have chosen to use conversation analysis (CA) to analyze and interpret the results. The method is a type of ethnomethodology and "is concerned with the analysis of the competence which underlie ordinary social activities" (Heritage 1984: 241). The forerunner for conversation analysis is discourse analysis and they have some common features:

"CA and DA are truly radical developments, because they examine discourse as a topic in its own right, and not as a reflection of wider structural conditions (...) Their prime concern was with language in use: the systematic ways it was being used, and what it was being used to do." (Wooffit 2005: 72).

According to Heritage, CA is founded on three assumptions:

"(1) interaction is structurally organized; (2) contributions to interaction are contextually organized; and (3) these two properties inhere in the details of interaction so that no order of detail can be dismissed, a priori, as disorderly, accidental or irrelevant (Heritage 1984: 241).

The assumption that no detail is irrelevant is well aligned with the ethnographic approach to gathering data, where the researcher should try to include as much detail as possible to see a given social situation from as many angles as possible. Conversation Analysis originally deals with "everyday, mundane conversations" (Heritage 1984: 238), which is exactly what this study is concerned with. Heritage further specifies that

"it is directed at describing and explicating the competences which ordinary speakers use and rely on when they engage in intelligible, conversational interaction. At its most basic, the objective is to describe the procedures and expectations in terms of which speakers produce their own behavior and interpret the behavior of others" (Heritage 1984: 241).

This is exactly what the objective for this study is; I seek to find out how Danish-Swedish interactants interpret the social situation to discover their underlying language ideologies. Just as language ideologies are structurally organized, conversation analysis presumes that all social acts are structurally organized and that conversation is a type of social act (Ridell 2008). Another purpose of Conversation Analysis is to find out how the participants perceive the interaction. The general idea is that every time a speaker takes turn, they act on what the previous speaker said and so their ut-
terance shows their interpretation of the previous utterance. Ridell (2008) refers to this as the *participant’s perspective*.

In Conversation Analysis it is assumed that people take and create context. As they speak they create more context and thus, context shapes speakers’ actions and speakers’ actions renew context: "the significance of any speaker's communicative action is doubly contextual in being both *context-shaped* and *context-renewing*" (Heritage 1984: 242).

Context-shaped means that a speaker's communicative action is only valid and existing in the given context. Without the context, the action would not exist and would not be relevant. Thus, the context shapes the action and serves as a frame for it. What interlocutors say "cannot be adequately understood except by reference to the context" (Heritage 1984: 242).

Closely related to this is context-renewing, which means that a speaker's communicative action renews context in that it governs what comes next.

Heritage argues that “it is sequences and turns-within-sequences which are (...) the primary units of analysis” (1984: 245). In relation to this, he introduces *paired actions*, which are common units of speech that belong together. Examples of these are question-answer, request-grant/rejection, invitation-acceptance/refusal, etc. These actions of units are also known as adjacency pairs. Heritage defines them as

“A sequence of two utterances which are adjacent, produced by different speakers, ordered as a first part and second part, and typed so that a first part requires a particular second part (or range or second parts)” (Heritage 1984: 246).

In this study adjacency pairs are interpreted as the options speakers have for accommodating. On an overall level in Danish-Swedish interaction, speakers can choose between languages and later they can accommodate further (e.g. through codeswitching).

Heritage argues that the adjacency pair structure is normative:

“Paradoxically, it is consideration of these ‘deviant’ cases, in which the adjacency pair structure is not implemented fully or unproblematically, which provides the strongest evidence for the normative character of the adjacency pair structure” (Heritage 1984: 248).

Utterances are not only governed by the preceding utterance but by the entire conversation. If a speaker asks a question, the second speaker does not necessarily answer the question in the following utterance. In between the question and the answer there might be other questions or counter-questions.

---

6 Translated from Swedish (by author) “deltagarperspektiv"
In a Danish-Swedish context one might think that a listener who does not understand what the speakers says (e.g. because he or she is not speaking the listener’s native language) might evoke patterns like the above. It shall be interesting to see what strategies interlocutors apply when/if a question is not answered within the expected time frame. The indications that such an analysis will map out will be supported by analyzing and comparing with the opinions informants utter in the interviews. An example of this would be a question that is not answered, leading the speaker to repeat or rephrase. The listener is expected to answer the question but there are many reasons for not doing so and just as many ways for both the speaker and the listener to handle such an inconsistency.
4. Analysis

In this analysis, I seek to account for the language choices Danes and Swedes make when talking to each other during a service encounter by using conversation analysis and compare with interview results. There are many different strategies interlocutors can apply when making this choice in order to enhance communication. Behind these choices and strategies are always underlying ideologies. In this analysis, I also seek to account for these ideologies and draw parallels between language choices and language ideologies in Danish-Swedish service encounters. Thus, I try to investigate the (potential) difference between and overlap of what people say they do and what they actually do.

First, I will account for the practice: what people do in Danish-Swedish service encounters. Second, I will account for the ideologies behind the language choices: what people say they do and why they think they do as they do. The relation between practice and ideology will be accounted for in the discussion section.

Results as such will be presented as I go through the analysis. All gathered material can be found in the appendix. In the examples presented in the analysis, none of the Danish customers appear twice. For that reason I have chosen not to assign each of the informants an individual name or number. Instead, each of the examples has been given Roman numerals, which should make it telling them apart sufficiently simple. Male informants have been assigned an “M”, while female informants have been assigned a “K”. If an interview includes more informants of the same gender, a number follows the letter (e.g. “K1” and “K2”). I, the interviewer, am always assigned the letter I. All of the Swedish shop assistants have one or two individual letters, which will be introduced as I describe them individually.

Introduction to shops and informants

Filippa K

Filippa K is a Swedish clothing brand, which is relatively high-end. They are known for their simple design and good quality. The prices are well above the average for garments in Scandinavia. The shop I visited was very modern: large rectangular room, concrete floors, neat and tidy. The atmosphere was both friendly and somewhat solemn. As such, it was difficult for me to feel like I blended in. As you walk into the shop, you will find a men’s department on your left, which takes up about a fourth of the shop’s area. After that, still on your left, is a door to the basement where the shop assistants take breaks and keep the stock. Then come the fitting rooms. On your right, is a small women’s department, then the cashier. The back of the shop makes up the rest of the woman’s department. I stood between the small women’s department and the cashier, because I could see both the
entrance, the fitting rooms and the rest of the shop from there. It also gave me access to observe the purchase interactions at the counter. Due to the relatively large size of the shop, it was difficult to follow customers to observe their behavior without being in the way or too obvious.

1st observation

_Sandra_ is in her late twenties and has worked in the retail industry for 11 years. She was born in Malmö and has lived in the city her entire life. Thus, she speaks Scanian and it is sometimes a challenge for me to understand what she is saying without asking her to repeat it once or twice. She claims to have visited Denmark a lot, but does not know much Danish. She does not know any Danish words. Sandra is not mentioned in any numbered examples and so she has not been assigned an individual letter.

_Lina_ is in her early twenties and lives in Malmö where she was also born and raised. Her dialect is Scanian but she is easy for me to understand. Lina is not mentioned in any numbered examples and so she has not been assigned an individual letter.

_Ebba_ is 19 years old. She grew up in Vellinge, Scania, where she still lives. Her Scanian dialect is relatively easy to follow. Ebba is not mentioned in any numbered examples and so she has not been assigned an individual letter.

2nd observation

_Lovisa_ is the store manager. She is the one I spoke to when I asked if they would participate in my study. I find her very friendly, helpful, and service-minded. When I meet her again on the day of the second observation, she does not seem to recognize me at first, but she is very friendly as soon as I have introduced myself. She is in her early thirties. Lovisa has been assigned the letter “L”.

_Sara_ tells me she is Danish and speaks Danish, but does not switch to Danish when I do. She seems nice and service-oriented but not overly enthusiastic about talking with me. Mid-twenties. Sara has been assigned the letter “S”.

_Axel_ is in his late twenties and I have described him as a hipster. He has tattoos all over his arms and wears a knitted hat. He is not very talkative and answers all my questions in a short manner. Axel has been assigned the letter A.

**Ecco**

Ecco is a Danish shoe brand, known for its quality. The Ecco shop in Malmö is about half the size of the Filippa K shop and has approximately this shape:
You enter the shop in the middle of the longest wall (the one which is at the bottom of the drawing). The two thirds at the right make up the women’s department. Behind this department is a small slide door that leads to the staff’s break room. On the wall immediately to the left as you enter the room are the children’s shoes. The men’s section is in the back in the left side of the shop. The counter is right between the children’s section and the men’s section. I mostly stood to the right of the counter with my back to the wall. This gave me an overview of most of the shop and allowed me to observe purchase encounters.

1st observation,

Jeanette is approximately 45 years old and speaks Scanian with quite a strong dialect. For example, she uses the word “bägge” (“both” in English) instead of the more common “båda”. She was born and raised in Scania. Jeanette has been assigned the letter “J”.

Emmelie is about 20 years old. She also speaks Scanian, but her dialect is not as strong as Jeanette’s. Emmelie is not mentioned in any numbered examples and so she has not been assigned an individual letter.

Moa is 24 years old. She has lived in Ängelholm, Scania, since she was 13 years old, but before that she lived in Stockholm, so her dialect is Stockholm and not Scanian. I find her Swedish very easy to understand. Moa has been assigned the letters “Mo”.

4.1. Practice – what informants do

In the following, I seek to account for the language choices informants made and the accommodation strategies they applied. Here, I will only look into the practical aspects, i.e. what informants actually did in this regard. I will underpin my observations by literature as described earlier. I have decided to split the section into three main topics: 1) language choice, 2) accommodation strategies, and 3) mutual intelligibility.

4.1.1. Language choice

As mentioned earlier, Danes and Swedes who talk with each other usually have the choice between using their respective native languages when they talk with each other (= receptive multilingualism) or switching to a lingua franca, which in this case is assumed to be English. The data indicates a very strong preference for Danes and Swedes talking Danish and Swedish respectively with each other, and so receptive multilingualism is by far the most frequently chosen strategy between the Danes and Swedes observed in this study. In this sub-section I will account for RM use in practice between Danes and Swedes in service encounters in Malmö, Sweden. According to Ten Thije et al. (2011) RM in its purest form is when two speakers speak different languages (or language forms) and still understand each other when using these languages but without making use of any other
languages. This phenomenon was quite common in the observations for this study but many varieties were not “perfect” in that they included hesitations, minor incomprehension incidents or similar. Example I, however, shows a shop assistant and a customer who speaks Swedish and Danish but still understand each other with no hesitation or incomprehension.

**Example I: Filippa K., Malmö, 16.10.15.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original version (Swedish/Danish)</th>
<th>Translation (English) by author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 A: Tjena!</td>
<td>Hey!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 M: Hej! Jeg har købt sådan en trøje engang.</td>
<td>Hi! I bought this shirt once.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 A: Merinoull är det, ja?</td>
<td>It is merino wool, right?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 M: Ja. Har du sådan noget?</td>
<td>Yes. Do you have something like that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 A: Jajomen! Vilken färg vill du ha?</td>
<td>But of course! Which colour do you want?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 M: Øh... Hvilke farver har du?</td>
<td>Uh... Which colours do you have?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 A: Blå, grön... Grå också.</td>
<td>Blue, green... Grey too.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Example I, the shop assistant from Filippa K., Axel, greets the customer in Swedish. He does not accommodate in any way. At this point he is probably not aware that this customer is Danish. The customer answers Axel – without hesitation – in Danish. There seems to be no misunderstanding or incomprehension between the two and as such this example shows *perfect receptive multilingualism*.

The strong preference for receptive multilingualism is evident regardless of potential obstacles. One might think that incomprehension would lead to a shift in language choice but that is rarely the case. One might also think that speakers who have more knowledge of the opposite language than the average Dane or Swede will codeswitch words or even longer stretches of speech. This is rarely the case, though. In one example, two women make use of receptive multilingualism when talking to Moa in the Ecco shop. During the subsequent interview with the two, the mother claims that her daughter is fluent in Swedish. The daughter agrees to this. She says she has taught herself to understand and speak Swedish in a month but still she does not make use of this skill when interacting with Moa in the Ecco shop. The fact that she chooses the receptive multilingualism strategy instead of switching to Swedish or making extensive use of codeswitching underlines the implications of a very strong preference for use of receptive multilingualism – at least among the Danes. A similar situation occurs when I talk to Sara, a shop assistant in Filippa K. As soon as I have revealed my top-
ic to her, she tells me that she is in fact Danish, although we have been speaking Swedish together up until this point:

**Example II: Filippa K., Malmö, 16.10.15.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original version (Swedish)</th>
<th>Translation (English) by author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 S: (...) Jag är dansk.</td>
<td>(...) I am Danish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I: Är du dansk?</td>
<td>Are you Danish?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 S: Ja. (In Swedish)</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 I: Så kan vi jo bare snakke dansk.</td>
<td>In that case, we could just speak Danish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 S: Ja, precis. Jag har jobbat i detaljhandeln i 6 år, så jag pratar ju danska med dom. Om jag orkar. I bland så orkar jag inte.</td>
<td>Yes, exactly. I have worked in retail for 6 years, so I speak Danish with them. If I feel up to it, sometimes I do not feel up to it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When I learn that Sara is Danish, I immediately switch to Danish. Sara, however, does not reply in Danish. Instead she keeps speaking Swedish. As with the Danish woman from the Ecco store, this indicates that receptive multilingualism is the preferred strategy. Even people who do in fact have some knowledge of the other language will prefer to use receptive multilingualism instead of accommodating by switching to their interlocutor’s language. In the first of the examples above, the Dane who claimed to know Swedish did not make use of it. In the second example, the Swede who claimed to know Danish chose the same strategy. Interestingly, this goes both ways and underlines the general practice for RM use. Thus, it can be concluded that Danes and Swedes; shop assistants and customers prefer to use receptive multilingualism to any other language or accommodation strategy. There are however situations that allow for different accommodation strategies and thus lead to deviations of the RM norm. These will be accounted for later.

Braunmüller’s (2013) argument that Europeans are generally not aware of the possibility to use receptive multilingualism is definitely not supported in the observations in this study. In fact, all informants were very aware of this possibility and made use of it to some extent.

Leaning on Firth’s definition of ELF (1996) as a “contact language’ between persons who share neither a common native tongue nor a common (national) culture, and for whom English is the chosen foreign language of communication” (1996: 240) English is the lingua franca for Danes and Swedes. The informants agree that they would choose English if they were to switch away from receptive multilingualism but choosing to speak English (instead of Danish/Swedish) seems to be the last re-
sort for almost all of the informants. They all agree that there needs to be a good reason for using English instead of RM. These reasons will be accounted for in the section “accommodation strategies” because that is what these reasons indicate: In order to use English, speakers need to adapt a different accommodation strategy. But there are some examples of ELF that show two things at the same time: 1) ELF is used and 2) even though ELF is used, the examples underline that this choice is not the first choice.

The fact that the collected data shows very few examples of ELF use in the service encounters in Malmö also underlines that RM and alternative accommodation strategies are prioritized over than ELF.

**Example III.** *Ecco, Malmö, 26.09.15.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original version (English/Danish)</th>
<th>Translation (English) by author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 M1: Do you have this in fortyfive?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 S: Jeg arbejder her faktisk ikke, jeg er bare på besøg, men Jeanette kan hjælpe dig lige om lidt.</td>
<td>I actually don’t work here, I’m just visiting, but Jeanette can help you in a minute.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example III is a sequence between a Danish male customer and myself. He addresses me in English and I respond in Danish. Later, when it is finally his turn to talk to the actual shop assistant, he speaks Danish to her. This is interesting, because if I had not been there, it is likely that he would have waited for his turn and then addressed Jeanette in English at once. Now, however, it is likely that he switches to Danish (i.e. making use of receptive multilingualism) because I have revealed to him that I am Danish. Later in this analysis you will see that the perception of English use in Danish-Swedish encounters is quite negative. Assuming that this is a common opinion, the man in Example III might find it embarrassing to be speaking English to a Swede in front of another Dane.

Example IV reveals that English is not the first choice for the shop assistant, who switches to English only after having tried Swedish for a little while.

**Example IV.** *Ecco, Malmö, 15.10.15.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original version (Danish/Swedish/English)</th>
<th>Translation (English) by author(^7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Mo: Dom satt bra? Va kul! Vet ni hur ni behandlar skorna? Eller sköter skorna? Ja? Eh, Eccos produkter till Ecco-skinn; alltid bäst.</td>
<td>They were a good fit? How nice! Do you know how to treat the shoes? Or take care of the shoes? Yes? Uh, Ecco’s products for Ecco skin;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^7\) Words in **bold** have not been translated.
always better,

Okay

Exactly because they are treated; these have been treated with Ecco's products. And Ecco's products are the best within treatment. So that; should there be a difference when you use a poorer brand; switch to Ecco in that case when you notice that it is not as good.

Okay.

Do you understand me?

Yes yes. Yes yes. Oh yes.

Yes.

Uhm...

4.1.2. Accommodation strategies

In this section I seek to account for the different strategies Danish and Swedish interlocutors use to enhance successful communication and understanding. I have found three overall strategies that I will elaborate on: 1) General indications of convergence, 2) codeswitching in use, and 3) use of English as a Lingua Franca. I will underpin these observations with relevant literature on the topics.

First, let us have a look at the general indications of convergence. On a more general level slow speech, pauses, asking for repetition, changing pronunciation, and the like are rather common. Some of these were observed when gathering data for this study and so I will account for them briefly. In Example IV, the shop assistant in Ecco uses several of the above-mentioned strategies. First, she rephrases her question to ask whether the customer knows how to protect her new shoes. She also speaks slowly and pronounces the words more carefully than she usually does in order to enhance comprehension for the customer.

Second, there is the concept of codeswitching. Codeswitching is used as a means of accommodating to one’s conversation partner. It is clear that if a Dane or a Swede knows some words from the other language, they are quite likely to make use of them in order to avoid misunderstandings. It was clear that customers and shop assistants who knew some words from the other language were quite likely to use them in the conversation. In the example below, Jeanette and the male customer convert by using RM but he accommodates to her by codeswitching two Swedish words that he knows: "size forty-five".
Example V, Ecco, 26.09.15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original version (Danish/Swedish)</th>
<th>Translation (English) by author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J: Och du?</td>
<td>And you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2: Og den her i storlek fyrtiosex.</td>
<td>This one in size forty-six.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Example V, the customer, M2, uses Danish as his ML (Myers-Scotton 1992) and the codeswitched utterance is in Swedish.

The final accommodation strategy is using English as a lingua franca. As I have mentioned earlier it is of course only an accommodation strategy when the speaker who chooses it does it in order to converge. And even though that is what the speaker intends, the listener might perceive it differently. I will elaborate on this paradox under ideologies. If you look at Firth's definition of ELF it soon becomes clear that English is in fact the lingua franca shared by Danes and Swedes, since the two do not share a common native tongue and all choose English as their foreign language. This is seen in both Example III and Example IV.

4.1.3. Mutual intelligibility

As mentioned in the literature review, it is a common conception that Danish and Swedish are two mutually intelligible languages (Gooskens 2007, Schüppert and Gooskens 2011). But that does not mean that communication is always smooth and without slips. The gathered data shows numerous examples of people who misunderstand or do not understand at all what the other person is saying. I will differ between incomprehension and misunderstanding. Incomprehension refers to the situation where the listener does not understand at all what the speaker is saying. Misunderstanding is when the listener thinks s/he heard what the speaker said but did not understand him/her correctly. The data shows different strategies in use for coping with the misunderstandings and incomprehension. One strategy is to ignore what was said. This can be done by 1) keeping up the conversation by changing the subject, or 2) saying nothing to give the speaker time to repeat or rephrase what was said. Sometimes, the listener also just needs a little time to comprehend what the speaker said, as is the case in Example VI between Ecco shop assistant, Jeanette, and a Danish male customer.

Example VI, Ecco, 26.09.15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original version (Danish/Swedish)</th>
<th>Translation (English) by author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J: Vad behöver du för skovård?</td>
<td>What kind of shoe care do you need?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1: (lidt pause inden svar) Nej tak. Det har jeg.</td>
<td>(short break before answering) No thank you. I already have that.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Example VI, the customer took a little time before he answered because he probably was not sure about what Jeanette was asking. This indication is strengthened by his answer; he does not really answer her question.

**4.2. Ideology – what informants say about what they do**

In the following section I seek to account for informants language ideologies as defined by Irvine: “conceptualizations about languages, speakers, and discursive practices” (2012: para. 1). Through informal interviews I have asked both the Swedish shop assistants and the Danish customers how they perceive language choice and accommodation strategies between speakers of Danish and Swedish. For easy comparison with the practical aspect of the results and analysis, I have chosen the same structure as in section "4.1. Practice": 1) language choice, 2) accommodation strategies, and 3) mutual intelligibility. Finally, I have added a paragraph about dialects as this was something that was not evident in data gathered through participant observation but was brought up by several informants.

**4.2.1. Language choice**

The data from the participant observation clearly shows that Danes and Swedes prefer to speak their respective native languages when talking to each other. In this section I seek to explain why Danes and Swedes prefer this language choice to other possibilities. In order to clarify this I will account for reasons for choosing receptive multilingualism as well as reasons for not choosing receptive multilingualism. After accounting for Danes and Swedes’ perception of receptive multilingualism, I will map out the alternative to this language choice, i.e. choosing English (ELF); when is this choice acceptable and when is it not acceptable. Furthermore, I will account for the concept of willingness and how it is perceived to influence language choice.

*Receptive Multilingualism*

When interviewing informants, it soon became clear that underlying ideologies about language choice between Danes and Swedes lead to the general opinion that receptive multilingualism is to
be the first choice in Danish-Swedish encounters. Both customers and shop assistants, Danes and Swedes, generally shared the belief that receptive multilingualism should be the first choice in Danish-Swedish interaction. Swedish shop assistant, Lina (Filippa K., 19.09.2015), put it this way: "You should try to understand each other. If you understand, you continue". In this quote Lina indicates Danish-Swedish interlocutors should always make an effort and try to make receptive multilingualism successful. However, she also makes it possible to choose something else if you do not understand each other. The ideologies behind these two language choices are so closely linked that I find it unnecessary to attempt to disentangle them. Thus, I will elaborate on the ideologies behind choosing receptive multilingualism as I go through the alternatives to this choice in the following section. As for the reasons for choosing receptive multilingualism, there really only is one: Informants think that Danes and Swedes ought to understand each other and therefore they do not mention any other reasons for choosing receptive multilingualism. Informants share this view with Schüppert and Gooskens (2011) and Gooskens (2007) who consider Danish and Swedish mutually intelligible languages. As you can read in Example VII, Lina is not the only one who thinks Danes and Swedes should try to understand each other. In this example the Danish male customer feels like he should be able to understand Swedish and he further adds that it feels wrong to be speaking English to a Swede, which only strengthens the indications on receptive multilingualism being the first and most correct choice.

**Example VII, Ecco, Malmö, 26.09.15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original version (Danish)</th>
<th>Translation (English) by author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 S: Okay. Tak. Hvilket sprog plejer I at vælge, når I snakker med nogle svenskere i Sverige?</td>
<td>Okay. Thanks. Which language do you usually choose when you speak to Swedes in Sweden?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 M: Må man godt sige halv/halv, fordi...</td>
<td>Is it okay to say 50/50, because...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 K: Ja, det tror jeg også.</td>
<td>Yeah, I think so too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 S: Ja, det må man gerne.</td>
<td>Yes, that’s okay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 M: Fordi det kommer lidt an på altså... Nogle gange så ender det bare på engelsk på én eller anden måde. Inden man overhovedet har fået testet, om det kunne have lykkes på nationalsproget, men jeg tror, jeg ville foretrakke at gøre det på nationalsproget, sådan ud fra... Man</td>
<td>Because it kind of depends on... Sometimes it just ends up with English in some weird way. Before you have even tested whether it could have been successful in the national language, but I think I would prefer to do it in the national language,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 Translation by the author
English as a Lingua Franca

When it comes to language choice between Danes and Swedes, there is really only one alternative to receptive multilingualism. That alternative is, of course, English, which is the common foreign language of choice between the two nations (Firth 1996). As mentioned in the previous section, the perceptions of making this choice are closely linked to the perception of choosing receptive multilingualism. When informants talk about choosing English they simultaneously devalue choosing English and indicate that receptive multilingualism is the preferred choice. Thus, this section will deal with both of the two language choice alternatives, although the main focus will be on the perception of ELF in Danish-Swedish encounters.

Both Danes and Swedes frame the choice of English in Danish-Swedish interaction negatively and refer to it as “wrong” and “foolish”. Thus, it seems that the general ideology about English as the language for Danish-Swedish interaction is that it is wrong, and definitely not the first choice. Example VIII highlights this ideology. Ahead of the interview with the Danish couple had encountered Swedish shop assistant Moa in the Ecco shop. Moa did not seem to understand what the Danish woman was saying (even after a few attempts at repetition) and so she chose to switch to English. The example illustrates the difference between the speaker and the listener’s perception of an utterance (in this case, language choice). Moa did not understand the woman and in order to give the best service possible she switched languages because she assumed communication would be easier and without misunderstandings in this way. She wanted to enhance communication and thus, she converged. But the Danish woman interpreted it as the opposite and so the case is actually “perceptual divergence” (Giles and Coupland 1991). The Danish woman has a negative attitude towards choosing English when Danes and Swedes talk. She considers it a “problem” (line 1 and 12) when Swedes don’t understand Danish, and she also calls it “wrong” (line 19). She blames the incomprehension on Moa and says that she has a “clear problem” (line 12) and is very negative about Moa’s lack of understanding and her following choice to switch to English. The customer seems to feel slightly offended. When talking in more general terms about Swedes not understanding her, she says they are often in a “deadlock” (line 3), which is yet another negative word about switching to English, when she speaks Danish to them. The fact that the Danish customer thinks that Moa is diverging instead of converging surely influences her perception of Moa in general. According to Giles
and Coupland (1991) convergence can trigger social approval and in the same way divergence can trigger social disapproval. It is very clear that the customer does not approve of Moa’s language choice. If the customer had realized that Moa changed language in order to converge (or had she perceived it that way), she might have thought more positively of Moa and the social situation. Instead Moa got an unhappy customer and the misunderstanding may have lead to a loss of sale.

Example VIII, *Ecco, Malmö, 15.10.15*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original version (Danish)</th>
<th>Translation (English) by author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>K: (...) Det er nogle bestemte, der har problemer, har jeg lagt mærke til.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I: Okay. Og så skifter man til engelsk?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>K: Ja. Ja, så går man sådan lidt i baglås.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>M: Generelt synes jeg ikke, eller jeg gør ikke.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>K: Det er ikke dig, jeg taler om. Det er forretningerne, Knud.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>M: Jo, men jeg synes ikke...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>K: Nej, men jeg har oplevet det selv, når jeg shopper, ikke?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I: Ja. Er der nogle situationer, hvor du selv ville skifte til engelsk eller et andet sprog?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>K: Hmm. Jeg vil helst fortsætte på... Så prøver jeg på noget svensk. Jeg prøver at finde et ord. Men så er der også nogle gange, de ikke vil forstå, hvad jeg siger. Sådan oplever man det. men sådan er vi vel også selv derhjemme nogle gange, ikke?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>M: men det går jo det meste. Tjena, tjena, hur är läget?, osv., ikke?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I: Ja.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>K: Altså hun havde et klart problem med at forstå dansk. Og så svært synes jeg ikke, det</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 word in *italic* are translated from Swedish and not Danish.
var, det jeg forsøgte at sige. Jeg bad hende om en størrelse 39, og så spurgte jeg hende, om det var en model, der hed "sculpture". Sculpture det er et bestemt læs, de har. En model, jeg har siddet og kigget på nettet, ikke?

that difficult, what I was trying to say. I asked her for a size 39 and then I asked her if it was a design called "sculpture". Sculpture is a certain lot that they have. A design I have found online, right?

13 I: Ja ja. Og så forstod hun det ikke.
Yeah. And then she didn't understand.

14 K: Hun forstod det godt, da jeg sagde Sculpture på engelsk og mig bekendt, lyder det ens.
She did understand it when I said "sculpture" in English and if you ask me it sounds the same.

Oh, but wasn't she good enough or what? I don't think there was anything wrong with her.

16 K: Der var ikke noget kritik, altså det var bare...
I wasn’t trying to criticize, I mean it was just...

17 I: Men, men... Så du har ikke noget i mod, at man skifter til engelsk. Ville du i højere grad gøre det?
But, but ... So you don’t mind that people switch to English. Would you do that to a greater extent?

18 M: Nah. Hvis folk ikke forstår mig, så gør jeg det på engelsk.
Nah. If people don’t understand me I’ll do it in English.

19 K: Jeg har jo heller ikke noget problem med det, jeg synes bare, det er forkert.
It’s not like I have a problem with it, I just think it is wrong.

20 M: Fordi hvis ikke vi kan kommunikere, så jeg får det, jeg vil have, så går jeg bare et andet sted hen.
Because if we can’t communicate so that I get what I want, I will just go somewhere else.

Example IV, where the customer responds to Moa’s switch to English by making it very clear that she understands Swedish and does not need to make use of English, also supports that English is not the first choice. This is of course related to the ideology that Danes and Swedes “should be able to understand each other”. It is quite the taboo to switch to English. Moa probably only asked the question to make sure she was giving the best possible service but the customer seemed to be experiencing a bit of a face loss when her Swedish comprehension skills were questioned.

Although it is generally considered wrong to speak English between Danes and Swedes, there are situations that seem to make that language choice more acceptable. However, as mentioned earlier,
it is important to keep in mind that this option is generally only considered acceptable when receptive multilingualism has been tested (and has failed). In general, the overall norm is not to speak English. Instead, people try to use their native languages first. Only two informants were indifferent to the question of language choice, so this section will try to explain what reasons interlocutors find a reasonable "excuse" to be speaking English to a Dane/Swede.

The way informants talk about ELF use in service encounters illustrates that English is only the third choice for most of them. Choosing English gets many negative comments. One example is a lady in Ecco, who says she would only choose English in an emergency situation\(^{10}\). That is quite a strong phrase that indicates that it would have to take a lot of attempts with Danish/Swedish before she switched to English. It could also be a critical situation where fast and efficient communication was more important than the strong RM preference. There is no doubt that using English is rarely the first choice when Danes and Swedes talk to each other. This is of course clear because everyone says RM is their first choice, but ELF is actually framed negatively by almost all informants. Only two (Knud and the teenage girl) said they did not care whether the conversation was conducted in English or Danish/Swedish. Most other people indicated that it would require a special situation before they were to use English instead of their native language.

*Work-related*

Although it is evident that receptive multilingualism is the most common choice of strategy, there are also clear indications that it depends on the social situation and perhaps the topic of the conversation. Many of the Danish informants stated that it is okay to use English in a "work-related" context or if the topic is more "technical". Of course, for the Swedish informants the situation is already work-related because they are working in the shops. Generally they seem to follow customers, which might make English more okay as long as the customer makes the choice. I will account for the influence the service encounter situation has on language choice as seen from the shop assistants point of view. For now I will focus on how the Danes talk about English in a work-related context.

There was a general tendency towards using English in a more professional context, i.e. something work-related. The word "technical" was used quite a lot in this regard. This Ecco customer says "technical" no less than three times and also mentions that in a "work-related situation" it might be okay, but only maybe.

\(^{10}\) "I nødstilfælde ville jeg vælge engelsk" woman, Ecco, 15.10.15.
### Example IX, *Ecco, Malmö, 15.10.15*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original version (Danish)</th>
<th>Translation (English) by author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  K2: (…) Det er jo mere, hvis du sidder i en eller anden teknisk situation, så kan det godt være, man slet ikke kan forstå det, ikke?</td>
<td>(…) It’s more like, if you are in some technical situation, then maybe you don’t understand each other at all, right?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  S: Okay. Ville det være en situation, hvor…?</td>
<td>Okay. Would that be a situation, where…?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  K2: Ja, der kunne det godt være, hvis det var sådan helt teknisk på en eller anden svær...</td>
<td>Yes, that is quite possible, if it was all technical in some difficult...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  K1: Her er det jo mange gange bare om størrelser: Har I den mindre eller større?</td>
<td>In many cases here, it is just about sizes: Do you have a smaller or a bigger size?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  K2: Ja, og hej og farvel og tak for i dag, kan man sige. men hvis det bliver sådan mere teknisk, tænker jeg, i forhold til - jeg ved ikke, hvad det skulle være, men arbejdsrelateret måske - så kunne det være lidt mere at slå over i engelsk.</td>
<td>Yeah, and hello and goodbye and thank you, I would say. But if it gets more like technical, I think, in relation to – I don’t know what it could be but work-related perhaps, then it would be a bit more to switch to English.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lack of understanding is also an acceptable reason for choosing English or switching to it. The Danish man from Example III, who spoke English to me explained in the consecutive interview that he had experienced that Swedes do not understand his Danish. This might be true as it is in line with Schüppert and Gooskens’ claim that it is easier for Danes to understand Swedish than it is for Swedes to understand Danish (2011).

Several informants mention that English is often easier than Danish-Swedish receptive multilingualism. They also mention this as an excuse for using English instead of Danish and Swedish, but some also seem to think that easy is not necessarily right. In Example IX, both of the informants give explanations for choosing English but they also make it clear that they do not consider it the correct choice.

### Example X, *Ecco, Malmö, 15.10.15.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original version (Danish)</th>
<th>Translation (English) by author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  K2: Hvis folk har... Altså hvis det skal gå stærkt, så er det måske lettere nogle gange at slå over i engelsk; er der mange, der må-</td>
<td>If people have... I mean, if they are in a hurry, then perhaps it is sometimes easier to switch to English; there are many, who perhaps share</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ske har den holdning. Jeg synes, det er et spørgsmål om lige...

that opinion. I think it is a matter of just...

2 K1: ... tage sig tid til det. ... taking your time.

3 K2: ... have tålmodighed og så lige "hvad var det lige, du sagde der?". Og så sværere synes jeg heller ikke det er. Jeg lærte det på en måned, ikke? Det er bare at snakke det. Og det tror jeg ikke er fordi jeg har et specielt godt sprogøre, det tror jeg bare er et spørgsmål om, at hvis du er tvunget til at snakke det, så gør man det jo. Og så kommer det ret naturligt.

... have patience and then "what did you say right there?". And then; I don't think it's any harder than that. I learned it in a month, right? It's just a matter of talking.

Another common ideology seen in the above two examples is that ELF is okay if you are in a hurry. Informants acknowledge that RM takes an effort and extra time but they still consider RM the first choice. Many informants seem to think that ELF might be easier than RM but that does not mean they think it should be done. When K2 in Example IX says that many people might find it easier to speak English, she indicates that the easy choice is not necessarily the right one. Instead, she thinks interlocutors should try harder, which leads us to the matter of "willingness" that will be accounted for below.

Willingness and its effect on language choice

Above I have mentioned reasons for choosing receptive multilingualism and English as a lingua franca respectively, but one aspect that especially the Danish informants mention as an influencing factor is the speakers' degree of *willingness to understand each other*. In this context it becomes even clearer that receptive multilingualism is the general preference. Several informants seem to be convinced that as long as you have the will to understand the other language or the "willingness" to accommodate to your communication partner, you will be able to understand what they are saying. In Example VIII, line 9, the Danish woman explains that "they don't want to understand what I am saying". She is convinced that as long as speakers make an effort, they are able to understand each other and so she supports Gooskens (2007) and Schüppert and Gooskens (2011) who claim that Danish and Swedish are mutually intelligible languages. This is also seen in Example VIII where the Swedish shop assistant Moa is perceived as diverging, when in fact she is converging. The Danish customer interprets this as Moa's lack of willingness to make receptive multilingualism work. She does not only think it is her own will that influences the success of the communication. She also as-
cribes misunderstanding and in comprehen sion to (some) Swedes’ lacking willingness to understand what she is saying. Unsuccessful receptive multilingualism does not seem to be an option for her. It is only a matter of trying hard enough. Jeanette’s strategy, as she explains in Example XI, also emphasizes this ideology. When she says that she will always prefer to speak Swedish to a Dane and that she will even switch language by her own initiative, she indicates that if you only try (= have the will) you should be able to understand each other. It is only a lack of willingness that leads to using English.

Schüppert and Gooskens argue “that Sweden enjoys a higher status in Scandinavia than Denmark”, which might “cause a bias in the willingness to understand the neighboring language, and thereby a bias in actual intelligibility” (2011: 338). This is seen with the Swedish shop assistant Moa, who is the one who most often switches to English. However, it is important to keep in mind that none of the other Swedish shop assistants have as many problems as her with understanding Danish. It is also argued that Danes “may be more willing to understand Swedish than the other way around, and therefore perform better in perception tasks” (Schüppert and Gooskens, 2011: 338). The amount of different topics and questions is limited, which perhaps makes it easier for the shop assistants and the customers to infer meaning, because there is an element of routine in it for them. This however, is not supported in the gathered data.

Only two informants claim to be indifferent towards language choice. They are both Danish. One is the male customer, Knud, in Example VIII, who says “It doesn’t matter to me. I speak all languages”11. Another example is a teenage girl. It is difficult to pinpoint why these two have a different opinion than the rest of the informants. The teenage girl might have this opinion because she is considerably younger than the other informants. Common for the two is that successful communication and mutual understanding seems more important than a potential loss of face by having to switch to English. To them successful communication is defined by how well interlocutors understand each other and not which language this understanding is done in.

_The effect of service encounters on language choice_

The service encounter situation has a great impact on language choice. “The customer is always right” seems to be the overruling ideology from the shop assistants’ perspective, so in this section I seek to investigate to what extent service trumps language choice ideologies.

11 Translated by the author from Danish: “For mig er det lige meget. Jeg kan alle sprog.” _Ecco, Malmö, 15.10.15_
Among the shop assistants, the general opinion is that service is more important than language choice. If they cannot provide the best possible service using receptive multilingualism, they will rather switch to English to make communication flow. Sandra from Filippa K describes the importance of good service in this way: "when the customer is happy, I am happy"\textsuperscript{12}. She further adds that it is "important to build up a relationship, important that the customer feels comfortable and gets the help that he or she needs"\textsuperscript{13}.

**Example XI, Ecco, Malmö, 15.10.15.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Original version (Swedish)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Translation (English) by author</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I: Ja. Vilket språk brukar du välja, när du pratar med dom?</td>
<td>Yeah. Which language do you usually choose when you speak with them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo: I början danska. Eller inte danska, jag börjar med svenska och är det så, att vi inte förstår varandra... För någon av dom blir sura, när jag använder engelska, men då använder jag engelska till sist för att det är viktigt, att vi förstår varandra i stället för att göra makt-kamp på att vi inte förstår varandra.</td>
<td>In the beginning Danish. Well, not Danish; I usually begin in Swedish and then if we don’t understand each other... because some of them get upset when I use English, but then I use English in the end because it is important that we understand each other instead of having a power struggle over not understanding each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I: Så du börjar på svenska och sen...?</td>
<td>So you start out in Swedish and then...?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo: Ja. I fall det inte funkar, så tar jag engelska. För jag ska kunna ge den bästa serviceen här liksom.</td>
<td>Yes. In case it doesn’t work, I choose English. Because I have to be able to give them the best service, you know.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moa is the only one of the Swedish shop assistants who talks negatively about the use of receptive multilingualism in the service encounters she takes part in. She refers to the way receptive multilingualism is conducted as a "power struggle". First, this indicates that she herself is not keen on the strategy. Second, it indicates that the receptive multilingualism ideology is so strong that people would rather not understand each other than switch languages. Moa’s first hand experiences with these ideologies are proof of their strength. The fact that customers become angry when she does not understand them and uses English instead is also an evidence of this strong ideology.

\textsuperscript{12} Translated by the author from Swedish "När kunden är glad, er jag glad" Sandra, Filippa K, Malmö, 19.09.15

\textsuperscript{13} Translated by the author from Swedish: "Det är viktigt att bygga upp en relation, viktigt, att kunden känner sig trygg och får den hjälp han/hon behöver" Sandra, Filippa K, Malmö, 19.09.15
Jeanette in Example XII is the only one of the shop assistants who prefers to keep speaking Swedish as opposed to switching to English. Even if a customer starts out in English, she will try to change the strategy to receptive multilingualism if she finds out that the customer is Danish. Thus, Jeanette’s Danish-Swedish ideology is stronger than her service encounter ideology.

Example XII, *Ecco, Malmö, 26.09.15.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original version (Swedish)</th>
<th>Translation (English) by author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  I: Vilket språk du brukar välja, när du pratar med danskarna och varför? Du sa jättemycket, när jag var här förra gången, men jag han inte skriva allt, som du sa.</td>
<td>Which language do you usually choose when you speak with the Danes and why? You said a lot of things when I was here the last time but I didn’t have time to write it all down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  J: Alltså jag brukar prata danska med dom ju. Ja ja. Sen kan det ju vara .. Jag hade en äldre dam här förra veckan. Jag hörde inte vad hon sa. Jag vet inte var hon var ifrån, men jag hörde inte vad hon sa. Och sen i går hade jag någon dansk kund som var här och handlade. Och hon var jätte snabb och pratade jätte fort, och då blev det... Då blir det lite engelska emellan dom danska, så vi förstod. Men det är kanske ett ord typ såhär, som man kanske inte förstår riktigt. Men annars så, ja, men jag måste säga... I bland pratar dom engelska; det första dom gör är med en om dom ska fråga efter storlek. Och sen så hör jag sen, att dom är i från Danmark. Och då brukar jag prata svenska: Skal vi prata svenska med varandra? Ja ja ja, så kanske man gör det... Alltså det är ju samma frågor och allting typ.</td>
<td>Well, I usually speak Danish with them. Yes yes. Maybe sometimes... I had an elderly lady last week. I couldn’t hear what she was saying. I don’t know where she was from, but I didn’t hear what she was saying. And then yesterday I had some Danish customer who was shopping here. And she was really quick and talked very fast and then it got... Then there will be a little English between Danish, so we understood. But it’s perhaps a word once in a while that you don’t really understand. But otherwise, yeah, I have to say... Sometimes they speak English; the first thing they do with you when they want to ask for a size. And then later I then hear that they are from Denmark. And then I usually speak Swedish: Shall we speak Swedish with each other? Yeah, then maybe we do that... I mean, it’s the same kinds of questions and everything.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scandinavia as a community

I found that the preference for choosing native languages might be based in especially the Danes’ sense of community with the other Scandinavian countries. This is well aligned with Schüppert and Gooskens’ (2011) claim that Danish and Swedish is mutually intelligible and that Sweden enjoys a higher status in Scandinavia than Denmark. A Danish female customer (who is included in Example XIII) explains to me that the Nordic people should be able to understand each other. She is not at all the only one who considers Denmark, Norway and Sweden to be a community of sorts. The Danish female customer from Example VIII, who thinks it is wrong to use English also speaks of “Scandinavian” as if it were an individual language, thus indicating that everyone within these countries should be able to speak with each other in their native languages, because they do in fact share a common language. Thus, it can be concluded that there is a sense of fellowship both community-wise and language-wise, which influences language choice and ideologies.

4.2.2. Accommodation strategies

Both Danes and Swedes make use of accommodation strategies in addition to their choice of language, which in some cases is also an accommodation strategy. There are two characteristics of the way the informants use accommodation strategies. First, the perception of these strategies is that they enhance comprehension. Second, they are used to support receptive multilingualism and make this communication more successful. The informants mention several accommodation strategies that they use in order to enhance successful communication and with that receptive multilingualism. Below I will account for these strategies so I will be able to compare what informants say they do with what they actually do and discuss any discrepancies that might occur, later.

In Example XIII the woman explains that slow and steady talk guards off any problems. Using simple words is another accommodation strategy, which is mentioned by the Danish male customer in Example XIV. He adds that it makes it easier and confirms that he adapts his language to Swedish listeners. He also adds that his Danish is at a lower level, when he speaks to Swedes.

Example XIII, *Ecco, Malmö, 15.10.15.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original version (Danish)</th>
<th>Translation (English) by author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 K: Ja. Dybest set, synes jeg, at hvis man taler stille og roligt, så plejer det ikke at være et problem. Slet ikke her i Malmö.</td>
<td>Yes. Basically, I think that if you speak slow and steady then usually there isn’t a problem. Especially not here in Malmö.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 “Det nordiske folk forstår hinanden-agtigt” / “The Nordic people understand each other”-ish.
Example XIV, Ecco, Malmö, 15.10.15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original version (Danish)</th>
<th>Translation (English) by author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 M: Og hvis man bruger simple ord, så er det nemmere.</td>
<td>And if you use simple words, it’s easier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I: Så man tilpasser sit sprog lidt på den måde også?</td>
<td>So you adapt your language a little bit like that too?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 K: Ja.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another strategy is to pronounce a word in your own native language but with an accent of the other language. This is explained by a Danish male customer in Example XV.

Example XV, Ecco, Malmö, 26.09.15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original version (Danish)</th>
<th>Translation (English) by author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I: Ja. Og hvad med den anden vejr rundt, hvad er sværest for jer med svensk?</td>
<td>Yes. And how about the other way around, what is the most difficult for you with Swedish?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 M1: Det er alle de ting, der hedder noget komplett anderledes, end øh... Altså, at man forsøger nogle gange at gøre et dansk ord svensk ved bare at udtale det på en lidt anden måde, men jordbær hedder nu engang ikke jordbær på svensk uanset, hvordan fa’en du forsøger at udtale det. (...)</td>
<td>All those things that are called something completely different, than uh... I mean, you sometimes try to make a Danish word Swedish just by pronouncing it a little bit differently, but strawberries (&quot;jordbær&quot;, ed.) just aren’t called strawberries in Swedish no matter how you try to pronounce it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it can be seen in the previous three examples, the Danish and Swedish informants make an effort to converge and are well-aware that this will make communication easier and understanding better. But even though most informants seem to believe they are accommodating, I have found very few practical examples in which speakers actually do so. Swedish shop assistant, Sandra (Filippa K), explains to me that she accommodates but later when a Danish customer enters, she speaks very quickly and the Danish female customer reveals in her conversation with me that she almost did not understand anything of what Sandra said.
Codeswitching

Both Danish customers and Swedish shop assistants make use of codeswitching and also mention this strategy in the informal interviews. There are two types of codeswitching: 1) codeswitching to English, and 2) codeswitching to the neighboring language.

Even though the general perception is that Danes and Swedes should talk Danish/Swedish to each other, the informants seem very aware that pure RM is not always possible if the encounter is to be successful. Thus, customers as well as shop assistants who know a few Danish or Swedish words are likely to use them to accommodate and enhance the listener’s comprehension. In Example XVI below, shop assistant, Lovisa, explains some of the tricky words that they have learned and now use. She indicates that the words for size ("störlek" in SE and "størrelse" in DK) are so similar that is usually is not an issue but she mentions it in regards to “something they don’t understand”. One word that she and her colleague have had to learn is the Danish word for jeans, “cowboybukser”. This is a word that she codeswitches to when she talks to Danes about jeans. Her final comment “man lär sig lite” ("you learn a little") indicates that the staff in Filippa K try to pick up on and learn these lexical differences.

Example XVI, Filippa K, Malmö 16.10.15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original version (Swedish)</th>
<th>Translation (English) by author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 L: Alltså vi kör nog mest svenska faktiskt. Och är det någon ting då, dom inte förstår… Men alltså dom kan ju det, asså storlek och størrelse, det ligger ju så nära varandra och det är liksom dom orden. Sen säger dom; vi säger ju jeans och dom säger cowboy-byxor. Och den, första gången nån kom in och sa cowboybyxor, vi bara: Va? Vad är det?! Och då blev et jätte konstigt. Vi bara: shit, vad är ett par cowboybyxor?</td>
<td>Well, we probably mostly use Swedish actually. And if there is something then that they don't understand... but I mean, they do know that, I mean, “storlek” (size in Swedish) and &quot;størrelse&quot; (size in Danish), it's so close to each other and it is kind of those words. Then they say; we say &quot;jeans&quot;, as you know, and they say &quot;cowboy trousers&quot;, and we were like: what? What is that?! And then it got really weird. We were like: shit, what are cowboy trousers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I: Ja.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 L: Och då heter det väl det på danska från början. Men, eh, ja, nu vet vi vad det är också. Att det heter cowboybyxor.</td>
<td>And then I guess that’s what it's called in Danish from the beginning. But, uh, now we know what that is too. That it’s called cowboy trousers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both Danes and Swedes agree that if you know some words it is probably an advantage to use them, since codeswitching enhances understanding, but of course it is mainly used together with receptive multilingualism. This leads to the conclusion that “pure” receptive multilingualism is the first choice, receptive multilingualism with codeswitching or other accommodation strategies is the second one, and using English is the third choice.

Even though Danes and Swedes agree that converging is generally a positive thing to do, they are aware that someone converging too much may have the opposite effect. Sara from Example II tells me that she speaks Danish but she chooses not to do it because it feels like showing off. If Danish-Swedish works fine, she sees no need to switch to Danish. A Danish woman was also aware of the consequence of “overconverging”. She knew some Swedish words but didn’t want to use it for fear of sounding too smart.

4.2.3. Mutual Intelligibility

The data does not provide many perceptions of intelligibility. It was difficult to ask for perceptions on incomprehension and misunderstanding as these situations were often either so small that neither the shop assistant nor the customer notices them, or so insignificant that they did not affect the overall success of the interaction. In general it can be said though that Danes and Swedes who make use of receptive multilingualism assume that the two languages are mutually intelligible. Lovisa in Example XVII, who says that “we understand each other”, thus indicating that Danish and Swedish is mutually intelligible, confirms this.

Example XVII, Filippa K, Malmö, 16.10.2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original version (Swedish)</th>
<th>Translation (English) by author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I: Brukar det gå bra att prata med dom?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I: Hur brukar du göra?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>L: Jag pratar svenska, dom pratar danska.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I: ja.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>L: Nästen alltid, för det funkar hur bra som helst, för vi förstår ju varandra. Jätte bra.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some informants thought that Danish was easier for Swedes than Swedish was for Danes and some informants thought the opposite. Several informants mentioned dialects and regional origin as an influential factor. I will elaborate further on this phenomenon later. For now I will focus on the how the listener’s attitude towards a given language influences the intelligibility between closely related languages (Gooskens 2007). Because of the ethnographic approach to the research and data gathering not all informants were asked the same questions. I adapted my questionnaire from time to time and often many times during each observation period. For that reason I have not asked all the informants about their perception of the opposite language. Those I did ask, however, seemed to agree that two languages were more or less equally appealing which is well-aligned with the fact that receptive multilingualism seems to be more or less unproblematic. One example that indicates something else is the following statement from Swedish shop assistant, Moa (Ecco, 15.10.2015), when she is asked what she thinks about the Danish language: “It is not exactly the prettiest but I don’t think it’s ugly. Like; why should ours be any prettier?”15. Here, she does not give the Danish language her unconditional love and praise. This pinned against the fact that she is the informant who has the most difficulties with succeeding with receptive multilingualism underlines Gooskens’ argument that attitude does have an impact in intelligibility.

**Example XVIII, Ecco, Malmö, 26.09.15.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original version (Swedish)</th>
<th>Translation (English) by author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  I: (...) Hvilket sprog taler I normalt, når I kommer ind i en butik i Sverige?</td>
<td>Which language do you usually speak when you enter a shop in Sweden?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 Author’s translation from original Swedish version: Det är ju inte den finaste, men jag tycker inte, det är fult. Liksom; varför skulle vårt vara finare? Nej.”
3 M2: Ja. (begge griner) Yes. (both laughing)
4 I: Ja. Yes.
5 M2: Jeg snakker dansk eller engelsk. I speak Danish or English
6 I: Hvad er det, der afgør, om du vælger det ene eller det andet? What is it that determines whether you choose one or the other?
7 M2: Øh, om den, der står i butikken, kan finde ud af at forstå mit danske. For jeg kan ikke et klap svensk. Uh, if the one in the shop understands my Danish because I don’t know any Swedish.
8 I: Okay, men du lagde ud på engelsk til, da du troede, jeg var ansat? Okay, but you started out in English when you thought I was staff?
9 M2: Nej, det gjorde jeg ikke, det gjorde du (points to the other man) No, I didn’t, you did (points to the other man)
10 M1. Ja, det gjorde jeg. Yes, that was me.
11 I: Det var dig. It was you.
12 M1: Det gjorde jeg. Jamen, det er simpelt-then fordi at jeg har oplevet at svensker forstår bedre engelsk end dansk - af en eller anden årsag. Så.. Så ja. Jeg tror nok, jeg bruker engelsk mest. I did that. Well, it’s simply because I have experiences that Swedes understand English better than Danish – for some reason. So... So, yeah. I believe I use English the most.

The Danish male customer, M1, from Example XVIII only switches if he is not understood, which does not make sense because he spoke English to me without knowing if I understood him. It is quite likely that he was worried in advance that either he would not be understood or he would not understand me. His final comment also indicates that receptive multilingualism is his first choice. Thus, it is fair to assume that he tries to avoid the embarrassment of not being understood by simply avoiding receptive multilingualism. He did, however, speak Danish to Jeanette after he learned that I was not Swedish.

Schüppert and Gooskens (2011) argue that it is likely that a positive attitude enhances intelligibility, but it could also be the other way around to that a high level of intelligibility leads to a more positive attitude. It is difficult to determine which one of these scenarios is the correct one but it is clear that there is a correlation between positive attitude and intelligibility. It seems fair to assume that the informants who strongly prefer to make use of receptive multilingualism (among other things) have this preference because they like the neighboring language, or at least that if they did
not like the other language they would be less willing to use receptive multilingualism. Thus, I argue that it is likely that willingness to accommodate goes hand in hand with the speakers’ attitude towards the other language, since intelligibility and attitude are entangled phenomena (Schüppert and Gooskens 2011).

This interview excerpt with Filippa K store manager, Lovisa, shows both a number of underlying ideologies and examples of codeswitching and receptive multilingualism. Lovisa seems convinced that Danes and Swedes should interact with each other in their respective native languages and make use of receptive multilingualism. She bases this on the assumption that Danes and Swedes understand each other. At the same time, she argues that the only reason for potential misunderstandings is geographical distance in dialects, which is well aligned with the previously mentioned assumptions about dialects.
4.2.4. Dialects
As I tried to discover what ideologies Danes and Swedes had about language, one feature that had not occurred to me before I started gathering data soon became a common denominator; namely the concept of dialects and more specifically how people’s geographical origin and their associated dialects influence language choice and mutual intelligibility. Even though there is no data supporting this theory, the informants seemed to think that the closer dialects were geographically, the higher the mutual intelligibility and the easier it was to use native languages instead of English. The most distinct example of this can be seen in Example XIX below, where the Danish male customer refers to Northern Swedish as “almost Saami”. Even though Saami and Swedish are lexically distant it illustrates that the further away from him (Copenhagen/Malmö) a dialect is, the less he will understand, and if it is far enough away it will be so difficult that it is almost another language, in which case it is okay to switch to English because that would be easier.

Example XIX, Filippa K, Malmö, 16.10.15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original version (Danish)</th>
<th>Translation (English) by author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> S: Okay, ja. Sidste spørgsmål. Er der nogle situationer, hvor I kunne finde på at snakke et andet sprog end dansk med en svensker?</td>
<td>Okay, yeah. Last question. Are there any situations in which you might consider speaking another language than Danish with a Swede?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> K: Ja. Jeg kan godt finde på at snakke engelsk, hvis der er et eller andet, der er helt umuligt at forklare, hvor jeg, hvis jeg har forsøgt at snakke dansk først, eller forsøgt mig på det svenska, jeg kan eller sådan noget, og det stadig ikke har givet mening, så synes jeg...</td>
<td>Yes. I sometimes speak English if something is totally impossible to explain, where I, if I have tried to speak Danish first, or tried with the Swedish I know, or something like that and it still doesn’t make sense; then I think...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> S: Så skifter du over.</td>
<td>Then you make the switch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> K: Ja.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> S: Hvad med dig?</td>
<td>How about you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong> M: Det samme. Ja. Det er mere sådan, hvis det er Nordsverige, altså næsten helt saamisk, så er det meget svært at forstå. Så ville jeg vælge at tale engelsk, men ellers nej.</td>
<td>The same. Yes. It’s more like if it’s Northern Sweden, I mean almost Saami, then it’s very difficult to understand. Then I would choose to speak English but not otherwise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Generally, informants tend to think that geographical closeness enhances comprehension between dialects. Thus, the Danes seem to agree that Malmö Swedish and other Scanian dialects are very easy to understand. One Danish woman even stated that “here in Malmö the Swedes almost speak Danish”\(^{16}\).

It clearly has an impact on language choice that Danes believe that Southern Swedish dialects are easy to understand and Northern Swedish dialects are almost impossible to understand. It is clear that if an interlocutor believes a dialect is easy to understand, they are more willing to conduct conversation in native languages. Of course, this also works the other way around: when an interlocutor experiences a difficult dialect (or one that is perceived as difficult), they are less likely to stick to receptive multilingualism and more likely to switch to English.

The Swedish shop assistant also experience and enforce the above-mentioned ideologies about dialects. Moa from Example XX grew up in Stockholm and did not move to Scania until she was 13. Her dialect is not Scanian but closer to that of Stockholm. As many of the informants’ assumptions indicate, she experiences herself that her dialect is harder for the Danes to understand than Scanian. This leads to the assumption that Scanian is easier to understand for Danes than more northern dialects. Moa explains it in the following paragraph:

---

**Example XX,**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original version (Swedish)</th>
<th>Translation (English) by author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I: Ja. Vad tror du är det svåraste för dom, när dom ska förstå svenska? Har du märkt något?</td>
<td>Yes. What do you think is the most difficult for them when they are to understand Swedish? Have you noticed anything?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Mo: Mmh, dom tycker min svenska är svår.</td>
<td>Uhm, they think my Swedish is difficult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I: Svårare än skånskan?</td>
<td>More difficult than the Scanian?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Mo: Ja. Det kan bli så här i bland; förstår ingenting.</td>
<td>Yeah. It sometimes gets like this; don’t understand anything.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 I: Var tror du det beror på?</td>
<td>What do you think that depends on?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{16}\) “... men normalt plejer det at være sådan at her i Malmö, der snakker svenskerne jo nærmest dansk” Ecco, 15.10.15.
Moa is also convinced that Scanian and Danish is more closely related than Danish and other Swedish dialects.

Dialects do not only have an impact on language choice but also on (other) accommodation strategies. In Example XXI, the Danish female customer clarifies that “down here” (in Malmö) Danish works perfectly fine but the further north she goes, the more she will codeswitch to Swedish. So in Scania she would only make use of receptive multilingualism but in more northern parts of Sweden she would accommodate and converge more to the Swedes and make use of codeswitching when possible.

**Example XXI, Ecco, Malmö, 15.10.15.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original version (Danish)</th>
<th>Translation (English) by author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I: (...) Hvad plejer I at göre, når I skal snakke med nogle svenskere? Sådan helt generelt.</td>
<td>What do you usually do when you are to speak to some Swedes? Generally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 K1: Det kommer an på, hvor i Sverige, det er.</td>
<td>It depends where in Sweden it is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I: Okay.</td>
<td>Okay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 K1: Så derfor, hvis man er længere oppe, så slår man lidt over i svensk og blander nogle svenske ord ind, men herneede kan man lige-så godt tage den på dansk.</td>
<td>So that's why; if you're further up then you switch to Swedish a bit and mix in some Swedish word, but down here you might as well do it in Danish.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Discussion

In this study I have found out that receptive multilingualism is by far the most preferred language choice when Danes and Swedes communicate. After choosing pure receptive multilingualism comes the choice of adding accommodation strategies such as the use of codeswitching to the receptive multilingualism. This is true for both Danes and Swedes. Finally, there is the choice of English, but this is only chosen when all other ways of communicating have been tried or if there is a reason for doing so.

Participant observation’s strongest advantage is also its disadvantage. Having the role as participant observer lets the researcher indulge in the data gathering process, be part of the scene and thus have access to information that he or she would not have had access too otherwise. At the same time it becomes even more difficult to stay objective because the researcher uses him-/herself as an instrument. I imagine it would have been an advantage for this study if I had had a research partner who could have made similar studies to compare and see whether the same results were found by a different researcher. Whether this would have been sufficient is uncertain, but it would definitely have been interesting to see if results were the same. The informal interviews also have both advantages and disadvantages. In the first data gathering session, I did not record any of the interviews. I wanted to see what I got more out of: recording or not recording. It turned out that I paid more attention to what the informants were saying in the moment when I was not recording because I knew I had only one chance to write down what they said. Recording and only listening without having to write down anything gave me some extra time to reflect on what the informants were saying, but I also noticed that I often was more focused on what I was going to ask next than what they were saying right now and how I could make them elaborate if there was something of extra relevance. I noticed this difference relatively soon and so I was able to adapt my behavior accordingly.

It is evident that my mere presence in the shops has also had an effect on the data I have gathered. Example XXII, which shows an excerpt of a conversation between Moa (Ecco) and me, confirms this. As the first Danish customers enter the shop, she greets them in English and keeps talking English throughout the encounter. The next time, however, she sticks with Swedish. When I confront her with this, she says that she tries harder to use receptive multilingualism because I am there. Of course this says a lot about my role in the social situation. She is very much aware of my presence and blankly admits that she would have acted differently if I were not there. It also shows that the general underlying assumption is that Danes and Swedes should be able to understand each other’s
languages. If they do not it is a little bit embarrassing and you should try to overcome the barrier and make it work. So when Moa says she tries harder because I am there, it is probably because she thinks that she should be able to understand Danish.

**Example XXII, Ecco, Malmö, 15.10.15.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original version (Swedish)</th>
<th>Translation (English) by author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I: Det låt som att det gick bättre med dom två?</td>
<td>It sounded like it went better with those two?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Mo: Ja, jag tror att jag försöker mera för att du är här också. Så jag måste förstå.</td>
<td>Yes. I think I try harder because you are here to. So I have to understand.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My question to Moa reveals that even I unconsciously consider receptive multilingualism superior to English. When I really wanted to ask her why she used receptive multilingualism instead of English, I just point out that it “went better” now that she used receptive multilingualism. This of course, only supports Moa’s existing ideologies regarding language choice: that it is better if she speaks Swedish and understand her customers’ Danish than if she switches to English. Perhaps she would have acted differently if I had been more neutral in my commenting and questioning of the situation. However, it is important to remember that Moa herself chose to speak English with the first Danish customers and switch to Swedish with the second set of customers.

Some interviews were shorter than others because I did not want to push forward if the informants did not want it. Some informants were very talkative and others were not. I am not the most extrovert person and so, I did not push anyone to talk in length if they did not seem like they had the time or wish to talk to me for too long. In retrospect, I realize that I could probably have asked some informants more questions. After all, they had agreed to participate in my study and were free to leave whenever they wanted.

For further studies, I would recommend conducting an identical study in Copenhagen, Denmark, and compare the results. This would let us see whether the country where the interaction takes place has an effect on how people act and the ideologies they carry. This is especially relevant in relation to the claim that Sweden enjoys a higher status in Scandinavia than Denmark (Schüppert & Gooskens 2011). It may give the Danes an advantage to be on the home turf in Copenhagen just as the Swedes may have an advantage in Malmö.
Another suggestion would be to look further into cultural differences between Danes and Swedes. I asked the shop assistants if they had noticed any differences between Danish and Swedish customers besides their native language and several of them mentioned that the Danes were much messier. The fact that the Swedes have a relatively negative perception about the Danish culture and how the Danes behave in the shop might be an influential factor in how willing the Swedish shop assistants are to accommodate to the Danish customers. I asked many of the shop assistants if they had noticed any cultural differences between the Danes and the Swedes. Most mentioned that the Danes seemed less willing to accept help from them and that they were messy. In Example XXIII Jeanette from Ecco explains her view on the messy Danes.

Example XXIII,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original version (Swedish)</th>
<th>Translation (English) by author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J: Det finns ju svenskar också, men inte alls.</td>
<td>There are Swedes too but it’s a pronounced characteristic, you know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det är ju ett markant drag. Det är ändå så,</td>
<td>They still clean up after themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>att dom städar tillbaka efter sig liksom. Det</td>
<td>What you have looked at and tried on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man har tittat på och provat. Ja. Sen vet jag inte varför det är så. Jag har ingen</td>
<td>Yeah. Then I don’t know why it is like that. I have no idea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aning. Vi har bara lite vatten emellan oss, så jag vet inte vad som är olika.</td>
<td>We only have a puddle of water between us, so I don’t know what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>makes the difference.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this quote, Jeanette is actually referring to the cultural differences between Danes and Swedes. However, I argue that it does relate to the underlying ideologies about language choice. “There is only a little water between us” indicates that since we are so close geographically, we should also be so in regard to language and culture.

Because this study investigates service encounters it is highly relevant in a business context. The encounters are concerned with providing good service to the customers but ultimately the goal is to sell products. In order to fulfill these objectives, successful communication is necessary. The results in this study show that the level of perceived convergence has an impact on how the service encounter plays out and if the customer leaves the shop with a good experience or not. Thus, shop assistants are likely to increase customer satisfaction if they become aware of the implications of their actions, i.e. language choices and accommodation strategies. The more a listener perceives a speaker to converge, the more the listener will think positively of the speaker. However, converging too much may have the opposite effect. Thus, shop assistants must find the right balance in order to
accommodate to their customers at the correct level. Finding this balance is less crucial to the customers as they have less to lose in the service encounter. Of course they are likely to be looking for good service, but if they do not receive it, they can just go shopping somewhere else. The shop assistants are dependent on the customers who enter the shop and so they have to be more forthcoming. It is interesting that the Swedes are more dependent on accommodating in the social situation under investigation, when the general assumption is that Danes are more willing to accommodate.

Even though receptive multilingualism is generally successful in Danish-Swedish encounters, the strong ideology about its superiority does sometimes get in the way of successful communication. When one of the interlocutors simply does not understand the other interlocutor, it can be argued that switching to a language that both are comfortable with is the better choice. In an increasingly globalized world, however, it is an advantage to be able to understand more than one foreign language, and so one could argue that practicing receptive multilingualism and strengthening one’s passive language would be an advantage in this regard. The fact that the use of native languages is so common between Danes and Swedes contradicts Braunmüller’s (2002) claim that people in Europe are not aware of the possibilities and advantages of receptive multilingualism.
6. Conclusion

As my aim was to investigate what determines whether Danes and Swedes respectively use English or their mother tongue when talking to someone with the opposite nationality, I conducted an ethnographic study with participant observation and informal interviews. The combination of the two allowed to explain how speakers adapt their language and how listeners perceive these adaptations (or lack thereof). On a more specific level, I sought to find out to what extent interlocutors make use of receptive multilingualism and alternative languages and why. In the same way, I sought to find out which (additional) accommodation strategies are used most and why. Data showed that accommodation strategies used by Danes and Swedes include (but are not limited to) pauses, slowed speech, codeswitching and are widely used to support the successful use of receptive multilingualism.

Furthermore, it can be concluded that making use of receptive multilingualism is the preference most often occurring in the gathered data. In short, this means that Danes and Swedes in service encounters in Malmö have the following hierarchy when choosing language and accommodation strategies: 1) perfect receptive multilingualism, 2) receptive multilingualism in combination with codeswitching and/or other accommodation strategies, and 3) English as a Lingua Franca.

Given that English as a Lingua Franca is the third and final option is clear that this is the last resort, i.e. something informants/interlocutors only turn to when all other possibilities have been explored. It is important to note that several of the Danish informants indicated that English was okay in certain situations, for example if the context was work-related. The Swedish shop assistants in the observed social situations were all in a work-related situation but they still chose Swedish over English in most cases. Ideologies about language choice reveal that especially the Danes have a strong sense of community with the Swedes, which might strengthen their preference for using receptive multilingualism.

The results of this study can be used in a number of ways. First of all, the Swedish shop assistants can get an insight into how Danes perceive their language choices and accommodation strategies and how it affects communication and ultimately sales. Second, on a more general level, it gives valuable insight into how receptive multilingualism is used in everyday mundane conversation as opposed to many other studies on the topic, which take basis in experimental studies. Finally, it shows that even though English, globally, is the most common lingua franca, there are other options when people with differing mother tongues communicate. Even though the Danish and Swedish informants in this study are very much aware of these options, the results might be relevant for the populations in other border regions where receptive multilingualism is less prevalent.
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Appendices

Appendix A: Filippa K, 19.09.2015

Sandra (ville desværre ikke optages):

- Danskarna är slaviga. Om det har varit många danskar, så finns det mera att städa på kvällen.
- Man kan inte se forskel, når de kommer ind. Det är först, när de begynder att snakke, att man kan høre, att de inte er svenskere.
- Man skal prøve at forstå hinanden. Hvis man forstår, så fortsætter man.
- Det kan være svært at forstå dansk, når de snakker hurtigt.
- Gør det kunden gør. (hvis kunden snakker dansk/slår over i engelsk, gør hun det samme)
- År det skillnad på, hur låtta dom är att förstå?
  "Ja, vissa är lättare, och vissa är lite grötigare, så att säga. Det beror kanske på dialekten."
- Pratar ni engelska ibland?
  "Ja, vi har turister från överallt, så det är inga problem"
- Desuden synes alle, at svenskerne er gode til engelsk, så de går ofte ud fra, at man kan det.
- opfører du dig anderledes, når der kommer en dansk kunde ind end en svensk?
  "Nej, en människa är en människa. En kund är en kund".
- meget fokuseret på at give kunderne en god oplevelse = at yde en god service
- Har mange stamkunder
- Filippa K är som en familj. Man lär sig känna kunderna.
- Det är viktigt att bygga upp en relation; viktigt, att kunden känner sig trygg och får den hjälpen han/hon behöver.
- Hjælpes ad med de andre i butikken, hvis de ikke forstår det, der bliver sagt. Nogle gange, er der ikke nogen, der forstår noget.
- "Service er jätteviktigt. Om folk skall betala 1000 kronor för ett plagg, så måste dom känna sig välkomna i affären"
- "jag älskar att jobba med människor"
- har været i branchen i 11 år
- Sandras succeskriterie for samtalen: "När kunden är glad, er jag glad"
- Har været meget i Danmark for at shoppe.
- Kender dog ikke meget til dansk og kan faktisk ikke nogle danske ord.
Selvom jeg selv taler svensk, så har jeg nogle gange svært ved at forstå, hvad Sandra siger. Hun taler meget skånsk og dermed ligger udtalen langt fra det rigssvenske, som jeg er vant til.

**Lina:**
- Opvokset i Malmø
- "Pratar som vanligt med danskarna"
- "Danskarna svarar alltid "Jeg kigger bare". Dom vill aldrig ha någon hjälp."
- Selv hvis hun spørger, takker danskerne nej til at få hjælp.
- Forsøger først på svensk.
- Kan nogle danske ord, som hun har lært, når hun har mødt danskere. "Vi ligger ju så nära"
- Visa att man är tillmötesgående ved at bruge danske ord, som f.eks. "størrelse" el. "kjole".

**Ebba, Vellinge**
- Opvokset i Vellinge (Skåne)
- Skifter gerne til engelsk, hvis det er nødvendigt, men prøver hellere på svensk ved at skifte ordene ud, tale langsommere osv.
- Ibland hårmar dom svenskarna, når dom säger "hej", men man hör direkt, att dom inte är svenskar.
**Observationer af danske kunder i Filippa K., Malmø kl. 10-13**


**11.00:** To voksne kvinder kommer ind. Omkring 40-45 år gamle.
Lina spørger, om de har brug for hjælp. De svarer "Vi kigger bare" (som Lina havde forudsagt).
De taler dansk/svensk med Sandra og samtalen lader til at forløbe fint.
Sandra: "Vilken storlek?"
Kunde: "Stor hvad?"
De finder ud af det og kunden prøver tøjet på. Nævner, at hun er gravid.
Sandra siger, at kjolen er "snygg". Får ingen respons.

De to kvinder er sammen i prøverummet, hvor de snakker dansk med hinanden. Sandra kommer ikke hen og spørger, hvordan det går. Måske tager hunubevidst de svenske kunder først.
De to kvinder kommer ud af prøverummet og hende, der prøvede kjolen på, udbryder "perfekt!".
Sandra spørger: "Den var bra?"
Kvinde svarer: "Ja, skønt".
På vej til kassen snakker en masse Sandra svensk.

Ved kassen gik det fint og ingen lod umiddelbart til at have misforstået hinanden.

Mine spørgsmål til kvinderne:
*Kommer I tit til Malmø?*
Ja, mindst en gang om året.

*Forstår I altid, hvad svenskerne siger.*
Den ene: Ja, jeg forstod det hele.
Den anden: Det er sjovt, fordi heroppe ved kassen, der forstod jeg det hele, men på vej over fra prøverummet, der kom hun med en lang smøre, og jeg forstod ikke et ord, så jeg sagde bare "ja".

*Hvilket sprog, synes I, man skal vælge, når man snakker med en svensk?*
Helt klart dansk! (hende, der ikke prøvede tøjet)
Ja, jeg synes, man skal prøve. (hende, der ikke forstod, hvad Sandra sagde)
11.15:
Kvinde på omkring 45 er i butikken med sin mand. Taler dansk med Lina og spørger til et bælte. Der er lidt tøven fra kundens side. Måske for at give Lina chancen for at gentage/omformulere, uden at direkte indikere, at man ikke forstår, hvad der bliver sagt. På den måde afværges en potentielt akavet situation. I hvert fald gentager Lina, det hun sagde, og denne gang er der ingen tøven. I prøverummet kommer Lina hen og spørger "Vill du att jag skall kika?"
Kunden svarer: "Hvad?"
Både Lina og kunden lader til at tale relativt langsamt. Altså tilpasser begge deres sprog.

Min samtale med kunden og hendes mand
De er enige om, at man altid bør snakke svensk.
Er i Malmø et par gange om året, men har lært at forstå svensk ved at arbejde sammen med svensker.
Man tilpasser sit sprog: Der er vendinger, man skal undlade eller vælge frem for andre. Derudover kan det hjælpe at tale tydeligere (herunder også langsommere).
Mener begge, at både danskere og svensker uøver denne tilpasning.
Manden uddyber, at det er vigtigt at undlade slang og særlige ord og vendinger. Han arbejdede selv sammen med en mand fra Göteborg, som bruge rigtig meget slang, hvilket betød, at han ikke forstod særlig meget.
Begge synes, de forstår svensk ret godt pga. arbejde.
Mener begge, at man skal prøve at snakke dansk til svensker.

12.15:
Dansk par med baby i barnevogn. De var begge meget stille, men var alligevel længe i butikken.
Kom ind, hilste ikke.
Manden spurgt Lina: "Can I try this on?"
Ekspedient spurgt kvinden: "Passede den?"
Hun svarede meget kort: "Nej."
Nåede desværre ikke at fange dem på vej ud af butikken, da jeg var meget i tvivl, om de overhave det var danskere. Sandra sagde, at det var de.

12.30:
Ægteparret fra tidligere kom tilbage, fordi kvinden gerne ville købe det bælte, hun havde prøvet.
Denne gang blev de ekspederet af Sandra, der taler meget skånsk. Kvinden måtte spørge "Undskyld, hvad?" flere gange.

På vej ud henvendte de sig selv til mig igen.
Manden var ivrig efter at fortælle om sine oplevelser:
Var til jobsamtale for nylig, hvor han valgte at gøre det på engelsk for at være sikker på, at nuancen og fagtermerne blev forstået rigtigt.
"Når kommunikationen er mere letbenet er to sprog okay, men hvis man skal være sikker på, at der ikke sker misforståelser, så slår man over i et andet sprog, man er bedre til".

_Er det sprog altid engelsk?_
Ja, det er det.

12.50:
Et ungt par kommer ind og går rundt i butikken. De har faktisk ingen kommunikation med de ansatte, men går bare for sig selv.
Vælger altid dansk. "Medmindre det er noget meget teknisk – så slår man over i engelsk". 
De er tit i Sverige. Hans moster bor i Skåne.
"det plejer at fungere fint" (på dansk-svensk, red.)

_Generelle observationer_
- Danskerne virker mindre interesserede i hjælp fra de ansatte
- I mine undersøgelser i Danmark har svenskerne en mindre grad af frihed i forhold til at kommunikere med danskerne. Hvis man er på restaurant, er man nødt til at bestille mad. På hostelet er man også nødt til at checke ind. I en tøjbutik kan kontakten minimere til et evt. køb. Man er ikke tvunget til at tage i mod vejledning fra de ansatte, hvis man ikke ønsker det.
- Jeg er mere opmærksom, når der ikke bliver optaget. Når bedre at høre, hvad de siger i stedet for allerede at tænke på det næste spørgsmål, jeg skal stille.
- Til gengæld når jeg jo ikke at skrive alt ned, men må i situationen beslutte, hvad der er vigtigt og uvæsentligt. Jeg går sikkert glip af nogle vigtige/interessante detaljer.
- Det lader til at være en kæmpe fordel for kommunikationen, at ekspedienterne er så udadvendte.
- Tanke: Når man kun har kort tid til at snakke med kunderne, mens de er på vej ud af butikken, er det bedre ikke at optage, for så taler de mere frit. Måske kunne man optage interviewet og så spørge dem bagefter, om det var okay?
Appendix B: Ecco, 26.09.15

Time: 10-15

Ansat: Jeanette

Den første times tid er der meget få kunder og jeg forsøger at lære Jeanette lidt bedre at kende, når der ikke er kunder. Hun fortæller (uopfrodret) om butikken og kædens omsætning. De har forskellige konkurrencer mellem butikkerne for at øge salget. Dem der øger mest i forhold til samme dag sidste år kan vinde 1000 kr til ”trivselskassan” og dem der sælger flest herresko kan vinde yderligere 1000 kr.

Jeanette har arrangeret en børnekonkurrence, som hun beder mig om at hjælpe til med. På den måde kan jeg også bedre blive en del af butikken, så folk ikke studser over, hvad jeg laver der.

35:00 - Jeanett fortæller om salget og kædens forventninger til hver enkelt butik. Ecco er kendt for ”kvalitet och komfort”.

c.a. 1.02.00:
M1: Do you have this in fortyfive?
S: Jeg arbejder her faktisk ikke, jeg er bare på besøg, men Jeanette kan hjælpe dig lige om lidt.

M1: Denne her.
J: I den størleken?
M1: Ja.
J: Och du? (henvendt til den anden)
M2: Og den her i storlek fyrtiosex.
<grin i baggrunden>
J: Mmh, då ska vi se... fyrtiofem bara.
M2: Hmm... Nej.
...
J: Vill du prova på då?
M1: Hvad?
J: Vill du prova?
M1: Nej, jag har prøvet.
J: Ja, så behåller jag dem där, så tar jag hand om dom här. Så kör vi på dom svarta också?
Svensk dame: Ja. (Jeanette betjener damen, mens de danske mænd venter og snakker med hinanden)
J: Ja, då kör vi dom här.
M1: Ja.
J: Vad behöver du för skovård?
M1: (lidt pause inden svar) Nej tak. Det har jeg.
J: Skokräm?
DM1: Det har jeg.
Ja: Det har du.
M1: Ja.
J: Då tar vi skorna för 999, tak.
M1: Ja.
(Jeanette pakker skoene ned, koden trykkes)
M1: I lige måde.
J: Ja.
M2: Så må jeg have den der. (et plejeprodukt)
J: Ja, det behöver man väl alltid.
M2: Så tager jeg også sådan et her. (tager et bolsje)
J: Ja, varsågoda och ta. (Bipper varen ind). 110 kronor tak.
M2: Ja.
J: Vill du ha en påse?
M2: Undskyld?
J: Du vill ha en påse, va?
M2: Om jeg vil have en pose? Ja tak.
J: Ja.
M2: Ja tak.
(koden trykkes)
M2: Tak for det.
J: Hej.
M2: Hej.
<Jeg stopper dem på vej ud og spørger om de har tid til et par spørgsmål>

S: Det er fordi jeg er ved at undersøge, hvordan danskere og svenskere kommunikerer...
M1: Ja! (meget entusiastisk)
S: ... så jeg har faktisk lige optaget jer derinde.
M1: Va? haha
S: Jeg skal lige høre, om det er okay, at jeg bruger det i min opgave?
M1: Selvfølgelig.
S: Super. Tusind tak for det. Og så har jeg nogle spørgsmål. Hvis I har tid.
M1: Ja.
S: De tager ikke så lang tid.
M2: Du spørger bare løs.
S: Fedt. Øhm... Hvilket sprog taler I normalt, når I kommer ind i en butik i Sverige?
M1: Det er forskelligt - du oplevede det i elv.
M2: Ja. (begge griner)
S: Ja.
M2: Jeg snakker dansk eller engelsk.
S: Hvad er det, der afgør, om du vælger det ene eller det andet?
M2: Øh, om den, der står i butikken, kan finde ud af at forstå mit danske. For jeg kan ikke et klap svensk.
S: Okay, men du lagde ud på engelsk til, da du troede, jeg var ansat?
M2: Nej, det gjorde jeg ikke, det gjorde du (peger over på den anden mand)
M1. Ja, det gjorde jeg.
S: Det var dig.
S: For at lette forståelsen med det samme? Ja. Øhm... Har I været meget i Sverige? Er I tit i Sverige?
M2: Jeg arbejder med svenskere.
S: Okay. Er I gode til at forstå svensk, selv?
M2: Ja.
M1: Arh, nej. Jeg er ikke. Det fordi jeg kommer... Jeg er tilflyttet til Sjælland, så jeg er mest vokset op med tysk og ikke så meget svensk, så jeg er ikke god til svensk.
S: Nej. Men du kan noget, som du har lært gennem arbejde?
M2: Ja. at forstå svensk, det er ikke noget problem. Så det er mere at få svenskere til at forstå mig.
M1: Det er ikke kun svenskerne, Troels. hahaha
S: Okay. Sidste spørgsmål. Ej, to spørgsmål. Hvad tror I er det sværeste for svenskerne ved dansk?
M1: Vi snakker hurtigt.
M2: Ja, det gør vi sikkert nok også. Så er der lidt med tallene og nogle ting og sager. Jeg tror, det er lidt af det hele.
S: Ja. Og hvad med den anden vej rundt, hvad er sværest for jer med svensk?
M1: Det er alle de ting, der hedder noget komplett anderledes, end øh... Altså, at man forsøger nogle gange at gøre et dansk ord svensk ved bare at udtale det på en lidt anden måde, men jordbær hedder nu engang ikke jordbær på svensk uanset, hvordan fa'en du forsøger at udtale det. Øh, så for mig, der er det... Der er bare nogle ting som...
M2: Shoppe tasker eller sådan noget
M1: Ja, lige præcis, som hedder noget komplett andet eller som øh... Så det er dét, der gør det svært, synes jeg.
S: Okay.
M1: Og jeg forstår sgu ikke alle de der... Der er for mange ord, jeg slet ikke forstår. Altså man forstår godt brudstykker, men øh... men ikke.. Ja, jeg kan ikke forstå en hel samtale på svensk.
M2: Som sagt, det er ikke noget problem for mig. Jeg har arbejdet med svenskere.
S: Hvor er du vokset op henne?
M2: På Sjælland.
M1: Ja, og du har sådan en kone, der er halvt svensk næsten, ikke? Noget svensk familie.
M2: Jaa, det er rigtigt. Det er rigtigt.
M1: Du er næsten indfødt.
M2: 10 år i en skandinavisk branche, så går det fint.
S: Det var bare det, jeg ville høre. Tusind tak for hjælpen. Hav en god dag.
M1/2: Det var så lidt. I lige måde.

KL. 11.28: Yngre par (midt 20'erne) går selv rundt i butikken. Ingen kontakt med personalet.

S: Undskyld? Må jeg stille jer nogle spørgsmål?
M: Ja.
S: Det er fordi jeg er ved at lave en undersøgelse om, hvordan danskere og svensker kommunikere og hvilket sprog, de plejer at vælge.
M: Okay.
S: Og nu nåede jeg selvfølgelig ikke at snakke med dem derinde, men ...
M: Vi kan svare på andre oplevelser.
S: Ja. Må jeg optage det?
M: Ja, det er fint.
S: Okay. Tak. Hvilket sprog plejer I at vælge, når I snakker med nogle svenskere i Sverige?
M: Må man godt sige halv/halv, fordi...
K: Ja, det tror jeg også.
S: Ja, det må man gerne.
M: Fordi det kommer lidt an på altså... Nogle gange så ender det bare på engelsk på én eller anden måde. Inden man overhovedet har fået testet, om det kunne have lykkedes på nationalsproget, men jeg tror, jeg ville foretrække at gøre det på nationalsproget, sådan ud fra... Man føler sådan lidt, at det er forkert at stå og snakke engelsk med en svensk. Vi burde kunne forstå hinanden.
S: Ja. Okay. Men hvad er det så, tror du, at man nogle gange kommer til at slå over i engelsk alligevel?
M: Det er hvis det skal gå lidt hurtigt.
K: Hvis det skal gå hurtigt eller hvis det sådan er lidt mere kompliceret.
S: Så hvis man skal være sikker på, at man forstår hinanden?
K: Ja.
M: Ja.
K: Ja, det vil jeg sige.
M: Noget i den stil, ja.
S: Er I gode til at forstå svensk?
K: Nej.
S: Nej?
M: Jeg synes, jeg er blevet okay. Jeg har arbejdet sammen med en svensk. Det gjorde i hvert fald, at jeg har fået en helt anderledes, kan man sige, forståelse for det, end jeg havde.
S: Ja. Så det er ikke noget, man lærer, når man er i Sverige?
M: Hvis man var her i noget tid, så ville jeg tro, man gjorde. Altså det handler nok om, at man skal vænne sig til at høre sproget.
S: Ja. Hvad er det sværeste ved svensk, synes I?
K: Mmm, det er svært at sige. Altså jeg synes, det er svært, når det går hurtigt.
S: Ja. Udtalen eller hvad?
K: Ja.
M: Så er der også de der falske venner, hvor der er et ord, der minder om noget på dansk, og så betyder det noget helt andet på svensk. Jeg kan ikke huske... Jeg ved i hvert fald, at "hyggeligt" på dansk, det forstår de slet ikke på svensk. Jeg tror, det betyder... Nej, jeg tror, den er måske ikke så slem, men der er et eller andet ord på dansk, som betyder noget andet på svensk. Som er et ret brugt dansk ord. Jeg kan ikke engang huske, hvad det er.

K: Ja.

M: Sådan så man tror, man har fanget et eller andet, men øh...

S: Ja. Hvad så med den anden vej rundt, hvordan oplever I, at svenskerne forstår jer, og hvad tror I er det sværeste for dem ved dansk?

M: Jeg tror, de synes, vi mumler.


S: Ja, okay.

M: Jeg tror, de synes, at det kører sådan helt monotont, at de slet ikke kan...

K: Jeg synes, der er mange, der siger, at det lyder lidt som en fuld svensker.

S: Ja.

M: Så, det tror jeg. Men det virker som om tit, i hvert fald tidligere har jeg haft en fornemmelse af, at de forstod os bedre end vi forstod dem.

K: Ja, det synes jeg også. Men jeg ved ikke hvorfor. Hvad det er baseret på.

M: Og så nordmænd og svenskere, det er en helt anden historie, de forstår hinanden fuldstændigt åbenbart. Og så danskerne ligger udenfor.

K: Ja.

S: Okay. Jeg skal lige høre, hvor I er vokset op henne, bare sådan dialektmæssigt?

M: I Jylland.

K: I Jylland.

S: Ja. Fint. Det var bare det, jeg ville høre.

M: Super.

S: Tusind tak for hjælpen.


S: Hej. Tak.

11.35. Emmelie er mødt på arbejde.

S: Hej. Simone.

E: Hej. Emmelie.

S: Hej.
E: Och du ska vara här i dag?
S: Ja, jag gör en undersökning om hur danskar och svenskar pratar med varandra.
E: Ja. Trevligt.
S: Ja. Har du haft många?
E: Jag är rett dålig på danska faktiskt.
S: Är du?
E: I butiken är jag ju bra, där kan man förstå ganska lätt, men typ när jag är i Köpenhamn... Jag har jättesvårt för att förstå, när dom pratar snabbt.
S: Okej. Vad är det som är svårt?
E: Jag vet inte.
S: Orden eller uttalet eller...?
E: Ja, jag vet inte. Jag vet bara, att jag har fastnat i, att jag tycker att ska vara svårt för mig.
S: Ja. Men det brukar funka här eller?
S: Ja, det är det.
...
S: Kan du berätta lite om vilket språk du brukar välja och varför?
J: Vad sa du?
S: Ja. Är det något särskilt, som är svårt? Siffrorna eller...?
J: Ja, usch, det kommer jag aldrig lära mig. <griner>
S: Haha, det kommer du aldrig lära dig?
S: Ja.
J: Eller hur?
S: Ja.
J: Halvfjerds och halvfems och...
S: Dom behövs inte med storleken i alla fall.
S: Du behöver bara lära dig fyrtio-någonting.
J: Haha hahaha. Nej, men det är... Nej, men jag tycker att det funkar bra. Absolut. Så vi får hoppas att det kommer lite... Här var ju någon.
S: Jag har pratat med fyra redan.
S: Ja, jag har sprungit efter dom.

--

Kl. 12.05
Mand + kvinde kommer ind. Går selv rundt og kigger uden at kontakte/blive kontaktet af personalet. Mandens telefon ringede, da de stod ved udgangen, så jeg nåede ikke at snakke med dem, men de snakkede jo ikke med andre end hinanden, så der var alligevel ikke meget at kommentere på.


--

Mand + kvinde i midten af 30’erne:
S: Må jeg stille dig nogle spørgsmål? Jer begge to?
M: Det må du gerne.
S: Det er fordi jeg er ved at lave en undersøgelse om, hvordan danskere og svenske kommunikere, og så... Ja. Må jeg optage det? Bare så jeg kan huske det.
M+K: Ja ja.
S: Tak. Første spørgsmål er, hvilket sprog l plejer at vælge, når I snakker med svenskere?
K: Jeg prøver sådan lidt dansk/svensk, tror jeg.
M: Dansk/svensk, ja.
S: Ja. Hvad gør du for at tilpasse det?
M: Jeg arbejder sammen med nogle, der også er svenskere. Så nogle gange er det... Ellers så skifter jeg over til engelsk.
S: Okay. Hvad er det, der gør, at man kan skifte over til engelsk?
M: Det er mere, hvis det er noget teknisk, man skal snakke om.
S: Ja.
M: Så er engelsk nemmere. Og man er sikker på, man forstår det.
S: Ja. Er der en grund til, at I vælger dansk frem for engelsk i første omgang?
K: Ja, det er bare...
M: Jeg tror, det er mere convenient.
K: Jeg kan simpelthen ikke, tror jeg, det er mærkeligt at vælge engelsk først. Tit så; de kan godt forstå, hvad jeg siger på dansk, og jeg kan nogen gange også godt forstå, men det er sværest på svensk.
S: Okay.
M: Og hvis man bruger simple ord, så er det nemmere.
S: Så man tilpasser sit sprog lidt på den måde også?
K: Ja.
S: Okay. Hvad, øh.. Hvad, synes I, er det sværeste ved svensk?
S: Ja. Altså mad-ord?
K: Ja.
M: Også når de snakker hurtigt.
K: Når de snakker hurtigt, ja.
M: Jeg kan som oftest forstå det, hvis folk snakker langsomt.
S: Okay. Så det er mere udtalen. Så hvis I skal læse noget, er det så nemmere?
M: Meget nemmere.
K: Meget nemmere.
S: Okay. Og hvad tror I så, at de synes er det sværeste ved dansk?
K: Det er sikkert det samme; at vi snakker hurtigt, når vi snakker dansk.
S: Ja. Det var sådan set det, tror jeg.
K: Okay.
M: Det var godt.
S: Tusind tak for hjælpen. Hav en god dag.
K: Velbekomme.

**KL. 13.35**


Kvinden med skoen spørger Jeanette, om en anden størrelse. Her ændrer hun sin udtale, så den minder mere om svensk og siger også tallene (39 og 40) på svensk.

*Interview*

K1: Med et bolsje i munden.
S: Det gør ikke noget.
K1: Nej, vel?
S: Det finder vi ud af. Øh... Hvad for et sprog plejer I at vælge, når I skal snakke med svenskere? Jeg kunne høre, at du ...
K2: Det er engelsk, normalt... Ej, det er lidt blandet. Fordi jeg bor herovre og jeg har boet her i næsten 6 år. Så det sådan; hvis de forstår mit svenske, snakker jeg sådan dansk/svensk. Øh, men der er nogen, de forstår det overhovedet ikke. Så slår jeg over i engelsk.
S: Okay, men du starter som udgangspunkt på dit dansk/svenske, og så går du over til engelsk bag-efter?
K2: Ja, hvis det er nogle af de ord, jeg kan udtale. Hvis jeg ved på forhånd, at jeg ikke kan komme igennem med det så, så gør jeg det på engelsk.
S: Okay. Og hvad med dig?
K1: Det er nok det mest danske, ikke?
K2: Jo.
K1: Ja. Det er mest dansk, jeg snakker til dem. Altså så kan jeg måske et enkelt svensk ord, som jeg så lige siger "tack så mycket" eller et eller andet, ikke?
K2: Ja, og ellers oversætter jeg.
K1: Ja.
S: Så du forstår...?
K1: Jeg forstår også godt...
K2: Jeg forstår det meste.
K1: Ja. Jeg kan godt forstå det.
S: Hvad er det sværeste ved svensk?
S: Nej. Hvad så, når du lytter til svensk, hvad er så det sværeste at forstå?
K2: Det er når de snakker hurtigt.
K1: Ja.
K2: Så får jeg svært ved sådan at få fat i ordene.
K1: Ja, når de snakker... Hvis de snakker stille og roligt, så synes jeg også, så kan jeg godt følge det, ikke også...
S: Ja. Hvad tror I så, de synes, er det sværeste ved dansk?
K1: Det hele. Jamen, jeg synes mange... de har meget svært ved vores sprog. Altså.
K2: Ja. Jeg ved ikke, hvad det er, de synes, der er svært, men det er som om de opgiver fra starten. Det er meget få herovre, synes jeg, der er villige til at forstå, hvis man ikke snakker flydende svensk.
K1: Ja.
S: Okay, forventer de så... Hvad forventer de så, at du gør?
K2: Snakker svensk.
S: At du snakker svensk?
K1: Så ikke den der velvillighed til at prøve og lytte det danske sprog.
K2: Det er der nogen der er, og der også nogen, der er rigtig gode. Og der er også nogle, der har for- talt mig, at de fatter ikke, at folk ikke forstår mig, hvis jeg slår over i det svenske. men øhm.
S: Okay. Så det er meget forskellige, hvad man møder?
K2: Ja. Så tror jeg også, at det er mange af dem, der har en anden, altså et andet oprindeligt sprog.
Hvis så jeg ikke kan snakke... Altså fordi de har jo ikke måske den relation til det danske sprog, så
snakker jeg ikke flydende svensk, så kan de ikke følge med, fordi de ikke har hørt det danske måske
så meget. Dem er der jo ret mange af i Malmø, der har enten østeuropæisk eller arabisk, afghansk
baggrund. Så synes de, det er svært ligesom at koble de to sprog sammen. Fordi for dem, der lyder
det vidt forskelligt. De kan ikke høre sammenligningen.
S: Jeg skal lige høre, hvor I sådan er vokset op henne i Danmark?
K2: Jeg er vokset op i Århus.
S: Okay. I Jylland.
K1: København.
S: København.
K2: men har boet i Jylland nærmest hele...
K1: Ja ja, men jeg voksede op...
S: Det er bare for dialekten, jeg kan godt høre, at der er lidt forskel.
K1: Ja, jeg er født i København. Og det også derfor, jeg tror, at jeg godt kan det svenske, fordi vi så
faktisk meget svensk fjernsyn, da jeg var barn.
K2: Og da jeg flyttede herover, der kunne jeg jo ikke et ord. Jeg forstod norsk, jeg forstod intet
svensk. Så det er simpelthen af at bo herovre, at det er kommet.
K1: Du har da undret dig nogle gange over nogle ord, jeg kan på svensk faktisk, ikke også, altså så-
dan.
S: Som du har lært ved at se fjernsyn?
K1: Ja, via fjernsynet fra da jeg var barn. Der sad vi bare og så svensk, ikke også, så ja.
S: Tusind tak for hjælpen.
K1: Det er bare i orden. Held og lykke med det.
S: Tak. Hej.
Appendix C: Ecco, 15.10.15.

Time: 10-17
Torsdag i danskernes efterårsferie.

Generelle observationer

- Jeanette siger ikke ”också”, men den skånske udgave ”osså”, som jo minder mere om den danske.
- De første danskere kom kl. 11.50. Sagde ”hej” og gik igen med det samme. Samme situation kl. 12.55.
- Eftersom det var en meget stille dag, hjalp jeg til med at pakke varer ud og sætte dem på plads på lageret i kælderen.
- Jeanette siger: ”Danskarna städar inte efter sig” (…) ”Jaha, det syns, att danskarna har varit här liksom”.

Kl. 13.45: Dansk mor og datter kommer ind, men gik inden for to minutter uden at sige andet end ”hej” til Jeanette. Jeanette spottede dem med det samme med kommentaren ”Danskarna är inte lika updaterade på mode”

14.15: to søstre og den enes to sønner.

Moa kommer ca. 14.45 og tager over, så Jeanette kan holde frokostpause.

M: Jobbar du här eller?

M: Hur gör du då, när du ska undersöka?
M: Ja, kanske det.
S: Vill du det?
M: Jag är ju väldigt dålig på det danska.
S: Varför det?
M: Jag tycker, det är svårt att förstå i bland, ja.
S: Vad är det som är svårt?
M: Det är svårt att... för mig är det otydligt, för jag tänker, att orden är svenska. Och så blir det otydligt i mitt huvud.
S: Men du är inte från Skåne?
S: Ja. Men det är du inte?
M: Nej.
S: Inte än. Okej. Hur eller när brukar du upptäcka att det är en dansk och inte en svensk, som är i affären?
S: Ja. Vilket språk brukar du välja, när du pratar med dom?
M: I början danska. Eller inte danska, jag börjar med svenska och är det så, att vi inte förstår varandra... För någon av dom blir sura, när jag använder engelska, men då använder jag engelska till sist för att det är viktigt, att vi förstår varandra i stället för att göra maktkamp på att vi inte förstår varandra.
S: Så du börjar på svenska och sen...?
M: Ja. I fall det inte funkar, så tar jag engelska. För jag ska kunna ge den bästa servicen här liksom.
S: Ja. Har du varit i Danmark?
M: Ja.
S: Har du lärt dig lite danska där? Kan du några danska ord?
M: Ja, lite. Det simplaste, ja.
S: Mm. Något som du använder när du jobbar?
M: Mm. Alltså jag förstår ju färgerna har jag typ lärt mig lite. Typ att man ska tänka "lyserød", sånna... Hur dom kopplar vissa ord, som inte vi gör, så jag förstår, men annars... Inte så, nej.
S: Vad tycker du om det danska språket? Du får vara helt ärlig.
S: Nej. Vad är svåraste när du ska förstå danska?
S: Ja. Vad tror du är det svåraste för dom, när dom ska förstå svenska? Har du märkt någonting?
M: Mmh, dom tycker min svenska är svår.
S: Svårare än skånskan?
M: Ja. Det kan bli så här i bland; förstår ingenting.
S: Var tror du det beror på?
S: Jo, det var väl det, tror jag. Finns det något mera du vill säga?
M: Nej.
S: Nå. Tack så jätte mycket.

To kvinder
K1: Det kommer an på, hvor i Sverige, det er.
S: Okay.
K1: Så derfor, hvis man er længere oppe, så slår man lidt over i svensk og blander nogle svenske ord ind, men hernede kan man ligeså godt tage den på dansk.
S: Så I bor i Sverige?
K1: Nej. Har gjort.
S: Okay. Fint nok. Så hvilket sprog, synes I, primært, man skal vælge, når man snakker med en svenska?
K1: Dansk, tror jeg.
S: Dansk. Ja. Er der nogle situationer, hvor man kunne vælge et andet sprog i stedet for?
K1: Tænker du på et eller andet?
K2: Jeg hørte ikke spørgsmålet.
K1: Om der er en situation, hvor du ville vælge noget andet end dansk til en svensker?
K2: Det tror jeg ikke. I nødstilfælde ville jeg vælge engelsk.
K1: Ville du det?
K2: Ja. Hvis jeg ikke var sikker nok på, at jeg ville kunne forstå det. Alle kan noget engelsk jo.
S: Jeg ville ikke forstyrre mere. Tak skal I have.
(...) 

S: År det skillnad på hur dom danska och svenska kunderna klär sig? 
S: Dom sa det på Filippa K också.
J: Dom gjorde det, ja?
S: Ja.

(... meget svært at høre, præcis hvad der bliver sagt pga. høj musik, men det handler om, at danskerne ikke rydder op efter sig):


<telefonen ringer>

Kunden, som Moa først snakkede engelsk med:
K: Og derfor var jeg lidt overrasket over, at hun ikke helt forstod, hvad det var vi sagde.
S: Ja. Og så skiftede hun til engelsk. Hvas synes I om det?
K: Det synes jeg er forkert. Ligesom når jeg rejser til Norge, så forsøger man også at kommunikere på skandinavisk.
M: For mig er det lige meget. Jeg kan alle sprog.
K: Nu skal vi jo forholde os til spørgsmålet.. Men altså. Fordi oppe i den anden deroppe, der er ingen problemer.
S: Der var ikke nogle problemer?
K: Nej.
M: Jamen, det er rigtig nok. Det er svært, nogle gange snakker vi dansk til nogen, så forstod de det, nogen gange har de overhovedet ikke forstået det. Sådan har det været hele tiden.
K: Sådan har det altid være, også da vi boede herøvre.
S: Okay. Men hvad tror I, der er det sværeste for dem ved dansk?
M: Jeg tror, vi taler for snabbt og så, øh...
K: For hurtigt, ja.
M: For hurtigt.
K: Jamen, det ved jeg ikke, fordi jeg synes, jeg prøver at finde nogle ord, som jeg forventer, de forstår. Eller formulere det på en anden måde.
M: Problemet er at sige sjuttisju.
K: Ja, det med 7, det er ikke så godt.
S: Det gik da meget godt.
K: Ja, det er jeg ikke så god til.
S: Nej.
K: Men ellers så har jeg ingen... Fordi da vi boede derovre, når vi handlede henne i Karoli derhenne, så sagde de til mig, at de forstod, hvad jeg sagde, men de forstod ikke, hvad han sagde. Og det blev han forbundet over.
S: Men er der forskel på jeres dialekt eller noget? Kommer I samme sted fra?
K: Ja, vi kommer fra København begge to. Så det... Og jeg har familie i Helsingborg, så jeg har selvfølgelig holdt ferie herovre som barn, men øh... Også da vi har boet her, der har sådan set heller ikke være problemer. Det er nogle bestemte, der har problemer, har jeg lagt mærke til.
S: Okay. Og så skifter man til engelsk?
K: Ja. Ja, så går man sådan lidt i baglås.
M: Generelt synes jeg ikke, eller jeg gør ikke.
K: Det er ikke dig, jeg taler om. Det er forretningerne, Knud.
M: Jo, men jeg synes ikke...
K: Nej, men jeg har oplevet det selv, når jeg shopper, ikke?
S: Ja. Er der nogle situationer, hvor du selv ville skifte til engelsk eller et andet sprog?
K: Hmm. Jeg vil helst fortsætte på... Så prøver jeg på noget svensk. Jeg prøver at finde et ord. Men så er der også nogle gange, de ikke vil forstå, hvad jeg siger. Sådan oplever man det. men sådan er vi vel også selv derhjemme nogle gange, ikke?
M: men det går jo det meste. Tjena, tjena, hur är läget?, osv., ikke?
S: Ja.
K: Altså hun havde et klart problem med at forstå dansk. Og så svært synes jeg ikke, det var, det jeg forsøgte at sige. Jeg bad hende om en størrelse 39, og så spurgte jeg hende, om det var en model, der hed "sculpture". Sculpture det er et bestemt læs, de har. En model, jeg har siddet og kigget på nettet, ikke?
S: Ja ja. Og så forstod hun det ikke.
K: Hun forstod det godt, da jeg sagde Sculpture på engelsk og mig bekendt, lyder det ens.
M: Årh, men er hun ikke god nok eller hvordan? Jeg synes ikke, der var noget i vejen med hende.
K: Der var ikke noget kritik, altså det var bare...
S: Men, men... Så du har ikke noget i mod, at man skifter til engelsk. Ville du i højere grad gøre det?
M: Næh. Hvis folk ikke forstår mig, så gør jeg det på engelsk.
K: Jeg har jo heller ikke noget problem med det, jeg synes bare, det er forkert.
M: Fordi hvis ikke vi kan kommunikere, så jeg får det, jeg vil have, så går jeg bare et andet sted hen.
K: Vi har ikke haft nogle problemer. Vi har været ude i Willy:s og i overskudsbolaget derude på Katrinalund, og der var ingen problemer, selvom de slog forkert ind på kassen og sådan nogle ting.
M: Ja, det var irriterende. Der blev jeg forbandet.
S: Ja. Undskyld, hvad skulle du til at sige.
M: Jeg siger, man bliver lidt forbandet... Det er meget tit, synes jeg, i store supermarkeder, at - også i Danmark - det er forkert slået ind. Når man kommer op og køber noget, så har man set i bladet, hvad det koster, og så når man kommer op til kassen, så slår de noget andet ind.
K: Det kan de jo ikke...
M: Nej, men det sker hver gang.
K: Ved du hvad, nu skal jeg altså op i den anden og hente de sko, jeg har bestilt.
S: Tusind tak for hjælpen. Kan I have en god dag.
S: Hej.

Ecco:

**Mor og datter, hvor datteren har lært svensk på en måned**

Meget utydeligt, da de står i henne i kvindeafdelingen - modsat af kassen, hvor optageren liggere på disken.

K1: Kan det være dem herovre?
M: Kan jeg hjælpe?
K1: Jaa, det var nogle sorte og hvide nogle, sådan nogle sko... Jeg har set dem til Ecco Walkathon i København.
M: I någon affär?
M: Påminde den om denna?
K2: Nej.
M: Nää. Var det en sportssko?
K2: Ja, neej, ikke sådan.
Utydeligt tale, men de fortsætter med at prøve at finde ud af, hvad det er for en sko, kunden mener. K2 er mor og K1 er datteren, der senere (i interviewet) fortæller, at hun kan svensk, men hun bruger det ikke her.

K2: men nogle gange har I noget andet herovre. 
M: Jo, så klart. 
K2: Nåh, men det var bare dét, vi kiggede efter. Tak. 

**Interview med mor og datter**

S: Så sætter jeg lige den i gang. Hvilket sprog plejer I at vælge, når I skal snakke med svenskere? 
K1: Hun kan svensk. 
K2: Jeg kan svensk, så jeg prøver at tage den på svensk. 
S: Okay. 
K1: Jeg snakker dansk. 
S: Du snakker dansk. 
K1: Ja, jeg tager dansk. 
S: Er der en særlig grund til, at I vælger dét frem for et andet sprog? 
K1: Nej, altså jeg forstår, hvad de siger. Nogle gange.
S: Ja. Er der noget særligt, der er svært ved svensk, synes du? 
K2: Men jeg tror altså... Nu har jeg... Jeg har lært det sådan lynhurtigt og har selvlært ved at snakke det. Og altså, jeg synes, vi er jo så tæt på hinanden sprogligmæssigt, så lad os da snakke dansk og svensk i stedet for at slå over på engelsk. Det synes jeg er tosset. 
K2: Så hellere prøve et par gange og sige "det forstod jeg ikke lige" og så altså, så finder man jo ofte ud af det. Det er jo sjældent, at når det er sådan noget shopping, at det er så sværere ord. Det er jo mere, hvis du sidder i en eller anden teknisk situation, så kan det godt være, man slet ikke kan forstå det, ikke? 
S: Okay. Ville det være en situation, hvor...? 
K2: Ja, der kunne det godt være, hvis det var sådan helt teknisk på en eller anden svær... 
K1: Her er det jo mange gange bare om størrelser: Har I den mindre eller større?
K2: Ja, og hej og farvel og tak for i dag, kan man sige. men hvis det bliver sådan mere teknisk, tænker jeg, i forhold til - jeg ved ikke, hvad det skulle være, men, arbejdsrelateret måske - så kunne det være lidt mere at slå over i engelsk.
S: Hvor det var lidt mere vigtigt, at...
K2: Ja, lige præcis. Ja. Menellers så synes jeg vi tager det... Jeg prøver bare.
K1: Ja ja.
K2: Ja, men det er lidt gebrokkent, men øh.. Jeg...
K1: Arh, jeg synes, du er god.
K2: Du er heller ikke svensker. <griner>
K1: Nej.
S: Er det så du føler... Nej, nu skal jeg lige finde ud af, hvad det er, jeg vil spørge om. Altså er der noget ved dansk, som l oplever, at de synes er sværere, eller som du måske mærker forsvinder, når du så prøver at snakke svensk? Forstå du, hvad jeg spørger om?
K1: Altså i forhold til at de forstår, hvad jeg siger eller?
S: Ja, altså når man snakker dansk, er der så noget, l oplever, at svenskerne synes er særligt svært ved det danske sprog?
K2: Nåårh.
K1: Jeg tror, det er ens. Altså jeg tror det, de oplever nogle gange, det er.. Der er nogle ord, de ikke fanger. Det tror jeg er på samme måde, som vi ikke lige; hey, hvad betød det ord egentlig? Altså jeg tror, det er det samme. Der synes jeg, vi ligger meget ens. Så langt er der jo heller ikke i mellem.
K2: Det er også et spørgsmål om vilje, tænker jeg.
K1: Det er det også, ja.
K2: Hvis folk har... Altså hvis det skal gå stærkt, så er det måske lettere nogle gange at slå over i engelsk; er der mange, der måske har den holdning. Jeg synes, det er et spørgsmål om lige...
K1: ... tage sig tid til det.
K2: ... have tålmodighed og så lige "hvad var det lige, du sagde der?". Og så sværere synes jeg heller ikke det er. Jeg læste det på en måned, ikke? Det er bare at snakke det. Og det tror jeg ikke er fordi jeg har et specielt godt sprogøre, det tror jeg bare er et spørgsmål om, at hvis du er tvunget til at snakke det, så gør man det jo. Og så kommer det ret naturligt.
S: Ja. Sidste spørgsmål.
K2: Ja.
S: Øh... Gør I noget for at tilpasse jeres sprog, når I snakker på dansk til en svensker.
K2: Ja, altså man kan jo... Nogle gange kan jeg godt, hvis der er nogle ord, som man godt, som du siger med "tasker", hvis der er nogle ord, man godt ved, at det hedder det ikke på svensk. Og der er
nogle enkelte ord, jamen, så kan jeg da godt prøve at snakke dansk og så sige det; ordet på svensk.
Lige præcis det ord, hvor jeg ved, at det forstår de ikke.
K2: Det tænker jeg nok egentlig, det er nok det.
K1: Ja, det siger jeg også.
K2: Jeg synes, det går meget godt. Vi er da ikke gået galt i byen endnu. Det er det vigtigste.
K1: Nej, nej. Vi har da fået det hele i de rigtige størrelser. Ha ha ha ha.
S: Tusind tak for det.
K2: Hvad bruger du det til?
S: Jeg er ved at skrive speciale.
K2: Nåårh, okay.
S: Så jeg skriver om sprogvalg og om hvordan kommunikationen rent faktisk foregår. Det er meget spændende.
S: Tak for det. Hej.

Moa:
S: Det låt som at det gik bättre med dom två?
Moa: Ja, jag tror att jag försöker mer för att du är här också. Så jag måste förstå.
S: Nej. Haha. Nå, men var det lättare eller?
Moa: Jo. Det var lättare, för dom sa ord, som jag förstod. Svart och vit.
S: Jahaaa.

Mor og datter fra Hvidovre

M = Moa
D: Okay.
M: Just för att dom är behandlat, dom här är behandlade med Eccos produkter. Och Eccos produkter är dom bästa innom vård. Så att, skulle det vara någon skillnad, när ni använder ett sämre märke; byt till Ecco i så fall, när ni märker att det inte går in lika bra.
D: Okay.
M: Do you understand me?
D: Ja ja. Ja ja, ork ja.
M: Yes.
D: Øhm...
P: Skal vi købe de produkter eller hvad?
D: Har du spray eller...?
M: Ja, då är det ju den. Ja, precis. Och så är det ju svart skokräm. Och så är det; det här lägger man
(...) så du tvättar, så lägger du på skokrämen, så putsar du in den (...) och sen så lägger du på im-
pregneringen, så att de ska sitta kvar och skydda mot väder och sånt. Vilken av dom?
D: (...) 
M: Ja. Nu ska vi se. Den här ligger på 110 och den här ligger på 100. Jag har för mig att den har gått
ner i pris. Vi kikar här helt enkelt.
D: Eh, jeg tror, jeg tager de to der.
M: Mm. Dom två?
D: Ja.
M: Det är ju det grundläggande, så kan du ju ta den sen, ja.
D: Ja.
J: Det är 110 på den.
M: Ja.
D: Øh, den der er protection, beskyttelse. Og den anden, det er skocreme. (henvendt til datteren)
M: Så här?
D: Ja, det er fint.
<bipper varerne ind>
D: Okay.
<braverne pakkes i posen>
<dankort-koden trykkes>
M: Och så gröna knappen igen där. Så. Jag tror, att min kollega vill ställa lite frågor till er angående
svenskar och danskar.
D: Okay. <griner>
M: Så, jag hoppas, dom blir bra nu.
D: Hej.
P: Hej.

Interview
S: Ja. Hvordan plejer I at snakke med svenskere? Hvilket sprog vælger I og hvorfor?
K: Jaa. Nu er det længe siden, vi har været i Sverige, øh... men normalt plejer det at være sådan at
her i Malmø, der snakker svenskerne jo nærmest dansk. Nogle gør. Og normalt kan jeg godt forstå
det og hvis det er, der er måske noget med priser, altså tallene, der kan være lidt sproglige problemer. Jeg har ikke nogle problemer med at snakke dansk med dem, så jeg synes ikke, det er et problem. Synes du det er sværere? (henvendt til datteren)
P: Altså jeg forstår godt det meste, hvad de siger, øhm, men jeg vil helst bruge dansk eller engelsk, hvis jeg taler til dem. Jeg kan godt forstå, hvis de skriver noget ned på svensk. Og de plejer også godt at kunne forstå mig.
S: Foretrækker du dansk eller engelsk, når du snakker med dem?
P: Det er ligevidigt for mig.
S: Det er ligevidigt. Okay. Hvad med dig?
S: Ja. Er der noget, I oplever som de synes er svært, når I snakker dansk?
K: Nej, altså det eneste, der plejer at være et problem, det er tallene. Og ikke nødvendigvis et problem, vel, men...
S: Nej, men dér hvor der er en forskel.
K: Ja. Dybest set, synes jeg, at hvis man taler stille og roligt, så plejer det ikke at være et problem.
Slet ikke her i Malmø.
S: Nej. Så prøver I at tilpasse jeres sprog lidt på den måde?
K: Ja, det gør jeg.
P: Ja.
S: Ja? Tale lidt langsommere og sådan nogle ting.
K: Ja.
S: Er det nogle situationer, hvor du ville vælge engelsk f.eks. eller et andet sprog frem for dansk?
K: Så skal det. Altså i den store verden, der ville jeg jo foretrække engelsk, og selvfølgelig, hvis vi ikke forstår hinanden så er det jo oplagt.
S: Øh... Har I været meget; nu sagde du, det var lang tid siden, I havde været i Sverige, men har I været her ellers meget eller kender til svensk på andre måder? Har I set svensk fjernsyn eller et eller andet?
K: Jeg har handlet her rigtig meget.
S: Okay. Så I har også fået det ind den vej.
K: Ja. Og også holdt sommerferie herovre nogle gange, da børnene var små, ikke?
S: Ja.
P: Jeg har en ven fra Sverige?
S: Ja? Og hvad snakker I sammen?
P: Øhm. Jeg snakker dansk og han snakker svensk til mig.
S: Og det fungerer fint?
P: Ja.
S: Hvor kommer han fra?
P: Stockholm.
S: Okay. Spændende. Og sidste spørgsmål: Hvor i Danmark bor I henne? Bare lige for dialekten.
K: Vi bor i Hvidovre.
S: Tusind tak for hjælpen.
Appendix D: Filippa K, 16.10.2015

Time: 12.00-16.15

Alle medarbejdere har travlt med oprydning, da jeg kommer, så jeg venter lidt med at stille spørgsmål.


Generelle observationer:
- Ingen danskere hele formiddagen. Generelt ikke så mange kunder, men det er jo også en almindelig hverdag for svenskerne.
- De svenske kunder snakker gerne og tager også gerne i mod hjælp.
- Jeg bemærker, at jeg selv er mere genert i dag. Det var meget lettere at snakke med Jeanette i Ecco, og jeg føler mig måske ikke helt tilpas i den mere fancy Filippa K-butik, hvor alle er velklædt.
- Antal kunder, der henvendte sig direkte til mig i troen, at jeg var ansat: 5. Mange flere hilste, og de troede nok også, at jeg var ansat, som jeg stod der ved kassen med min blok.
- Kun en eneste dansker er kommet alene i butikken (kun én i Ecco).

Optagelser:
L = Lovisa
S = Sara
I = Interviewer/Simone
A = Axel
M = Mand
K = Kvinde

10.05:
L: Ja, och du underhåller dig själv liksom?
I: Ja, jag försöker störa så lite som möjligt.
L: Ha ha. Bra.
--
S: Hej.
I: Hej. Simone
S: Trevligt. Sara.
S: Ja. Vad läser du?
I: Kommunikation. I Köpenhamn.
S: I Köpenhamn.
I: Ja.
<kunder kommer og spørger efter nogle sko>

10.20:
I: Har ni haft många danskar i dag?
I: Är du dansk?
S: Ja.
I: Så kan vi jo bare snakke dansk.
S: Ja, precis. Jag har jobbat i detail-handeln i 6 år, så jag pratar ju danska med dom. Om jag orkar. I bland så orkar jag inte.

--

L: Vi har nästan inga danskar i dag. Dom har varit här i veckan och sen så...
I: Har dom det?
I: I går också?
L: Ja, oh ja.
I: Asså jag var på Ecco i går och där kom typ ingen.
L: Ingen?
I: Nå.
I: Mmh.
...
I: Brukar det gå bra att prata med dom?
L: Ja, oh ja. Absolut.
I: Hur brukar du göra?
L: Jag pratar svenska, dom pratar danska.
I: Ja.
I: Kan du några danska ord, som du använder?
L: Alltså vi kör nog mest svenska faktiskt. Och är det någon ting då, dom inte förstår... Men alltså dom kan ju det, asså storlek och storrelse, det ligger ju så nära varandra och det är liksom dom orden. Sen säger dom; vi säger ju jeans och dom säger cowboy-byxor. Och den, första gången nån kom in och sa cowboybyxor, vi bara: Va? Vad är det?! Och då blev et jätte konstigt. Vi bara: shit, vad är ett par cowboybyxor?
I: Ja.
L: Och då heter det väl det på danska från början. Men, eh, ja, nu vet vi vad det är också. Att det heter cowboybyxor.
I: Man lär sig lite.
L: Man lär sig lite sådana grejer, absolut.
I: Ja.

13.10:
mor og datter kom ind og kiggede rundt, men havde ingen kontakt med de ansatte
13.30:
A: Så det har inte varit några danskar på hela dagen?
I: Nej.
A: Konstigt.
I: Ja.
A: I går var det massor.
I: Ja, dom kommer på eftermiddagen, tror jag.
A: Va sa du?
I: På eftermiddagen.
A: Ja. De trillar nog in så småningom.
I: Ja. Precis.
A: Hur är det, ska du kolla hur vi snackar? Danska och engelska, är det det?
I: Ja. Vad brukar du göra?
A: Ja, jag snackar svenska med dom.
I: Brukar det funka?
A: Ja.
I: Ja?
A: Asså nu er det vissa, som ... vissa snackar ju engelska. I går var det en som gjorde det.
I: Vad sa du?
A: En som hade jobbat här så mycket, så började han osse snacka engelska i stället. Men i bland får man ju säga någonting på engelska, om man inte förstår varandra.
I: Ja, just det.
A: men det brukar gå rätt bra.

13.45: 2 unge piger (13-14 år) spurgte efter en pose. De løb nærmest ud igen, så jeg nåede ikke at snakke med dem. De snakkede dansk:
P: Har I en pose, vi må få?
A: Va?
P: En pose?
A: Ja. Varsågod.
P1+2: Tak!

14.35: forældre og ung teenagedatter. Svarer ikke, når de ansatte spørger, om de har brug for hjælp = ingen mundtlig kontakt med de ansatte.
- Jeg har lagt mærke til, at svenskerne, der "bare kigger" er mere interesserede end danskerne i at snakke med de ansatte. Danskerne lader til at mene det bogstaveligt, når de siger, at de bare vil kigge, mens svenskerne i højere grad kigger, fordi de ikke ved, hvad de leder efter, men de vil stadig gerne købe noget.

14.55: Mor, søn og bedstefar kigger rundt, men har ingen kontakt med de ansatte.

Kæreste par sidst i 20’erne
14.55: Et kæreste par. Axel siger: "ni får säga till om ni behöver någon hjälp"
Manden svarer: "Det skal jeg göra tak".

S: Ja. Hvilket sprog plejer I at vælge? Eller hvilket sprog synes I, man skal vælge, når man snakker med en svensker?
S: Ja. Så I kan nogle tal og sådan noget?
K: Ja.
M: Ja ja.
S: Og hvordan har I lært det?
M: Vi bor i København, så der er svenskere.
K: Ja, Haha.
S: Kommer I tit i Sverige?
M: Nej.
K: Nej, ikke sådan voldsomt.
M: Det er en to-tre år siden sidst eller sådan noget, ikke?
K: Jaaa, ej, det er ikke så mange år.
M: Jeg har været her en enkelt gang på forretning.
K: Vi har også kørt igennem Sverige i vinters.
S: Hvad synes I, er det sværeste ved svensk?
M: Skånsk er der ikke noget svært ved.
K: Der kan godt være nogle enkelte dialekter, hvor det er sværere.
S: Ja. Har du nogen fornemmelse af, hvad der er for nogle?
K: Meget nordligt.
S: Okay. Og hvad tror I, de synes er det sværeste ved dansk? Altså når I snakker dansk og de skal forstå, hvad I siger?
M: Tal.
K: Tal, tror jeg.
K: Så ved jeg ikke, så er der nogle, der har bare sådan generelt svært ved dansk, synes jeg.
S: Okay, ja. Sidste spørgsmål. Er der nogle situationer, hvor I kunne finde på at snakke et andet sprog end dansk med en svensker?
K: Ja. Jeg kan godt finde på at snakke engelsk, hvis der er et eller andet, der er helt umuligt at forklare, hvor jeg, hvis jeg har forsøgt at snakke dansk først, eller forsøgt mig på det svenske, jeg kan eller sådan noget, og det stadig ikke har givet mening, så synes jeg.
S: Så skifter du over.
K: Ja.
S: Hvad med dig?
S: Så det er hvis du ikke selv kan forstå det.
M: Ja, lige præcis.
S: Tusind tak for hjælpen.

To mænd, der ikke snakkede med nogle ansatte:
S: Hvilket sprog plejer du at vælge, når du skal snakke med svenskere?
M1: Svensk.
S: Svensk?
M2: Dansk.
S: Og hvordan plejer det at gå?
M1: Det plejer at gå okay. Det synes jeg faktisk.
S: Ja. Er der noget særligt, du synes er svært ved svensk, eller som du tror, svenskerne synes er svært ved dansk?
M1: Nej, jeg tror, de har sværere ved at forstå os.
S: Ja. Hvad kan det skyldes, tror du?
M1: Ord eller hvordan?
S: Ja, eller noget bestemt ved sproget.
M1: Nårh, men jeg tror bare, de har sværere ved at forstå, hvad vi siger. Jeg har ikke de store problemer med at forstå, hvad de siger faktisk.
S: Okay.
M2: Man kan godt se, at de kan godt halte lidt bagefter, når de spørger os, hvad vi siger, ikke?
M1: Og nogle gange slår man over i engelsk.
S: Okay, og hvad kunne det være for nogle situationer? Eller er der noget bestemt, der gør, at man gør det?
M2: Der er ikke noget specielt.
S: Nej okay.
M2: Det er bare en fornemmelse, at de har væsentligt sværere ved at forstå dansk, end vi har ved at forstå svensk.

15.00: Mand og kvinde. Begge oprindeligt fra Jylland.

_interaktion med ansatte_

A: Tjena!
M: Hej! Jeg har købt sådan en trøje engang.
A: Merinoull är det ja?
M: Ja. Har du sådan noget?
A: Jajomen! Vilken färgh vill du ha?
M: Øh... Hvilke farver har du?
A: Blå, grön... Grå også.
<de går hen i herreafdelingen, og det er svært at høre, hvad de siger, men kommunikationen mellem Axel og manden forløber fint, mens kvinden må gentage sig selv en del mere. Manden skal faktisk ikke gentage en eneste gang. De snakker begge jysk>

A: Kommer straks.
M: Tak.

<Axel går på lageret efter trøjerne i den rigtige størrelse>
A: Här har jag dom.
M: Fantastisk.
A: Sen har du i merino, där har du också denna.
M: Ja, men det kommer jeg inte...
A: Nej, det (...) heller inte.
M: Nej.
A: Nej, jag har den heller inte, men det er veldigt snyggt.
M: Men om vinteren er det sikkert okay, men jeg er bange for, at jeg ikke kommer til at bruge den.
A: Nej, jag tycker också det är jävligt fint med polotröja\textsuperscript{17}, men jag kan inte ha det, det blir for varmt.
M: Ja, men jeg bliver bare varmere og varmere og varmere og varmere. Og det er derfor det her merino, det er rigtig fint til mig. Det er det.
A: Sen är det ju också schysst och ha under en jacka, kostym.
A: Nu ska vi se här. 2200 svenska blir det då.
M: Ja. Hov.
<koden trykkes>
A: Vill du ha kvittot i påsen?
M: Ja, det er fint. Ej, hvor fedt (henvendt til konen). De har lukket i København der i Magasin eller hvor det var, jeg havde købt dem.
K: nåh, der har de det ikke?
M: Der var ikke, jeg har ikke set dem siden. Ved du, om der er noget Filippa K i København stadigvæk?
M: Så er det bare mig, der ikke har set det. Kongens Lyngby.
A: Jag vet inte riktigt, men jag tror det finns tre eller fyra butiker i Köpenhamn.
M: Godt. Så er det bare mig, der... Har ikke set det i mange år. Så det var... Så jeg blev helt glad, da jeg kom forbi her.
A: Ni är välkomna åter.
M: Det er godt. Tak for hjælpen.
K: Tak.

\textsuperscript{17} = rullekravetrøje
Interview

S: Hvilket sprog, synes I, man skal snakke, når man snakker med en svensker?
M: Sit eget sprog. Jeg arbejder med svenskere hver dag, så for mig er det ikke noget. Det er nok mere min kone, du skal tale med i virkeligheden.
S: Jamen, I må gerne begge to svare, hvad I nu synes.
K: Jo. Men det hjælper jo ikke noget, jeg siger, man skal snakke svensk, hvis ikke man kan svensk.
S: Men hvad gør du så i sådan en situation?
K: Jamen, det kommer lidt an på, hvilken del af Sverige, man snakker med, synes jeg, fordi der er dele af Sverige, hvor jeg simpelthen ikke forstår, hvad de siger. Og så slår du over i engelsk.
S: I engelsk.
K: Ja, det gør jeg, men ikke hvis vi er her. Så er der ikke noget.
S: Så er det ikke noget problem?
K: Nej.
S: Kan I nogle svenske ord og sådan noget eller?
S: Ja. Hvad med dig?
K: Ja, jeg kan nogle, men det er ikke sådan nogle, jeg bruger bare fordi jeg kommer herover.
M: Du prøver ikke at spille smart med det.
K: Nej, men så tit er jeg her jo slet ikke, at det kan betale sig at begynde at involvere mig i den del.
M: Det er også umådeligt svært at spille smart med.
K: Ja. Haha.
S: Er det nogle situationer, hvor du ville slå over i engelsk?
M: Nej.
S: Det har du ikke haft brug for?
M: Nej. Vi har en finsk-svensker i vores firma, som øh... Ham forstår jeg ikke en lyd af. Så snakker vi engelsk, men det er ligesom sådan... Han er svær at forstå.
S: Ja. Er det noget, I oplever, at svenskerne synes er svært, når I snakker dansk? Altså hvad tror I, de synes, er det sværere ved dansk?
K: Der er jo frukost og lunch, ikke, der kan være lidt fremmede, og det sad vi lige og snakkede om her.
M: Ja. Jeg kan da huske da, vores HR-chef tog herover, da hun havde fået sit HR-chefjob, så skulle hun tale med hele den svenske ledelse. Og de kom ind alle de her mænd én efter én og satte sig ned og så rev de sig i håret lidt og sagde: jeg trænger simpelthen sådan til at bolle med nogen. Og så var
det, hun tænkte... Det var så ”at sparre” på svensk. Det var sådan lidt overskridende for hende indtil hun fandt ud af, hvad det var, de egentlig var ude efter.
K: Ha ha. Det er sådan en lidt udvidet HR-chef. Ha ha ha ha.
M: Ja. Det var nok ikke lige dét, du tænkte på, men jeg synes bare, det var så sødt. Tascha, hun var helt: ”Hvad?”.
S: Jamen, der er da de der ord, man lige skal...
M: Jeg synes heller ikke, der er nogen... Nogle gange kan jeg godt tale for hurtigt.
S: Okay.
M: Men det kan de jo også.
S: Ja.
M: Skåningene kan være svære at forstå, synes jeg.
S: Sværere end nogen, der kommer andre steder fra?
M: Ja, når det sådan bliver skånska, hvor det samtidig går hurtigt, så synes jeg godt, det kan være...
Men dem, vi har i firmaet, der er sådan, de ved jo godt, at de skal lige skrue lidt ned for tempoet.
S: Så du oplever faktisk at begge tilpasser sig?
S: Okay. Tusind tak for hjælpen.


Interaktion med de ansatte
S: Hej.
Dansker: Hej.
S: Kan jag hjälpa med någonting eller?
Dansker: Ellers tak.
S: Nej.
<de går hen i herreafdelingen og kigger på forskellige stykker tøj. Sara kommer hen og hjælper. Her slår hun over i dansk med lidt accent>
Ved kassen:
S: Og I kunne ikke finde noget? Ikke i dag?
.. Moren snakker med nogle af børnene.
S: 2200 skal jeg bede om.
<moren trykker koden og snakker videre med børnene>
S: Kvitteringen, kan jeg putte den ned i posen?
M: Ja ja, det er godt.
Søn: Mange tak for hjælpen.
S: Selvfølgelig.
Søn: Hej hej.
S: Hej.

Interview
S: Hvilket sprog, synes I, man skal snakke, når man snakker med en svensker normalt?
M: Jeg prøver på dansk først og så går man over til engelsk, hvis den er helt gal.
S: Hvis den er helt gal?
M: Ja.
S: Hvad kunne det være for nogle situationer?
S: Så er det nemmere.
M: Ja, hvis man ikke er forberedt.
S: Ja. Er der noget særligt, der er svært ved svensk?
K: Der er mange ord, der er svære, ikke?
M: Ja, der er nogle ord.
S: Altså de ord, der er anderledes?
K: Ja, hvis der er nogle sådan... Fagord, ikke.
S: Jo.
K: Ovre i en skibutik, der gik vi over i engelsk, fordi han kunne ikke rigtig forklare os det på svensk.
Eller vi forstod det ikke på svensk.
S: Okay. Så der måtte I skifte over?
K: Ja, i sådan nogle situationer.
S: Ja. Er der noget særligt, I oplever, at svenskerne synes er sværere ved det danske?
K: Nej, egentlig ikke.
M: Nej, jeg føler, at de har nemmere ved os, end vi har ved dem. Eller i hvert fald jeg har.
S: Okay. Fint nok. Tusind tak for hjælpen.

15.40: Kvinde
L: Vill du ha lite hjälp här eller?
K: Ellers tak.
Hun kigger bare og går hurtigt igen.
15.45:
S: Så du läser kommunikation? Och inte Malmö Högskola utan du läser det i Köpenhamn?
I: Ja.