



Working Papers in

Urban Language & Literacies

Paper **305**

**Ideologies of language and authenticity
in the construction of educational
identities**

Anne Larsen (*University of Copenhagen*)

2022

Ideologies of language and authenticity in the construction of educational identities

Anne Larsen
University of Copenhagen

2022

Abstract

In this paper, I investigate language ideologies of academic language in an upper secondary classroom, focusing on different senses of authenticity as a legitimate user of the academic register, and the implications of this for students' educational identities. The study is based on data collected through ethnographic fieldwork at a Danish STX-Gymnasium. Drawing on the analysis of metalinguistic acts in interviews and classroom interactions, I argue that the students' abilities to perform educational identities are influenced by their own ideologies as well as the teacher's, and that the discrepancy between students' and teachers' ideologies of authenticity plays a crucial role in local identity work, with potential consequences for students' social mobility.

Key words: Language ideologies, authenticity, academic register, educational identities, social mobility

1. Introduction

As described by Gal and Irvine (2019: 1) "Statements about language are never only about language – and they are never only statements". Comments on language use also involve comments on social life and works as signals about identity; how the speaker positions self and others, and such statements are always part of an ideological construction produced from a position in the social hierarchy. In educational settings language use and what is perceived as "the academic language" plays a key role for the student's placement in the local academic and social hierarchy. In Irvine and Gal's (2000) approach, boundaries between different languages or registers (Agha 2007) are ideologically constructed. "Academic language" can therefore be understood as a register locally negotiated in an ideological process of differentiation in the school system. Such ideological constructions of linguistic features as more or less appropriate in the classroom setting, and beliefs about who uses and who ought to use the appropriate and academic language, come through in metalinguistic acts (Rampton 2006: 276; Silverstein 1993; Janowitz 1993) in and outside the classroom.

In this paper, I study the language ideological work in an upper secondary Danish classroom and discuss how language ideologies can contribute to creating unequal access to educational identities such as being 'a good student'. Connecting with studies showing that students are socialized by and negotiate school identities in interactions with their peers as well as their teachers (Wortham 2005; Sadowski 2003; Korp 2011; Rymes & Leone-Pizzighella 2020), I argue that it is important to study how the students' language ideologies affect their abilities to position as 'good students' in interaction with the teacher's.

Based on analysis of metalinguistic acts of students and a teacher in interviews and in classroom interactions in a Danish classroom I investigate:

- Which language ideologies are expressed by the teacher in interview and in metalinguistic practices in the classroom?

- How are these ideologies reproduced or contested by the students in and outside the classroom?
- How can the language ideologies as expressed through metalinguistic practices affect the students' possibilities to position as 'good students'?

In the first part of the analysis, I investigate the expressed and enacted language ideologies and language policies of the teacher as they appear in interviews and classroom practices. Next I look into interviews with the students and examples of classroom interaction where the students' and the teacher's language use and ideologies conflict. Against this backdrop, I argue that the students' abilities to perform as 'good students' are affected not only by the ideological practices of the teacher but also by the student's own ideologies as well as by the ideologies of their peers. I demonstrate that especially the students' ideologies of linguistic authenticity can have implications for the construction and negotiation of educational identities.

2. Identity and 'the good student'

It is well established in contemporary approaches to identity in interactional sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology that social identities are dynamic and interactionally constructed, ascribed and negotiated positions (Bucholtz & Hall 2005; Blommaert 2005; Rampton 2006; Agha 2007; Coupland 2007; Jenkins 2008; Korp 2011). Actors can construct a variety of different identities but do not have access to all possible identities in all contexts. Whether or not an actor can claim access to a specific group identity, is for example depending on whether the actor recognizes the group, has access to the repertoire of signs associated with the group and if the actor is recognized and acknowledged as part of the group. From this perspective, educational identities, such as 'a good student', are social positions which are negotiable but also depend on access to particular resources.

In addition, Coupland (2007) describes how actors can be more or less invested in social identities. This implies that it is possible to project a social identity without being personally invested in it or feeling a strong sense of belonging. Jenkins (2008) similarly distinguishes between internal and external identities. The internal identities are self-images: the experience of having unique characteristics as well as belonging to a group, and the external identities are external images of the actor. As researchers, we do not have access to the internal identification processes, but Jenkins' theorization of the relationship between internal and external identities is relevant to understand how locally situated actions can affect people's self-image. According to Jenkins, persons cannot see themselves detached from other people's gaze; they can internalize the external identity or resist it and define themselves in opposition to other's definition, but in both cases it becomes a part of the self-image. Likewise, the external positioning enacted by a person is based on their internal identity image. This relationship between the internal and external resembles Bourdieu's notion of habitus: the internalization of ideas, practices and preferences associated with a social position and thereby (often) a reproduction of the position (Bourdieu 1997). Jenkins (2008) argues that the degree to which an actor internalizes the external identification from other actors depends on the power relationship. An actor can have more or less definitional power in a specific setting. While teachers have the institutional power to define good and bad students, students do have tremendous social power to define each other. In line with studies like Sadowski (2003), I argue that students' performances and positions are shaped by the expectations and actions of their peers as well as their teachers. Language is centrally related to all identification processes both as medium for identity positioning and as signs

indexically linked to cultural models and social identities. In this article, I focus on the social identification processes made available through the language policy and ideologies of teachers and students, and how students indicate investment in the projected identities.

3. Registers, metalanguage and language ideologies

With linguistic features and actions that are indexically linked to specific groups, positions or statuses, an actor can claim membership of a group and position themselves and others. In the educational system, educational identities are linked to norms for academic or school language. What counts as appropriate and good language in a school setting varies, and instead of understanding academic language as a fixed entity that some students have easier access to than others, it is fruitful to apply Agha's concept of register. "A register is a repertoire of performable signs linked to stereotypic pragmatic effects by a sociohistorical process of enregisterment" (Agha 2007: 80). As described by Agha the construction of a register is a continuous process. Registers are associated with particular social practices and categories of persons, but the registers and the associated values are always potentially changeable (Agha 2007; Agha & Frog 2015). According to Agha (2007: 146-7) there will always be social asymmetry linked to registers and most people will be able to recognize more registers than they master. Some will benefit from specific systems of normative values, while others will not, and as actors do not have the same access to the institutions where competences are reproduced, competing valorization and normative judgements of the registers will exist simultaneously (Agha 2007: 157). Recognition and competence as well as understandings and valorizations of registers are learned through socialization processes (Agha 2007: 146-7). Such processes of language socialization take place in everyday settings in more and less institutionalized ways. In schools teachers have an institutionalized responsibility to teach language, but language socialization is a co-constructive process where an actor (the student) does not necessarily integrate or internalize the expert's (the teacher's) norms and values, but can contest and resist them or integrate them with other values (Cekaite 2020: 114).

4. Language ideologies in the classroom

Understandings of the boundaries and value of the academic register can, as mentioned, be described as language ideologies - understood as more or less conscious sets of beliefs or systems of meanings about language and language use, which are often perceived as common sense truths (Silverstein 1979; Woolard 1998; Irvine & Gal 2000; Gal & Irvine 2019; Fairclough 2008). The notion of ideologies entails that systems of beliefs about language and its users are always positioned and "suffused with the political and moral issues pervading the particular sociolinguistic field and are subject to the interests of their bearers' social position" (Irvine & Gal 2000: 35). The focus on ideology hence entails a focus on the power relations and struggles embedded in discourse about language. Following Gal and Irvine (2019: 2), I see ideologies as neither true nor false, but as ideas from a specific point of view. A point of view that only shows a partial truth and is part of social negotiations of power. According to Fairclough, ideologies can be more or less hegemonic in a specific field (or order of discourse) or in society in general, but the hegemony will always be contested in a hegemonic struggle (Fairclough 2008: 98).

In the school setting it is interesting to take the teacher's language ideologies as they are constructed in and outside the classroom into account, since they can vary from institutional

ideologies and policies and have real influence on students' everyday lives. Language ideologies of teachers are often linked to their understanding of the purpose of their teaching. According to Biesta (2012; 2019) teaching ideally has three aims: *qualification* which is about giving the students knowledge and competencies in solving specific tasks; *socialisation* which concerns socializing students in to societal norms, values and traditions; and *subjectification* which involves focus on the student as a subject that should be supported in being an autonomous thinking individual. As argued by Jaspers (2020), it is often a great challenge for teachers to balance these three main purposes of education, since a focus on one dimension will impact on how the others can be weighted. Some practices can equally focus on the wished outcome on more than one parameter, while others will be at the expense of one of the others. Language ideologies of teachers can be understood as a way of making meaning of the experiences of these complex purposes of (language) teaching.

To study the ideological acts of the teacher and her students, I will investigate metapragmatic acts. By 'metapragmatic acts', I understand all language use commenting on "some regularity or pattern of speech use" (Lucy 1993: 2). Metapragmatic acts are reflexive linguistic actions, which can be more or less explicit. Implicit metapragmatic activities are common in everyday language use when speakers contextualize or signal how pragmatic forms are to be interpreted (Lucy 1993: 17). In this article, I will focus on explicit metapragmatic actions – metalinguistic acts. According to Silverstein (1993: 55) "Explicit metapragmatic registers instantiated in metapragmatic discourse encapsulate ideologies of language use", and as argued by Janowitz (1993: 393), all metalinguistic actions, such as defining or translating words, are based on the interpreter's ideas of language and the way words function – that is language ideologies. In my analysis, I will look into the teacher's and students' explicit metapragmatic practices in interviews and in the classroom such as explanation of the meaning of words, evaluations of and reactions to language use and descriptions of own and others' competencies. These metapragmatic practices are reflexive acts showing what is considered appropriate language and for whom in the classroom.

5. Authenticity

In my study, I find that language ideologies of authenticity play a crucial part in the construction and negotiation of educational identities in and outside the classroom. In newer sociolinguistic studies involving authenticity, authenticity is described as claimed and created in processes or in acts of authentication (Coupland 2000, 2007, 2010, Rampton 2018, Shenk 2007, Eckert 2003; 2014, Yang 2018, Johnstone 2014). In these studies, the focus is often on how to be an authentic speaker of language associated with places or ethnicities. In such cases authenticities can be, as shown by Shenk (2007), very directly linked to family background or bloodline. This is not in the same way the case with the academic register, where authenticity and its relation to background is often not as directly articulated, but many of the elements of authenticity are the same. In her study of how majority and minority languages gain authority, Woolard describes an ideology of authenticity: "... authentic languages can be learned by no one; speakers are supposed to come by them 'naturally' rather than working to acquire them" (Woolard 2016: 25). Even though this is meant as a description of ideologies related to minority languages, this understanding of authentic language as something that comes from within also to some extent applies to the ideologies of the authenticity of languages or registers associated with academic superiority. Who passes as an authentic speaker in different settings is, as described by Eckert (2003), locally negotiated but in all cases bounded to the believe that some people are more natural speakers of a register than others:

“Locally located and oriented, the Authentic Speaker produces linguistic output that emerges naturally in and from that location. The notion of the authentic speaker is based in the belief that some speakers have been more tainted by the social than others – tainted in the sense that they have wandered beyond their natural habitat to be subject to conscious, hence unnatural, social influence. Thus the villager who travels to the city, or working class speaker who aspires to become middle class, or even the African American speaker who uses African American Standard English are all viewed as less natural than their peers who have not strayed from the variety assigned to them.” (Eckert 2003: 392-3)

In my data, I find that students and teachers orient towards different ideologies of authenticity or what could be described as different ideologies of the level of authenticity necessary to perform linguistically as a good student. Inspired by Yang’s (2018) concept of hierarchical ‘authenticity’ and by Coupland’s typology of authenticity (2001, 2003), and based on my findings, I suggest a distinction between 3 different ideologies of authenticity, all linked to understandings of language users having to be natural and speak “like themselves”:

- *The ideology of ownership*: That language should be fully-owned and unmediated. This is the ideology that speakers “(...) should be, fully responsible for the forms and meanings of their own utterance” (Coupland 2001: 415);
- *The ideology of historicity*: That a participant can only legitimately use a register if they are perceived as someone who has been speaking in this way always or at least for a long time;
- *The ideology of consistency*: The ideology that being yourself implies not adapting to different settings, and that people should therefore not shift language in different situations.

In some cases these three could be understood as three strands of one ideology of authenticity, but I find that while some actors orient towards all strands as necessary, others only invoke one and do not engage in the others. In other words, actors construct different ideologies of the level of authenticity needed in the specific setting to be understood as a legitimate user of a register. I therefore find it fruitful to distinguish between these as different ideologies that can be complementary or competing.

In interactions, actors can invoke historicity, consistency and/or ownership in the authentication or de-authentication of self and others and these acts are linked to the three ideologies. An actor can claim authenticity-by-historicity by referencing to a long-term practice. This, though, does not entail that the actor engages in ‘the ideology of historicity’ where historicity is seen as necessary to be understood as a legitimate user of a register, but just that historicity is claimed as a sufficient factor to be understood as a legitimate user. In de-authenticating practices on the other hand, acts with reference to historicity, such as claiming that actors do not have the right to use part of a register they have just learned, are acts invoking ‘the ideology of historicity’, where long term knowledge is seen as necessary for using a specific register in a specific setting.

6. Context

In this section, I will briefly introduce the Danish STX-schools, the subject Danish and social mobility issues in higher education in Denmark to provide context for the analysis and discussions.

STX-schools

The Danish STX-school is a specific kind of ‘gymnasium’, which is an optional 3 year long upper secondary education that adolescents attend after finishing 9th or 10th grade. The students are approximately 16 years old when they start at the gymnasium and 19 when they finish. The gymnasiums have their origin in the Latin schools that had preparation for studies in theology as its main purpose, and in the nineteenth century the purpose of the gymnasiums officially became “almendannelse” eng. “liberal education”. During the 20th century, the gymnasiums have undergone several reforms that entail more specialized paths within the educational system (Haue 2022). From the 1980’s there have officially been four types of gymnasiums: STX, HF (a 2 year long higher preparation exam mainly for adult students or students who have at least 10th grade), HTX and HHX. Where HTX and HHX focus on science/technical skills and mercantile subjects respectively, STX and HF (with focus on the professional aspects of academic subjects) have a general introduction to classic academic subjects as its core. The STX-school is also the most common gymnasium with 60 % of all the students that attend a gymnasium (EVA 2017). The main official purpose of all of the gymnasiums today is preparation for higher education and as part of this liberal education also understood as ‘personal authority’ (and has been since 1967) (Børne- og undervisningsministeriet 2022, 957§1; EVA 2017), which could, in Biesta’s terms, be described as an official emphasis on subjectification in education (Biesta 2019). From 2005 the purpose is furthermore described as preparation for rights and duties in a society with freedom and democracy (EVA 2017 with reference to the 2005 gymnasiereform).

Danish

The subject Danish is a cultural subject with literature, media productions and language as its three main themes. In the STX-schools, Danish is obligatory at A-level, which entails that the subject is taught in all three years of STX, has written as well as oral exams, written and oral marks of the year, and that the marks from Danish Class is weighted with a factor 2 in the grade point average. The official national teaching plan (Børne- og Undervisningsministeriet 2017) specifies that the Danish course in STX has a generally educating and study-preparing purpose, and language is set forth as central for the program and the students’ general development as democratic citizens:

”Centralt står arbejdet med elevernes udtryksfærdighed med fokus på et sikkert sprogligt udtryk og formidlingsbevidsthed. Sikker udtryksfærdighed og kritisk-analytisk sans fremmer elevernes muligheder for som medborgere at orientere sig og handle i et moderne, demokratisk, digitaliseret og globalt orienteret samfund.”

“Centrally positioned is the work with the student’s expressive proficiency with focus on a confident linguistic expression and consciousness of communication. Confident linguistic expression and a critically analytic sense advances the students’ possibilities as citizens to orient and act in a modern democratic, digitalized and globally oriented society.”

Danish class is therefore important for student’s grade point averages and officially central in the linguistic socialization of the students.

Social mobility

Access to primary, secondary and tertiary education is free in Denmark, and during the last 50 years, an increasing number of adolescents have attended a gymnasium. According to numbers from EVA (2017: 35), 33 % of 16-17 year olds attended a gymnasium in 1980 and 76 % in 2016 (hereafter the uptake has stagnated). Many students in gymnasiums are therefore the first in their family to attend an academically oriented education, which has led to concerns about how this group manages. Studies have shown that adolescents from homes without gymnasium education have been less likely to continue into higher education, on average have had lower grades and more often have dropped out of gymnasiums (Holm & Jæger 2004; Ulriksen et al. 2009; EVA 2012; 2015; Munk 2014; Munk & Baklanov 2014).

In public discourse, inequality in educational chances is often explained as deriving from a poor understanding of the cultural codes of gymnasiums and especially of the academic language. This view is also developed in a larger study of the so-called “Gymnasiefremmede” (‘non-traditional students’/first generation in gymnasiums) by Ulriksen et al. (2007; 2009). Based on interviews with students from homes where the parents do not have a gymnasium degree, they argue that there is a linguistic barrier for these students, that the language in gymnasiums resembles a foreign language, and that especially the foundational non-technical language (in Danish “førfaglige” directly translated “pre-technical”) in cultural studies, such as language and social science classes, poses problems. Since the midst of the 2000’s, there has been an increased focus in public discourse and didactic literature and programs on enhancing the “gymnasiefremmedes” possibilities by explicitly teaching “the language of the gymnasiums”.

7. Data

My study is based on data collected as part of my PhD project. In this project, I have conducted ethnographic field work in two 3rd year classes in a Danish STX-school, which I call Graabølle High. The students were all young adults, the youngest turned 18 during the fieldwork and the oldest 20.

I have followed the students and teachers in and outside of the classroom for 6 months from September 2019-March 2020, collected self-recordings conducted by the students with lapel microphones in different classes, written field diaries, informally interviewed students and teachers at the school and formally interviewed 44 (out of 46) students and the two Danish class teachers.

Graabølle High is a STX-school with a higher proportion of students with non-academic backgrounds than the average in Denmark. The school and the individual teachers often highlighted their ability to help students with non-academic backgrounds and students with social problems to obtain an education. The school offers help and counselling to students as well as many extracurricular activities. The teachers generally have free rein to conduct their classes in the manner they see fit and put together the curriculum freely (within the national frame). The teachers are therefore also very different in their pedagogical strategies, and the curricula – and especially the linguistic strategies – vary in different classrooms. In this paper, I will focus on the classroom where I found the most explicit teaching of vocabulary: Danish class in classroom A. This is an especially good case because it shows how language socialization does not run smoothly even in a classroom with very explicit teaching in language, and where the students in general also respect their teacher. In other classrooms there were other linguistic strategies: some teachers spoke what the students described as youth language and others tried deliberately not to focus on technical terms and had very

little explicit metalanguage. In all cases, some students experienced being excluded because they did not understand the codes, were not able to reproduce the register, were not recognized as authentic speakers by their classmates, or did not agree with the teacher's language choices and ideologies. Similar conflicts as the ones described here therefore occurred.

In the present study, I focus on interviews with the teacher, individual interviews with all students in the class and close analysis of four Danish lessons. The four lessons were chosen because they entail classical teacher-led classroom discussions, which makes it possible to see how the whole classroom together negotiate different positions in the local academic hierarchy. In two of the lessons the theme is modernistic poetry and in two it is short stories. The themes are thus not directly about language, although, as we shall see, language is often addressed directly in the discussions of literature and poetry. Different microphone holders were chosen, so that the four recordings represent different places and different groups in the classroom. In all recordings it is possible to hear the collective classroom interactions. The four lessons are spread from the beginning of fieldwork to the final stages after I have visited the class for several months. The pattern of the teacher's metapragmatic actions seems to be unaltered by my presence over time.

The interviews were individual semi-structured interviews. The teacher as well as the students asked to be prepared for the interviews. I gave them written but informal introductions to the themes. In the student-interviews: Where they come from and what they do in their spare time; their experience of the STX school - academically and socially; language: how they talk in different contexts; their plans for the future; and finally background information on their parents' education and employment. The themes in the teacher-interview: characteristics of the school, different types of students and the class; her thoughts on her role and tasks as the teacher; her perspective on what a good student is; language: her perception of different ways of speaking among the students, good language and her thoughts on linguistic socialization or education in STX-schools. Most of the students did not prepare for the interview and we had a very free conversation led by me. The teacher came prepared and took more control of the conversation.

Interviews and classroom interactions were coded for explicit metalinguistic practices and all passages transcribed. The classroom interactions were subsequently coded for subtypes of metalinguistic practices: teacher's evaluations; teacher's introductions of (technical, non-subject specific and text) words; and peer commentary to get an overview of which linguistic forms were explicitly addressed in the classroom. The students' interviews were coded for various register-labels and evaluations of own and others competencies in them. For the purpose of this paper, I studied all explicit metalinguistic descriptions of language use of teachers, descriptions of how the students should talk to the teacher, and their descriptions of their own competencies.

8. The good student

Before we look at the excerpts, I will briefly clarify what the teacher and the students explain as characteristic of 'a good student'. The teacher describes the good student as showing creativity, expressing themselves with nuanced language and technical terms while avoiding swearwords and finally someone who is nice to their classmates. The students equivalently describe the good student as active in class, polite, concise, speaking with precision, using technical terms and "fancy words", avoiding slang and avoiding complaining to the teacher. It is beyond the scope of this paper to dive into an analysis of the enregisterment of the good student and the academic language, but central for the analysis is that the students and teacher

connect being a good student with not only having specific knowledge but also using and avoiding specific language and actions. The good student is then associated with specific competences as well as social norms such as politeness.

9. Teacher's ideologies expressed in interview

In this section, I will investigate the ideological work of the teacher in interview and metalinguistic practices in the classroom and relate it to the preceding descriptions of language ideologies in school settings. In the interview I found four important themes regarding language ideology:

- a. the academic register is different from the students' language – especially regarding the repertoire of words
- b. a “nuanced” language with many words is a means to expand your consciousness and grasp reality and get power
- c. it is the teacher's (especially Danish teachers') responsibility to expand the students repertoire
- d. it is important to be able to codeswitch.

Examples of a-c are illustrated in the excerpt below. Susanne, the teacher, was, as described above, prepared to talk about specific subjects, and my impression was that she had given it a lot of thought before entering the interview. Her descriptions must be understood in the light of this preparation and be understood as highly reflexive answers.

Excerpt 1: Interview with teacher Susanne.

01	Susanne:	fordi (0.4) <u>det er</u>	Susanne:	because (0.4) <u>that is</u>
02		det sjoveste sjoveste		the funniest funniest
03		sjoveste ikke		funniest right
04	Int:	[mm]	Int:	[mm]
05	Susanne:	[det] er at når de	Susanne:	[that] is when they come
06		kommer her så oplever		here then they first of
07		de jo for det første		all experience d- some
08		nogle a- helt andre		completely different
09		sproglige koder		linguistic codes
10		(.)		(.)
11	Int:	ja	Int:	yeah
12		(0.6)		(0.6)
13	Susanne:	så det kan være meget	Susanne:	so it can be very
14		fremmed og <u>meget</u>		unfamiliar and <u>very</u>
15		voldsomt og meget		intense and very
16	Int:	ja	Int:	yeah
17		(0.9)		(0.9)
18	Susanne:	skræmmende (0.3) for	Susanne:	frightening (0.3) for
19		dem (0.6) øhm (0.3)		them (0.6) ehm (0.3) and
20		og det skal vi jo		we have to think about
21		tænke på (0.4) der er		that (0.4) there is a
22		mange ord de ikke		lot of words they do not
23		kender		know
24		(.)		(.)
25	Int:	mm	Int:	mm
26		(0.4)		(0.4)

<p>27 Susanne: °altså en bæk (0.6) 28 anlæg (0.7) en viol° 29 °°{hvad er en viol for 30 noget}°° altså 31 (.) 32 Int: mm 33 Susanne: og de:r skal man hele 34 tiden (.) som lærer 35 hele tiden være med i 36 udviklingen og sige 37 ja nu skal du passe 38 på når du bruger de 39 her ord fordi i l.g 40 ved de ikke hvad det 41 betyder vel 42 Int: mm 43 (0.7) 44 Susanne: men for (.) men jeg 45 jeg taler meget 46 eksplicit med dem om 47 sprog selvfølgelig 48 fordi jeg er 49 dansklærer 50 (.) 51 Int: ja 52 (0.4) 53 Susanne: og d- jeg plejer at 54 sige til dem <u>sprog</u> 55 (0.7) <u>kan</u> du meget s- 56 er du god til (.) 57 mange ord er du god 58 til at tale er du god 59 til at kommunikere så 60 kan du magte mange 61 ting 62 Int: mm 63 Susanne: så får du magt over 64 (.) på den gode måde 65 (0.8) over din 66 <u>selvindsigt</u> for så 67 kan man sætte <u>ord</u> på 68 hvordan man har det 69 Int: mm 70 (.) 71 Susanne: en ting er at man kan 72 mærke man er lidt (.) 73 pyha man har det ikke 74 så godt (.) det 75 øjeblik du kan sætte 76 sproget på 77 (.) 78 Int: mm 79 Susanne: så (0.5) så har du 80 det her og så kan du 81 (.) 82 Int: mm 83 Susanne: tale med og om det 84 ikke og så kan du</p>	<p>Susanne: °well a brook (0.6) layout¹ (0.7) a violet° °°{what is a violet for a thing}°° well (.) Int: mm Susanne: and there: you have to all the time (.) as a teacher all the time be part of the progress and say you have to pay attention when you use these words because in l.g they do not know what it means right Int: mm (0.7) Susanne: but because (.) but I I speak very explicitly with them about language of course because I am a Danish teacher (.) Int: yeah (0.4) Susanne: and t- I usually say to them <u>language</u> (0.7) if you <u>master</u> a lot l- if you are good at (.) many words are you good at speaking are you good at communicating them you can manage a lot of things Int: mm Susanne: then you get power over (.) in a good manner (0.8) over your <u>self-</u> <u>insight</u> for then you can <u>apply words</u> to how you feel Int: mm (.) Susanne: one thing is that you can feel that you are bit (.) phew you do not feel well (.) the moment you can attach the language (.) Int: mm Susanne: then (0.5) then you have this and then you can (.) Int: mm Susanne: talk with and about it right and then you might</p>
---	--

¹ Recreation grounds

86		måske meget bedre magte dig selv			also handle yourself much better
87	Int:	mm		Int:	mm
88		(0.3)			(0.3)
89	Susanne:	du kan magte (.) din		Susanne:	you can handle (.) your
90		kommunikation med			communication with
91		andre (0.3) du kan få			others (0.3) you can
92		andre til at <u>forstå</u>			make other people
93		dig og du kan også			<u>understand</u> you and you
94		lave <u>sjov</u> med [andre]			can <u>joke</u> with [other]
95	Int:	[mm]		Int:	[mm]
96	Susanne:	mennesker og du kan		Susanne:	people and you can
97		<u>manipulere</u> med andre			<u>manipulate</u> through
98		mennesker i sproget			language
99		mm		Int:	mm
100	Int:	og du bliver		Susanne:	and you are manipulated
101	Susanne:	manipuleret ikke (.)			right (.) so language is
102		så sprog er magt			power
103		(.)			(.)
104	Int:	[mm]		Int:	[mm]
105	Susanne:	[men] magt på den		Susanne:	[but] power in a good
106		gode måde (.) ikke			sense (.) right (0.3) so
107		(0.3) så så så det			so so it is a question
108		handler meget om at			of learning <u>new words</u>
109		lære <u>nye ord</u> og			and a question of
110		handler om at lære			learning new terms and
111		nye begreber og og de			and they have you know a
112		har jo altså de har			<u>joy</u> absolutely learning
113		en <u>glæde</u> simpelthen			new words
114		ved at lære nye ord			

In the excerpt Susanne explains that the students generally experience a very different code when they arrive at the STX-school and then elaborates that this code is characterized by new words. It is worth noticing that the words she refers to are not just technical terms but words such as *brook* and *violet* (l. 27-28) which might be words found in the curricular short stories and poems. This divide between the linguistic codes of the gymnasium and the students' home languages is in itself an ideological act that draws a boundary between the school and the homes. It is worth noticing, however, that where the public discourse rooted in the research about "gymnasiefremmede" mentioned above describes *an* academic code, Susanne talks about codes in plural. This, in combination with the words she uses for exemplification, indicates a slightly different and more fine-grained understanding of the boundaries between different codes, where the specific subject has its own codes. Further on, she explains that it is the teacher's responsibility to be aware of the linguistic barrier and teach the students new words. Finally, it is important to note that language is understood as mind-expanding, that knowledge of a range of words will give the students deeper insights not only to texts, but themselves.

In her description of language as mind-expanding, I see similarities with what De La Cruz Albizu (2020) has described about school-principals' ideologies regarding multilingualism. He calls this The Resource Integrative Democratic Ideology, which entails ideas about language as a resource that should be learned for integrative reasons. He relates this to an understanding of the general goal of education as "democratic equality". He distinguishes this ideology from Resource Instrumental Mobility Ideology, where the focus in language teaching is on what is an asset on the job market. This Resource Integrative Democratic Ideology is present in the national teaching plan where language is linked to managing in a democratic society. The teacher's ideology here has some similarity since there is a focus on

students not just learning language for school or the job market, but for internal purposes. Her language ideology, though, differs in some ways and is better described in Biesta's terminology as a focus on subjectification (which is also present in the gymnasium law): that the main goal of her class is to make the students competent in being individuals that can manage themselves by having the words for what they are feeling and experiencing. In her view as expressed here in the interview, gaining competence in language will in this way also enhance subjectification. I therefore use the term 'subjectification ideology'.

The ideology of appropriateness

In the interview the teacher also emphasizes that it is important to understand that different codes exist and when to use which. In one part of the interview, she explains that the students are not allowed to swear in her classroom and gives an example with a specific student that she has corrected when she swears, concluding that

“Det er jo vigtigt de er bevidste om hvad det er de gør. Det er ikke forkert nødvendigvis det de gør, men det - bare de er bevidste om at nu har de en anden sprogkode når de siger sådan nogle ting der”

“it is of course important that they are conscious about what they do. It is not necessarily wrong but it - if they are just aware that now they have a different language code when they say stuff like that”

In another part of the interview she repeats this point:

”Hvis de ikke taler anderledes med hinanden end når de taler i en i en situation hvor vi taler fagligt, så ville det være farligt, ikke”.

”If they do not speak differently with each other than in a in a situation where we speak academically, then it would be dangerous, right”.

In her study on language ideologies among teachers in an American SKILSS program, Love-Nichols (2018) finds a similar ideology, which she names the ideology of appropriateness. Referring to Fairclough, she describes this as a general ideological shift in language policy in educational institutions: “Instead of replacing supposedly deficient or broken languages in students' linguistic repertoires, educational materials now advocate teachers' 'adding' hegemonic varieties that students may use when 'appropriate' while still 'respecting' students' home languages” (Love-Nichols 2018: 92). This ideology manifests in pedagogical practices with heightened focus on explicitly teaching students with minoritized or working class backgrounds the 'academic' language while claiming that their home-language is not bad in other settings, just not appropriate in an academic context. According to Love-Nichols, this ideology is problematic since it contributes to the oppression of non-standard speaking students (in her case racialized students) as it positions their language as worth less in an academic context and implies that the inequalities of society can be overcome if the students learn the correct code. As Love-Nichols also remarks, the teachers cannot freely choose linguistic strategies in their teaching, but must take official curricula as well as the language needed to manage in higher education into account. The notion of the ideology of appropriateness is relevant because it accentuates that even if the divide between specific codes is based on the best of intentions, it is also bound up with power differences because all students do not have equal access to specific registers.

10. Metalinguistic practices in the classroom

In my study of the lessons, I find that the teacher in classroom discussions often explains or introduces words as well as she praises students for using specific words. Besides a focus on vocabulary, I also find metapragmatic actions focused on the pronunciation of unfamiliar words and names, as well as, less explicitly, on argumentation, but in accordance with the teacher's statements in the interview, the lexical focus is predominant. In the following I will examine the words foregrounded in the teacher's explanations and evaluations.

Introduction of words

A frequent way the teacher highlights words is by explaining what they mean when they occur in texts or by introducing a new word that can be applied in the context. This occurs quite often in the four lessons, even though it is a class taught in the first language of all students. On average 6-7 words are introduced in every lesson. This corresponds to a new word every 15 minutes. When new words are introduced, students are often asked to try to explain these words (see excerpt 4). The introduction, description and translation of words has at least two functions: 1) they serve to make sure that the students understand what is said; and 2) the translated words are put forward as important and to some extent academic words. They can be divided into three groups: A) words from the texts read; B) technical terms; C) non-subject specific.

In the first category, I find words that she anticipates that the student do not know beforehand and which occur because they are part of older literary texts in the curriculum. In other words, these are inherent in the subject (see Table 1). Whether these are understood as part of the academic register or not, can be discussed. As seen in the interview, the teacher uses such non-technical terms as emblematic of the language code that the students do not have when they arrive, and these words can be understood as inherent in the subject since they are part of the curricular texts discussed in classroom interactions. I also find that having these words in their repertoire is an advantage for the students in the construction of identities as good students.

The next group is the technical terms. The technical terms used in this classroom are predominantly Latin and Greek words for genres, eras etc. Many of the words introduced through these Danish lessons are technical terms that might be new to all of the students since they are part of a specific academic subject. But, as we will see in excerpt 4, students from homes with specific cultural capital might still have an advantage since the vocabulary is connected to the arts and high culture.

Finally, there is also the introduction of non-subject specific terms such as "bourgeoisie" and "urbanization", which corresponds to what Ulriksen et al. (2007) describes as "før-faglige ord" (eng. pre-technical or foundational terms). These words are not directly technical terms or as inherently a part of the curriculum as the words from the analyzed texts. But, when they are emphasized as words it is necessary to introduce and translate during Danish lessons, they are being linked to the academic register and framed as important. It is more likely that these non-subject specific terms are found in contexts outside the classroom, and students from homes with academic educations might have an advantage in knowing these words beforehand. However, in the data I find no evidence that the educational level of the student's parents has a huge impact on the knowledge of these words in the students' third year at STX-school.

Table 1: Introduced words

Words from the texts		Technical terms		Non-subject specific terms	
Feston	Festoon (embroidered edging)	Multimodalitet	Multimodality	Digression	Digression
Kjolesøm	Dress seam	Volta	Volta (turning point)	Urbanisering	Urbanization
Forvendelse	Remorse	Biedermeierkultur	Biedermeier culture	Borgerskabet	Bourgeoisie
Lyse ud	old expression for “ walking a guest outwith light ”	Kvartet	Quartet	Skyggeside	Shadow side
		Terzet	Terzet	Naturbeskrivelse	Description of nature
		Det lyriske jeg	The lyric I	Klassekamp	Class conflict
Profanitet	Profanity	Sonet	Sonnet		
Pantelåner	Pawn broker	Versaler	Versals (Capital letters)		
Bænkevarmer	Bench warmer (wallflower)	Retoriske spørgsmål	Rhetorical questions		
		Panoramisk	Panoramic		
		Scenisk	Scenic		
		EksPLICIT fortæller	Explicit narrator		
		Flade personer	Flat personas		
		Personifikation	Personification		
		Besjæling	Antromorphism		
		Reportage	Reportage		
		Impressionisme	Impressionism		

Evaluations

The most explicit metapragmatic actions are evaluations – situations where the teacher compliments or reprimands a student’s choice of words. The evaluated words are often not technical and non-subject specific words. The teacher generally praises the students for their contributions in class, but when the language is directly addressed, it is primarily for using poly-syllabic words and words that are described by the dictionary of the Danish Language (“Ordbog over det danske sprog” ODS) as mainly used in literary and written language such as *kummerlige* and *retskaffen* (ODS). These are words that, according to the teacher, probably catch the essence and the complexities of the texts, which are older texts, but this also indicates a specific understanding of the academic register where poly-syllabic, literary and loan words have a special status.

Table 2: positively evaluated words

Words students are praised for using
Selverkendelse (self-awareness)
Alkoholmisbrug (alcohol abuse)
Mangfoldighed (diversity)
Kummerlige (miserable)
Melankolsk (melancholic)
Sentimental (sentimental)
Retskaffen (honourable)
Fascineret (fascinated).

In the following excerpt, we see an example of how a student is praised for using a specific word.

Excerpt 2: Danish lesson. Teacher-led classroom discussion of Karen Blixen's "Ringen" ("The Ring") and the characters in the text.

01	Martin:	jeg synes det virker som	Martin:	I think it seems like
02		om han har <u>accepteret</u> at		he has <u>accepted</u> that
03		han er lavere stillet i		he is positioned lower
04		hierarkiet		in hierarchy
05	Susanne:	jaøh ((tøvende)) han ja	Susanne:	yeaeh ((hesitantly))
06		han er en solid fyr ikke		he yes is a solid guy
07				right
08		(.)		(.)
09	Martin:	fordi at han prøver	Martin:	because he tries to
10		ligesom at være sådan		like be like how can
11		hvad skal man sige (.)		you say it (.)
12		retskaffen xx		honourable xx
13		(0.6)		(0.6)
14	Susanne:	det var et flot ord	Susanne:	that was a fine word
15		(0.3)		(0.3)
16	Martin:	så retskaffen som muligt	Martin:	as honourable as
17		over for hende		possible towards her
18	Susanne:	ja (0.4) det var et	Susanne:	yes (0.4) that was a
19		meget fint ord		very good word
20		(.)		(.)
21	Martin:	tak	Martin:	thank you
22	Susanne:	ja	Susanne:	yes
23		(0.4)		(0.4)
24	Lucas:	((griner))	Lucas:	((laughs))
25	Susanne:	ja men det var jo godt	Susanne:	yes but that was
26		sagt ikke (.) det er		actually well put
27		rigtigt		right (.) it is right

In the excerpt, Martin explicitly addresses that he is looking for the right word to express his thoughts about the character. In line 14 Susanne praises the word "retskaffen" (honourable) saying it is "a fine word". When he repeats his point with the same word she praises it again as a "very good word" (l. 18-19). In this way it becomes very explicit which words she evaluates positively. He thanks her, and finally she praises his contribution in a manner that is not as explicitly concerning the choice of words, but indicates that she finds that the observation in general is good and correct. In these overt evaluations of language use, there is a general focus on lexical competence. Once or twice she states that something is "expressed well" or as in the above "well said" which can be seen as synonymous with a "good word" but can also encapsulate whole phrases, sentences or arguments. Such cases are not listed in the tables above.

The teacher rarely directly disregards answers, and in the four lessons I have only found two examples of situations where the students were asked to rephrase an answer. In the first example a student's answer is labelled as read from the text and she asks him to rephrase it in "human words". This could be understood as an ideology of ownership, where students are not allowed to directly copy the book. There is only this one example where this ideology is seen. Whether or not his words were the exact words from the text, the correction with the articulated preference for "human words" reveals an ideology that students sometimes use language that is too literary, and it hints at an ideology of authenticity where students should be, if not themselves, at least authentic as human beings, using words that are understood as natural in oral communication. In the other example of negative evaluation of a student's choice of words, she explains that the word is too long. Although this is not very often

articulated, it is then a present ideology that the students have to balance the use of long, literary words in the classroom.

In the analyzed lessons there is no indication of ideologies of consistency or historicity in the teacher's explicit metapragmatic acts: The two negative evaluations show that students who both do and don't use polysyllabic words and technical terms are asked to rephrase with simpler or shorter words, and the positive evaluations show that students with different backgrounds and habitual linguistic practices are also all praised for using poly-syllabic, literary and loan words.

In this section, we have seen how the teacher produces an ideology of difference between home and school language, an ideology of appropriateness and an ideology of subjectification and how the teacher's ideological stance unfolds in pedagogical practices with a profound focus on teaching the students vocabulary and praising them when they use specific words. In accordance with the ideological stance expressed in the interview, not only technical terms are addressed explicitly but also old words in texts and other non-subject specific terms are explained and foregrounded as good. Especially polysyllabic words and technical terms with Latin and Greek origin are foregrounded. These practices can be understood as part of an enregisterment process constituting the academic register. Still, even though there is a predominant focus on learning words of this sort, some words are framed as too long or too literary for the students to use and there is an ideology of ownership present where students can be positioned as inauthentic if they use language too close to the read secondary literature. However, ideologies of authenticity are not predominant in the teacher's actions inside and outside the classroom. Students are praised for using long, archaic or polysyllabic words regardless of their customary practices and being able to codeswitch is stressed as important in the interviews. So while it is sometimes emphasized that students should be responsible for their own words and sound authentic as orally speaking students, it seems that neither historicity or consistency are invoked by the teacher as important for a student to be considered a legitimate user of the repertoire associated with the academic register.

The language ideologies of the teacher are in themselves important for the students' abilities to position as good students. By spending much time on teaching vocabulary during class, vocabulary is framed as very important and this could be expected to affect the students' understandings of their own academic identities. In the following section, I will show that this explicit language teaching does not result in a smooth language socialization of all students, that some students have ideologies that differ from the teachers, and that this leads to different possibilities for the use of language preferred by the teacher and for positioning as a good student.

11. Language ideologies of students

In the interviews, the students reproduce the focus on not swearing as part of school language and almost all students explain that students should be more formal, use less "slang" and be polite in the classroom, especially in Susanne's class. Seven of the 16 students also emphasized the importance of using technical terms or "fancier terms", when asked how they spoke in class, how it differed from other situations, if there was a difference between the teachers' and the students' language use, or if there was a way of speaking that was better in class. It was mainly students who did well in school and were invested in being or doing 'good students' who mentioned vocabulary as important. Moreover, when asked directly if it is important to use specific words in the classroom, some students directly said no, such as Cathrine in the following excerpt:

Excerpt 3: Interview with Cathrine.

01	Int:	fylder det noget	Int:	does it take up in
02		overhovedet i for		any time in for
03		eksempel		instance Danish
04		danskundervisningen (.)		lessons (.) such
05		sådan noget med hvordan		things as how you
06		man taler eller hvilke		talk or which words
07		ord man bruger og sådan		you use and stuff
08		noget		like that
09		(0.5)		(0.5)
10	Cathrine:	mm det føler jeg ikke	Cathrine:	mm I do not feel so
11		(.)		(.)
12	Int:	nej	Int:	no
13	Cathrine:	jeg lægger ikke mærke	Cathrine:	I do not notice that
14		til det		(0.7)
15		(0.7)		
16	Int:	det er ikke noget (.)	Int:	it is not something
17		Susanne snakker om og		(.) Susanne talks
18		sådan		about and such
19		(.)		(.)
20	Cathrine:	mm næh	Cathrine:	mm nope

This indicates that the students do not necessarily experience the vocabulary as important, or that they are not equally reflexive about language use. It also implies that the language socialization works differently, or at least reveals that despite the teacher's focus on teaching vocabulary (where she frequently introduces a new word or praises the use of words), vocabulary is still not the first thing that comes to mind for some students when talking about language in school. Students also expressed different ideologies regarding the use of the academic register and different levels of investment in it. In the following sub-sections, I will present three boys who project very different school identities: Karl, Martin and Lucas. My point of departure is an excerpt where they react differently when the teacher introduces a new word by asking if the students know a term for a concept.

Karl

Excerpt 4: Danish class. Teacher-led discussion. The teacher Susanne is explaining that the poem they have read has some stanzas with four verse lines and some stanzas with three verse lines and then explains that this has a specific term that they might know from the world of music.

01	Susanne:	tre vers (0.4) og (.)	Susanne:	three verses (0.4) and
02		fire og den har (.)		(.) four verses and
03		tre vers (0.5) okay		this has (.) three
04		(0.7) der er en eller		verses (0.5) okay (0.7)
05		anden systematik i		there is some sort of
06		det (2.7) hvad kalder		systematism in this
07		man noget med <u>fire</u>		(2.7) what do you call
08		inden for <u>musik</u> (0.6)		something with <u>four</u> in
09		verdenen ved I det		the world of <u>music</u>
10		(0.4) når noget (0.8)		(0.6) do you know that
11		er fire-hændigt		(0.4) when something
12		(3.5)		(0.8) is for four hands
13		((elever snakker med		(3.5)((students talk to
14		hinanden, mumlende))		each other, mumbling))
15	Susanne:	hvad kalder man det	Susanne:	what do you call that

16	(1.2)		(1.2)
17	Frederik: er det ikke øh fire	Frederik: is it not four measures	
18	takter		(0.4)
19	(0.4)		
20	Susanne: joeh men når når det	Susanne: yeah but when when	
21	er fire eller der	there is four or there	
22	fire musikere der	is four musicians who	
23	spiller sammen ikke	plays together right	
24	det er måske et bedre	that might be a better	
25	udtryk (1.2) det ved	expression (1.2) Karl	
26	Karl	knows that	
27	Karl: det hedder en kvartet	Karl: it is called a quartet	
28	Susanne: ja (.) det er rigtigt	Susanne: yes (.) that is correct	
29	Martin: EN HVAD ((spørgende))	Martin: A WHAT ((question	
30	(0.7)	intonation))	
31		(0.7)	
32	Susanne: kvartet (0.8)	Susanne: quartet (0.8)	
33	((Elever snakker i	((students talk in the	
34	baggrunden))	background))	
35	Susanne: så den her er der	Susanne: so this one there (0.8)	
36	(0.8) [kvartetter]	[are quartets]	
37	Martin: [ja slap af xx]	Martin: [yeah relax xx]	
38	Lucas: xx	Lucas: xx	
39	Susanne: det er nyt stof det	Susanne: it is new material this	
40	her ikke (0.8) ja der	right (0.8) yes there	
41	er kvartetter (3.1)	are quartets (3.1)	
42	det er der også her	there are also here	
43	(0.4) der er to	(0.4) there are two	
44	kvartetter	quartets	
45	(1.1)	(1.1)	
46	Lucas: °kvartetter°	Lucas: °quartets°	
47	((spørgende	((question intonation))	
48	tonefald))	(0.8)	
49	(0.8)		
50	Susanne: Karl ved du så også	Susanne: Karl do you then also	
51	hvad det hedder når	know what it is called	
52	det er <u>tre</u>	when there is <u>three</u>	
53	(1.3)	(1.3)	
54	Karl: mm (2.2) nej det kan	Karl: mm (2.2) no I cannot	
55	jeg ikke huske	remember	
56	Susanne: nej det er heller	Susanne: no it is not that	
57	ikke så almindelig	common either it is	
58	det er terzetter	terzets	
59	(2.4) [terzetter]	(2.4) [terzets]	
60	Unknown: [tarteletter]	Unknown: [tartlets]	
61	Martin: TARTELETTER	Martin: TARTLETS	

In the first turn, Susanne asks what something with four is called and hints to the field of music. She thereby indicates that she expects that the term for a stanza with four verse lines is unknown to everyone and in l. 39 she explains that is new material and thus underlines that it is not something she has introduced before. After she poses and rephrases the question there are several long periods of silence. The long pauses indicate that most of the students either do not want to participate in the activity or do not know the word or understand which word she is looking for. She then repeats the question and after a pause Frederik gives an answer that she acknowledges, but then she rephrases the question, indicating that this was not what she was looking for. From the context we can presume that Karl must have raised his hand, as she says “Karl knows that”. It is worth noting that this phrasing already positions Karl as

someone she expects to have the right answer. Karl also answers very confidently without any hedges, “it is called a quartet” (l. 27), which she answers is correct. By engaging in the activity and phrasing his answer with confidence, he aligns with the teacher’s language policy and positions himself as a student who knows and also participates – in other words a good student. Susanne continues asking Karl if he then also knows what it is called when there are three, indicating that she sees him as someone with expert knowledge in the field. He answers that he does not “remember” (l. 54-55) and thereby upholds the position as someone who would know this, but just forgot. Susanne aligns and says that it is not that common and instead of asking if anyone else knows, she gives the answer herself: “terzet” (l. 56-59) and thereby implies that if Karl does not know, she does not expect that anybody else knows.

Karl is in this way often put forward as a student with expert knowledge in high cultural matters. He has parents in the arts (one of them with a higher degree) and from the interview I know that it is very likely that he has knowledge of classical music from home. This knowledge seems to give him an advantage in positioning as a good student in this context even though the theme of the lesson is not music, because the liberal arts in general have overlapping terms. Karl is also one of the students that often uses words such as “melancholic” that are praised by the teacher. While the knowledge of such technical and non-technical words are of course part of his ability to position as a good student, it is not the only important matter. He engages with the teacher-led activity and thereby participates in the ideological work that upholds the relevance of knowing words such as quartet and terzet.

In the interview he generally describes himself as someone who finds it easy to converse the teachers, using the right words and getting high marks. He also reproduces the ideology of appropriateness and in connection to his understanding of the academic language, explains that it comes naturally to him to switch language in different situations. This is seen in the following excerpt from the interview where he has explained how students need to change their language with teachers, using less slang, less profanities and more technical terms:

Excerpt 5: Interview with Karl

01	Int:	så tror du at det har en	Int:	so do you think it has an
02		betydning for hvor godt		influence on how well you
03		man klarer sig egentlig		manage actually how you
04		hvordan man		
05	Karl:	mm til en vis grad	Karl:	mm to some extent
06	Int:	ja	Int:	yes
07	Karl:	til en vis grad (1.0)	Karl:	to some extent (1.0)
08		fordi jeg tror at det er		because I think it is
09		<u>vigtigt</u> at man kan finde		<u>important</u> that you can
10		ud af (0.7) <u>hvornår</u> man		figure out (0.7) <u>when</u> you
11		skal snakke på en bestemt		should speak in a certain
12		måde		way
13	Int:	mm	Int:	mm
14		(1.0)		(1.0)
15	Karl:	[for eksempel]	Karl:	[for example]
16	Int:	[har det] egentlig øh	Int:	[has it] actually ever
17		nogensinde været: <u>svært</u>		been: <u>difficult</u> to
18		at <u>forstå</u> lærerne da I		<u>understand</u> the teachers
19		startede		<u>when you</u> started
20		(0.4)		(0.4)
21	Karl:	øh f- jeg har aldrig	Karl:	eh f- I have never really
22		rigtig haft noget problem		had a problem with it
23		med det (0.4) øh		(0.4) ehm
24	Int:	mm	Int:	mm
25		(1.4)		(1.4)

26	Karl:	sådan noget er altid	Karl:	such things have always
27		kommet rimelig naturligt		come quite naturally to
28		til <u>mig</u> (.) fordi at		<u>me</u> (.) because (1.7) I
29		(1.7) jeg har altid været		have always been kind of
30		sådan meget opmærksom på		very aware of how people
31		hvordan folk snakker (.)		speak (.)
32	Int:	mm	Int:	mm
33	Karl:	og altid prøvet (.) jeg	Karl:	and always tried (.) I
34		tror det det kommer lidt		think in a way it it
35		sådan naturligt for mig		comes a bit like
36		hvis jeg (0.6) er i en		naturally for me if I
37		gruppe (0.5) hvis jeg		(0.6) am in a group (0.5)
38		møder nogen som snakker		if I meet someone who
39		på en bestemt måde så går		talks in a certain way
40		det sådan <u>ret</u> hurtigt		then it comes <u>quite</u>
41		(0.9) altså så går det		quickly you know (0.9)
42		ret hurtigt inden jeg		well then it goes quite
43		selv snakker på den måde		fast before I talk like
44				that myself

Karl's description here illustrates that he engages in the ideology of appropriateness and describes it as a good thing to switch language in different situations. It is not possible to say whether this is related to Susanne's teaching or to longer-term socialization from former schools or home, but the data show that this is different from how other students react to the language policy and ideologies of the teacher. The excerpt also illustrates how he positions himself in a conversation with me, a researcher, as an authentic speaker of the academic register as he explains how it comes "naturally" (l. 35-36) to him and compares it to how he switches in all social accounts. This indicates that he is invested in the identities projected through his linguistic actions in class.

Martin

If we then turn to the other students' reactions in the classroom interaction in excerpt 4 above, we see that after Karl answered "quartets", Martin says "a what" out loud (l. 29), and thereby demonstrates to the whole classroom that he does not recognize the word. Martin and Lucas' following comments are not very distinct. It sounds like Martin says "relax", but it is not clear whether Martin only addresses Lucas, the classroom or the teacher. The teacher's response – "it is new material" (l. 39) – indicates that she hears him and interprets his comment as resistance towards her expectation that someone could know the word. By making everyone aware of his lack of knowledge and by acting in a way that might be considered impolite, since he is interrupting the class while the teacher is explaining something, he positions himself in contrast to the ideal of the good student. Moreover, if the phrase "relax" is interpreted as addressed to her, it could be understood as a very direct challenge of her authority. In both cases it can be interpreted as a small rebellion against her language policy. When Susanne introduces them to the next word "terzets", Martin and a boy in the back reacts by saying "tartelletter" (l. 60-61) (here translated "tartlets". Tartlets are a popular Danish dish, traditionally served at lunch and they are associated with being boorish rather than high culture, such as the French loan word might implicate). This could be understood as a ridiculing wordplay on the 'terzet'. Martin was a student that, though he was active when he was in school and also to some extent adapted to the language policy of the teacher as shown in excerpt 2, in many ways often marked opposition to the school activities. The wordplay can be understood as a recognition of the word as very academic and a deliberate use of the conflict between this language and his own (and most of his peers') to

perform as tough, funny and in opposition to the academics. Martin’s ridicule of the term *terzet* in the excerpt above can also be interpreted as an overt explication of an ideological conflict. By ridiculing the term Martin indicates that learning the word is unnecessary and not important and thereby contests the ideology valuing these words. Such overt resistance and openly ridiculing words make the students appear as in opposition to the school activity and the ideal of a good student. Such resistance can also be more covert as we shall see in the following excerpts with Lucas.

Lucas

In line 46 in excerpt 4, Lucas (who is wearing the microphone) repeats the word “quartets”. His intonation implies that it is a question, but his tone of voice indicates that it is only addressed to himself and it could be a repetition for memorization while he maybe writes the word down. Such activities indicate that Lucas adapts and acknowledges the teacher’s language policy and authority. However, outside the classroom he contests her language use and he produces slightly different language ideologies.

In the following excerpt from the interview, I ask Lucas if there is a difference between how the teachers and the students talk.

Excerpt 6: Interview with Lucas

01 Int:	har du egentlig tænkt -	Int:	have you actually thought
02	er der stor forskel på		- is there a great
03	hvordan lærerne taler og		difference between how
04	hvordan eleverne taler		teachers talk and how the
05	(1.7)		students talk
06			(1.7)
07 Lucas:	ja så er der for eksempel	Lucas:	yes for example someone
08	sådan en som Susanne hun		like Susanne she is <u>really</u>
09	er <u>rigtig</u> god til at få		good at spouting a <u>lot</u>
10	fyret en <u>rigtig</u> masse af		where it sounds <u>really</u>
11	hvor det lyder <u>rigtig</u>		wise and really smart
12	klogt og rigtig smart		
13 Int:	mm	Int:	mm
14 Lucas:	øh som man måske nogle	Lucas:	eh that you maybe
15	gange tænker (.) <u>er</u> det		sometimes think (.) <u>isn't</u>
16	ikke bare det her hun		it just this she is saying
17	siger jo det var det så		and then yes it was
18	(.)		(.)
19 Int:	mm (1.0) så hun bruger	Int:	mm (1.0) so she uses some
20	nogle ord som man måske		words that people maybe
21	ikke helt forstår [eller]		not completely understand
22			[or]
23 Lucas:	[ja] i	Lucas:	[yes] at least some where
24	hvert fald nogle hvor man		you think that you
25	tænker det kunne man		actually could have
26	egentlig godt have		communicated it much
27	formidlet meget nemmere		easier (.) [than] that
28	(.) [end] som så		
29 Int:	[ja]	Int:	[yeah]
30	(1.3)		(1.3)
31 Lucas:	øh (1.0) ja hvordan	Lucas:	eh (1.0) yeah how the
32	lærerne taler i forhold		teachers speak compared to
33	til eleverne (1.3) det		the students (1.3) I do
34	ved jeg ikke de skal vel		not know they probably
35	jo også bruge - altså de		have to use - well they
36	skal jo tale det så det		have to speak so that it

37	er relevant for	is relevant for the
38	undervisningen [også]	lessons [as well]
39	Int: [mm]	Int: [mm]
40	Lucas: så vi ligesom lærer nogle	Lucas: too like teach us some new
41	nye ting [så]	stuff [so]
42	Int: [mm]	Int: [mm]
43	Lucas: det er der jo	Lucas: that is of course
44	(0.6)	(0.6)
45	Int: ja	Int: yes
46	(.)	(.)
47	Lucas: de snakker jo på en anden	Lucas: they do of course talk in
48	måde (.) så vi ligesom	another way (.) so that we
49	kan lære af det	can like learn from it

Lucas explains how he sometimes experiences Susanne saying things in a way that sounds smart but could be expressed in an easier and more understandable way. Note that he expresses this as she “får fyret en hel masse af” which can be translated as “spouts a lot” (1.9-10). This expression implies an aversion towards this practice or at least a downgrading of it. He then explains that the teachers have to speak in specific ways, so that the students can learn from it. Thereby he reproduces an ideology of difference between the academic language and the students’ language, and the same understanding of the teachers’ responsibility to teach the language to the students as we saw in the interview with Susanne. But by stating that Susanne might sound smart but that the meaning could be expressed simpler with other words, he also indicates that he finds this register rather unnecessary. This is also seen in how he describes the way he himself changes his language in the classroom:

Excerpt 7: Interview with Lucas

01	Lucas: jeg tænker i hvert	Lucas: I at least think a
02	fald mere over hvordan	bit more about how I
03	jeg sådan - hvis jeg	like - if I should
04	nu skulle sige et	say some sentence
05	eller andet en eller	that it should
06	anden sætning at den	ideally be
07	skulle helst formidles	communicated in a
08	på sådan en ordentlig	proper sense like a
09	måde (.) sådan en god	good sense so that it
10	måde så det lyder	<u>might</u> sound smarter
11	(0.4) måske klogere	than it actually is
12	end det egentlig er	[right]
13	[ikke]	
14	Int: [ja]	Int: [yeah]
15	(0.4)	(0.4)
16	Lucas: så den store forskel	Lucas: so the big difference
17	der er (.) kontrast	there is (.) contrast
18	der er i mellem når	there is between when
19	der er en lærer og når	there is a teacher
20	der ikke er en lærer	and when there is not
21	til stede	a teacher present
22	Int: mm	Int: mm
23	Lucas: hvordan vi snakker der	Lucas: how we speak then
24	(1.1)	(1.1)
25	Int: hvordan får man noget	Int: how do you make
26	til at lyde klogere	things sound smarter
27	(.)	(.)
28	Lucas:	Lucas:
29		

30	åh phh bruger nogle	Int:	oh phh use some <u>fancy</u>
31	Int: <u>fancy</u> begreber og	Int:	terms and stuff like
32	sådan noget		that
33	Lucas: ja	Lucas:	yeah
34	(1.3)		(1.3)
35	det er nok primært det		it is probably
36	Int: der ligesom er	Int:	primarily that
37	(0.3)		(0.3)
38	Lucas: mm	Lucas:	mm
39	(0.9)		(0.9)
40	i dansk for eksempel		like in Danish for
41	sige at øh ej men det		example say that eh
42	her der rammer han		well but this here he
43	Int: følelserne	Int:	affects the feelings
44	Lucas: (.)	Lucas:	(.)
45	mm		mm
46	øh der bruger øh		eh here eh the writer
47	forfatteren - der		uses - there he comes
48	kommer han ind og		in and affects the
49	påvirker læserens		feelings of the
50	følelser så går man		reader then you go in
51	ind og bruger <i>han</i>		and use <i>he employs</i>
52	<i>benytter sig af</i>		<i>the appeal form</i>
53	<i>appelformen patos for</i>		<i>pathos to get in and</i>
54	<i>at komme ind og</i>		<i>affect our feelings</i>
	<i>påvirke vores følelser</i>		xxx ((stylized
	xxx ((stiliseret))		voice))

Lucas' stylization of himself saying "he employs the appeal form pathos to get in and affect our feelings" (l. 49-53), and his description of this as using "fancy terms" (l. 28-30) to make something "sound smarter than it actually is" (l. 10-12) can be understood as a de-authenticating practice, where he positions himself as a less invested and natural speaker of the academic register than was the case with Karl above.

The ideological stance expressed in the two excerpts from the interview is also in direct contrast to the teacher's understanding of the new words as something that will open the students' gaze and make them see and be able to describe things in themselves as well as in school related activities. Lucas' description here is much more in line with the Resource Instrumental Mobility Ideology where the sole purpose of learning the words he experiences as fancy are instrumental: to do better in school by being *perceived* as clever. More of the students seems reproduce this instrumental and external motivation: for example, eleven say more or less directly that they or their peers change their language to impress or please the teachers, while I do not find that any of the students describe internal motivations for learning new words or reproduce the ideology of subjectification.

Lucas' statements illustrates that even if students have knowledge of the repertoire and can reproduce lexical items associated with the academic register, they might not share the language ideology of the teacher. Even though this does not have as direct consequences for his external school identity in the classroom as overt resistance, it is an important part of his educational identity that might affect his ideas about his own competences and experience of a consistent social identity.

The data from the classroom thus suggest that the focus on vocabulary makes it an easier task to position as a good student for the students that have the knowledge of specific words beforehand and for the students that have the cultural background to make qualified guesses. In excerpt 4, we saw that by having what in this classroom is very exclusive knowledge of classical music, Karl has an advantage in positioning as a good student when the new word "quartet" is introduced in class, while students like Martin and Lucas, who do not know this

or related words, have the possibility to silently adapt or perform opposition. But not only is their knowledge important for their positions – it also matters how they engages with the teacher-led activities. The excerpts illustrates that students engage in the language ideological work differently: while Karl aligns with the teacher in and outside the classroom and positions himself as an invested and authentic user of the academic register, Martin engages in counter-ideological work that positions him very overtly in opposition to the school activities and the ideal of the good student. Lucas aligns to some extent by acknowledging the teacher’s authority and reproducing the understanding of the forms associated with the academic register, while at the same time contesting this language policy and constructing motivational ideologies for this language use that differ from the teacher’s. In doing so, he de-authenticates himself as a speaker of the academic register and produces identities and language that might be considered less consistent. As we shall see in the next section, consistency might be of special importance for the students’ possibilities to be perceived as good students or acknowledged for their language use by their peers.

12. Peer policing and authenticity

The students’ identity work is also affected by the ideological acts of their peers. I find that some students express ideologies of authenticity where switching to the academic register is understood as inauthentic for some participants. This is seen in the interviews as well as in peer policing in the classroom. Even though many students describe it as natural to modify their language when speaking to teachers, it is also disapproved of when some people change in a way that might be perceived as too much or too far from their language in other settings. In the following excerpt, Ida reflects on the language use of some of the boys:

Excerpt 8: Interview with Ida

01	Ida:	jeg synes godt no:gle	Ida:	I think that some:times
02		gange nogle af drengene		some of the boys can be
03		godt kan være meget		very like then they
04		sådan så vil de lige		will like show that
05		sådan vise at de har		they have a good grip
06		styr på et emne eller		of some subject or you
07		sådan så kan de godt		know then they can
08		(0.6) lige pludselig		(0.6) suddenly talk
09		snakke som om at de		like they are just
10		bare er (0.3)		(0.3) mega formal and
11		megaformelle og skal		will just use this and
12		bruge dit og dat		that terms and just
13		begreber og bare sådan		like all sorts of words
14		alle mulige ord		(.) so that if they
15		(.) så hvis de		[should say]
16		[skal sige]		
17	Int:	[mm]	Int:	[mm]
18	Ida:	et eller andet <u>helt</u>	Ida:	some sort of <u>completely</u>
19		normalt ord (0.6) så		normal word (0.6) they
20		bruger de lige et andet		just use some kind of
21		synonym for ordet som		synonym for the word
22		(.) bare lyder lidt		that (.) just sounds a
23		finere		bit more posh
24	Int:	ja	Int:	yeah
25	Ida:	hvor man sådan: okay	Ida:	where you like: okay
26		altså hvad lav- men så		well what ar- but then
27		synes man også selv det		you just think yourself

28	er sådan lidt okay hvad		that it is a bit okay
29	laver du agtigt		what are you doing ish
30	Int: ja	Int:	yeah
31	Ida: fordi så er man sådan	Ida:	because you are then
32	det ville man jo - det		like you would - you
33	ved man at det ville de		know that they would
34	aldrig gøre (.) til en		never do that (.) to
35	selv (.) eller		oneself (.) or at home
36	derhjemme eller sådan		or something like that
37	noget		(0.3)
38	(0.3)		
39	Int: nej	Int:	no
40	Ida: og sidder lærerne jo	Ida:	and then the teachers
41	helt ej hvor er du god		are all wow you are
42	((griner))		good ((laughs))

Ida says that when a non-specified group of boys use synonyms for words to sound posh in front of teachers, she thinks “okay what are you doing - ish” and explains that this is because they would not do this outside the classroom (l. 33-36). This indicates that she experiences the boys’ language use as a crossing (Rampton 2018) into a language style they are not legitimate users of and hints an ideology of consistency where “you have to be yourself” and cannot claim personal authenticity if your language changes in different settings. This perception is in contrast to the teacher’s understanding of codeswitching between classroom and non-classroom language as natural, necessary and an expression of linguistic competence. In more of the interviews, I find that the students describe it as important to sound natural inside and outside the classroom, and in some interviews there are indications of an ideology of language not just as a means to gain insights or advantages, but as part of who you are. Martin, for example, says the following about people who shift into a certain slang register:

“men jeg føler bare det er den forkert måde ligesom og og gøre det på fordi man skal - jeg synes jeg synes dybt dybt inde i mig selv at man skal være sig selv”

”but I just feel that it is the wrong way like to to do it because you have to - I think deep deep inside myself that you have to be yourself”

By describing language as part of who you are in relation to why you should not shift into new registers, codeswitching/crossing is put forward as compromising yourself, trying to be something you are not – in other words being inauthentic. Martin stresses that this is something he thinks “deep deep inside”. Even though this is not directly in relation to school language, it is interesting in this context because it explicates how language and self is connected and how emotionally invested in such ideologies some students seem to be.

In the classroom, the students often react to each other’s contributions, and the public reactions that involve the whole classroom always appear ridiculing. The following excerpt shows how a student is ridiculed for using a phrase referencing another school-subject. In the excerpt, the class is discussing what happens with individuals during the urbanization process:

Excerpt 9: Teacher-led classroom discussion about the individual under the urbanization process in the late 19th century.

01	Susanne:	ja så siger I (.) ja	Susanne:	yes then you say (.)
02		man får større		well you get more
03		ansvar hvis man er		responsibility if you
04		individ ikke (0.6)		are individual right
05		øh man øh man øh		(0.6) eh you eh you
06		(3.3) man er uvant		eh (3.3) you are
07		med situationen		unaccustomed with the
08		(1.6) og så er der		situation (1.6) and
09		en af jer der sagde		then there is one of
10		fremmed (1.3) ja		you who said
11		(.)		unfamiliar (1.3) yes
12				(.)
13	Mikkel:	kan man ikke føle	Mikkel:	can't you feel lonely
14		sig ensom		
15	Susanne:	JO	Susanne:	YEAH
16	Mikkel:	altså jeg ved ikke	Mikkel:	well I don't know
17		einsam gemeinsam jeg		einsam gemeinsam I
18		ved ikke		don't know
19		(.)		(.)
20	Susanne:	det er <u>fuldstændig</u>	Susanne:	it is <u>completely</u>
21		[rigtigt]		[right]
22	Martin:	[ÅRH JA] TYSK DER	Martin:	[OH YEAH] GERMAN
23				THERE
24	Unknown:	ÅRH JA	Unknown:	OH YEAH
25	Martin:	[TYSK PÅ A MAND]	Martin:	[GERMAN A MAN]
26	Unknown:	[ÅRHH]	Unknown:	[OHH]
27	Unknown:	[HOLD KÆFT MAND]	Unknown:	[SHUT UP MAN]
28	Unknown:	[ÅH]	Unknown:	[WOW]
29	Lucas:	hvad sagde han ((to	Lucas:	what did he say ((to
30		Martin))		Martin))
31		((uro i klassen))		((bustle in the class
32				room))
33		(.)		(.)
34	Martin:	einsam gemeinsam det	Martin:	einsam gemeinsam it
35		er det vi lige har		is the thing we just
36		haft i tysk ((to		had in german class
37		Lucas))		((to Lucas))
38		(.)		(.)
39	Unknown:	du skal da have tysk	Unknown:	you should have
40		A sammen med os		german A with us
41	Mikkel:	nej skal jeg ikke	Mikkel:	no I should not
42	Lucas:	((griner)) xxx	Lucas:	((laughs)) xxx
43	Susanne:	vi tager den lige	Susanne:	we will just take
44		her (.) hvor-		this here (.) where-
45		hvordan kan det lade		how can it be (.)
46		sig gøre (.) at		that you can go out
47		man øh kan gå ud på		on a field in
48		en mark i Hvertssund		Hvertsund and feel
49		og så føle at øh alt		that everything is
50		er godt og man har		fine and that you
		mange øh (...)		have many eh (...)

First Mikkel answers that you can feel lonely and hesitantly adds the German phrase “einsam gemeinsam” (l. 13-18). By saying “I don’t know” before and after answering, he flags that he is either not completely sure that the phrase “einsam gemeinsam” is appropriate in the context or it could be understood as a marker that he is just not confident using these words because he is ‘crossing’. The teacher reacts by praising his answer as “completely right” (l. 20-21).

The answer also leads to reactions from the classmates led by Martin who first shout “oh yeah German there” (l. 22) which is followed up by more of the classmates shouting “oh” and the like. This shouting can be interpreted as a way of signaling that Mikkel is transgressing the norms of how to speak and simultaneously as a way of positioning him as someone who is not associated with saying something correct or being a stereotypic speaker of the academic register. In other words, Mikkel’s answer is here treated as inauthentic by his classmates. In line 29 Lucas turns to Martin asking what Mikkel said and Martin answers “einsam gemeinsam it is something we just had in German class” (Lucas has Spanish as his third language and does not attend German class). This shows that Martin knows and understands the reference and indicates that his shouting is directed at Mikkel’s use of the reference and thereby Mikkel’s identity and not the words themselves (as in excerpt 4). The class continues teasing Mikkel with his German skills. One boy suggests that he should have high level German and Mikkel responds to the sentence “you should have German A with us” with a “no I should not” (l. 41), which indicates that he does not see it as a compliment. The teasing is stopped when the teacher continues trying to highlight the point of his contribution rather than the wording.

It can be discussed whether the phrase “einsam gemeinsam” is understood as part of the academic register or just as German. I will argue that it is probably understood by the students as a technical term that could be used in Danish class, especially since the teacher praises the answer without any comments about the German origin of the phrase. I therefore assume that the teasing is not only related to the switch to German, but that this phrase for the students appears as a marked switch to the academic register. Several strands of authenticity could be at play here. The teasing could be related to the ideology of consistency, with Mikkel understood as not being himself when he uses technical terms because he does not do so generally. The fact that other students know where Mikkel knows the phrase ‘einsam gemeinsam’ from could also cause the perception that it is not “his own words” linked to the ideology of ownership as well as the ideology of historicity, where you have to have long term knowledge and use of a register to be considered a legitimate user of it. For the students it might thus be considered inauthentic to make such references to other subjects or things you have just learned. These kind of peer responses are sometimes seen when students make references to other subjects, earlier lessons, use specific words or in other ways perform smartness. Mikkel is one of the students who is more often commented on than others by his peers. I have not found these kinds of response to contributions from students who are generally positioned as very competent/smart such as Karl. This indicates that certain students are more likely to be understood and pointed out as transgressing and that this is linked to their general practices and positions in the classroom. This tendency supports the interpretation of peer policing as based on ideologies of consistency and historicity, where mainly students who are already understood as regular and long-time users of the repertoire associated with the academic register are treated as legitimate users of the register.

This kind of peer policing can then be understood as simultaneously producing and a product of the students’ positions in the classroom. This is important regarding the ability to be perceived as a natural speaker of the academic register and thereby a good student by the teacher and peers, but it could also affect the internal experience of belonging in a field where the academic register is dominant. Furthermore, the peer policing possibly also affects the students that do not actually take part in the specific interaction. The risk of peer policing can lead to students trying to avoid being the victim of ridicule by risking crossing the line of what they are perceived as legitimate speakers of. Therefore they might not participate in the classroom interaction, or not in the manner the teacher expects or prefers. In this way, language ideologies of peers, especially the ones that prevail in the classroom, can affect a student’s actions in the classroom. The ideologies of authenticity and the students’ peer

policing raise some issues regarding social mobility and the teacher's role in the reproduction of social inequality, since societal and institutionalized norms of who is perceived as good in school or typical speakers of a register might affect the students' perception no matter the policies of the teacher.

13. Conclusion

The teacher produces: a language ideology of *difference* between the language of the STX-school and the students' language – especially regarding vocabulary; an ideology of *appropriateness*, where a certain language is appropriate in the classroom and the students should be aware of switching between different codes; and an ideology of *subjectification*, where the learning of new words is perceived as expanding the students' consciousness and empowering them. These are all found explicitly expressed in the interview as well as enacted in the classroom through a focus on teaching technical, non-subject specific and text-based vocabulary. Finally, I find that the teacher produces an ideology of *ownership* where students should be responsible for their own speech to be considered authentic and legitimate users of the register.

The ideologies of the teacher are not merely adopted by the students – they are contested, adjusted and sometimes not even recognized. The students who recognize the ideologies meet the ideologies and the enacted language policy in different ways. While some students reproduce the ideologies of the teacher, some only reproduce part of them and try to adapt with low investment, and others again directly rebel against the language teaching, using these ideological differences actively in the performance of identities in opposition to school activities. This underlines how language teaching is not a simple socialization process where the teacher has the sole power to define the language ideologies of the classroom.

Many of the students do reproduce the ideology of difference and appropriateness, but do not necessarily reproduce the teacher's understanding of the academic register or the perception of the importance of codeswitching, and none of the students reproduce the ideology of subjectification. Instead of a focus on how language can form their inner life, I find a profound focus on whether or not language is an authentic expression of the inner self, and one of the most interesting differences between ideologies of the teacher and some of the students is regarding the level of authenticity necessary to be perceived as a legitimate user of the academic register. Where the teacher reveals ideologies of authenticity only to a limited extent and only in the form of the ideology of ownership where students should not sound as if they read from the books, more of the students express strong ideologies of authenticity where consistency, historicity and ownership are all important and intertwined. This might be connected to different understandings of the social identities of the students. From the teacher's point of view, the students are probably first and foremost learners in the classroom, whereas the students are engaged in more complex identity work where they are also doing being young and being friends involved in the process of building social identities across different settings. In other words, the students orient towards other activities than just the teacher-led school activity in the classroom (Rymes 2010).

The language ideologies of the teacher set the local framework for what is perceived as the academic register and what is rewarded in the classroom. This directly affects who can manage well and perform as good students. Even in a situation where the teacher's understanding of the academic register is taught explicitly, those students with a specific cultural background (from home or former institutions) have an advantage in positioning as good students if they know the vocabulary or similar words taught in class beforehand and if they share the ideologies of the teacher. In this case, primarily polysyllabic, archaic and

loanwords with mostly Greek and Latin origin and the understanding of the necessity to change according to the situation. This advantage can be even stronger because of the dominant ideologies of authenticity among the students in the classroom, where using eg. language learned during their shared school experience is treated as inauthentic and where a certain level of consistency in language use in and outside the classroom is expected and enforced.

Even though the teacher does not discriminate between practiced users of the register and learners, the students police each other to act in line with their former practices, and while the teacher describes it as dangerous not to code-switch, many of the students might experience it as dangerous to try to produce language associated with the academic register. Moreover, the students' understanding of who is an authentic speaker of the academic register might be bound to other social identities and expectations to specific social groups. In these ways, the ideology of authenticity can result in unequal access to perform in specific ways, even if equal access to understand and reproduce the register is provided.

Thus, although ideologies of teachers can play a role in the students' construction of educational identities, the teachers do not have exclusive power to position the students and teaching style alone cannot overcome inequality in the educational system. It is important to take the whole classroom and the possibility of divergent ideologies into account if we want to understand the linkage between language and educational identities, and it is necessary to combine studies of the language ideologies of the students and teachers to understand how language can play a part in social inequality in the school system.

Transcription conventions*

Symbol	Meaning
<u>Abc</u>	Emphatic stress
:	Prolongation of sound
(.)	Micropause (less than 0.3 seconds)
(0.5)	Pause measured in seconds
[Overlap begins
]	Overlap ends
-	Interruption of word or sentence
°Abc°	Speech with low volume
°°Abc°°	Speech with very low volume/whisper
ABC	Speech with high volume
<i>Abc</i>	Stylization
Xxx	Inaudible speech
{Abc}	Speech hard to determine, author's guess
((comments))	The author's comments on the transcript

*Stress, prolongation, pauses, overlaps and volume are not transcribed in the short quotes and instead standard punctuation for writing is applied.

References

- Agha, A. (2007). *Language and Social Relations*. Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511618284
- Agha, A. & Frog (2015). An Introduction to Registers of Communication. In A. Agha & Frog (eds.) *Registers of Communication*. *Studia Fennica Linguistica* 18. SKS. DOI: 10.21435/sflin.18
- Biesta, G. (2012). Giving Teaching Back to Education: Responding to the Disappearance of the Teacher. *Phenomenology & Practice*, 6(2), 35-49. DOI: 10.29173/pandpr19860
- Biesta, G. (2019). What Kind of Society Does the School Need? Redefining the Democratic Work of Education in Impatient Times. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 38(6), 657–668. DOI: 10.1007/s11217-019-09675-y
- Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A critical introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1997). *Af praktiske grunde: Omkring teorien om menneskelig handlen*. Hans Reitzel.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, 7(4–5), 585–614. DOI: 10.1177/1461445605054407
- Børne- og Undervisningsministeriet (2017). *Stx - læreplaner 2017*. Dansk A – stx, august 2017. www.uvm.dk
- Børne- og undervisningsministeriet (2022). LBK957. Bekendtgørelse af lov om de gymnasiale uddannelser. www.retsinformation.dk
- Cekaite, A. (2020). Teaching Words, Socializing Affect, and Social Identities: Negotiating a Common Ground in a Swedish as a Second Language Classroom. In M. J. Burdelski & K. M. Howard (Eds.), *Language Socialization in classrooms: Culture, interaction, and language development*. Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/9781316946237.008
- Coupland, N. (2001). Stylization, Authenticity and TV News Review. *Discourse Studies*, 3(4), 413–442. DOI: 10.1177/1461445601003004006
- Coupland, N. (2003). Sociolinguistic authenticities. *Journal of sociolinguistics*, 7(3), 417-431. DOI: 10.1111/1467-9481.00233
- Coupland, N. (2007). *Style: Language Variation and Identity*. Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511755064
- Coupland, N. (2010). The Authentic Speaker and the Speech Community. In C. Llamas & D. J. L. Watt (Eds.). (2010). *Language and identities*. Edinburgh University Press, 99-112. DOI: 10.1515/9780748635788-013
- De La Cruz Albizu, P.J. (2020). Exploring New York City elementary school principals' language ideologies. *Language and Education* 2020, 34(6), 503–519. DOI: 10.1080/09500782.2020.1772817
- Eckert, P. (2003). Elephants in the room: Sociolinguistics and authenticity: an elephant in the room. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7(3), 392–397.
- Eckert, P. (2014). The trouble with authenticity. In Lacoste, V. (Ed.). (2014). *Indexing authenticity: Sociolinguistic perspectives*. De Gruyter, 43-54. DOI: 10.1515/9783110347012
- EVA (Danmarks evalueringsinstitut) (2012) *Betydningen af studenternes sociale baggrund før og efter reformen. Effekter af gymnasireformen*. Danmarks Evalueringsinstitut.
- EVA (Danmarks evalueringsinstitut) (2015). *Den sociale profil i optagesystemet. Perspektiver på karakteroptag og social (u)lighed i optaget til universiteterne*. Danmarks Evalueringsinstitut.

- EVA (Danmarks evalueringsinstitut) (2017). Den faglige udvikling i gymnasiet: En undersøgelse af udviklingen i dansk, engelsk, matematik og fysik i perioden 1967 - 2017 – belyst gennem læreplaner og eksamenssæt. Danmarks Evalueringsinstitut.
- Fairclough, N. (2008). *Kritisk diskursanalyse: En tekstsamling*. Hans Reitzel.
- Gal, S., & Irvine, J. T. (2019). *Signs of Difference: Language and Ideology in Social Life* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/9781108649209
- Haue, Harry (2022). Gymnasium. Den store danske. Lex.dk. Det Danske Sprog og Litteraturselskab. <https://denstoredanske.lex.dk/gymnasium>
- Holm, A. & Jæger, M. M. (2004). 'Penge, (Ud)Dannelse, Forbindelser Eller Brains? En Test Af Fire Forældreressourcers Betydning for Unges Uddannelsesvalg i Danmark'. *Dansk Sociologi* 15(3), 67–85. DOI: 10.22439/dansoc.v15i3.264
- Irvine, J. T., & Gal, S. (2000). Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation. In *Regimes of language: Ideologies, politics, and identities*. School of American Research Press; J. Currey, 35–83.
- Jaspers, J. (2020). Linguistic dilemmas and chronic ambivalence in the classroom. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 43(4), 281–294. DOI: 10.1080/01434632.2020.1733586
- Janowich, N. (1993). Re-creating Genesis: the metapragmatics of divine speech. In Lucy, J. A. (Ed.). (1993). *Reflexive Language: Reported Speech and Metapragmatics* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press, 393-405. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511621031
- Jenkins, R. (2008). *Social identity* (third Edition). Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Johnstone, B. (2014). "100 % Authentic Pittsburgh": Sociolinguistic authenticity and the linguistics of particularity. In Lacoste, V. (Ed.). *Indexing authenticity: Sociolinguistic perspectives*. De Gruyter, 97-112. DOI: 10.1515/9783110347012
- Korp, H. (2011). What counts as being smart around here? The performance of smartness and masculinity in vocational upper secondary education. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 6(1), 21–37. DOI: 10.1177/1746197910397909
- Love-Nichols, J. (2018). "There's No Such Thing as Bad Language, but ...". In M. Bucholtz, D. I. Casillas, & J.-S. Lee (Eds.), *Feeling it: Language, race, and affect in Latinx youth learning*, 91-111. DOI: 10.4324/9781315099729
- Lucy, J.A. (1993). Reflexive language and the human disciplines. In Lucy, J. A. (Ed.). *Reflexive Language: Reported Speech and Metapragmatics* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press, 9-32. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511621031
- Munk, M. D. (2014). Social Ulighted Og Uddannelse. *Sociologi* 4: 187–219.
- Munk, M. D. & Baklanov, N. (2014). *Unequal Access to Universities in a Country with High Social Equality: A Multinomial Latent Transition Analysis of Horizontal and Vertical Stratification*. 27th Conference of the Nordic Sociological Association, Lund, Sweden.
- ODS. Ordbog over det danske sprog. Historisk Ordbog 1700-1950. Det danske sprog- og litteraturselskab. www.ordnet.dk/ods
- Rampton, B. (2006). *Language in Late Modernity: Interaction in an Urban School*. Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511486722
- Rampton, B. (2018). *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents* (Third edition). Routledge.
- Rymes, B. (2010). 19. Classroom Discourse Analysis: A Focus on Communicative Repertoires. In N. H. Hornberger & S. L. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and Language Education. Multilingual Matters*, 528–546. DOI: 10.21832/9781847692849-021
- Rymes, B., & Leone-Pizzighella, A. (2020). Making the Familiar Change: Language Socialization via Contrapuntal Interaction in a US High School Language Arts Class.

- In M. J. Burdelski & K. M. Howard (Eds.), *Language Socialization in Classrooms* (1st ed). Cambridge University Press, 132–157. DOI: 10.1017/9781316946237.009
- Sadowski, M. (2003) Why Identity Matters at School. In M. Sadowski (Ed.) *Adolescents at school: Perspectives on youth, identity, and education*. Harvard Education Press, 1-6.
- Shenk, P. S. (2007). ‘I’m Mexican, remember?’ Constructing ethnic identities via authenticating discourse. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 11(2), 194–220. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9841.2007.00318.x
- Silverstein, M. (1993). Metapragmatic discourse and metapragmatic function. In J. A. Lucy (Ed.), *Reflexive Language: Reported Speech and Metapragmatics* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press, 33-58. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511621031
- Silverstein, M. (1979). Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology. In P. R. Clyne, W. F. Hanks & C. L. Hofbauer (eds.), *A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels*, 193-247.
- Ulriksen, L. Murning, s., Ebbensgaard, A. B. & Simonsen, B. (2007). Fra gymnasiefremmed til student – større fagligt udbytte for elever fra gymnasiefremmede miljøer. Gymnasieskolernes lærerforening.
- Ulriksen, L., Murning, S. & Ebbensgaard, A. B. (2009). Når gymnasiet er en fremmed verden. *Eleverfaringer - Social baggrund - fagligt udbytte*. Samfundslitteratur.
- Woolard, K. A. (1998). Introduction: Language ideology as a Field of Inquiry. In B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard, P. V. Kroskrity (eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory*. Oxford University Press, 3-20
- Woolard, K. A. (2016). *Singular and Plural: Ideologies of Linguistic Authority in 21st Century Catalonia*. Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190258610.001.0001
- Wortham, S. (2005). *Learning Identity: The Joint Emergence of Social Identification and Academic Learning* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511810015
- Yang, M. (2018). Discourses on ‘authenticity’: Language ideology, ethnic boundaries, and Tibetan identity on a multi-ethnic campus. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 39(10), 925–940. DOI: 10.1080/01434632.2018.1458854