



**Utrecht
University**

Sharing science,
shaping tomorrow

**Dutch, English and Everything in Between: Scenarios of the Interplay of
Language Policies and Practices in Participatory Bodies at Utrecht University**

Annick van der Bijl (6302327)

Master Thesis Intercultural Communication

Track: English

Department of Language, Literature and Communication, Utrecht University

Supervisor: dr. Carolin Schneider

Second Supervisor: em. prof. dr. Jan D. ten Thije

June 29, 2022

14.365 words

Abstract

This thesis analyses the current language policies and practices of Utrecht University's participatory bodies. More specifically, it uses the term linguistic scenarios; therefore, its main research question is: which linguistic scenarios are currently present within the employee and student representation of Utrecht University? This issue is highly relevant because a new, multilingual Dutch/English language policy was recently approved by the University Council. Hence, Utrecht University will have to find the best way to deal with multilingualism in its employee and student representation in the coming years. In order to provide an overview of the current situation, this study took a qualitative approach. Firstly, focus group interviews with Dutch and international participants from various faculties, departments, and participatory bodies were organised; secondly, the transcripts of these interviews were examined through Keyword in Context (KWIC) analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). The results of this analysis presented the following five linguistic scenarios: 1) a strict monolingual Dutch policy; 2) a Dutch preferential policy; 3) a strict monolingual English policy; 4) an English preferential policy; 5) a multilingual Dutch/English policy. Furthermore, these language policies and practices are characterised by the way in which different linguistic tools and services that support participation are made available. Finally, it was found that these scenarios had a significant influence on the inclusion and exclusion of Dutch and international representatives at Utrecht University.

Table of Contents

Abstract	2
Table of Contents	3
1 Introduction	7
2 Contextual Framework	9
2.1 Multilingualism in Participatory Bodies of Dutch Universities	9
2.2 M&M-project	10
2.3 Prior Research within the M&M-project	11
2.4 Proposed Language Policy of Utrecht University	13
2.5 Relevance of this Study	14
3 Theoretical Framework	15
3.1 Diversity and Inclusion in Organisations	15
3.1.1 Definition of Diversity	15
3.1.2 Definition of Inclusion	16
3.1.3 The Importance of Diversity and Inclusion in Organisations	16
3.2 The Contribution of Language Policies to Diversity and Inclusion in Organisations	18
3.3 Multilingual Meetings	19
3.4 Including Personal Experiences in a Language Policy	21
3.5 Different Modes of Communication: Inclusive Multilingualism	22
3.5.1 Lingua Receptiva (LaRa)	22
3.5.2 Codeswitching (CS)	23
3.5.3 English as a Lingua Franca (ELF)	24
3.5.4 Mediation by Translation and Interpretation (MT)	24
3.6 The Constituents of a Language Policy	25
3.6.1 Status/Prestige Planning	25
3.6.2 Corpus Planning	26
3.6.3 Acquisition Planning	26
3.7 Recurring Language Policies as Scenarios	27
4 Research Questions	27
4.1 <i>Main Research Question</i>	27
4.2 <i>Sub-questions</i>	27
5 Corpus and Methodology	28
5.1 Focus Group Interviews	28

5.2	Participants	29
5.3	Materials	30
5.4	Procedure	31
5.4.1	Interviews	31
5.4.2	Ethnographic Observations	32
5.4.3	Transcripts	32
5.4.4	Keyword Analysis	33
5.4.5	Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)	34
5.5	Ethical Considerations	34
6	Analysis and Results	35
6.1	Synthesised Phrases: Keywords in Context	35
6.2	Inclusion and Exclusion	36
6.3	Tools and Services	37
6.4	Overview of the Five Linguistic Scenarios	38
6.5	Scenario 1: Strict Dutch Monolingual Policy	40
6.5.1	The Attitudes of Dutch and International Students and Staff towards the Introduction of an International	40
6.5.2	Differences between Dutch and International Students, Scientific, and Support Staff	41
6.5.3	The Translation of Written Documents	42
6.5.4	The Use of Keywords	42
6.5.5	The Application of Trainings and Courses	42
6.5.6	The Employment of Interpreters	43
6.6	Scenario 2: Dutch Preferential Policy	43
6.6.1	The Attitudes of Dutch and International Students and Staff towards the Introduction of an International	43
6.6.2	Differences between Dutch and International Students, Scientific, and Support Staff	45
6.6.3	The Translation of Written Documents	45
6.6.4	The Use of Keywords	46
6.6.5	The Application of Trainings and Courses	46
6.6.6	The Employment of Interpreters	48
6.7	Scenario 3: Strict English Monolingual Policy	49
6.7.1	The Attitudes of Dutch and International Students and Staff towards the Introduction of an International	49
6.7.2	Differences between Dutch and International Students, Scientific, and Support Staff	50

6.7.3	The Translation of Written Documents	51
6.7.4	The Use of Keywords	51
6.7.5	The Application of Trainings and Courses	52
6.7.6	The Employment of Interpreters	52
6.8	Scenario 4: English Preferential Policy	52
6.8.1	The Attitudes of Dutch and International Students and Staff towards the Introduction of an International	53
6.8.2	Differences between Dutch and International Students, Scientific, and Support Staff	54
6.8.3	The Translation of Written Documents	54
6.8.4	The Use of Keywords	54
6.8.5	The Application of Trainings and Courses	55
6.8.6	The Employment of Interpreters	56
6.9	Scenario 5: Multilingual Dutch/English Policy	56
6.9.1	Attitude of Dutch and International Students and Staff towards the Introduction of an International	57
6.9.2	Differences between Dutch and International Students, Scientific, and Support Staff	59
6.9.3	The Translation of Written Documents	59
6.9.4	The Use of Keywords	60
6.9.5	The Application of Trainings and Courses	60
6.9.6	The Employment of Interpreters	61
6.10	Additional Findings	61
6.10.1	The Role of the Chair	61
6.10.2	Interaction between Focus Group Participants	62
7	Discussion	62
7.1	Five Linguistic Scenarios of Utrecht University's Participatory Bodies	62
7.1.1	Scenario 1: Strict Dutch Monolingual Policy	63
7.1.2	Scenario 2: Dutch Preferential Policy	64
7.1.3	Scenario 3: Strict English Monolingual Policy	65
7.1.4	Scenario 4: English Preferential Policy	66
7.1.5	Scenario 5: Multilingual English/Dutch policy	68
7.2	Additional Findings	69
7.2.1	Role of the Chair	69
7.2.2	Interaction between Participants per Focus Group	69
7.3	Limitations	70

7.3.1	Participants per Faculty	70
7.3.2	Rationalisation of the Scenarios	70
7.3.3	The Categorisation of Internationals	71
8	Conclusion	71
8.1	Current Language Policy of Utrecht University's Participatory Bodies	71
8.2	Inclusion	72
8.2.1	Inclusion of International Employee and Student Representatives	72
8.2.2	Inclusion of Dutch Employee and Student Representatives	73
8.3	Suggestions for Future Research	74
9	Recommendations	74
9.1	Status/Prestige Planning	75
9.2	Corpus Planning	75
9.3	Acquisition Planning	75
10	References	76
11	Appendix A	83
	English Consent Form	83
12	Appendix B	84
	Dutch Consent Form	84
13	Appendix C	85
	English Information Letter	85
14	Appendix D	88
	Dutch Information Letter	88

1 Introduction

The internationalisation of Dutch universities has been on the rise during the past years. Hence, as an increasing number of non-Dutch speaking students and staff have been joining Dutch universities, language policy has become extremely relevant. Consequently, multilingualism and internationalisation have been ongoing issues within academia, internationally as well as in the Netherlands. Utrecht University is no exception to this, stating that “UU’s co-participation bodies have been struggling for years with the question of how to get a growing group of international students and staff to become more involved in university democracy” (Van Elven, 2020, para. 5). Since the academic year of 2020/2021, Utrecht University has started to allow internationals to join the university council. As a result, it has been putting multilingualism to the test in its university council by opting for *Lingua Receptiva (LaRa)* (Backus et al., 2013) as the communicative mode. This allows internationals to speak English as long as their receptive Dutch competences are sufficient, while Dutch members can continue to speak Dutch (Ten Thijs & Naber, 2021). Thus, LaRa provides a more inclusive alternative to *English as a lingua franca (ELF)* (Backus et al., 2013) or Dutch as the communicative language in meetings at the university.

However, the application of LaRa has not been without difficulties. For instance, some members of the University Council have advocated for a transition towards an English-only approach (Duque, 2021), while others assert that ELF is no solution either as it is not inclusive towards Dutch speakers who are not highly competent in English (Van den Broek & Rechsteiner, 2021). Additionally, LaRa requires a certain competence in the Dutch language (Backus et al., 2013), which can be challenging to deal with. Therefore, the implementation of LaRa and other communicative modes within the various employee and student representative bodies of Utrecht

University is being monitored closely by the Multilingualism & Participation (M&M) research group. On that account, this thesis is written within the greater framework of the M&M-project. The M&M-project was initiated and is being funded by the Executive Board of Utrecht University to support and research the implementation of the university's language policy and the participation of internationals in the university and the faculty councils.

The aim of this study is to investigate how internationals and Dutch members are experiencing the language policy of the employee and student representative bodies of Utrecht University. Previous research (Correale, 2020a; Correale, 2020b; Levelt, 2020; Morwood, 2021) has mainly focused on Utrecht University's university council, but the language policies and their implementation of the university's faculties have not yet been investigated. Additionally, while the university council currently uses LaRa, participatory bodies within faculties can choose their own language policy. This has resulted in different official and unofficial language policies in the employee and student representation across the university, such as ELF, LaRa, or Dutch.

The language policy of Utrecht University is currently being discussed internally and will be decided on soon. Therefore, the outcome of this study is highly relevant as it shines a light on the perspectives of staff on the university's participatory bodies' respective language policies and their implementation. As the language policy as proposed is currently designed to be bilingual, allowing for Dutch and English to be communicative languages, taking into account students' and employees' perspectives on such multilingualism is essential.

This paper is structured in the following manner. Firstly, this study's contextual framework is presented in section two and its theoretical foundation is outlined in section three; this covers topics such as diversity, inclusion, multilingual meetings, and language policies in organisations and Utrecht University. Additionally, section four states the research questions that

originated from this framework. Furthermore, an account of this study's methodology is given in section five; this contains information on how the focus group interviews were conducted, the participants, and the analytical approach that was taken. Subsequently, the analysis is outlined in section six and is supported by the participants' quotes, which are linked to relevant theory in the discussion in section seven. Finally, this study's research questions are answered in the conclusion in section eight, and the recommendations that were formulated based on these findings can be found in section nine. Lastly, the references are listed in section ten, followed by the appendices.

2 Contextual Framework

2.1 Multilingualism in Participatory Bodies of Dutch Universities

While perhaps the most well-known discussion on what the language policy of Dutch universities should be is related to the language of instruction of degree programmes, the administrative language of Dutch universities is a topic that has been deliberated on, too. For example, the Dutch Language Union has collaborated with researchers to investigate the implementation of LaRa in the participatory bodies of Utrecht University. As a result, Utrecht University is engaged in a process of moving away from a monolingual policy and instead allowing for Dutch and English to be used as administrative languages. However, this procedure needs to be monitored and evaluated in order to be successful.

Therefore, the Dutch Language Union has incorporated the M&M-project into a collection of thirteen studies on LaRa and multilingualism in various domains (Gulikers et al., 2021). Accordingly, the M&M-project is part of a larger network of research and pilots on multilingualism in different domains; the project is engaged in partnerships with Fontys Venlo University of Applied Sciences, Ghent University, and universities in South Africa (Gulikers et

al., 2021). Through these collaborations, valuable knowledge and findings on multilingualism in the universities' participatory bodies can be shared.

2.2 M&M-project

This thesis is part of the larger framework of the M&M-project of Utrecht University. This project started in September 2020 and is aimed at ensuring and encouraging the multilingual participation of members of the employee and student representation across all levels of Utrecht University. This includes researching and monitoring the use of LaRa in the University Council (henceforth, U-council), as well as researching and providing advice for the various faculty and department councils and meetings with regards to their respective language policies and implementation (Gulikers et al., 2021). Ultimately, the M&M-project is meant to provide policy-related advice based on scientific research on multilingualism in meetings at Utrecht University. Additionally, the project offers support for council members and other staff and students who participate in multilingual meetings in representative bodies at the university (Gulikers, et al., 2021). The M&M-project (www.uu.nl) consists of six sub-projects, as outlined in table 1:

Table 1

Overview of the Subprojects of the M&M-project

Number	Title of Sub-project	English Translation
1	Meertaligheid in de Universiteitsraad UU	Multilingualism in Utrecht University's Council
2	Meertaligheid in de medezeggenschap op faculteitsniveau	Multilingual participation on the faculty level
3	Vergelijking meertaligheid in de	A comparison of multilingualism in

	Universiteitsraad bij andere Nederlandse universiteiten	University Councils of other Dutch universities
4	Internationale vergelijking universiteiten (samenwerking Taalunie)	International comparison of universities (in collaboration with the Dutch Language Union)
5	Meertalig vergaderen	Multilingual meetings
6	Ontwikkeling receptieve leerlijn Nederlands als bestuurs taal	Development of a receptive Dutch course on administrative language

As this thesis focuses on multilingualism within meetings at faculties and departments of Utrecht University, it is primarily related to sub-project two of the M&M-project; it is linked to sub-project one to a lesser extent.

2.3 Prior Research within the M&M-project

Since the start of the M&M-project in 2020, multiple studies have been carried out with the aim to investigate multilingualism in council and faculty meetings. In particular, this has resulted in the publication of three MA student theses and one internship research report. Each paper focused on different aspects of the M&M-project and intended to explain which roles different modes of communication played with regards to meetings.

The first study that was conducted within the framework of the M&M-project focused on the contribution of LaRa to the inclusivity of the internationally oriented Utrecht University (Correale, 2020a). Notably, the timing of this study caused it to serve as a preparation for the implementation of the multilingual policy of the U-council. Through the research, the option of a multilingual language policy as opposed to the previously utilised monolingual Dutch policy could be explored (Correale, 2020a); it was found that the attitude of the participants towards LaRa was generally positive. This stance stemmed from the opinion that the communicative

language does not determine the quality of the debate in council meetings. Furthermore, allowing members to communicate in a language that they are comfortable with can promote diversity and inclusion. Nevertheless, it is crucial that members prepare well when taking part in a multilingual meeting to ensure communicative effectiveness (Correale, 2020a). As a result, four measures were suggested: creating a receptive course on administrative language; providing official documents in Dutch and English; creating a list of institutional keywords; and lastly, to hire interpreters (Correale, 2020a); therefore, these recommendations are taken into account in this study as well.

The second study also focused on LaRa, but took other communicative modes into account as well (Morwood, 2021). During this research, the U-council had already been communicating via LaRa in their meetings for up to half a year; thus, an analysis of the communication within the U-council could be carried out. Aside from LaRa, there was an additional focus on the role of the chair of the U-council and on the impact of non-verbal communication. Among other findings, this resulted in two conclusions relevant to this study. First, the actions of the chair enabled LaRa to be the U-council's communicative mode (Morwood, 2021); hence, it can be stated that the attitude and activities of a chair are instrumental to the success of a multilingual meeting. Second, it was found that incorporating translators and interpreters into LaRa encouraged multilingual communication, since speakers were given "the freedom to speak the language they feel they can control best in the context of the council meetings" (Morwood, 2021, p. 2). Consequently, this study considers the role of the chair and of interpreters and translation to be of importance.

Thirdly, a study that compared Utrecht University to other Dutch universities was finalised (Levert, 2021). Despite the fact that some key elements of this study have remained

confidential, its three main conclusions that are relevant to this present study are as follows.

First, it was found that while the language of instruction policies were outlined clearly for most of the universities involved, the administrative language policy continued to be a grey for many institutions (Levert, 2021). Second, a discrepancy between policy and practice was observed; this interfered with the language planning that was outlined in the universities' policies (Levert, 2021). Third, including internationals in council meetings was found to be challenging, as universities did not facilitate their needs sufficiently. However, adopting an English language policy caused issues for the inclusivity of Dutch councillors (Levert, 2021). Since this study also considers these elements to be of significance, these results are taken into consideration.

Finally, another study specifically investigated the significance of institutional keywords in multilingual U-council meetings at Utrecht University (Correale, 2020b). As it was found that the knowledge of these keywords influences the perception of inclusion, a list of institutional keywords that occur frequently during council meetings was created (Correale, 2020b). Furthermore, it was recommended that LaRa is supplemented with Codeswitching and English as a lingua franca (Correale, 2020b). Because of the expectation that these findings can be extended to meetings in other administrative areas of Utrecht University, these results are regarded as relevant to this present study.

2.4 Proposed Language Policy of Utrecht University

As these prior studies have shown, Utrecht University is actively engaged with multilingualism and linguistic diversity in its administrative domain, and is making efforts to ensure that an official, written language policy reflects the views of the people involved with council meetings at the university. As a result of these efforts, a new language policy has been

formulated; this policy is supposed to be implemented during the upcoming academic year of 2022/2023 (Schrijver, 2022).

Although the focus of this document is not solely on the language of the university's participatory bodies, this study only takes into account the policy's elements that refer to employee and student representation. With regards to this, the policy states that internationals will be allowed to participate in all participatory bodies across the university. The four following distinctions are made: education committees of non-Dutch programmes; education committees of Dutch programmes; faculty councils; and the U-council (Schrijver, 2022). Aside from the education committee of non-Dutch programmes, the language policy dictates that a multilingual policy is possible for the remaining three situations.

It is also important to note that more differences between these four categories exist. For instance, staff members are expected to learn Dutch in order to participate in faculty councils and the U-council. Nevertheless, in all four categories, immediate participation is essential for students and staff (Schrijver, 2022). This might cause issues: if Dutch is required for participation, but international employees can participate in councils before having mastered Dutch, what are the implications for their participation? Furthermore, there is no mention of document translation and interpretation during meetings in this section of the policy paper (Schrijver, 2022), even though prior research conducted in the context of the M&M-project has shown this to be relevant to the effectiveness and inclusiveness of multilingual policies.

2.5 Relevance of this Study

As a result of these recent developments, it is crucial that multilingualism within participatory bodies across Utrecht University is investigated further. Multilingualism within employee and student representation at the university will still be relevant in the coming years, as

the policy sets out that monolingualism will be limited to a small domain only. In order for this policy to be successful, however, it is important to gather information on the current policies and practices of the participatory bodies of Utrecht University, and to reveal the opinions of the staff and students involved.

While this has partially been done through research within the M&M-project's framework, this research focused mainly on multilingualism within the U-council (Correale, 2020a; Correale, 2020b; Morwood, 2021; Levert, 2021). However, as is demonstrated in the new language policy (Schrijver, 2022), Utrecht University has multiple types of participatory bodies in addition to the U-council, such as faculty councils and education committees. Therefore, this study takes into account all of Utrecht University's participatory bodies, and focuses on the administrative language policies within faculties in particular. This way, it could expose which policies currently exist within the university and how this relates to the 2022/2023 language policy.

3 Theoretical Framework

3.1 Diversity and Inclusion in Organisations

Diversity and *inclusion* in organisations have been widely researched during recent years. Nevertheless, it is still important to define both terms, as understandings of them may vary.

3.1.1 Definition of Diversity

For instance, diversity can be interpreted differently based on context (Van Ewijk, 2011); as a result, a study's definition of diversity has direct consequences on its results. This study uses the following definition: diversity is not limited to people from different cultures coming into contact with each other in a particular context, but rather extends to diversity within each individual; individuals can display different cultural personalities, thus creating a unique persona

(Cole, 2016). This could be extended to Utrecht University's equality, diversity and inclusion programme (www.uu.nl), where it is stated that "diversity refers to recognising, respecting and valuing differences between people" (www.uu.nl, para. 2). Among other domains, this refers to people's cultural and ethnic backgrounds (www.uu.nl). Through this study's interpretation of diversity, it is acknowledged that individuals can have various cultural identities.

3.1.2 Definition of Inclusion

A common modern definition of inclusion in organisations is the ability of employees to participate and to contribute (Nair & Vohra, 2015). This means that they should all have access to the same information and resources, feel equally connected to their managers and their colleagues, and that they should be able to participate in and influence decision-making processes (Nair & Vohra, 2015). In particular, it is of importance that employees have actual influence on the decision-making process; instead of "involvement for the sake of involvement" (Miller, 2015, p. 147), employees should be consulted and be given high quality information, as the organisation can then better implement its decisions (Miller, 2015, p. 148). Besides, a lack of meaningful participation might negatively influence organisational change and even cause conflict (Miller, 2015, p. 161), which would negate the potential benefits of a diverse workforce, like increased inventiveness and problem-solving (Miller, 2015, p. 225).

Furthermore, inclusion is primarily provided by the group, since the group decides if someone is included or excluded (Otten et al., 2013). This notion is supported by Nair and Vohra (2015), as they state that inclusion is "the degree to which an employee is accepted and treated as an insider by others in a work system" (p. 51). Hence, it is evident that the degree of inclusion that is experienced by someone stems from the behaviour of their group members.

3.1.3 The Importance of Diversity and Inclusion in Organisations

The importance of diversity and inclusion in organisations has been underscored by multiple studies. First of all, diverse employees present several advantages for organisations; they can contribute to reaching the company's goals due to their experiences, abilities, and perception, which can be useful for initiating learning and change (Nair & Vohra, 2015). Nonetheless, this cannot be accomplished when not all employees are treated equally (Nair & Vohra, 2015). Such unfair conduct can occur when an organisation is not sufficiently focused on inclusion, but rather on diversity management alone (Nair & Vohra, 2015). Inclusion goes beyond outlining the differences and instead promotes the participation of employees, making sure that they have a voice in the decision making process (Nair & Vohra, 2015). Nevertheless, this cannot be accomplished without creating an environment where all employees feel comfortable enough to speak up and where they are equally represented (Nair & Vohra, 2015).

It is, therefore, the responsibility of management executives to ensure that these conditions are realised, as inclusive leaders should take initiative in valuing diverse contributions, be culturally competent, display self-awareness, and possess listening skills (Nair & Vohra, 2015). A place where managers can showcase their inclusive leadership is a meeting, as meetings are central activities in organisations and provide an opportunity for relationships to be built (Virkkula-Räisänen, 2010). Hence, inclusive meetings are the starting point for creating a more inclusive organisational culture (Heath & Wensil, 2019; Rogelberg, 2021), since meetings present an opportunity where different outlooks can be represented and used to an organisation's advantage (Rogelberg, 2021). However, if meetings are managed wrongly, an adverse effect can be observed (Rogelberg, 2021). Inclusive conduct in a meeting, monitored closely by executives, can make sure that everyone has the opportunity to be represented and that all are given a chance

to speak up (Heath & Wensil, 2019). Nonetheless, in order to achieve this, a clear set of rules should be presented at the start of a meeting, and everyone should adhere to them (Heath & Wensil, 2019).

3.2 The Contribution of Language Policies to Diversity and Inclusion in Organisations

An organisational domain where setting such clear rules can be particularly beneficial is language; language is essential for ensuring social equality, as it provides access to social connections and knowledge resources (Matras & Robertson, 2017). Additionally, in a present-day global environment, language skills are crucial for opening doors to advancement (Matras & Robertson, 2017). These language skills could be promoted by providing tools and services such as interpreters, translations, and the opportunity to learn English (Matras & Robertson, 2017).

Besides that, the needs of employees should be evaluated, through which *modus operandi* could be drafted that describe how such tools and services can be provided (Matras & Robertson, 2017). This could be done by officially creating a diverse and inclusive *language policy*. This is also called a *language regime*, which is defined as “a language policy that determines a set of official and working languages along with rules concerning their use for communication within and outside a multilingual organisation, and the extent of translation and interpreting to be provided in such languages” (Gazzola, et al., 2019, p. 548). By determining for which meetings interpreters are available and which documents are translated, the degree to which an organisation offers support for employees with different linguistic backgrounds can be measured (Gazzola, et al., 2019). It is even argued that it is feasible to translate all documents into the official languages of an organisation (Gazzola, et al., 2019).

Furthermore, linguistic diversity does not necessarily impact harmony and productiveness in an organisation negatively, as employees can use their complete set of linguistic skills to adjust to different situations and people (Gazzola, et al., 2019). This can potentially decrease the number of misunderstandings and disputes within an organisation (Gazzola, et al., 2019). Nevertheless, it is essential that linguistic diversity is managed correctly in order to ensure this effect (Gazzola, et al., 2019). For instance, simply choosing English as the official organisational language can account for exclusion of people who do not speak English sufficiently, which restricts their participation to an extreme extent (Marácz & Adamo, 2017); this could even apply to people in managerial positions (Virkkula-Räisänen, 2010). Besides, opting for an English-only approach “fails to account for diverse forms of communication, values and beliefs” (Mori, 2020, p. 481), which may cause insufficient inclusion in the decision-making process (Mori, 2020). Despite this, English is still often used as the communicative language in businesses today (Virkkula-Räisänen, 2010).

3.3 Multilingual Meetings

Having established that inclusion can be advanced through meetings, it is important to take a look at multilingual meetings. Firstly, the choice of language for a meeting is highly context dependent (Wodak, et al., 2012). For instance, it depends on the power and the position of the chair of the meeting, the topic that is being discussed, the agenda, and the type of conversation. Additionally, register or language for specific objectives is an influential factor in language choice (Wodak, et al., 2012); hence, language choice should be based on different organisational characteristics (Wodak, et al., 2012).

Furthermore, language choice does not necessarily account for opting for one official language (Gazzola, et al., 2019). This claim is supported by the notion that participants in

meetings frequently switch between different languages, and employ monolingual as well as multilingual strategies (Mondada, 2022). If this happens, the role of mediator that people attending multilingual meetings can have is crucial (Mondada, 2022; Virkkula-Räsänen, 2010; Heath & Wensil, 2019).

Additionally, it is important to note that multilingual speakers hold a more powerful position than monolingual speakers (Gunnarson, 2013). This strengthens the argument that opting for monolingualism can exclude people who are not competent enough in the official language (Marácz & Adamo, 2017). It is even argued that the lower someone's proficiency in a second language is, the less power that person has in their workplace (Gunnarson, 2013).

Nevertheless, being a native speaker of a foreign language can also pose difficulties. As a non-native speaker of an organisation's official or working language(s), a person's proficiency in that or those language(s) may not be excellent. This can be an issue, since language competencies and proficiency can account for a connection among colleagues (Piller & Takahashi, 2011). On top of that, it is claimed that "*linguistic assimilation*" (Piller & Takahashi, 2011, p. 372) is often perceived as the best option for achieving social inclusion; however, in reality, this often leads to exclusion (Piller & Takahashi, 2011). In fact, social inclusion could be promoted more effectively by instating a multilingual strategy (Piller & Takahashi, 2011).

However, such a strategy comes with certain risks and should be treated carefully, as non-native speech can "quickly acquire a skin colour" (Piller & Takahashi, 2011, p. 376); thus, people who do not speak an organisation's communicative language on a near-native level may be behaved towards differently than native speakers. This strengthens the argument that management should monitor linguistic diversity closely (Gazzola, et al., 2019), as a multilingual mentality is not automatically more inclusive (Piller & Takahashi, 2011).

This has a direct impact on the formulation of a language policy: policy makers need to take into account such experiences in order to evaluate the effects of language practices on inclusion and exclusion (Piller & Takahashi, 2011). Particularly, within an ethnolinguistically diverse organisation, this should be done through a bottom-up strategy to show which languages employees use in practice (Kingsley, 2013).

3.4 Including Personal Experiences in a Language Policy

Taking into account such personal experiences of employees is essential because it can uncover underlying issues such as racism (Shohamy, 2009), which is essential for improving inclusion. Furthermore, including employee perspectives can make a policy more valid (Shohamy, 2009, p. 88); through ethnography, these outlooks could be uncovered and included (Johnson, 2011).

The implementation of these findings could be executed through diversity trainings (Bezrukova, et al., 2012). These types of trainings are suitable for this since it “challenges the way one views the world and deals with issues that may seem emotional or subjective” (Bezrukova, et al., p. 208). Therefore, they could be used to show employees how each other's worldviews influence the social cohesion of the workplace, which might promote employee participation within an inclusive environment (Nair & Vohra, 2015). Nonetheless, research on diversity trainings is limited and needs to be expanded in order to draw extensive conclusions about their set-up and effectiveness (Bezrukova, et al., 2012). It should also be noted that taking part in such trainings can take up an employee's valuable time. Because it has been proven that a healthy work-life balance contributes to diversity (Nair & Vohra, 2015), management should plan carefully and respect personal time and workload. This notion could be extended to the

recommended language trainings in which employees can participate (Matras & Robertson, 2017).

In spite of that, the time and cost investments into these trainings could be worth it, especially if they have a focus on multilingualism (Gazzola, et al., 2019); it has been demonstrated that “making use of the entire linguistic repertoire instead of just one language increases the probability of successful communication by 10%” (Gazzola, et al., 2019, p. 555). Thus, by employing people’s full linguistic repertoire, which is less restrictive than monolingualism, more efficient communication can be achieved (Gazzola, et al., 2019), in addition to improving inclusion.

3.5 Different Modes of Communication: Inclusive Multilingualism

A multilingual approach as described above has also been mentioned in comparison with other modes of communication that aim to cope with multilingualism (Gazzola et al., 2019). Thus, it has become clear that communication involving interlocutors’ receptive skills has been widely researched and has been given different denotations. In this study, the definition of Backus et al. (2013) is used. Advocating *Inclusive Multilingualism (IM)*, which is derived from the fact that most people who use non-native languages will not become fully competent in these languages (Backus et al., 2013), different modes of IM are presented that involve various linguistic strategies.

3.5.1 *Lingua Receptiva (LaRa)*

One of these approaches is *Lingua Receptiva (LaRa)*, which is defined as a mode in which “partners each use a different language or variety when conversing, but nevertheless mutual understanding is achieved, as each has sufficient receptive skills in the partner’s

language” (Backus et al., 2013, p. 15). Thus, people can understand one another while using different linguistic varieties if they both have a passive understanding of the other’s language.

LaRa, however, does require specific communicative skills, such as adapting or accommodating one’s language to make it easier to understand to non-natives, and to frequently check for understanding with one’s conversation partner (Backus et al., 2013, p. 15). If this is carried out, successful communication, a.k.a. mutual understanding, can be achieved (Backus et al., 2013). Within LaRa, two distinctions can be identified: “*inherent*” and “*acquired*” use (Backus et al., 2013, p. 15). The inherent use refers to using languages that are connected and thus bare resemblance to each other, while the acquired use applies to the possibility of employing all languages without any limitations (Backus et al., 2013, p. 15). However, in both uses, a downside of LaRa can be identified; using LaRa is often perceived as unnatural, as it “goes against the natural accomodation process” (Backus et al., 2013, p. 16) in interaction. Nevertheless, if this initial hurdle is overcome once people get accustomed to LaRa, it is a communicative mode that provides equalness, since no participant is limited by their productive abilities (Backus et al., 2013). Additionally, the communicative skills people develop to execute LaRa successfully contribute to a collaborative attitude (Backus et al., 2013).

3.5.2 *Codeswitching (CS)*

In addition to LaRa, there are three other communicative modes relevant to this study. The first one is called *Codeswitching*, which was briefly described before (Gazzola, et al., 2019). Codeswitching is defined as “the use of two (or more) languages at the same time, often by the same speaker, and often within an individual sentence” (Backus et al., 2013, p. 17). Hence, it allows people to switch frequently between different languages. Nevertheless, it is not often seen

as a feasible means of communication in official domains like organisations (Backus et al., 2013).

However, using Codeswitching in a conversation allows speakers to achieve mutual understanding more easily than in cases where monolingualism is used (Backus et al., 2013). For a non-native speaker, this could mean that if they struggle to find a word in one language or would like to emphasise something, they could briefly switch to a language they are more competent in; this could promote mutual intelligibility (Backus et al., 2013).

Moreover, Codeswitching allows for switching between languages depending on the context (Backus et al., 2013), or topic, which could be useful in a multilingual meeting (Mondada, 2022); this notion is also referred to as *topicalisation* (Kurhilla, et al., 2021).

3.5.3 *English as a Lingua Franca (ELF)*

A second additional mode is *English as a Lingua Franca (ELF)*. While positions on ELF may vary, this study takes the definition of Backus et al. (2013) as its baseline. ELF is used frequently across the world, and differs from using English as a native language in the sense that ELF speakers value comprehension above correctness (Backus et al., 2013, p. 12). This has resulted in the fact that “ELF users make particular efforts to render communication unproblematic” (Backus et al., 2013, p. 12), which makes ELF a mode that enables speakers to use tactics to keep the conversation flowing smoothly without adhering to linguistic limitations set by native speaker norms. Since these strategies will change depending on context, ELF does not have an established format (Backus et al., 2013).

3.5.4 *Mediation by Translation and Interpretation (MT)*

Thirdly, another mode, the use of which was briefly touched upon before (Gazzola, et al., 2019, p. 548), is *Mediation by Translation and Interpretation (MT)*. MT is especially relevant in

cases where the interactants' linguistic competence is too limited; thus, LaRa would not be an option, and neither would ELF (Backus et al., 2013). Specifically in situations where important matters are discussed and comprehension is crucial, MT could be helpful (Backus et al., 2013). While in reality, interpreters are often non-professionals, trained experts might be preferred in cases where high linguistic competence of a particular subject is required (Backus et al., 2013). Nonetheless, it should be determined per situation which type of MT is needed; sometimes, a synthesised translation could be sufficient, while others demand a literal interpretation. Moreover, in some cases, an online translation tool could suffice (Backus et al., 2013).

It is important to point out that these modes do not exist completely separately, but they can be integrated with one another when deemed necessary. Communicative contexts are never exactly alike; therefore, an approach can be adapted by adding components of different communicative modes (Backus et al., 2013).

3.6 The Constituents of a Language Policy

The communicative modes presented in this theoretical framework could be included in a language policy as described earlier (Gazzola, Templin & McEntee-Atalianis, 2019, p. 548). In this study, the framework of Spolsky (2009) is taken as a model for this. In this literature, three different types of language planning can be identified: *status planning*, *corpus planning*, and *acquisition planning* (Spolsky, 2009).

3.6.1 Status/Prestige Planning

As its name states, status planning refers to the status a language variety receives through official allocation of such a variety to a societal domain (Spolsky, 2009). As a variety is given a certain function, its status is affected; speakers are managed to use the variety in domains such as education or the workplace (Spolsky, 2009). Essentially, the use of a particular variety is

preferred over another, raising the chosen language's status; this is made official in a language policy. In relation to the modes of IM and the context of Utrecht University, the specific modes mentioned before could be allocated to the university's institutional domain. Through this, it could be decided that, for instance, LaRa or ELF is instated as the university's official language policy; this would award that particular mode prestige.

3.6.2 *Corpus Planning*

While status planning refers to the choices made by executives, corpus planning is linked to the way decisions are made in planning out the structure of a language. Hence, it requires more linguistic expertise. An example of corpus planning is the standardisation of a language through creating textbooks that state the 'right' grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation. In this study, corpus planning relates to the relevance of the development of a list of keywords for multilingual meetings, which has been proven useful in prior research (Koole & Ten Thije, 1994). As a shared knowledge of the interpretation of a word frequently used in meetings, meaning, a keyword, is vital to the intercultural cooperation of employees, it is important that all employees understand the keywords similarly; this is also called a *discursive interculture* (Koole & Ten Thije, 1994). Since employees with a diverse background are more prone to feeling excluded from a team because they do not understand keywords, creating a set list of institutional keywords can level the playing field for native and non-native employees (Koole & Ten Thije, 1994).

3.6.3 *Acquisition Planning*

Lastly, acquisition planning denotes the broader practice of evaluating the status of a language, devising a corpus, and then implementing this into society (Spolsky, 2009). It is vital that such acquisition planning takes place in collaboration with the people who are to acquire the

language in order to make sure that the implementation is successful; pushbacks can result in financial losses and political issues (Spolsky, 2009). Therefore, in the case of Utrecht University, it should be decided which communicative modes take prevalence in participatory bodies in cooperation with its employees and students.

3.7 Recurring Language Policies as Scenarios

It has been outlined that language policies can take many shapes or forms and can contain different stances on language status, corpus and acquisition planning (Spolsky, 2009). Additionally, when choosing a communicative language, no situations are exactly alike as different options exist (Backus et al., 2013). As a result, many different practices of and attitudes towards language use could arise; while these practices may differ depending on context, an attempt to categorise them might provide a clearer overview of their implementation and consequences (Steyaert et al., 2010).

Therefore, this study aims to investigate which “regularities at the level of language in terms of recurring patterns” (Steyaert et al., 2010, p. 273) occur within the context of Utrecht University's participatory bodies. In this study, these regularities will be called *scenarios*; thus, when alluding to this notion, they are defined as the recurring language policies that are currently being observed. This led to the formulation of the following research questions.

4 Research Questions

4.1 Main Research Question

Which linguistic scenarios are currently present within the employee and student representation of Utrecht University?

4.2 Sub-questions

1. What is the current language policy of Utrecht University's employee and student representative bodies?
2. How are the scenarios realised in relation to the international employee and student representatives?
3. How are the scenarios realised in relation to Dutch employee and student representatives?

5 Corpus and Methodology

In order to answer these questions, people affiliated with Utrecht University who are currently or have recently taken part in meetings in participatory bodies across the university were asked about their opinions. In an effort to create an image that is as representative of the current language policies as possible, people from various faculties were invited to join focus group interviews.

5.1 Focus Group Interviews

The data of this study was gathered through focus group interviews (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 144). Focus group interviews "involve a group format whereby an interviewer records the responses of a small group" (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 144). Aside from being an economical way to gather qualitative data, the most profitable aspect of focus group interviews is the "within-group interaction" (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 144), which can cause discussion among participants. In this study, the focus group interviews were semi-structured (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 144). This allowed for specific topics to be discussed, but also for participants' own input (Dörnyei, 2007).

Furthermore, focus group interviews with participants from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds can bring forth a broad collection of standpoints (Pinto da Costa, 2021); this is applicable to this study as it analysed the perspectives of Dutch people as well as

internationals. However, diversity can also cause problems in focus group interviews (Pinto da Costa, 2021); therefore, preparation of this study included gathering information on the local context of Utrecht University's participatory bodies as well as registering the cultural and linguistic background of each participant.

5.2 Participants

The participants of the focus group interviews were members of the employee and student representation of Utrecht University. For efficiency purposes, they were selected through *convenience sampling* (Dörnyei, 2007); students of the receptive Dutch course on administrative language organised by the M&M-project were approached, and participants were also contacted through the M&M-project researchers' personal network. Moreover, participants were found through *snowball sampling* (Dörnyei, 2007), since focus group participants were asked to relay the contact information of other suitable candidates. Furthermore, it was aimed to select participants from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds, and the composition of the focus groups was intended to represent the faculties of Utrecht University as well as possible. An overview of the participants can be found in Table 1 and Table 2, with a total of 13 participants:

Table 1

Overview of Dutch and International Participants across the Focus Groups

Nationality of Participants	Number of Participants
Dutch	7
International	6

Table 2

Overview of Participants per Faculty

Faculty	Number of Participants
Humanities	5
Law, Economics and Governance	3
Medicine	1
Social and Behavioural Sciences	3
Science	1
Geosciences	0
Veterinary Medicine	0

5.3 Materials

Firstly, prior to their participation in a focus group, participants received an information letter and a consent form, with which they gave informed consent (Appendices D, E, F, G) for their participation in this study and the processing of their data.

Moreover, before each focus group, a set of questions was prepared. This was a cyclical process (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 126), meaning that there was "moving back and forth between data collection and analysis" (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 126). Hence, the questions were adapted per focus group interview based on the responses of the previous one. However, in order to maintain comparability between participant groups, the themes of the questions remained largely the same.

In addition to the list of questions, a time management plan and a Microsoft PowerPoint presentation were prepared. The PowerPoint informed participants about the M&M-project and the context and purpose of the focus group interviews. The PowerPoint also restated information on the participants' informed consent. The PowerPoint was only shared at the beginning of the

interview and was removed at a later stage. This way, participants could best see each other's expressions and their responses on their screen, thus promoting interaction.

5.4 Procedure

5.4.1 Interviews

The focus group interviews that were carried out for this study were organised in three rounds. Each focus group contained different participants, since the interviews were conducted within one session that lasted two hours. Despite the fact that carrying out multiple interviews with the same participants can generate more substantial insights (Dörnyei, 2007), the researcher opted for a single interview. This was done to respect the participants' time, as well as to ensure that data collection was achievable within the given time period.

Furthermore, a secure environment was created by allowing for a twenty-minute introduction period at the start of each interview. During this time, the researchers presented information about the M&M-project, its underlying theory, the practical implications within Utrecht University, and the question themes, planning, and procedure of the focus group interview. Additionally, participants could introduce themselves and share information about their position in the university, experience with representation, and their language skills.

During the interviews, three researchers of the M&M-project were present in order to control the set-up of the interview, to ask the interview questions, to devise additional follow-up questions, and to take ethnographic notes. However, it is possible that this presence was overwhelming for the participants.

Moreover, since this study aimed to include the perspectives of international as well as Dutch members of the university, it was ensured that there were three different types of focus groups: the first one consisted of international participants; the second one was a mixed group

with international and Dutch participants; and lastly, the third interview was conducted with Dutch participants. Therefore, each focus group had a different language policy to facilitate the participants: the international focus group interview was held in English; the mixed group was mainly English but allowed for Dutch if needed; and finally, the Dutch focus group interview was conducted entirely in Dutch. The various structures of the focus groups allowed for a different type of participant interaction in each round.

The focus group interviews took place online via Microsoft Teams (www.microsoft.com). Hence, *sociotechnical affordances* need to be taken into account, as people interacted with the computer as well as with other individuals (Vatrapu, 2009). The online environment made participation more accessible and plannable since participants did not have to travel to an on-site location. Moreover, Microsoft Teams is available to all university employees and students through their official university Office 365 accounts and has a built-in recording option; therefore, it was considered the most efficient option.

5.4.2 *Ethnographic Observations*

In addition to the recordings, the researcher took ethnographic (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 129–133) notes during all interviews. Since this study's intention was to discern the linguistic scenarios within Utrecht University, ethnographic observations of interviews with staff and students in participatory bodies were relevant as they could help reveal the current language policies (Hornberger, 2013). Moreover, ethnography can uncover "indistinct voices, covert motivations, embedded ideologies, invisible instances, or unintended consequences of language policy emergent in context" (Hornberger, 2013, p. 106); therefore, any negative, unintended impacts of discovered language policies could also be exposed.

5.4.3 *Transcripts*

As a result, machine-generated transcripts (www.github.com) were made of the recorded interviews. Since the data was processed pseudonymously, participants' names were removed from the transcripts and replaced with a number; however, if specific statements were made, these could be traced back to them. The Faculty Ethics Assessment Committee Humanities (FETC-H) approved (approval code: 21-155-03) this data collection procedure and the data storage on SharePoint (www.microsoft.com).

Furthermore, the automated transcripts needed to be corrected manually in order to analyse them. Because of the size of the corpus and the scope of this study, it was decided that only relevant excerpts would be used for the analysis; hence, a vetted corpus had to be created.

5.4.4 *Keyword Analysis*

This vetted corpus was developed by combining the ethnographic observations with *Keyword In Context (KWIC)* research. "A KWIC index is a form of concordance (word index) where each occurrence of the keyword is displayed together with surrounding words in a list of strings" (Mäki, 2006, p. 1607). KWIC research is particularly suitable for large data sets that contain long phrases (Mäki, 2006), such as the automated transcripts of this study. Thus, the researcher uploaded the machine-generated transcripts to the corpus manager Sketch Engine (www.sketchengine.eu) and searched for keywords that were mentioned frequently by participants; these were registered in the ethnographic notes.

Through this process, the concordances of each keyword were looked up, and the researcher composed synthesised phrases that show the context of these frequently used words. Hence, a *typology* of multilingualism in participatory bodies at Utrecht University was created;

this formed the basis of the formulation of five different scenarios that participants discussed in the interviews, which are outlined in the results section of this study.

5.4.5 Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

The vetted corpus was then analysed with *Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)*, which can bring power relations, ideologies and institutionalised ideas to the surface (Fairclough, 2010). Particularly, denotations like power, discrimination, and social order can be discussed through CDA (Van Dijk, 2015) and related to their institutional context (Fairclough, 2010); in this study, this is the context of Utrecht University. Hence, in this research, CDA could uncover what role language plays in shaping the power relations between international and Dutch members of participatory bodies.

Moreover, Fairclough (2010) has created a CDA model that consists of the three following dimensions:

1. Text
2. Discursive processes of interpretation and production
3. Sociocultural practices

On account of dimension two of this model, a discursive text should be interpreted through the lens of the producers and the recipients of the discourse (Fairclough, 2010); thus, in this study, the statements in the transcripts were analysed from the perspective of international and Dutch employee and student representatives of Utrecht University. Additionally, inclusion and exclusion, which were the sociocultural practices that surfaced through CDA of the transcripts, pertain to dimension three of Fairclough's CDA model (Fairclough, 2010).

5.5 Ethical Considerations

Furthermore, due to ethical considerations, any specific references to speakers and their respective faculties, departments, and participatory bodies were omitted from this study; therefore, the participant description in this section is limited. Additionally, to further respect the privacy of the participants, the quotes used in the analysis chapter do not contain any names or other references to participants' personal information. Finally, the published version of this paper does not include the machine-generated or vetted transcripts in order to anonymise as much as possible.

6 Analysis and Results

Firstly, this section lists keywords and synthesised phrases that constitute the typology of Utrecht University's participatory bodies. Secondly, it presents the general results of this study; since the most prominent themes that came to light during the interviews were inclusion and tools and services for dealing with multilingualism, these are discussed in general terms. Thirdly, the five linguistic scenarios (Table 4) that were found and their six aspects are outlined and supported by quotes from the focus group participants. Lastly, relevant findings that could not be attributed to any of the scenarios are described.

6.1 Synthesised Phrases: Keywords in Context

This segment outlines the seven most frequently used keywords as found through the KWIC analysis in their given context; this created a typology that was used to discern the six different aspects of the five linguistic scenarios and is shown in Table 3.

Table 3

Keywords in Context through Synthesised Phrases

Keyword	Synthesised Phrase
Translated	<i>Translated</i> documents are very helpful. However, not all documents are <i>translated</i> , and the quality of translation varies.
Interpreter	Despite the fact that an <i>interpreter</i> supports the participation of individuals who are not competent in the communicative language, they are not always available.
Speak	Internationals would like Dutch people to <i>speak</i> Dutch to them. However, Dutch people frequently <i>speak</i> English instead, although not all Dutch individuals <i>speak</i> English comfortably.
Understand	It is not necessary to <i>understand</i> everything that is being said in a meeting in order to participate. However, if an individual indicates that they do not <i>understand</i> something, accommodation from other meeting attendees is desired.
Dutch	Internationals should receive support for learning productive and receptive <i>Dutch</i> . This is instrumental, as <i>Dutch</i> is often the preferred communicative language in meetings.
English	<i>English</i> language courses should be made available for Dutch individuals, because not all of them are competent in <i>English</i> . Additionally, trainings on LaRa, which allows internationals to speak <i>English</i> , should be offered.
Terms	A list of institutional <i>terms</i> should be published in Dutch and English.

6.2 Inclusion and Exclusion

As inclusion is a highly relevant yet sensitive topic, opinions on this matter were discussed frequently during all three focus group interviews. Firstly, it became clear that internationals do not always feel included in meetings at Utrecht University, as arrangements and adjustments to accommodate them are rare. An exception to this is the fact that Dutch peers often switch to English when speaking with internationals. However, this was seen as detrimental to

internationals' sense of inclusion, because practising the Dutch language was found to be key to advancing inclusive participation. Dealing with this was deemed difficult by most international participants; although it was pointed out that internationals should speak up about their communicative preferences, several participants stated that they felt uncomfortable with being this direct. As a result, the exclusion of internationals is maintained and, in some cases, furthered.

Moreover, it was pointed out by international and Dutch participants that inclusion does not solely pertain to internationals. Dutch speakers are often apprehensive about using English in meetings, as not all of them have reached a high level of English; thus, if Dutch individuals are forced to use English, they can experience exclusion. Despite this, not all participants agreed on this matter; in fact, for one participant, the introduction of one international in a participatory body provided the incentive to switch to an English language policy.

Furthermore, it was mentioned that LaRa at Utrecht University is not always an inclusive option either. Since not all internationals are native English speakers, this would put them at a disadvantage. In addition to this, some participants agreed that since Utrecht University is a Dutch university, the Dutch language should be the leading administrative language; this would also prevent exclusion of Dutch representatives. However, it was understood that this was not the most inclusive option for international staff and students.

6.3 Tools and Services

In addition to inclusion and exclusion, nearly all focus group participants mentioned the use of tools and services in multilingual meetings. Firstly, the employment of (professional) interpreters in multilingual meetings was deemed a successful measure; it was evident that live interpretation of Dutch speech in meetings helped the internationals tremendously in

understanding what was being said. Although it was mentioned that offering this service would be expensive, if this meant that internationals could be included while maintaining the Dutch language, this was considered a worthy investment.

Furthermore, all participants with prior experience with document translation agreed that this was an extremely helpful service; even automatically generated translations could provide internationals with a better understanding of Dutch documents, although professional translations were preferred. However, it was expressed that translation services are rarely provided by faculties, departments and participatory bodies; additionally, in some cases, only translated summaries were offered. Besides this, almost all participants were positive about providing a translated list of institutional keywords for employee and student representatives.

Lastly, the participants discussed trainings and courses for staff and student representatives. They all had a positive view on the workshop multilingual meetings, which is offered by the M&M-project, as it creates awareness about accommodation and cultural differences. One participant even stated that everyone in any type of council should participate in such trainings, particularly the chairs. However, no consensus was reached on whether representatives should participate in obligatory English and Dutch courses.

6.4 Overview of the Five Linguistic Scenarios

When analysing the statements of the participants more in-depth, five hypothetical linguistic scenarios could be distinguished; these scenarios each represent a different approach to dealing with multilingualism in participatory bodies. Furthermore, they are based on six different aspects which were discerned through the KWIC research. These aspects are: a) the attitudes of Dutch and international students and staff towards the introduction of an international; b) differentiation between scientific and support staff; c) the translation of written documents; d) the

use of keywords; e) the application of trainings and courses; f) the employment of interpreters.

In order to provide a schematic overview of the five scenarios that were found through conducting the focus group interviews, they are shown in Table 4:

Table 4

Overview of Current Scenarios of Multilingualism in Participatory Bodies at Utrecht University

Scenario	Description	Language of Meetings	Documents	Implications for Minority Language Group ^a
1	Strict monolingual Dutch policy	Dutch	Dutch	Excluded
2	Dutch preferential policy	Dutch	Bilingual or summarising translation	Facilitated ^b , but participation is limited
3	Strict monolingual English policy	English	English	Excluded
4	English preferential policy	English	Bilingual or summarising translation	Facilitated ^b , but participation is limited
5	Multilingual policy Dutch/English	Dutch/English	Bilingual or summarising translation	Facilitated ^b , but participation is limited

^aMinority language group refers to non-Dutch speakers who cannot participate fully with a Dutch language policy. In the case of an English language policy, it refers to non-English speakers who cannot participate fully.

^bThe minority language group can be facilitated through language courses, interpreters, or document translation.

Besides this, additional relevant findings which could not be attributed to the five scenarios are included in the analysis.

6.5 Scenario 1: Strict Dutch Monolingual Policy

This first scenario denotes a situation where internationals are almost always prohibited from taking part in a participatory body because of their level of Dutch, while Dutch speakers can participate freely and without any linguistic restrictions.

6.5.1 The Attitudes of Dutch and International Students and Staff towards the Introduction of an International

In scenario one, the introduction of an international in the council is deemed virtually impossible. According to the focus group participants, the international would need to have acquired a near-native level of Dutch in order to be allowed to stand for election in a participatory body. This is caused by the high level of Dutch that is being used in meetings in this scenario, and by their fast-paced nature. Participants believed that the only way a truly high quality discussion can be held is to speak the Dutch language at a native-like level: *"I'm a bit concerned about the inclusiveness of it all, why not just deciding that we're going to have Dutch council meetings and unfortunately there's no place for internationals here. Because that's the only way to really do it at a high level"*.

It is crucial to note that this approach does not stem from ill will; rather, the Dutch participants worry that inclusivity cannot be reached if internationals cannot fully participate because of their Dutch skills. In addition to that, this strictly Dutch scenario is preferred because of the environment Utrecht University is situated in: *"we are still a Dutch university and you participate in a governing body of a Dutch organisation, then I think you can expect to learn the language"*. It was also expressed by participants that they strongly prefer to be allowed to make

their statements in Dutch, without any restrictions; in their opinion, this is the only way to get a point across effectively. This leads to the overarching notion of this scenario: *"[...] yes inclusiveness is certainly important but at what cost?"*.

6.5.2 Differences between Dutch and International Students, Scientific, and Support Staff

In fact, the attitude of Dutch members towards internationals is not negative at all. In this scenario, the inclusivity of international participation is doubted, but it is mainly questioned whether electing international members will pose problems for the inclusivity for Dutch members: *"if I am completely honest, that is an option that should be considered very seriously. And that is a great pity. And indeed it is absolutely not in line with the inclusivity objectives that we have. But the question is whether the objective of having internationals fully functioning in the participatory bodies is completely realistic I think"*.

In addition, certain groups are indicated to particularly benefit from scenario one. Firstly, it is pointed out that staff who use Dutch in their everyday work are expected to have reached a much lower level of English, which would prevent them from taking part in non-Dutch meetings: *"in general, what I also notice among colleagues, whether they are OBP or WP, is that many of them do not talk in their normal work, they actually only talk in Dutch. And then you see, even if they can read and write English well, etc., to express themselves in English during meetings, consultations, they find that quite difficult indeed"*.

Besides this, students are seen as a group that particularly suffers from a language barrier if any language other than Dutch would be used in meetings: *"on the other hand, there is a big problem that we are facing, and I know it applies to staff, but it is really problematic for students. A huge shortage of candidates. [...] And if we start putting up extra barriers, such as a language requirement, but also just for English, then I think the student body can halve in size pretty*

quickly because we just can't find enough people". Thus, this participant explains that as a result of a non-Dutch policy, a vital democratic element of Utrecht University's student representation could be threatened; an insufficient number of students would stand for election.

6.5.3 The Translation of Written Documents

The option of translation of documents in this scenario is non-existent. It was noted by a focus group participant that document translation was too costly to implement, although opinions on this monetary investment differed: *"what I did find interesting is that the translation of documents and the use of interpreters cost more than a ton a year. And that that is a lot. To be honest, I don't think it's that much, in other words, isn't it worth the money to do that?"* Nevertheless, a preference for a monolingual Dutch policy was more prevalent; as a result, no translations are available in this scenario.

6.5.4 The Use of Keywords

Although it was stated by multiple focus group members that a list of institutional keywords was helpful in multilingual situations, it was deemed more important that internationals were fully competent in Dutch instead, because this promoted efficiency in meetings. Therefore, no list of Dutch keywords is composed for internationals in scenario one.

6.5.5 The Application of Trainings and Courses

While deemed useful by various participants, scenario one does not allow internationals to take part in Dutch language courses, as it is believed that internationals should reach the required near-native Dutch level before joining a council. While these expectations are high, participants believed that they should be upheld: *"communicate more clearly the higher expectations you have. Look, if you have a clear idea in advance as a participant of the*

participation process of what you have to comply with, so a good command of the language, that can be quite helpful".

6.5.6 The Employment of Interpreters

Although it is acknowledged that interpreters promote mutual understanding, the fact that their employment decreases efficiency is regarded as an obstacle to the quality of the debate in a meeting; it could cause people to *"lag behind"*. Therefore, the employment of interpreters is prohibited.

6.6 Scenario 2: Dutch Preferential Policy

The second scenario as described by the participants of the focus groups is that (council) meetings primarily take place using Dutch. In this scenario, there is little room for translation and interpretation services, and internationals often have to rely on their limited Dutch skills and put in considerable effort to improve their level of Dutch as quickly as possible.

6.6.1 The Attitudes of Dutch and International Students and Staff towards the Introduction of an International

When an international is introduced in a participatory body in this scenario, they quickly come to realise that there are little to no accommodations to ensure their participation. Participants described that they are often left to fend for themselves, even though their Dutch counterparts express no ill will towards them. Thus, internationals' participation can only be ensured by learning the Dutch language as quickly as possible. This is demonstrated by the following quote: *"I think it's always, it depends on us, like if we really want to learn the language then we should push ourselves to just be like yeah, just continue"*.

Furthermore, when asked if internationals were treated differently than Dutch representatives, it was stated: *"I think that in the beginning yes, because it's just this very grey*

area and the very grey idea what's going to happen". Hence, when an international is introduced, Dutch colleagues behave the same towards them because there is no clear policy in place.

Another participant also insisted that participation within this scenario is difficult at first: *"so in the beginning obviously, the credibility that you're given as an international is lower because you don't have all the context that Dutch participants have"*. This often results in a less active participation as internationals mostly kept quiet during meetings and did not fully voice their opinions. This notion was related to the power dynamics within the meetings: *"I think I always felt it as a comfort and sort of power dynamic. And I wish, I wish I had more confidence to ask people to speak English. And when I really needed it I think I felt I couldn't ask"*. The participant elaborated on what could have caused this: *"I also think not native Dutch by culture and being very direct and asking for what you need is not that easy"*. Thus, not only language, but also cultural influences seem to play a role here.

Ultimately, participating in a Dutch meeting as outlined in this scenario is challenging for an international and limits their contribution, especially at the start of their participation: *"it was a challenge and I. I take a lot of notes, I didn't, generally didn't participate quite as much I asked a lot of questions"*. The level of Dutch that is actually required for unlimited participation in this scenario is underscored by this participant: *"well sometimes we have membership, so for instance the curriculum committee. Then and then because all the evaluations. These members in the curriculum committee they must be able to read the caracal evaluation so. And we say well it's perfect if you're international but you must be able to read the documents more or less. Because otherwise, they cannot perform the work of the members"*. Thus, it is evident that internationals must acquire an extremely high level of Dutch in order to be eligible for actual participation.

Additionally, Dutch councillors often express that a certain degree of adaptation to internationals' needs is acceptable, but a firm line is drawn when it comes to using humour in meetings. This is demonstrated as follows: *"we did hear feedback from some of the Dutch users well if I couldn't, if I can't tell jokes anymore I don't even want to be part of the council"*. Therefore, it is shown that Dutch councillors in this scenario are willing to cooperate with internationals to a moderate degree.

6.6.2 Differences between Dutch and International Students, Scientific, and Support Staff

In this scenario, a distinction between the attitudes of different groups can be identified. Firstly, it was mentioned that international scientific staff members need to acquire knowledge of Dutch in order to advance in their career: *"the route to full professor, then it's like oops, where is your Dutch. And then climbing the ladder, it gets harder"*.

An additional comment was made about support staff, as it was explained that less regulations were in place and expectations for this group seemed to divert from scientific staff: *"so it seems it seems like there are processes in place for academic staff, there are processes in place. At faculty level and there are processes in place for students because that's the expected stream of international people. And then there aren't that many OBP'ers"; "I think the expectation is that over the years OBP'ers are going to be Dutch and that if they are not it's really an outlier"*.

6.6.3 The Translation of Written Documents

The written documents that are discussed in meetings in this scenario can be translated, although this is not necessarily preferred by Dutch individuals. Nevertheless, an effort is being made; when asked if documents are translated for meetings in which an international is present, the following answer was given: *"yes in general"*. However, it was not further specified what

these translations entailed; it was unclear if they were summaries or complete translations, and if they were translated professionally or via machine translation.

6.6.4 The Use of Keywords

Institutional keywords were deemed vital by the Dutch and international participants. Nevertheless, in the Dutch scenario, no list of Dutch institutional keywords is provided for internationals. According to a participant, the reasoning behind this was: *"although some jargon and phrases, we have this kind of minor programmes in the second year or verdiepingspakketten and you see that these terms are used in Dutch because there's not a very proper translation"*. Hence, in this scenario, Dutch institutional keywords are regarded as impossible to translate to English; this shows that Dutch colleagues are not opposed to the concept of keywords translation, but rather, they do not know how to execute it correctly.

6.6.5 The Application of Trainings and Courses

In this scenario, Dutch courses are available to international participants, but they often have to finance this themselves and take the courses in their personal time instead of during work hours: *"so what I would like to suggest to the policy makers. To consider these, this time investment. To see if you can give the international colleagues more time, time support and also financial support. So in the past two years I invested so much of my own time and my own money I say I think it is not really sustainable"*. Hence, while the international participants might eventually learn Dutch if they are motivated enough to do so, it comes at a great cost for them. This was supported by another participant: *"I am supposed to get to this certain level in Dutch and that that's only it's only done in my own personal time so it's an interesting thing, they keep, the university keeps talking about work pressure and work pressure but for some international employees there's this additional thing of learning Dutch which is important. But we're not given*

any actual time to do it and we should we have to sacrifice time with our family our free time time to relax".

However, internationals stay motivated to participate in Dutch courses due to the necessity of learning Dutch within a given timeframe; often, it is an official requirement in their contracts. Although not all international participants were supported sufficiently, there was an exception to this: *"we really stimulate our our international staff to learn Dutch and we also facilitate that, so how we make sure that they can follow Dutch classes pretty much, to a certain extent. So they can take classes for half a year with the language school Babel. And we also give them some time in their first year so when they start teaching with us we gave them almost 0.5 FTE time to learn Dutch".* This degree of support is highly valued by international staff, as they suggested to officially incorporate such measures: *"make it official. Like a right in the contracts or right in the yearly evaluation".*

Furthermore, a participant specified which courses they would like to have access to: *"Dutch courses maybe should also be part of programmes. And not just A0 A2 that the university is already offering but also the Luistertaal so now this year is the pilot, but maybe next year we can actually implement this as courses. And, the follow-up, so A0 to A2 and then B1 and then afterwards B2 because to be honest there is this exam called Nt2 that everyone that wants to have a Dutch passport has to do, and Nt2 is just to B2 so if we can reach the level of the B2 we are fine in a way".*

In addition to Dutch courses for internationals, the participants were asked whether intercultural training sessions, during which participants learn to deal with colleagues who come from different cultural backgrounds, are available to Dutch and international members. In this scenario, such trainings are valued highly, but not always available to people participating in

Dutch meetings as described in this scenario. Rather, people participate in these trainings because they are part of other meetings in which a multilingual strategy is used: *"I ended up having two people that I met with, they were both on the university council and they had gone through the Luistertaal training for for the Dutch members, so they were made aware of Luistertaal and adjusting and it and I was able to, they spoke in Dutch and I spoke English, we were able to have a full thirty minute conversation, I understood like ninety five percent of what they were saying in Dutch versus when people weren't aware of Luistertaal so I just could, the Dutch I could not follow, it was too fast, the vocabulary was unknown, so the awareness for Dutch speakers when they're speaking to internationals, I think that's a really important aspect that could be developed well"*. This shows that it is vital for an internationals' understanding of a discussion that Dutch colleagues adapt; nevertheless, these trainings are not offered to groups of people that opt for a monolingual Dutch strategy.

6.6.6 The Employment of Interpreters

Participants described that no official interpreters were available at any given point during their participation in Dutch meetings, even though this could have positively influenced their participation: *"I think maybe it would have been, particularly in the beginning. I think now my receptive Dutch is enough to follow along the general idea so I'm not lost, but in the big beginning, yeah it definitely [laughs], it would have been very helpful"*. This service is simply not available, as no official interpreters are hired: *"zero experience with interpreters, they have never been offered or available"*.

The only instance of interpretation in this scenario is when a Dutch colleague informally translates fragments of the meeting that the international indicates they cannot understand. However, such requests are greatly dependent on the social coherence among meeting attendees,

as well as on the directness of the personality of the international. Therefore, participants expressed that a professional interpreter should always be available when necessary: *"I think that you should, so as a backup, you should always have someone prepared. In ehm, actually it's a fulltime job this interpreter"*.

6.7 Scenario 3: Strict English Monolingual Policy

This scenario paints a picture of a language policy in which no accommodations are made for Dutch speakers, which contrasts with the previously mentioned Dutch scenarios. In fact, this situation excludes Dutch speakers who are not highly competent in the English language.

6.7.1 The Attitudes of Dutch and International Students and Staff towards the Introduction of an International

Scenario three presents a situation in which the English language is dominant in participatory bodies. The reasoning behind this attitude is that the Dutch should acknowledge the international status of Utrecht University: *"it's not just adapting to English speaking people or them adapting to us, it's also the Dutch adapting to an international environment"*. Hence, even the participation of one international student or colleague can account for a radical switch to English, which is outlined in the following example: *"this faculty year we decided to speak English in the council. Because we had a new member from [foreign country] who did its master's programme who's doing a master's programme. And it didn't speak Dutch. So, we contemplated a number of different options and we thought that we should adapt to the new member and speak English"*.

This approach is regarded as fair by some, since most internationals are not native English speakers either; it can be seen as more fair that no council member or meeting participant speaks in their mother tongue to avoid unfair advantages. Thus, Dutch members are extremely

accommodating by stepping away from using their native language and instead opting for an approach that levels the playing field for everyone in most cases: *"you have more or less the same playing field, because nobody speaks English, not even the foreigners, and neither do we"*.

Internationals indicated to support this approach by stating that *"I think if they switch to English they will all have to think before they say it, so it will be more properly because this is all for all of us the second language, thinking will be difficult. It's a bit not fair that I am an international in a Dutch meeting suffering with this"*. Essentially, in this scenario, this approach is seen as the option that is the most unbiased towards everyone involved. Thus, this policy dictates that a certain minimal level of prerequisite knowledge of English should be reached by every member, regardless of their background: *"I think that if you open for internationals, then there needs to be a baseline for all. And then you need to have a requirement of English [...]"*.

6.7.2 Differences between Dutch and International Students, Scientific, and Support Staff

As displayed in the focus groups, this strict English-only scenario requires a positive attitude towards the international member(s). However, it was expressed in the focus groups that certain groups might experience difficulties with a sudden switch to English. In particular, students who are enrolled in a Dutch educational programme can struggle with speaking English: *"and for students is also difficult [...]"*. This results in student participation to decrease dramatically, as described by one participant: *"I repeatedly witnessed people falling silent in student committee meetings because they got stuck in English [...]. I think my English is pretty adequate. I wouldn't say I speak C2-level English. Passively, maybe. Active a bit less. But I sometimes get stuck too. I try to present an argument with which I try to convince a councillor or my fellow councillors and halfway through the argument I get stuck. In my words, in my expressions, I no longer know where I'm going. And at that point your whole story collapses and*

you can't have a proper conversation anymore". Thus, even students with a basic understanding of English can struggle with participating in an English meeting to a great extent. Nevertheless, experiences with student participation in meetings with a strict English policy are varied and can be successful as well. Despite this, many students in a Dutch programme do struggle: "but for the students and I didn't expect that but many of the students follow a Dutch bachelor programme. You know and some of them are very confident and or they don't care and just throw it out but others not".

Additionally, although it was initially expected that support staff with a lower level of education might have difficulties with this policy, this appeared not to be the case: *"so but I must say that I was I was pleasantly surprised with how the support staff did, I wasn't really sure of it beforehand. Scientific staff is more used to, more used to it they publish internationally they speak internationally and international context so for them it is easier. For the board it's also easy because they're professors, they also operate in an international environment".* However, it was also expressed that the participation of high-level executives was not always successful; at times, this could even result in less active participation: *"in fact, in our executive board. So I thought everyone would speak English well enough, the of the scientific staff, but that's not true now and there are big differences in level you know".*

6.7.3 The Translation of Written Documents

This scenario uses English documents only; no translation into Dutch is provided for any council members or meeting attendees, as it was not mentioned by any focus group participants.

6.7.4 The Use of Keywords

In this scenario, as there is no facilitation of Dutch speaking individuals, no translated list of Dutch keywords translated is created. Even though it was implied by participants that the

creation of such a list could greatly benefit Dutch speakers whose level of English is not yet sufficient, it was not specifically mentioned by any participants in relation to a strict English monolingual policy.

6.7.5 *The Application of Trainings and Courses*

Scenario four denotes that Dutch individuals should partake in an English language course prior to joining a participatory body. Since the Dutch members will need to achieve a certain level of English in order to participate in the meetings, it is essential that this is accounted for in a collective setting: *"probably the most important thing is that everyone should go on an English course I think and and it's also a great way to get to know each other so if you have a team or a council or, or maybe they should. And they need to speak English they should do together"*. Hence, all members should enrol in an English course that prepares them for speaking English in a meeting; additionally, this could train them in having meetings with people with other cultural backgrounds. However, if someone does not reach the required level of English, they are excluded from taking part in meetings in this scenario.

6.7.6 *The Employment of Interpreters*

Interpreters are not available in this scenario. While in this case it might be less necessary for an international to have access to an interpreter, it would be beneficial to Dutch members who do not fully master the English language. Nevertheless, this service is unavailable to them, as it was not mentioned by any participants in relation to a strictly English policy.

6.8 Scenario 4: English Preferential Policy

Essentially, this scenario represents a more moderate version of scenario three. While in scenario three, accommodations and services for Dutch people are not present, scenario 4 does provide them with tools to help improve their participation.

6.8.1 The Attitudes of Dutch and International Students and Staff towards the Introduction of an International

While scenario three mentions the importance of a strongly positive attitude towards internationals, scenario four acknowledges the problems that can arise when adopting an English language policy more adequately, as demonstrated by a participant: *"there is also another side to this is that if Dutch people are forced to speak English, and they should when there's an English speaking member, it's not always so easy"*. This denotes that Dutch speakers are regarded as meeting attendees who might have issues with the English language when it is adopted as the main language too abruptly. This is underscored by another participant, who observed that using English only can make meeting attendees uncomfortable, limiting their contribution to the discussion: *"I know that there is a huge variety of comfort level of Dutch members from, in the staff members from people who it doesn't matter, they switch it's no problem, to other people who are very self-conscious and do not, you notice the change in participation, yeah, visible. People who would normally be very very participatory and have a lot to contribute suddenly are very quiet [...]"*. This is confirmed by another participant, who stated: *"I asked them to share their opinions and it was really really clear that they were very uncomfortable talking in English"*.

Thus, people are understanding towards Dutch speakers who are unable to participate to the fullest extent in English meetings, and certain arrangements are made to help them. Nevertheless, this English approach does not fully prevent internationals from inadequate participation either: *"we did speak English for them, but to integrate them in the whole discourse was still difficult"*.

6.8.2 Differences between Dutch and International Students, Scientific, and Support Staff

It should be noted that the distinction between different types of meetings attendees, who come from various backgrounds within the university, is relatively similar to scenario three. Besides, a similar distinction was made between Dutch and internationals, as *"certainly not everyone in the staff representation is comfortable speaking English"*.

6.8.3 The Translation of Written Documents

Since this scenario is more forgiving towards Dutch individuals, there are translations of written documents. Specifically, English as well as Dutch versions are made accessible to each meeting attendee or council member, although they are not professional translations; instead, they are machine-generated: *"[...] for the written documents we use an interpreter. Yeah. And our secretary, she had to get used to it but. Now she's very handy with with automatic translation. So she throws it into Google or she uses something else actually. And then she can make sort of a text of it if she makes notes in Dutch"*. As a result of this approach, everyone who attends a meeting has access to documents in a language they comprehend. However, it should be noted that automatic translations are not always correct, and can cause discrepancies between the original text and the translated version; this could potentially lead to misunderstandings.

6.8.4 The Use of Keywords

In contrast to scenario three, scenario four does include the use of a list of institutional keywords to a great extent. In fact, participants indicated that composing and distributing a list of frequently used words in a meeting is extremely beneficial, as demonstrated in this participant's statement: *"so for the faculty council so the other thing that I started doing is making a vocabulary. Of ehm, medezeggenschap words which we use in management and control and also in our democracy, our representation"*. Such lists are made to help people understand what is

being said during a meeting, *"because you have limitations for expressing certain nuances or or understanding certain words and speaking certain words"*, as explained by a participant. Hence, it can be challenging for internationals as well as for Dutch people to learn to use specific terms, and it is easier to have a pre-comprised list of terms that are important; this way, everyone is on the same page, and misunderstandings can be limited.

6.8.5 The Application of Trainings and Courses

Besides a list of keywords and translations, language courses are marked as the most important factor in this scenario. According to participants, taking part in an English course can greatly improve the cooperation and participation within a meeting. Owing to the fact that a transition to English can present difficulties, the need for Dutch or English language training is underscored. This is demonstrated by the following statement: *"so I think that there should be attention for, for people who are having difficulty expressing themselves in that language"*; this shows that if people cannot express themselves in English sufficiently, they should receive aid.

It is important to note that this aspect of scenario four differs from scenario three in terms of the kind of language trainings offered; in this scenario, the option of taking part in an English and/or a Dutch course is pointed out. This is denoted in the following quotes: *"you know I think it is very important if you stimulate a staff member to learn Dutch or English, but also make it, ehm, facilitate it"; "but something that I think I'll show should be in the back of our minds it's also for the Dutch ones to have an English basic course and I know in my experience that some of them don't have C1, B2 English level that will so for them it's really really hard to talk English"*. Thus, it is stressed that both Dutch and English-speaking members should be given the opportunity to learn each other's language. This could also be a receptive course: *"just to provide*

that basic, like we have, the listening and receptive course, that they can have a receptive English course let's say".

Additionally, while it is not mentioned explicitly by participants, intercultural workshops that promote cooperation between individuals with different cultural backgrounds are also included in this scenario. As a participant mentions, not only language, but cultural factors are vastly influential on participation too: *"[...] make them familiar with what is considered normal over here [laughs] because that is very helpful, and what she just said in the chat, getting to know people personally. Then they know a little bit better how you communicate and then sometimes words are even not that important anymore"*. For instance, this knowledge of local meeting culture could be taught in an intercultural awareness training.

6.8.6 The Employment of Interpreters

Contrary to the facilitation of document translation, interpreters are not made available to either Dutch nor international attendees during meetings. When explicitly asked if interpreters are used, a participant replied with *"no, did just for the written documents"*. Hence, the positive effects of interpretation are not acknowledged or known. This might be problematic for Dutch speakers who participate in meetings in this scenario; while the measures taken in this scenario might contribute to their overall understanding of English, it is precisely during the actual meetings that they are not supported.

6.9 Scenario 5: Multilingual Dutch/English Policy

Finally, scenario five revolves around the use of more than one language during meetings, as it allows for Dutch as well as English. Thus, this bilingual scenario involves different communicative modes, such as LaRa and Codeswitching. As a result, people's receptive and productive skills can be employed in multiple ways.

6.9.1 Attitude of Dutch and International Students and Staff towards the Introduction of an International

Firstly, in scenario five, the introduction of an international to a participatory body is accommodated by introducing the concept of LaRa. When using LaRa, it is essential to indicate the required level of Dutch of the international member, as a minimum receptive level is required in order for LaRa to be successful. This is also denoted by a participant who states that their level of Dutch was insufficient for LaRa when first taking part in meetings, but who can now employ this mode: *"I think now my receptive Dutch is enough to follow along the general idea so I'm not lost"*.

Additionally, a positive attitude towards LaRa is needed from all participants, Dutch or international, as everyone has to adjust their way of speaking. Importantly, Dutch members should not resort to speaking English to internationals, as this limits their ability to practise Dutch. However, participants express that this does happen regularly: *"[...] in general the Dutch will switch to English, they have a high level of English they'll switch to it in in order to be helpful, but it's actually not helpful if you want to improve and you have to be very very you have to be Dutch you have to be very direct and be like no no no don't speak English to me, speak Dutch to me because I'm trying to improve like but to get that you have to be very direct and if that is not your personality then it's really hard to improve"*. This behaviour is also described from a Dutch point of view: *"but everyone in, in private or individual conversations ehm they talk to them in English because well it's quicker and it's understandable et cetera so"*.

Furthermore, internationals noted that Dutch people resorted to English based on their physical appearance. Particularly, internationals' race was influential: *"yeah I think it is also depends on what you look like. For me, my face is not a Western face and the people on the street*

or in the shop they speak English to me, directly, and they immediately, so sometimes I respond to Dutch and then oh, you speak Dutch". Another participant responded to this by stating that their appearance caused a different experience: *"I get the assumption that I'm a native Dutch speaker and I think [laughs] they hear me speak and somehow although I think, I think my pronunciation is pretty good, somehow they're able to identify that I'm not, and there's an almost immediate switch to English. And I found that to be true almost regardless of my environment [...]"*. Thus, internationals have to anticipate this by pointing out that this is not the desired type of accommodation, and that they would like Dutch people to speak Dutch in order to keep using LaRa.

Moreover, it is expressed that LaRa requires Dutch people to be compassionate, since discussions in LaRa might take longer than usual: *"you know, sometimes, people lose patience a little bit but then I say hey listen if you want me to speak Dutch then you have to cooperate. So then they do that"*. However, the required directness as mentioned by this participant could pose problems for internationals who are unfamiliar or uncomfortable with being this outspoken about their linguistic preferences. Nonetheless, Dutch speakers also praise LaRa for being a mode in which internationals can train Dutch skills: *"and then sometimes it goes a bit slower because we have to translate now and then, but it's very nice because you see those people making real progress in Dutch"*. For this reason, using LaRa is suggested by Dutch speakers as well: *"yes I have a lot of meetings and if there are colleagues who are not originally Dutch and most of them I already know so I know if they can understand Dutch. And if they can I always propose Luistertaal"*.

In addition to LaRa, Codeswitching is a mode that is employed in this scenario. Codeswitching is used in situations in which it is deemed too difficult to express oneself in a

foreign language, as stated by this participant: *"I myself would speak English. I still switch to English if I feel like I need to say something that requires thought, strategy"*. Hence, it becomes clear that internationals use English when trying to get a crucial point across. Moreover, Codeswitching takes place on a turn- and preference basis; internationals might indicate that they prefer to discuss something in English, and thus switch to using another language, as demonstrated by a participant: *"then, we use Luistertaal but if our colleagues who I know already or if they indicate that they prefer English we switch to English"*.

6.9.2 Differences between Dutch and International Students, Scientific, and Support Staff

This scenario primarily distinguishes between Dutch and international individuals. While internationals claim that LaRa helps them to acquire Dutch, and is, therefore, their preferred mode, Dutch members generally show a more apprehensive attitude. This is especially shown during discussions in which arguments need to be expressed carefully: *"a pity about the Luistertaal. That's not possible right now. Because you just really need to have a conversation down to the last detail. That is my experience. Yes, I think it's really no ill will"*.

6.9.3 The Translation of Written Documents

Scenario five denotes that documents are translated at least partially. While complete translations are preferred by internationals, those are not always provided. Rather, English summaries are distributed to internationals, as stated in the following quotes: *"so they give us a summary of the translation of whatever the document but the summary, it's very not informative"*; *"and the other thing is when I have to read financial or housing documents, only a summary is not helpful"*. Hence, while English summaries of Dutch texts can help an international's participation to a certain extent, they are insufficient for challenging topics or information that should be treated with accuracy.

6.9.4 The Use of Keywords

In this scenario, a list of keywords is an indispensable tool for successful meetings. Since the international participants are expected to eventually learn Dutch, the list of keywords is seen as a first step in expanding their knowledge on Dutch institutional language. This is underscored in this statement: *"I believe you made a list of words that could not really be translated. And they. Which the internationals just learned in Dutch. You see this everywhere throughout the organisation, including abbreviations, for example. And that works pretty well"*. Moreover, developing a similar list of English keywords for Dutch peers is suggested: *"what can be provided to them also a basic English with the terms of also like we have the list of terms in Dutch for them to also have the translate them in English [...]"*.

6.9.5 The Application of Trainings and Courses

When using LaRa, the focus group participants expressed clearly that awareness is the key to success. Without awareness, LaRa is an inefficient communicative mode; however, when representatives partake in intercultural awareness trainings, the usefulness of LaRa can be improved: *"it's awareness on both sides. Dutch language training for the internationals but also this awareness training for the Dutch colleagues"*. Nevertheless, it can be difficult to achieve this; while the Dutch generally have an accommodating attitude, putting this into practice can be challenging: *"I think that certainly as a result of those workshops, the willingness is there. Only the awareness. It's just the awareness that sometimes lags behind, especially when discussions get a bit more complicated"*.

Additionally, a receptive Dutch course, like the one currently offered by the M&M-project, is needed for advancing internationals' participation with LaRa. Since internationals often enrol in this course while they are already part of a council or meeting, it

cannot be expected that they reach the desired level of receptive Dutch through this course right away. Nonetheless, the minimum Dutch level that is needed for LaRa can be obtained through this course, which is important: *"[...] it does require an initial level, you can't start at someone at A0 or A1 and just throw them into Luistertaal to talk [laughs]. It does require some background knowledge, it just doesn't work otherwise, but at certain levels yeah it's very effective or it can be".*

6.9.6 The Employment of Interpreters

At the first stage of LaRa, an official, live interpreter is indispensable when the international council member has not yet reached a sufficient level of receptive Dutch to actively participate in the meetings. This may shift towards a more relaxed approach after the internationals' participation in the receptive Dutch course. Hence, the interpreter might switch from complete translations to paraphrasing at the request of the international. An international and a Dutch participant who participate in a scenario five situation were both positive about interpreters: *"the [interpreters] it's eh, because I have two [interpreters] both of them works really well [...]"; "but I think it is indeed the best modus operandi [...] I think it's best that way, actually".*

6.10 Additional Findings

In addition to findings that could be connected to the five scenarios, two secondary results were uncovered that could not be attributed to a specific scenario. These results were considered relevant to the context of this study; thus, they are outlined below.

6.10.1 The Role of the Chair

Firstly, the role of the chair as moderator and confidant was underscored. While this was not anticipated in the focus group interviews, it became evident regardless, as demonstrated by

the following quote of a chair: *"well I what I did is I talked a lot to them. Around the council meetings. Asking them how it was what it was what it was like if they need any support. If they need support from me during the meetings you know so. For example if I know [...]. To clarify things more to clarify things so if they for example if they would have a certain subject that they were going to talk about in the council than I would say are you comfortable with the. Is there something that I can help to pull or to sure you know so. Yeah. That their helps a little bit".*

6.10.2 Interaction between Focus Group Participants

Secondly, it was found that the interaction between the participants of each focus group accounted for different types of statements. It was evident that more nuanced views were expressed in the heterogeneous focus group, in which Dutch and international participants took part, as opposed to the homogeneous focus group, in which either Dutch or international participants joined. Specifically, it appeared that the participants of the homogeneous groups felt more comfortable making bold statements about their standpoints on their own participation and inclusion as well as on the opposite group.

7 Discussion

In this section, the results of this study will be related to its theoretical framework. Among these results are the five linguistic scenarios as described in the results section, how meetings at Utrecht University are affected by these scenarios, and the implications this could have for diversity and inclusion at Utrecht University. Furthermore, the limitations of this study are pointed out.

7.1 Five Linguistic Scenarios of Utrecht University's Participatory Bodies

As presented earlier, the focus group interviews with participants who had experience with taking part in the university's participatory bodies in a relevant way brought forth five

different linguistic scenarios. These scenarios describe what is actually happening within the employee and student representation; they also indicate what could be potential language policies.

7.1.1 Scenario 1: Strict Dutch Monolingual Policy

The first scenario presented in this study has an undeniable impact on the participation of internationals in particular. As it was shown that internationals meaning to join meetings in representative bodies in this scenario would have to master the Dutch language nearly as well as their native-speaking counterparts, it can be concluded that this would require the internationals to go to great lengths in order to be allowed to participate. However, Dutch native speakers would be facilitated substantially, as they would not have to adapt any of their language.

According to the theory, this has several implications. Firstly, it is important that meetings give everyone the opportunity to be represented (Heath & Wensil, 2019). This has several advantages for any organisation, but most importantly, it provides an environment in which a wide arrange of stances can be articulated (Rogelberg, 2021). Hence, if the university would administer a strictly Dutch language policy for its participatory bodies, it is likely that the opinions of its international employees and students will only be heard to a small extent. This could be detrimental to their inclusion, as language is a key tool for promoting social equality within institutions such as the university (Matras & Robertson, 2017). The solution to this problem would be the linguistic assimilation of the internationals (Piller & Takahashi, 2011); however, this approach has been debunked as an effective road to inclusion. Through responses from the participants, this process could be even more difficult for people of colour, which aligns with the understanding that non-native language can "acquire a skin colour" (Piller & Takahashi, 2011, p. 376).

It should be noted that the Dutch participants describing this scenario do not mean to cause such negative outcomes; rather, they fear that the inclusion of internationals in participatory bodies can simply not be realised, and that their participation could also have grave consequences for the participation of Dutch natives. Only then, the exclusion of internationals to the employee and student representation as a group is justified (Otten et al., 2013). Furthermore, scenario one dictates that the quality of the debate would suffer if a high level of Dutch is not mandatory; remarkably, this is not in accordance with prior research (Correale, 2020a).

Because of the strong preference for Dutch, it can be presumed that a strict Dutch language policy as presented in scenario one would give considerable status to the Dutch language (Spolsky, 2011), and therefore, to its native speakers. Furthermore, in terms of acquisition planning (Spolsky, 2011), this scenario dictates that there is little help offered to internationals wanting to learn Dutch, meaning that Dutch courses are not offered specifically to enable joining a participatory body; rather, internationals would have to take initiative.

7.1.2 Scenario 2: Dutch Preferential Policy

This second scenario diverts from the first one that was outlined in this study in one crucial aspect in particular: scenario two represents a situation in which employees and students who do not (yet) fully master the Dutch language are allowed to join a participatory body. It was observed that Dutch native speakers should adapt their language in order to facilitate the participation of the internationals in a Dutch-speaking council or meeting; however, in scenario two, this only happens to a limited extent.

Participants expressed that when joining a meeting under these circumstances, their participation and contribution to the discussion was essentially non-existent at the very beginning, especially when their level of Dutch was considered to be inadequate for

comprehending their Dutch colleagues' speech and the Dutch documents; thus, their language competence accounted for exclusion (Marácz & Adamo, 2017). Hence, this created a power balance in which internationals did not feel secure enough to voice their opinions; such situations can account for exclusion (Nair & Vohra, 2015). Therefore, even though internationals are involved in the decision-making process in this scenario, it raises a question: are internationals given a seat at the table because their diverse contributions are valued and could help the university reach its goals (Nair & Vohra, 2015), or is this "involvement for the sake of involvement" (Miller, 2015, p. 148)?

On top of that, it could be argued that the strict Dutch policy might stop internationals from being promoted to higher positions since Dutch would be needed for this; this was expressed by a participant as well as outlined by theory (Matras & Robertson, 2017). Thus, Dutch native speakers could keep advancing to higher positions at the expense of internationals, causing a skewed balance of power within the university.

Lastly, since internationals are not given the opportunity to take Dutch courses to advance their participation by the university, they have to acquire the language on their own terms. This would affect internationals' work-life balance negatively; this was confirmed by participants, while theory dictates that a healthy work-life balance contributes to diversity (Nair & Vohra, 2015).

7.1.3 *Scenario 3: Strict English Monolingual Policy*

In contrast to scenarios one and two, scenario three represents a language policy that would negatively affect Dutch native speakers in particular. This scenario shows many similarities with the strict Dutch scenario one; instating English as a lingua franca (Backus et al., 2013) in participatory bodies in this scenario would exclude Dutch speakers who are not fully

competent in English, causing them to be underrepresented (Heath & Wensil, 2019). Besides, English as a lingua franca (Backus et al., 2013) is known for failing to represent diverse stances in communication, which can also foster exclusion (Mori, 2020). Thus, this would limit the number of views reflected in meetings (Rogelberg, 2021) and might eventually cause participatory and social exclusion of Dutch individuals (Marácz & Adamo, 2017; Matras & Robertson, 2017). Moreover, participants stated that Dutch people from all levels of the university could be affected by this; even people in managerial positions (Virkkula-Räisänen, 2010).

This type of policy could have an extensive impact on a Dutch individual's career path within Utrecht University (Matras & Robertson, 2017). The only means for them to progress would be to adopt linguistic assimilation (Pillar & Takahashi, 2011), meaning that Dutch speakers would have to devote themselves to learning English on a near-native level. Thus, it is shown that implementing a strict English monolingual policy that does not allow for accommodations and services for any meeting attendees is detrimental to inclusion.

7.1.4 Scenario 4: English Preferential Policy

As opposed to scenario three, scenario four does allow Dutch speakers who are not fully competent in the English language to join participatory bodies. However, bearing similarity to the Dutch preferential policy of scenario two, the participants made it clear that Dutch speakers still experience exclusion based on this scenario.

Particularly, it was noted by participants that they expected that an English approach as depicted in this scenario would cause Dutch natives to fail to contribute fully to the conversation in meetings. Participants observed many instances in which Dutch individuals' participation declined after adopting English as a lingua franca (Backus et al., 2013). Furthermore, it was

noted by Dutch participants that this monolingual English approach did not account for sufficient inclusion of internationals either, although efforts to speak English were made (Marácz & Adamo, 2017; Pillar & Takahashi, 2011).

It was also mentioned that speaking English in meetings and reading documents in English was especially challenging for some groups of students. Since Utrecht University offers degree programmes that are taught entirely in Dutch, it is unlikely that all students reach a high level of English. The same was stated for scientific staff if they frequently researched and published in Dutch. While providing Dutch translations of documents offers some assistance, thus promoting inclusion (Gazzola, et al., 2019), this was deemed insufficient by participants.

Despite this, a strong preference for adopting ELF (Backus et al., 2013) was expressed by some participants. In their eyes, English is essential with respect to the international environment of Utrecht University and should, therefore, be installed as the communicative language as soon as internationals wish to join a participatory body. Since English is the language that organisations resort to the most in such situations (Virkkula-Räisänen, 2010), this is not surprising.

However, it should be noted that this approach creates a disbalance of power between internationals and Dutch speakers, as the status (Spolsky, 2011) of internationals is heightened. Furthermore, in terms of language acquisition planning (Spolsky, 2011), scenario four presents an interesting aspect, as it is stated that Dutch speakers should take part in an English course that should be provided by the participatory body; this aligns with recommendations made in prior research (Matras & Robertson, 2017).

7.1.5 Scenario 5: Multilingual English/Dutch policy

Lastly, scenario five denotes a policy that diverts from the scenarios presented previously. Calling for cooperation and accommodation of internationals and of Dutch speakers, this scenario can be ascribed to Inclusive Multilingualism (Backus et al., 2013). In particular, three different modes can be discerned: LaRa, Codeswitching, and MT (Backus et al., 2013).

Within this scenario, all representatives are given the opportunity to participate by deploying these modes. Firstly, the introduction of LaRa allows for people to use their receptive language skills in addition to their productive skills (Backus et al., 2013); this has been proven to be an effective way of using employee's language skills to an organisation's advantage while also promoting communicative efficiency (Gazzola et al., 2019; Mondada, 2022). Second, the addition of interpreters and translations of documents positively influences the inclusive conduct of a meeting and eases multilingual communication (Gazzola et al., 2019; Pillar & Takahashi, 2011), as expressed by the participants. Especially when internationals' receptive Dutch skills are not yet sufficient, interpreters and translations are indispensable.

Furthermore, Codeswitching was observed to be of value within a multilingual Dutch/English scenario as well. Participants noted that through topicalisation (Kurhilla, et al., 2021), it was determined whether parts of the discussion were held in Dutch or English, depending on the topics that the international had to pay special attention to. This promoted mutual intelligibility (Gazzola et al., 2019) and aligns with the fact that many speakers in meetings already adopt this approach (Mondada, 2022).

However, participants expressed that in order for a multilingual strategy to be implemented successfully, awareness of the multilingual situation was essential. In line with theory, participants dictated that (receptive) language courses and trainings focused on

multilingualism, diversity and inclusion (Bezruoka et al., 2012) were extremely beneficial for promoting awareness.

7.2 Additional Findings

7.2.1 *Role of the Chair*

Firstly, a remarkable observation from the focus groups was the role of the chair. It was expressed that the chair could play a vital role in ensuring that everyone could speak up and feel included; this can be linked to theory supporting the requirement of an inclusive leader in a multilingual meeting, and how management is responsible for promoting inclusivity (Heath & Wensil, 2019; Mondada, 2022; Morwood, 2021; Virkkula-Räisänen, 2010).

While no interview question specifically focused on the role of the chair, the topic was still brought up and discussed thoroughly by several participants. Therefore, it can be stated that the role of the chair is of particular importance for ensuring that multilingualism is dealt with inclusively.

7.2.2 *Interaction between Participants per Focus Group*

Secondly, it was observed that the interaction between the participants of the different types of focus groups resulted in different opinions and stances on multilingualism, participation, and inclusion. Particularly, it became evident that the environment of the homogeneous groups allowed for participants to express more uncompromising statements than the participants of the heterogeneous group. This could be related to the assumption that diversity in focus group interviews can account for issues (Pinta Da Costa, 2021) that hamper the "within-group interaction" (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 144); hence, participants might have felt it was more difficult to express their views within a diverse, heterogeneous environment in which members of the 'other group' could judge them. While the composition of the focus groups has affected the outcome of

this study, it is not researched and described in-depth; in future research, this could be explored further.

7.3 Limitations

7.3.1 *Participants per Faculty*

Firstly, as was shown in the methodology chapter, it is clear that the participant group is not representative due to the small number of respondents. Moreover, the participants were not distributed proportionally across the faculties of Utrecht University. However, even with this restricted participant group, it was possible to discern five language policy scenarios, which is remarkable.

7.3.2 *Rationalisation of the Scenarios*

Despite the extensive evidence that was found for some aspects of the scenarios through using participants' quotes from the focus group interviews, not all aspects could be accounted for equally. Particularly, the distinction between the English language policy scenarios three and four was not as evident from the data as was shown in the presentation of the scenarios. Nevertheless, an analytical distinction between scenarios three and four was made, which was not fully represented in the data.

Moreover, it should be noted that the scenarios as described in this study are not each other's mirror images. Although the strict monolingual scenarios one and three, and the preferential policies two and four bear a number of similarities, notable differences between these scenarios do exist. It is likely that the Dutch context of Utrecht University played a role in this; since Dutch universities have historically adhered to Dutch as the institutional language, it can be assumed that the preference for Dutch is rooted more deeply than the preference for English. Therefore, opinions that advocated a Dutch language policy were voiced more strongly,

and the tools and services offered to Dutch individuals differ from those provided for internationals.

7.3.3 The Categorisation of Internationals

This study used the concept 'international' to indicate non-Dutch participants, staff, and students. Additionally, throughout this research, 'internationals' were referred to as people who speak English on a (near-)native level; however, it should be emphasised that in real-life, this cannot be expected. In fact, it is likely that internationals who are non-native English speakers will never acquire a (near-)native level of English; this could account for obstacles in employee and student representation as well, which was not taken into account in this study.

Moreover, it should be mentioned that individuals can have diverse cultural identities (Cole, 2016); thus, someone's proficiency in a language or multiple languages is part of their diverse persona. While this study presented the Dutch and the internationals as two separate groups, reality denotes that people cannot be categorised this way; a more nuanced outlook on diversity is required, which was not allowed for in this study.

8 Conclusion

This section will present the core results of this study and formulate answers to its research questions. Besides this, this study's recommendations will be presented and explained, along with suggestions for further research.

8.1 Current Language Policy of Utrecht University's Participatory Bodies

This study aimed to investigate which language policies currently exist within the employee and student representation of Utrecht University. Therefore, the main research question was: which linguistic scenarios are currently present within the employee and student representation of Utrecht University? As the results of this study have shown, five linguistic

scenarios could be distinguished: a) a strict monolingual Dutch policy; b) a Dutch preferential policy; c) a strict monolingual English policy; d) an English preferential policy; e) a multilingual Dutch/English policy.

These scenarios constitute the current language policy of Utrecht University's employee and student representation. Therefore, there is currently no uniform language policy for Utrecht University's employee and student representation; each faculty, department, and participatory body devises its own language policy.

8.2 Inclusion

This study has shown that these various approaches have different implications for inclusion in participatory bodies and meetings at Utrecht University. Specifically, each scenario affects the participation of at least one of the two groups described in this study: either the Dutch or the international group.

8.2.1 Inclusion of International Employee and Student Representatives

Firstly, the findings of this study presented two scenarios in which the participation of internationals is particularly restricted through the application of a Dutch language policy: scenarios one and two. In scenario one, internationals are excluded from participatory bodies and meetings because of the (near-)native level of Dutch that is required to participate, while no facilities are offered to improve their Dutch. Hence, scenario one dictates that internationals cannot contribute meaningfully to the decision-making process within Utrecht University. Furthermore, while scenario two does facilitate internationals to some degree by offering services such as English translations of Dutch texts, access to resources that advance internationals' participation is still too restricted to ensure significant contribution in meetings and the employee and student representation.

Therefore, scenarios one and two have a significant impact on the inclusion of internationals. Because the participation of internationals is limited, an institutional disparity is created; the standpoints of Dutch individuals within Utrecht University can be expressed and incorporated into policymaking, while internationals' opinions are systematically left out. In light of the increasing internationalisation of Dutch universities, this is an undesired effect.

It is important to note that this approach is not rooted in Dutch racism or bigotry, but rather in the idea that an English language policy would account for exclusion of Dutch staff and students. It is likely that since Utrecht University is an institution that is situated in the Netherlands, where universities have historically had a Dutch language policy, it is believed that it is the internationals' responsibility to adapt in order to participate.

8.2.2 Inclusion of Dutch Employee and Student Representatives

In contrast with the Dutch language policy scenarios, the English scenarios three and four cast a different light on inclusion within Utrecht University's employee and student representation. In fact, these scenarios denote that Dutch individuals who wish to contribute to meetings or participatory bodies encounter exclusion. Particularly, scenario three describes a situation in which Dutch staff and students need to obtain a (near-)native level of English before joining a meeting or participatory body; no tools and services are offered to reach this required level. Even though scenario four does allow for a lower level of English and provides access to some facilities, it is still too difficult for some Dutch staff and students to contribute to the discussion in a meaningful way.

Consequently, Dutch perspectives are under-represented at Utrecht University; Dutch individuals are either not represented at all, or they cannot communicate their viewpoints properly due to their limited knowledge of English. As Utrecht University is a Dutch university,

it can be expected that this skewed power balance is not accepted by the Dutch at Utrecht University, and neither by Dutch society.

8.3 Suggestions for Future Research

Firstly, as it was not disclosed which scenarios were found in which faculties, departments, or participatory bodies of Utrecht University, this could be researched more in-depth in a university-wide anonymous survey that contains the themes that were discussed in the focus group interviews of this study. Additionally, through this quantitative method, a more representative sample of respondents from all faculties could be accumulated.

Furthermore, future studies could inquire into the language practices of the employee and student representation of other universities in the Netherlands in a similar manner; this way, these language policies could be compared and contrasted. This might provide insights into the factors that influence and determine language choice in the participatory bodies of universities.

9 Recommendations

Finally, it is recommended to adopt a multilingual Dutch/English language policy as depicted in scenario five of this study. Although exclusion cannot be avoided completely in this scenario, it does provide the most inclusive solution to dealing with multilingualism in participatory bodies for two main reasons. First, it allows Dutch and international individuals to join participatory bodies regardless of their level of Dutch or English. Second, it offers a complete range of tools and services that facilitate the participation of Dutch and international staff and students.

Therefore, the following section presents recommendations related specifically to the implementation of a multilingual Dutch/English policy in the employee and student

representation; these are categorised according to Spolsky's (2009) framework and related to Utrecht University's proposed language policy (Schrijver, 2022).

9.1 Status/Prestige Planning

- It is recommended that the IM modes LaRa, Codeswitching, and MT are included in Utrecht University's official language policy. However, MT is currently not taken into consideration (Schrijver, 2022).
- Dutch and English should be given equal status; this emphasises the bilingual character of Utrecht University. This is already included in the language policy (Schrijver, 2022).

9.2 Corpus Planning

- A basic list of institutional keywords should be devised; if possible, this list should be published in English as well as in Dutch. This is not yet incorporated into the language policy (Schrijver, 2022).

9.3 Acquisition Planning

- Free Dutch and English (receptive) language courses ranging from A1 up to and including B2 level should be made available for employee and student representatives. Additionally, a percentage of employees' FTE should be allocated to taking such courses. Although language courses are mentioned in the proposed language policy, no specific levels or regulations are mentioned (Schrijver, 2022).
- Finally, all members of participatory bodies should take part in intercultural awareness trainings and multilingual meeting workshops; as of now, this is not part of the language policy (Schrijver, 2022).

10 References

- Backus, A., Gorter, D., Knapp, K., Schjerve-Rindler, R., Swanenberg, J., Ten Thije, J. D., & Vetter, E. (2013). Inclusive Multilingualism: Concept, Modes and Implications. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1(2). Retrieved 1 April, 2022, from <https://doi.org/10.1515/eujal-2013-0010>
- Bezrukova, K., Jehn, K. A., & Spell, C. S. (2012). Reviewing diversity training: Where we have been and where we should go. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(2), 207–227. Retrieved 1 April, 2022, from <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2008.0090>
- Correale, V. (2020a). *Multilingualism in university council meetings: What contribution can lingua receptiva make to the inclusivity of an internationally oriented university?* [Master's thesis, Utrecht University]. Retrieved 10 March, 2022, from <https://studenttheses.uu.nl/handle/20.500.12932/37270>
- Correale, V. (2020b). *The importance of the shared knowledge behind a word: An analysis and formulation of a small glossary of Dutch and English institutional keywords used by the Utrecht University Council* [Internship research report, Utrecht University].
- DeepL. *DeepL translate: The world's most accurate translator*. (2022). Retrieved 1 June, 2022, from <https://www.deepl.com/translator>
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Duque, A. (2021, 24 February). *Why English should be the official language of the UU Council*. Retrieved 31 January, 2022, from <https://www.dub.uu.nl/en/opinion/why-english-should-be-official-language-uu-council>

- Gazzola, M., Templin, T., & McEntee-Atalianis, L. J. (2019). Measuring diversity in multilingual communication. *Social Indicators Research*, 147(2), 545–566. Retrieved 3 March, 2022, from <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-019-02161-5>
- Cole, D. (2016). The material force of signs and the reconfiguration of superdiverse identities. In Goebel, Z., Cole, D., & Manns, H. (Eds.). *Margins, hubs and peripheries in a decentralizing Indonesia* (Number 162, pp. 112–125). Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies.
- Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The critical study of language*. (2nd edition). Routledge.
- Github. (2022). *Kaldi NL: Code related to the Dutch instance and user groups of the kaldi speech recognition toolkit*. GitHub. Retrieved 1 May, 2022, from https://github.com/opensource-spraakherkenning-nl/Kaldi_NL
- Gulikers, E., Ten Thije, J. D., & Smits, M. (2021). *Luistertaal-etage: De potentie van luistertaal in onderwijs, professionalisering en samenwerkingsverbanden*. Taalunie. Retrieved 14 May, 2022, from <https://taalunie.org/publicaties/197/luistertaal-etage-de-potentie-van-luistertaal-in-onderwijs-professionalisering-en-samenwerkingsverbanden-inventarisatie-en-beschrijving>
- Gunnarsson, B. L. (2014). Multilingualism in European workplaces. *Multilingua*, 33(1–2), 11–33. Retrieved 10 May, 2022, from <https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2014-0002>
- Heath, K., & Wensil, B. F. (2019, 30 September). *To build an inclusive culture, start with inclusive meetings*. Harvard Business Review. Retrieved 26 May, 2022, from <https://hbr.org/2019/09/to-build-an-inclusive-culture-start-with-inclusive-meetings>

- Hornberger, N. H. (2013). Negotiating methodological rich points in the ethnography of language policy. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2013(219), 101–122. Retrieved 12 May, 2022, from <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2013-0006>
- Johnson, D. C. (2011). Critical discourse analysis and the ethnography of language policy. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 8(4), 267–279. Retrieved 19 May, 2022, from <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2011.601636>
- Käki, M. (2006). *FKWIC*: Frequency-based keyword-in-context index for filtering web search results. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 57(12), 1606–1615. Retrieved 14 June, 2022, from <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.20338>
- Kingsley, L. (2013). Language choice in multilingual encounters in transnational workplaces. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 34(6), 533–548. Retrieved 2 April, 2022, from <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2013.807271>
- Kitzinger, J. (1994). The methodology of focus groups: The importance of interaction between research participants. *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 16(1), 103–121. Retrieved 25 May, 2022, from <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9566.ep11347023>
- Koole, T., & ten Thije, J. D. (1994). *The construction of intercultural discourse: Team discussions of educational advisers*. (Utrecht studies in language and communication; Vol. 2). Rodopi.
- Kurhila, S., Kotilainen, L. & Inkheri, L. (2021). Orienting to the language learner role in multilingual workplace meetings. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 12, 1–25. Advance online publication. Retrieved 19 April, 2022, from <https://doi-org.proxy.library.uu.nl/10.1515/applirev-2021-0053>

- Levert, B. (2021). *Nederlands is niet altijd the language we speak around here: An analysis of multilingual policies in Dutch university councils* [Master's thesis, Utrecht University].
- Lexical Computing CZ (2022, March 2). *Create and search a text corpus: Sketch engine*. Retrieved 1 May, 2022, from <https://www.sketchengine.eu/>
- Marácz, L., & Adamo, S. (2017). Multilingualism and social inclusion. *Social Inclusion*, 5(4), 1–4. Retrieved 19 April, 2022, from <https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v5i4.1286>
- Matras, Y., & Robertson, A. (2017). Urban multilingualism and the civic university: A dynamic, non-linear model of participatory research. *Social Inclusion*, 5(4), 5–13. Retrieved 19 April, 2022, from <https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v5i4.1137>
- Microsoft. (2022). *Video conferencing, meetings, calling: Microsoft teams*. Retrieved 1 May, 2022, from <https://www.microsoft.com/en/microsoft-teams/group-chat-software/>
- Miller, K. (2022). *Organizational Communication: Approaches and Processes*. Cengage Learning.
- Mondada, L. (2022). The dynamics of embodied participation and language choice in multilingual meetings. *Language in Society*, 41(2), 213–235. Retrieved 20 April, 2022, from doi:10.1017/S004740451200005X
- Mori, A. S. (2020). Next-generation meetings must be diverse and inclusive. *Nature Climate Change*, 10(6), 481. Retrieved 19 April, 2022, from <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-020-0795-z>
- Morwood, M. (2021). *Multilingual council meetings at Utrecht University* [Master's thesis, Utrecht University].
- Naber, K., & Ten Thije, J. (2021, March 15). *Why there should be a place for both English and Dutch in the university council*. *Digitaal Universiteitsblad*. Retrieved 31 January, 2022,

from

<https://www.dub.uu.nl/en/opinion/why-there-should-be-place-both-english-and-dutch-university-council>

Nair, N. & Vohra, N. (2015). *Diversity and inclusion at the workplace: A review of research and perspectives* [Working paper]. *Indian Institute of Management Ahmedabad*. Retrieved 19 April, 2022, from <http://hdl.handle.net/11718/16616>

Otten, S., Jansen, W. S., & De Vroome, T. (2013, December). *Werkt diversiteit? Arbeidsintegratie en vertrouwen in een kleurrijke samenleving*. Retrieved 19 April, 2022, from <https://www.instituutgak.nl/onderzoek/onderzoeken/werkt-diversiteit-arbeidsintegratie-en-vertrouwen-in-een-kleurrijke-samenleving/>

Piller, I., & Takahashi, K. (2011). Linguistic diversity and social inclusion. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 14(4), 371–381. Retrieved 1 April, 2022, from <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2011.573062>

Pinto Da Costa, M. (2021). Conducting cross-cultural, multi-lingual and multi-country focus groups: Guidance for researchers. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 20, 1–6. Retrieved 3 April, 2022, from <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069211049929>

Rogelberg, S. (2021, October). *Inclusion starts and ends in meetings*. RCIO 2021 Presentations, Chattanooga, Tennessee. Retrieved 16 May, 2022, from <https://scholar.utc.edu/rcio/2021/sessions/2/>

Schrijver, P. (2022). *Language policy proposal*. Utrecht University.

Microsoft. (n.d.). *SharePoint: Hulpprogramma's voor teamsamenwerking*. Retrieved 1 May, 2022, from <https://www.microsoft.com/nl-nl/microsoft-365/sharepoint/collaboration>

- Spolsky, B. (2009). *Language Management*. Cambridge University Press.
- Steyaert, C., Ostendorp, A., & Gaibrois, C. (2010). Multilingual organizations as ‘linguascapes’: Negotiating the position of English through discursive practices. *Journal of World Business*, 46(3), 270–278. Retrieved 19 April, 2022, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2010.07.003>
- Utrecht University. (2021). *Multilingualism in employee and student representation*. Retrieved 26 May, 2022, from <https://www.uu.nl/en/organisation/governance-and-organisation/employee-and-student-representation/multilingualism-in-employee-and-student-representation>
- Utrecht University. (2022, 25 May). *Equality, diversity & inclusion*. Retrieved 26 May, 2022, from <https://www.uu.nl/en/organisation/equality-diversity-inclusion>
- Van den Broek, J., & Rechsteiner, K. (2021, 24 February). *Why English should not be the only official language of the UU Council*. Retrieved 31 January, 2022, from <https://www.dub.uu.nl/en/opinion/why-english-should-not-be-only-official-language-uu-council>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), 249–283. Retrieved 20 May, 2022, from <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2015). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton & D. Schiffrin (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 486–485). Wiley Blackwell.
- Vatrapu, R. K. (2009). Towards a theory of socio-technical interactions. In U. Cress, V. Dimitrova & M. Specht (Eds.), *Learning in the synergy of multiple disciplines: 4th European conference on technology enhanced learning* (pp. 694–699). Springer Science & Business Media.

- Virkkula-Räsänen, T. (2010). Linguistic repertoires and semiotic resources in interaction: A Finnish manager as a mediator in a multilingual meeting. *Journal of Business Communication*, 47(4), 505–531. Retrieved 19 April 2022, from <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021943610377315>
- Wodak, R., Krzyżanowski, M., & Forchtner, B. (2012). The interplay of language ideologies and contextual cues in multilingual interactions: Language choice and code-switching in European Union institutions. *Language in Society*, 41(2), 157–186. Retrieved 20 April 2022, from <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0047404512000036>

11 Appendix A

English Consent Form



**Universiteit
Utrecht**

Faculty Ethics Assessment Committee – Faculty of Humanities (FEtC-H)

FEtC-H reference number: 21-155-03

(enter this number only after approval by the FEtC-H)

DECLARATION OF CONSENT for participation in:

**Focus groups about multilingualism in Faculties of the project Multiilingualism & Participation
(M&M-project)**

I hereby confirm:

- that I have been satisfactorily informed about the study through the information letter;
- that I have been given the opportunity to ask questions about the study and that any questions I asked have been satisfactorily answered;
- that I have had the opportunity to carefully consider participation in this study;
- that I voluntarily consent to participating.

I consent to the following:

- the data collected will be obtained for scientific purposes and retained as stated in the information letter; · the transcripts may be shared with other scientists and/or re-used to answer other research questions;
- video recordings will be made for scientific purposes.

I understand that:

- I have the right to withdraw my consent to the use of data, as stated in the information letter.

Name of participant: _____

Signature: _____ Date, ____ / ____ / ____,

To be completed by the researcher carrying out the study:

Name: _____

I declare that I have explained to the above-mentioned participant what participation in the study entails.

Signature: _____

Date: ____ / ____ / ____, _____

12 Appendix B

Dutch Consent Form



Universiteit Utrecht

Facultaire Ethische ToetsingsCommissie – Geesteswetenschappen

FETC-GW-referentienummer: _____

(dit nummer pas invullen ná goedkeuring door de FETC-GW)

TOESTEMMINGSVERKLARING voor deelname aan:

Focusgroepen over Meertaligheid in Faculteiten
van het project Meertaligheid & Medezeggenschap (M&M-project)

Ik bevestig:

- dat ik via de informatiebrief naar tevredenheid over het onderzoek ben ingelicht;
- dat ik in de gelegenheid ben gesteld om vragen over het onderzoek te stellen en dat mijn eventuele vragen naar tevredenheid zijn beantwoord;
- dat ik gelegenheid heb gehad om grondig over deelname aan het onderzoek na te denken;
- dat ik uit vrije wil deelneem.

Ik stem er mee in dat:

- de verzamelde gegevens voor wetenschappelijke doelen worden verkregen en bewaard zoals in de informatiebrief vermeld staat;
- de verzamelde, gecodeerde, onderzoeksgegevens door wetenschappers kunnen worden gedeeld en/of worden hergebruikt om eventueel andere onderzoeksvragen mee te beantwoorden;
- er voor wetenschappelijke doeleinden ook beeld- en/of geluidsopnamen worden gemaakt.

Ik begrijp dat:

- ik het recht heb om mijn toestemming voor het gebruik van data in te trekken, zoals vermeld staat in de informatiebrief.

Naam deelnemer: _____

Handtekening: _____ Datum: ____ / ____ / ____ (dd/mm/jjjj)

In te vullen door de uitvoerend onderzoeker:

Ik verklaar dat ik bovengenoemde deelnemer heb uitgelegd
wat deelname aan het onderzoek inhoudt.

Naam: _____

Datum: ____ / ____ / ____ (dd/mm/jjjj)

Handtekening: _____

13 Appendix C

English Information Letter

Information about participation in

Focus groups about Multilingualism in Faculties of the project Multilingualism & Participation (M&M-project)

1. Introduction

The M&M-project would like to provide insights into how people deal with multilingualism in participation bodies (faculty councils, education committees, etc.) within faculties of Utrecht University through focus groups with (international) employee and student representatives and those involved. These focus groups will serve as input for scientific research, which is why recordings and transcripts will be created. The utilisation of focus groups is a qualitative research method in which a group or groups of people are brought together to talk about a predetermined topic, with the goal to gather data. The researcher will function as interviewer and will facilitate the discussion.

Since you are involved with the employee and student representation, you have been invited to take part in this study. For your participation and the utilisation of your data, your consent is required. This study has been approved by the Faculty Ethics Assessment Committee – Humanities. In case you want to end your participation after signing up, you can contact Professor Jan D. ten Thije, professor intercultural communication, via email (J.D.tenthije@uu.nl) to opt out of participation.

2. What is the background and goal of this study?

The M&M-project has been created in 2019 to research forms of multilingualism within the employee and student representation on faculty and university levels within Utrecht University, so that eventually an advice can be presented about what forms of multilingualism fit what situations.

3. How will the study be carried out?

Through focus groups, participants will share their experiences with multilingualism within the employee and student representation with each other. These discussions will take place digitally and will be recorded.

4. What is expected of you?

During the focus groups, you will take part in a digital discussion (via MS Teams) with others who are involved with the employee and student representation. These focus groups will be led by one or more researchers of the Project Multilingualism and Participation. You will be asked about your experiences with multilingualism within the employee and student representation. Each session will last a maximum of 120 minutes. Depending on your function, you will take part in one or multiple sessions.

5. What are the possible advantages and disadvantages of participating in this study?

You might experience it as an disadvantage that your pseudonymised statements will be saved and stored. Even though personal information will be deleted, it is important to be aware that your statements can be traced back to you when you tell anecdotes or speak of other traceable information about yourself or your co-workers. By giving permission, you will contribute to scientific research. Thanks to you, facilities for multilingualism in the employee and student representation can be developed. These facilities will contribute to a more inclusive academic international community.

6. Voluntary participation

Participation is voluntary. Your data is only allowed to be collected for our study if you give permission for this. If you decide not to participate, you do not need to undertake any action. You do not need to sign anything. You also do not need to state why you do not wish to participate. If you do participate, you can always change your mind and cease participation — also during the study. You can revoke consent after your participation as well. Choosing to do this does not mean that the processing of your data thus far has to be reversed. Your personal research data that we would have gathered at that moment would then be deleted. This concerns the videos of your conversations. The transcripts of the conversations will not be deleted, but data pertaining to you will be anonymised; otherwise, the research cannot be accounted for by us.

7. Storage of gathered data

Since this concerns a study that will be performed internally at Utrecht University, the name and email address of the participant can be retrieved through intranet. Therefore, this data will not be saved and stored.

Video and audio recordings will be made of the focus groups. These will be transcribed with automatic voice recognition¹. Subsequently, personal data will be deleted from the transcripts and replaced with codes. Because of privacy, no key file will be created for codes. This way, pseudonymised transcripts will be created which will be used for analysis. For the purpose of research replication, the video recordings will be saved and stored. These will be stored on a closed server for a minimum of 10 years and will only be accessible to researchers involved. Since the recordings will be saved and stored, the consent forms will be saved and stored as well as they form the legal basis for the processing. Because the transcripts could theoretically be linked to the recordings, the transcripts are, according to the GDPR, not anonymised but pseudonymised. Only the pseudonymised research data can be shared and/or repurposed by other researchers to answer any other potential research questions.

8. Compensation

¹ Note 1: The account for the platform for automatic voice recognition is protected by a username and password, and the data files will only be on it for a short amount of time. Of course, when an account is hacked, “third parties” could enter and the recognition results (not the audio files) could be downloaded. In this regard, the system is no different from Google, Amazon or Microsoft. However, by continuously deleting the project when the recognition results have been downloaded, in the case the account is hacked, the chance that this happens is very small.

The participant will not receive any compensation, because the participant will take part in the focus group through their position in the employee and student representation. Besides, the focus groups will take place digitally via MS-Teams, which is why there will be no travel expenses.

9. Privacy personal data and complaints

The Faculty Ethics Assessment Committee – Humanities (FETC-GW) has approved this study. If you have a complaint about the way this study is carried out, you can contact the secretary of the FETCGW, email: fetc-gw@uu.nl. In case you have a complaint or question about the processing of personal data, you can contact the data protection officer of Utrecht University (privacy@uu.nl). This person can help you with exercising the rights you have through the GDPR. Furthermore, we would like to point out that you have the right to file a complaint with the Dutch Data Protection Authority (www.autoriteitpersoonsgegevens.nl).

10. More information about this study?

For asking questions and gathering further information before, during, and after the study, you can contact Professor Jan D. ten Thije, professor intercultural communication. Available via email: J.D.tenthije@uu.nl or by telephone via: +31 30 253 6337.

11. Attachment

- Consent form

14 Appendix D

Dutch Information Letter

Informatie over deelname aan

Focusgroepen over Meertaligheid in Faculteiten van het project
Meertaligheid & Medezeggenschap (M&M-project)

1. Inleiding

Het M&M-project wil door middel van focusgroepen met (internationale) medezeggenschappers en betrokkenen in kaart brengen hoe er met meertaligheid in medezeggenschapsorganen (faculteitsraden, opleidingscommissies, etc.) binnen faculteiten van de Universiteit Utrecht wordt omgegaan. Deze focusgroepen dienen als input voor wetenschappelijk onderzoek en daarom zullen er opnames en transcripten worden gemaakt. Het inzetten van focusgroepen is een kwalitatieve onderzoeksmethode waarbij een groep of groepen mensen bij elkaar worden gebracht om te praten over een vooraf bepaald onderwerp, met als doel om data te verzamelen. De onderzoeker zal optreden als interviewer en de discussie faciliteren.

Omdat u betrokken bent bij de medezeggenschap bent u uitgenodigd deel te nemen aan dit onderzoek. Wij hebben voor uw deelname en het verwerken van uw gegevens toestemming nodig. Dit onderzoek is getoetst door de Facultaire Ethische Toetsingscommissie – Geesteswetenschappen. Mocht u na uw aanmelding toch willen afzien van deelname, dan kunt u zich afmelden door contact op te nemen met Professor Jan D. ten Thije, hoogleraar interculturele communicatie via e-mail (J.D.tenthije@uu.nl).

2. Wat is de achtergrond en het doel van het onderzoek?

Het M&M-project is in september 2019 in het leven geroepen om vormen van meertaligheid binnen de medezeggenschap op facultair en universitair niveaus binnen de Universiteit Utrecht te onderzoeken, zodat er uiteindelijk een advies kan worden gegeven over welke vorm van meertaligheid past bij welke situatie.

3. Hoe wordt het onderzoek uitgevoerd?

Door middel van focusgroepen zullen participanten hun ervaringen met meertaligheid binnen de medezeggenschap met elkaar delen. Deze discussies zullen digitaal plaatsvinden en worden opgenomen.

4. Wat wordt er van u verwacht?

Tijdens de focusgroepen neemt u samen met andere betrokkenen uit de medezeggenschap deel aan een digitale discussie (via MS Teams). Deze focusgroepen worden door een onderzoeker(s) van het Project Meertaligheid & Medezeggenschap begeleid. Er wordt gevraagd naar uw ervaringen met meertaligheid

binnen de medezeggenschap. Elke sessie duurt max. 120 min. Afhankelijk van uw functie zal u deelnemen aan een of meerdere sessies.

5. Wat zijn mogelijke voor- en nadelen van deelname aan dit onderzoek?

U kan het wellicht als nadelig ervaren dat uw (gepseudonimiseerde) uitspraken worden opgeslagen. Hoewel persoonlijke gegevens worden verwijderd uit de transcripten is het belangrijk dat u er zich van bewust bent dat uw uitspraken naar u te herleiden kunnen zijn wanneer u zelf anekdotes of andere te herleiden gegevens over u of uw collega's verteld. Door toestemming te geven draagt u bij aan wetenschappelijk onderzoek. Mede dankzij u kunnen er faciliteiten voor meertaligheid in de medezeggenschap worden ontwikkeld. Deze voorzieningen dragen bij aan een inclusievere academische internationale gemeenschap.

6. Vrijwillige deelname

Deelname is vrijwillig. Uw gegevens mogen alleen voor ons onderzoek verzameld worden als u hier toestemming voor geeft. Als u toch besluit niet mee te doen, hoeft u verder niets te doen. U hoeft niets te tekenen. U hoeft ook niet te zeggen waarom u niet wilt meedoen. Als u wel meedoet, kunt u zich altijd bedenken en op ieder gewenst moment stoppen — ook tijdens het onderzoek. En ook nadat u heeft meegedaan kunt u uw toestemming nog intrekken. Als u daarvoor kiest, hoeft de verwerking van uw gegevens tot dat moment overigens niet te worden teruggedraaid. De onderzoeksgegevens die wij op dat moment nog van u hebben, zullen worden gewist. Dit geldt voor de video's van de gesprekken. De transcripten van de gesprekken worden niet gewist, maar zullen voor wat betreft uw deelname worden geanonimiseerd, omdat wij anders het onderzoek niet kunnen verantwoorden.

7. Opslag verzamelde gegevens

Omdat er sprake is van een onderzoek dat intern bij de Universiteit Utrecht wordt uitgevoerd, zijn naam en e-mailadres van de participant via het intranet te verkrijgen. Deze gegevens worden daarom niet opgeslagen.

Van de focusgroepen worden beeld- en geluidsopnames gemaakt. Deze worden door middel van automatische spraakherkenning getranscribeerd ¹. Vervolgens worden voorkomens van persoonsgegevens verwijderd uit de transcripten en vervangen door codes. Omwille van privacy wordt er geen sleutelbestand aangelegd voor codes. De (niet-anonieme) video-opnames worden omwille van onderzoeksreplicatie wel bewaard. Deze worden op een gesloten server opgeslagen voor minimaal 10 jaar en zijn alleen toegankelijk voor betrokken onderzoekers. Aangezien de opnames worden bewaard worden de toestemmingsverklaringen, die immers de legale grondslag voor de verwerking vormen, ook

¹ Noot 1: Het account voor het platform voor automatische spraakherkenning is beveiligd met een username en password en de bestanden staan er maar kort op. Natuurlijk, als een account gehacked is, dan kunnen “derden” erbij en kunnen de herkenningsresultaten (niet de audiofiles) gedownload worden. Hierin is het systeem niet anders dan Google, Amazon of Microsoft. Maar door steeds een project te deleten wanneer de herkenningsresultaten gedownload zijn, is, als het account gehacked is, de kans dat dat gebeurt heel erg klein.

bewaard. Doordat de transcripten in principe aan de opnames te koppelen zijn, zijn de transcripten volgens de AVG niet geanonimiseerd, maar gepseudonimiseerd.

Alleen de gepseudonimiseerde onderzoeksgegevens kunnen worden gedeeld met en/of worden hergebruikt door andere wetenschappers om eventueel andere onderzoeksvragen mee te beantwoorden.

8. Vergoeding

De deelnemer krijgt geen vergoeding, omdat de deelnemer vanuit zijn functie betrokken bij de medezeggenschap aan de focusgroep zal deelnemen. Daarnaast zullen de focusgroepen digitaal via MS-Teams plaatsvinden, waardoor er geen reiskosten zullen zijn.

9. Privacy persoonsgegevens en klachten

De Facultaire Ethische Toetsingscommissie - Geesteswetenschappen (FETC-GW) heeft dit onderzoek goedgekeurd. Wanneer u een klacht heeft over de manier waarop dit onderzoek wordt uitgevoerd, dan kunt u contact opnemen met de secretaris van de FETC-GW, e-mail: fetc-gw@uu.nl. Heeft u een klacht of een vraag over de verwerking van persoonsgegevens, dan kunt u terecht bij de functionaris voor gegevensbescherming van de Universiteit Utrecht (privacy@uu.nl). Deze kan u ook helpen bij het uitoefenen van de rechten die u onder de AVG heeft. Verder wijzen we u erop dat u het recht heeft om een klacht in te dienen bij de Autoriteit Persoonsgegevens (www.autoriteitpersoonsgegevens.nl).

10. Meer informatie over dit onderzoek?

Voor het stellen van vragen en het inwinnen van nadere informatie voor, tijdens en na het onderzoek kunt u contact opnemen met Professor Jan D. ten Thije, hoogleraar interculturele communicatie. Bereikbaar via e-mail: J.D.tenthije@uu.nl of telefonisch via: +31 30 253 6337.

11. Bijlage

Toestemmingsverklaring