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Mapping the langscape - developing multilingual norms in a transient project community

Abstract
This contribution explores the development of language choice practices within one transient project community, here an international theater ensemble. Transient project communities consist of groups, the members of which have been drawn together in order to complete some or other pre-determined project. In projects constituted of members drawn from different linguistic backgrounds, this may involve the local development of interactional norms and practices, including at the level of language choice. The study uses a longitudinal set of video-recorded data to track emergent practices related to congregational norms for language use within one workplace community. This wider scope of perspective allows one to account for emergence and transience in the cohort’s social and linguistic practices.

Keywords: transient project communities, workplace interaction, language choice practices, interaction, change

Introduction
We are presently experiencing a far-reaching upturn in cross-border mobility in many parts of the world, with culturally and linguistically diverse people and peoples entering into shared activities together. These people, their origins located in different parts of the world, may find themselves together due to processes of globalisation, increased integration of partner countries such as those
in the EU, or flight from one of many humanitarian crises to which we have lately been witness. We hear these transnational flows of migrants and travellers regularly discussed as statistics, quotas, migration estimates. The research reported on in this article counterbalances these sometimes faceless numbers by focusing on lived experience of these transient members of oscillating and overlapping communities, looking at their linguistic and social practices in social context where they are engaged in face-to-face interaction with one another, live and work together, collaborate on this or that project and ultimately, learning to co-exist in new social configurations, where members must enter together into new social contracts on everything from how to treat one’s neighbour to what language to use at work.

These demographic changes have resulted in a growing number of researchers from a range of academic disciplines, as well as such stakeholders as public and private sector organizations, paying increased attention to the changing dynamics of the internationalized workplace. The current article seeks to add to this burgeoning field with an empirical account of changing language practices within a multilingual workplace community made up of members from different countries.

Ethnographic research into such social configurations is not new, with a relatively large body of research employing survey tools to explore attitudes, ideologies and practices relating to the linguistic life of a workplace (e.g. Harzing & Pudelko 2013; Ehrenreich 2010; Mahili 2014; Neeley 2013). Studies that work from recordings of naturally occurring interaction within these communities are somewhat rarer (Bargiela-Chiappini, 2011). These existing studies typically provide fine-grained analyses of snapshots of social encounters within these workplaces to describe how language is used as a tool for engaging in the work of being a member of a particular institutional setting, including the implications of multiple languages being used (e.g. Gafaranga 2001; Goebel 2010; Hazel, 2015; Skårup 2004; Markaki et al. 2013; Mondada 2012; Moore et al
2013). These studies describe how things are discovered to be: how multilingual language use plays out as members go about their business.

What sets the current study apart from those discussed above is the use of a longitudinal data set of video recordings of workplace interaction to track how norms for language use in the workplace change over time, and what may account for these shifts. In the case at hand, we note how members indeed change their language choice practices as they discover what linguistic resources they share with others, which we discuss as langscaping. Ultimately, by bringing a longitudinal approach to an empirical study of such a community in its taking shape, we can contribute to our understanding of norm development in these types of transient workplace.

**Transient project communities**

The case study featured here is one type of transient multilingual community (Mortensen 2013, this issue; Mortensen and Fabricius 2014), what I will refer to as a transient project community. These are cohorts of people who are brought together to be engaged in some temporary bounded joint endeavour which results in a prior agreed-upon outcome. On reaching this outcome, however successful the target product ultimately turns out to be, the group of people connected to the project disbands and members move on to contribute to other collaborative projects within other constellations of membership. In skills-based collaborative work, these bounded project communities are variably ad hoc, with members commonly drawn together for this project and on the basis of a contributor’s relevant expertise, qualifications and experience. Other factors that may play a part are availability, interest, geographical location, reputation, testimonials, and/or personal connection. Prior history of the potential members can also be a defining factor, but this is usually only when the recruitment relies on this personal approach, and where there is some understanding that the person in question has the necessary qualifications.
With each individual project presenting its own unique set of tasks, challenges, requirements, and demands for staffing, expertise and experience, it would be rare to find the same constellation of members participating across different projects. Whether the project is to build a particular bridge, organize a particular festival, or respond to a crisis following a natural disaster, these projects require different configurations of professionals to come together to successfully carry them off. Hence, a group that is established around the common, temporally bounded, shared endeavour has greater transience than that found in other, more stable communities, for example a university department (e.g. Hazel & Mortensen, 2013), a group of workers within a pharmaceutical company (e.g. Lønsmann 2011), or a settled, shared socio-economic community (e.g., Trudgill 1974). At the same time, they display enough of an orientation to the “stickiness” of the shared endeavour to frame the cohort of participants as a community, rather than a gathering consisting of an entirely ad hoc series of encounters, for example as found in the first time again interactions of helpdesk service counters (e.g., Gafaranga and Torras 2002, Moore et al 2013, Mortensen & Hazel 2014, Hazel 2015a) or other meetings between previously unacquainted persons (e.g., Mondada 2009, Hazel & Mortensen 2014).

Rather, these cohorts are brought together in a cooperative organizational framework to collaborate on reaching a particular prior stated project objective, and during this period they must negotiate working practices for the team as a whole, establish new sets of role relationships with others in the cohort which they may or may not have been acquainted with previously and who are themselves negotiating perspicuous role relationships themselves, while remaining sensitive to personally exogenous ways of going about the task at hand. In line with this, those engaged in the conjoint project may encounter differences between how the different members go about their work. At the workplace sociocultural level this may include such things as notions of due process, accountability, organizational hierarchies, procedural frameworks; on a linguistic level, it includes the very
language used to describe, categorize and produce the above social organizational features. To compound this, the workplace culture of one sub-group within the joint project may be very different from that of another, and as such little can or should be taken for granted *a priori*. Furthermore, when projects are constituted with participants from very different backgrounds, including at the level of the national, cultural and the linguistic, we may see the need for greater flexibility, sensitivity and openness from all parties involved.

*The creative ensemble as transient project community*

Workplace communities like the theater ensemble studied here are premised on the recruitment of a particular constellation of contributors that best fits the overall goals of a project. Different theater projects necessitate different types of expertise, which in turn entails employing the right people for the project at hand. It is common to find among these cohorts of cast, crew and other creative contributors, members who have previously not been acquainted. Gaining access to such a project from its inception in order to track how common grounds for conduct are established between the parties as the cohort organizes itself into a working community is what the current case study set out to do. In this, the interest was not only in language practices, but also the social practices of collaborative theater making. Here, however, we will be dealing first and foremost with norm formation related to language use in the workplace, and particularly focusing on the multilingual nature of the group.

*Transient multilingual project communities*

Some lines of work are premised on there being a linguistic outcome to the project for example a project report (Mortensen, 2014), or a negotiated contract. In others, language is not the main target outcome, for example when groups collaborate around the design and production of a new car, the
construction of a building, or the organizing of a music festival. In such cases, the *transient multilingual project community* does not differ fundamentally from those project communities where members of the cohort all share the same or similar first language resources. The cohort is constituted through the same processes of selection and recruitment, on the basis of project-related skills, expertise and experience, rather than on the basis of language identity. Whether the members are from Britain or Bahrain, locals or recent settlers to the region, the linguistic identities of the members are as irrelevant to such a project as those of the monoglots are in other project communities. Although there may be benefits from bringing people together people from various national backgrounds, this would rarely be solely in order to ensure that more languages and greater variability in social norms are present in the project (although see Lønsmann, this issue). Rather, the benefits of international collaboration are often based on being able to recruit from a wider pool of professionals with a potentially wider international outlook, set of experiences, and professional network to contribute to the shared venture.

However, what may differentiate the mono- and the multilingual project community is that each relies on language to facilitate the working processes of the embarked-upon project, but the former may do so without needing to attend to the same degree to such sociolinguistic features of the workplace such as language choice, language policies and socioculturally sedimented interactional norms of conduct. An orientation to the need for a designated lingua franca, or to the geographical location of the workplace and the role of the local language in that locality may provide members in transient multilingual settings with general pointers towards normative expectations pertaining to language use. However, such considerations may not be explicit, and how such ideologies are ultimately adopted and implemented may be open to interpretation. Furthermore, attracting the desired constellation of people to secure the right outcome for a project may also impact on any one
member or sub-group of members being successful in implementing policies relating to social conduct, and as such, these may be open to negotiation between all parties.

Data and method

The fieldwork for the study involved a large-scale co-production between two Danish theater and dance companies with some 25 performers and a similar number of other creative and production staff. The author was embedded within the company as a researcher-in-residence, following the company from early in the rehearsal process through to the performance stage. Video-recordings were produced using multiple cameras, with additional audio-recording augmenting the data quality. The researcher followed this company for some seven weeks over two development phases (Spring and Summer) leading up to the premiere of the theater production.

The method adopted here is ethnomethodology-inspired interaction analysis, drawing on the methodological procedures of Conversation Analysis (Sacks et al. 1974). This approach applies an *emic* praxeological perspective, seeking to explicate the practices through which members produce social order in situ, by analysing social actors as they go about shaping their social world in their moment-by-moment interacting with relevant others. The primary data are thus audiovisual-recordings of – and artefacts stemming from – social engagement in its natural ecology.

The research interest here was to track practices related to emergent congregational norms for language use within this project community. This involves adopting a longitudinal frame of reference with regard to the temporally constituted project community. This temporally extended scope of perspective expands on many conventional ethnomethodological approaches that focus on snapshots in time that are not linked to histories of interaction and allows for an analysis that accounts for emergence and transience in the cohort’s social practices. Secondly, we remain close
to those practices by seeking to identify and analyse discrete, local sequences captured in the recordings where language practices, including at the level of language choice, provide evidence of the emergence of normative practices. In what follows, we will deal with a series of short segments of the transcribed data, which trace the development of language practices, from the first meeting between the larger congregation that forms the project community, through to extracts from later stages in the project.

Analysis

The following analytic sections are built around a number of illustrative examples extracted from the extensive data set of audio-visual recordings generated over the course of the seven weeks in which the larger company worked together on the project. We start with a number of extracts from the beginning of this phase of the collaborative work, and move forward to map some of the changes in linguistic conduct that are witnessed as the company becomes more stabilized over time.

First general meeting. Pre-rehearsal.

The first day of this working phase involved a meeting of the entire group of performers (with one absence, as mentioned in line 29). Before this meeting, during an earlier workshop phase, different sub-groups of the performers and other creative staff had worked together within their own disciplines. For example, the dancers had worked together on generating movement material at an earlier stage, video recordings of which were used in the later stage of development. However, the cohort as a whole had not previously worked together.

At the start of the working day, and immediately prior to the below sequence, the production manager had taken the whole group through some house rules relating to the use of the facilities at
the theater, as well as such issues as taking breaks, calling in sick and so on and so forth. This was done in Danish, and we note how Danish is also used when the Director is allocated the next slot following this. The director starts by welcoming the cast and attendant crew, and it is at this point that she introduces a new member to the group that makes up the dancers in the piece.

We note here how at the start of this sequence, Dir is addressing the company in plenum, using Danish. In line 11, she starts introducing Sally. This is initiated in Danish, with “så er det Sally” (“then it’s Sally”) acting as a topic shift marker that draws attention to this new member in the group. The director however does not immediately proceed to introducing Sally, but first provides
an account of her joining the company, speaking of the pregnancy of company member Bernadette, whom she is replacing. The account of Bernadette’s withdrawal from the company is produced in Danish, but the moment the director moves to introducing Sally in more substantial terms, she proceeds in English. We note that the “she is from Germany” (line 18) does not use Sally’s name, and as such appears to both skip-connect back to line 11, as well as treat the intervening account as being produced as an account relevant to the incipient introduction.

The turn in which the director switches to English is also produced with turn-final rising intonation, and we note how it is Sally who provides confirmation to this in response (“yes,” line 19). A number of observations can be made here. First, Sally being introduced to the others in the company orients to others’ lack of background knowledge of her. With this in mind, the switch from Danish to English provides the other members with grounds for inferring the significance of this switch, and one inference that could be made is that Sally is not a Danish-speaker. If Sally is not a Danish speaker, then switching from Danish to English allows her to be included in the ongoing talk, and as such treated as a recipient member in the same way as the others. The use of rising intonation on line 18 is treated as requiring confirmation by Sally, even though the director knows already that Sally is from Germany (note, it was not formatted as an open question). Sally confirms the account, and in doing so, turns the account of her membership into a collaborative production, with Sally now acting as co-speaker. This appears to afford the director the right to speak further about what Sally would normally have epistemic primacy over, i.e. her personal life (Pomerantz 1980, Sacks 1984), without requiring Sally to offer further confirmation on the account presented. Once the account is finished, the director addresses Sally again directly, this time offering her words of welcome. As they have spoken prior to this encounter, these publicly produced words of welcome may act as a ceremonial act, speaking on behalf of the others present.
In this excerpt, we observe a public, stepwise act of inducting a new member to the larger body of the company. In this short sequence, Sally is first topicalized; then accounted for; then included in the act of plenum communication through a switch to a language she understands; invited to actively participate in her introduction; and finally, formally welcomed to the group. The introduction includes reference to Sally’s national background, her professional experience with one of the partners in the collaboration, a personal connection to a member of the company, and implicitly her lack of proficiency in Danish. This final point is subsequently taken up more explicitly in what follows (lines 37-44). Following an account for others who are absent on this occasion, the director proposes that she will speak in English so that Sally can understand (line 37), although she expands on this with “if that’s all right” (line 39). Although this could be directed at Sally, it could be more reasonable to suggest that this shows sensitivity to others in the ensemble who may object to this. Sally appears to orient to the latter possibility, as she acknowledges the suggestion (“okay”) but subsequently adds “I’m trying,” which can be interpreted as a form of mitigation of the necessity to adopt English as medium for interaction (Gafaranga & Torres 2001) on her behalf. Exactly what she is trying is left ambiguous, but we can see in what follows how it is understood by others. The response by another member of the ensemble, “you don’t have to” (line 41) indicates that she has understood what Sally claims to be trying, and the director’s subsequent referring to another non-Danish speaking member of the company (“but also for marco, so he can,”line 43/44) appears to skip-connect back to her account in 37, using English for purposes of understanding, as well as acting as a further mitigating device, downplaying the English language choice as being connected solely to the presence of Sally. Taken together, it would appear to be understood that Sally is suggesting that she is trying to understand the Danish used, and would make sense following the extended activity preceding this excerpt, which was carried out entirely in Danish.
Although the excerpt at hand concerns the first time the whole of the ensemble and crew have been brought together, only Sally is entirely new to the project, with others having worked in smaller groupings together during an earlier workshop phase. Most of these have at the very least some Danish language proficiency, although not all (Marco, a French member of the creative team, for example). This then entails the articulating of an informal language policy, adopting English as a working language to ensure that all can understand the proceedings. We note, however, that the adoption of a general language policy for the benefit of the inclusion of the few is treated as not entirely unproblematic, with members producing mitigating displays, including proposals to remedy this (“I’m trying”), laughter tokens (line 42), downplaying both the role of the person for whom the policy is adopted, and the need for remedial action to be taken (see also Hazel 2015).

Day 1. Later in the day. Mid-rehearsal.

Having identified one explicit articulation of a language policy, we can scan forward to observe how this manifests itself once the company moves into the project activity. The following sequence presents a snapshot of one discussion during the first day of rehearsals. This discussion followed a guided improvisation, with members of the ensemble working on some choreographic ideas generated in the early workshop phase. Following the improvisation, the cast, choreographer and director gathered together in a circle to discuss the outcome, and to make suggestions as to where to take the improvisation next. As well as these members, others were also present as ratified overhearers (Goffman 1981), including among others the composer, the assistant director and the script-writer.

SH-WP-Day1-rehearsal DIR Director; CHO choreographer; DAN Danish performer; FIN Finnish performer; DAN2 Danish performer
The excerpt demonstrates how the English-medium language policy articulated prior to the start of the rehearsal is implemented in the project work at hand. Although only a few lines of her talk are included here, we note that the director opts to use English in the plenum post-improvisation diagnostic feedback (lines 35/36). This is subsequently taken up also by the (Danish) choreographer. In lines 38/39, we see how he initiates a topic on the abstract notion of the body as an expression of time past. In this description, he makes mention of the body as “corporealized time” (line 39), a somewhat abstract phenomenological concept that might not be immediately accessible to those who have no prior knowledge of the term. Furthermore, the term corporealized is not a term used in common English parlance. Indeed, the choreographer himself here appears to
acknowledge this in how he hedges the term with the formatting features of the utterance, prefacing it with hesitation markers, a momentary suspension of the turn, the claim downgrade in the form of the sotto voce “I think it’s” (line 39), and the turn-final rising intonation. Rather than proceed to the account for the introduction of this concept and how it relates to the feedback, at this point he also suspends the account, and following a pause provides a candidate translation of the formulation into Danish. Following the acknowledgment token by one member of the cast, here in the form of a single laughter particle in line 43, the choreographer continues with the Danish discourse marker “altså” (Eng. “so”) and moves back into English as he continues the account (lines 44-55) and subsequent instruction (line 57 and 61). This displays an orientation to English having been appropriated as the base language, with Danish at this point only featured for providing clarification in a side-sequence environment (Jefferson 1972).

During the choreographer's feedback, the only responses from the other members are minimal response tokens, these often bivalent, i.e. not easily identifiable as being of one language or another (Woolard 1999). However, as the choreographer moves to close the sequence (line 65), interestingly invoking a French “oui” to do so, we also note that the Danish performer starts up another topic sequence, again using English to do so. Although this is effectively part of talk between two Danes, it makes that talk accessible to all, and indicates an orientation to the norm that English to be maintained as the working language.

It appears that at this point of the project, the first day of the larger company ensemble working together, the language policy suggested in passing prior to the rehearsal commencing has been successfully adopted, with the ensemble orienting to English as the working language, at least in the presence of non-Danish speaking members. Danish is used as a supplementary resource for providing clarification, but it is English that constitutes the working medium of interaction. However, English is only one of the available sets of linguistic resources present in the ensemble,
and even as soon as during this first day, when smaller groups break away, other languages are brought into play.

Day 1. End of the day. Post-rehearsal.

At the end of the first day rehearsal, as the ensemble dispersed, other, less public conversations emerged between members, some of whom have not previously been acquainted. As Sally packed up her bags in one corner of the rehearsal space, Rob struck up a conversation.

**SH-WP-Day1-post-rehearsal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>ROB:</th>
<th>SAL:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>have you spent time in ireland</td>
<td>is it because i have an irish lilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>is that why you're asking</td>
<td>yeah yeah i spend a lot of time in ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>people start to complain about it</td>
<td>eh hah hah hah hah hah:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We note how language is used as one conversation opening topic. Here, the first time Sally and Rob have spoken, Rob, who is British, opens the conversation with an enquiry about Sally having spent time in Ireland. With no other prior mention of an Irish connection, Sally is left to infer the reasoning behind the question, and, correctly it transpires, surmises that Rob has identified “an Irish lilt” (line 13) in her English. The opening gambit appears to pay off, as it leads to further background information sharing, as the two members discuss their connections to particular places and activities in Northern Ireland. At a certain point, another member of the ensemble, Peter, one of the opera singers, strikes up another “first” conversation.

**SH-WP-Day1-post-rehearsal**
Whereas Rob uses a dialectal quality in Sally’s English speech production as a topic for a conversational gambit, Peter focuses on the initial information pertaining to her country of origin. Again, this is used in developing some sense of shared experience through their respective connections to a particular place. It is true that such explorations of one another’s background are commonplace in workplaces where people come into contact with one another for the first time, as members scope out possible professional shared connections. Here, however, where a contemporary dancer and an opera singer are less likely to have shared professional affiliations in the wider field of theater, there is less opportunity to explore intersecting paths on grounds of a shared area of work. Participants must then find some other common ground, and a shared connection to a country appears to allow for this. What is more, Peter’s approach to Sally is initiated in German, thereby instantiating in practice a shared link in their respective linguistic identities. In sum, the shared connection to Germany is augmented through the mobilizing of shared German linguistic resources in conversing on the topic.

Although we noted above how an informal language policy was adopted pertaining to the use of English to facilitate understanding where non-Danish speakers are present, we observe in events such as these *acquainting sequences* that language is also relevant as an identity marker in social relationship building. Traces of our personal histories, origins and travels can be identified in our language production, which may in turn be used to engender affiliation between members, while
shared linguistic resources other than those promoted through language policy considerations may foster a sense of co-membership in addition to that shared by the larger project collective. In this way, the data evidence a range of other languages present within this project community, including Finnish, French, Dutch, and Swedish, as members map out what we could call a langscape of the cohort, and discover where personal and professional histories crossed paths, as well as the contingent shared linguistic resources that can be drawn on in addition to the language(s) adopted as the working language for the larger group.

This langscaping, here understood as where members explore and discover one another’s linguistic repertoires and social-geographic trajectories and histories, appears especially salient for internationally constituted transient communities like the one described here, whose members are temporarily brought together on the basis of their professional expertise and potential contribution to the project. With members having only limited time to develop social relationships with others in the cohort and, what is more, the collaborative nature of the setting necessitating members to find sources of common ground with others with whom they do not necessarily have any established or shared personal history, categorization devices such as shared linguistic resources and intersecting socio-geographic narratives provide members with opportunities for establishing points of co-membership with others in the emerging workplace community.

Once mapped, this langscape opens up for the expansion of linguistic resources available for carrying out the project activities. Rather than constraining the linguistic resources, for example through an promotion of some language policy practice that allows for only a certain language or languages to be used as witnessed at the start of rehearsals, members are more at liberty to appropriate other linguistic resources where these are deemed more appropriate.
Interlude/recitative period of the project

Although we witnessed the expression of an informal language policy proposed as a management tool on Day 1 of the current rehearsal phase, one that formulated how English would act as working medium-of-interaction where non-Danish speakers were present, practically and pragmatically this was difficult to police for several reasons. First, the language for the spoken component of the performance was Danish. In this production, this included eliciting from the performers personal accounts, stories and snatches of poetic language, the sum of which was woven into the final performance script. Although the cast included performers from different parts of Europe, ultimately only Sally spoke English on stage, and another performer used some French, this being thematized in addition as part of the show. Hence, although the working language was proposed as English for all intents and purposes, Danish featured heavily in the rehearsal space, and indeed could be said to be the main language for many of the rehearsal sessions. Pursuing the use of English to discuss the Danish text would have added a level of complexity to the working practices that appears to have caused a re-specification of language policy, as the English-only policy would have been cumbersome for carrying out such Danish-text focused activities.

Second, within the distribution of differentiated tasks that a project such as this hinges on there is the implication that not all tasks are relevant to all members in the ensemble at any given time. As such, even within a framework in which English was designated as the project language, there was a strong goal/activity-oriented logic for the use of Danish for activities in which all members in the sub-group were Danish-proficient, leading to the language maintaining a strong presence in the workspace. With the nature of this collaborative work entailing fluctuating constellations of engagement frameworks, with others moving in and out of participation from one moment to the next, members are required to remain sensitive to the changing make-up of the working group in which they were participating, and the contingent language identities therein (see also Hazel &
Mortensen 2013). However, this sensitivity did not always require strict adherence to English, as the use of Danish when non-speakers were present did not always result in communicative breakdown in the activity. In other words, in-the-moment assessments of communicative practice and outcomes allowed members to gauge how far the use of Danish could be used, drawing on other resources such as non-Danish speakers’ receptive language competences and the shared activity framework. We turn now to two examples from the latter stages of the rehearsals, where the ensemble was rehearsing on the theater stage as opposed to the rehearsal studio, and where a range of other members had joined the daily work, including set and lighting designers, costumers, and stage- and technical managers.

On-stage rehearsals with lighting, set and stage properties

Two excerpts from the latter stage of rehearsals, both snapshots less than a minute in length, will serve to illustrate the adopted practices within the *langscape* of the company following several months of working together. In the first, members of the ensemble are on stage, as the director enters stage right with the assistant director Mette and one of the performers, Dorte.

SH-WP-week7-on-stage-rehearsal. FRA Francine (French director); DOR Dorte (Danish performer); ALB Albert (French performer); MET Mette (Danish assistant director); KRI Kristina (Danish set designer)
In this activity, Francine and Dorte arrive on stage and discuss the moving of a stage prop (15-16); Francine refers to a curtain and checks with designer Kristina that it will not be there at that moment in the staging, which is also responded to by assistant director Mette (19-23); Francine
positions Sally at a particular place on the stage (25-28), then does the same with Albert (32-43); she then initiates the scene again (49-50), though needing to call the performers to attention (52-53); Albert prompts the other performers to start the scene (56), which they do. Francine then corrects how Albert is holding a prop (58-66), while Dorte asks to be reminded about what the feedback had addressed (65-67).

We can first note that the linguistic resources through which this sequence of activities take place are far more diverse than we observed in the earlier rehearsal. They include a French national using Danish (lines 16 and 19), English (lines 20, 22, 49 and 50) and French (line 52) with Danish colleagues, and Danish (lines 35 and 58) and French (lines 39-43; 63-66) with fellow French national Albert, who himself uses Danish (line 37), French (line 40), and English (lines 34 and 61) with Francine, as well as English with the others (line 56). Finally, we have German Sally using English, and Dorte using both Danish and French on this occasion.

Space precludes us from analyzing this segment in any great detail here. However, it can still act as an illustration of the dynamic multilingual medium-of-interaction that has developed over the course of the project, where a practiced language policy for including a wider set of linguistic resources appears to be in operation. This is tightly linked to the development, within the project of a stronger shared understanding of the project framework and the fact that the members in the community had had the time to map out the resident linguistic resources within the cohort. This enabled them to use languages other than that those foregrounded in the initial language policy articulated months earlier. We will end this section with the closer analysis of one sequence, recorded on the same day as the above excerpt. Here, following the suspension of the rehearsing of a scene, we see onstage Marco address Francine in the auditorium, with what he identifies as a problem with the staging.
We focus here on the sequence between lines 18 and 25. Following Francine’s request to suspend the ongoing scene with the bivalent Danish/English “stop” (spoken through an amplified microphone), her French compatriot Marco turns to her and formulates an assessment on the topic of the levels of stage lighting, using French to do so. French is for these two colleagues a default language for carrying out negotiations, and we have observed earlier how Francine on a previous occasion had categorized Marco as a non-Danish speaker. Here, however, we note that the Danish open repair initiator (Drew 1997) “hva” that Francine deploys in response treats Marco now as someone with at least some receptive language competences in Danish, at least enough to be able to identify the social action being performed. In turn, we note that Marco is indeed able to identify the action, and that the use of Danish does not lead to a breakdown in communication. However, we also note that the open repair format does not specify what type of trouble Francine is flagging up. For example, it could point to a mishearing, or to an issue of volume of his voice not carrying the distance of the auditorium, or pragmatically, the way that the use of French may exclude relevant others, for example the lighting designer or assistant director. As a consequence, it is up to Marco to
decide upon what type of remedial action is required here. Although difficult to represent faithfully in transcription, Marco does enunciate more clearly in the repeated formulation (line 23), with less of the quiet voice trail-off witnessed in line 19; he also removes the hedge (“pour moi”—‘for me’) which is now treated as redundant; moreover, he switches to English to perform the repeat. Without any uptake from Francine (line 24), Marco closes the sequence in line 25. Francine then summons one of the Danish performers to provide him with an item of feedback, displaying that the suspension of the scene had related to some quality of the performed action of the dancers, and that consequently the relevant next action for Francine was to address this issue, rather than be engaged in a discussion of the lighting. This in turn could point to the relevance of Marco using English at this point, as it would enable the assistant director Mette to make a note of this for later discussion, and the Swedish lighting designer to overhear the account.

These sequences show how far the language choice practices of this project community developed over the course of the project. Whereas at the start of the full ensemble production stage, there were proposed regulations regarding language choice and constraints to avoid exclusion and promote greater inter-comprehension, by this later stage in the process there appears to have developed a preference for using an expanded set of linguistic resources, allowing members to draw on their wider language repertoires where this did not cause disruption to the project work. Indeed, as we see from the final excerpt, permission to alternate between languages afforded members opportunities to deploy language alternation in the service of organizing communicative conduct between the members, prompting reformulations that are inclusive of relevant others, as well as displaying attention to particular people and local activities within the larger project work at hand.

**Discussion**
Theater productions are interesting cultural artefacts in the very nature of their transient existence. The live performance is manifested only in the particular practices, routines, spatial configurations, and relationships worked up in situ by those people engaged in the performing of the work. Although these practices can become highly regimented and robust, and minutely detailed in their organization, the moment the participants leave the stage and vacate the theater space, the artefact of the performance ceases to exist as an artefact in and of itself. It only comes back into being when the performers arrive again and organize themselves in the ways they have learned to conjure it up. The event may continue to exist in documentary form, in descriptions, in recordings, in tellings and in the imagination, but its life as a live theater performance can only exist in the practices enacted by the social actors involved in its production.

In much the same way, a community exists only in the practices people adopt to enact the particular sociality of whichever co-membership is made relevant by those engaged in it. A community cannot exist outside of its enactment, except for in the same accounting practices as those that document the theater performance. Communities are thus transient affairs, social ephemera that require members to negotiate with and organize themselves in particular ways with and around social others. In addition, whereas a theater product emerges from the bringing together of a particular congregation of people, each with her own background and expectations, each with his own experiences and outlook relating to what the theater performance could or should be imagined to be, and imagined into being through collaborative endeavour, so too are we able to conceptualize this emergence in communities of various types and degrees of transience.

Writing from an ethnomethodological perspective, Heritage and Clayman (2010) problematize often-articulated understandings of the institutions of social life, rejecting the idea that people are fully constrained by some externally constituted contextual framework within which they act according to externally imposed norms (“the bucket theory”), and arguing for a more dynamic
production of such social norms and practices by the members themselves. This aligns with longstanding linguistic anthropological approaches to context as being both a backdrop for and an outcome of interaction (Duranti and Goodwin 1992). At a time where transient communities are becoming increasingly prevalent, it would appear prescient to continue to explore ways to deal with the study of the property of emergence within social organizations, where people from different backgrounds find themselves gathered together in a shared social activity, where they must negotiate a communal set of norms and practices. Drawing on longitudinal data sets such as the one featured in the current study allows for empirical studies of transient project communities to offer rich possibilities for investigating how particular organizational features of a community develop. In the current study, for example, we were able to observe a suggested language policy articulated and implemented at the beginning of this project, and monitor how the resulting practices developed on implementation, resulting in the (different) language choice practices in evidence at a later stage.

In the current case study, we found how a sizeable team of participants involved in the creative process of putting the theater production together was drawn from a range of European countries, with a wide range of linguistic identities present. Although Danish and English were the predominant languages in the setting, others, for example French and Swedish, were also recurrent features of the linguistic make-up of the cohort. Moreover, the language(s) chosen for carrying out particular activities between members of the team evidenced a shift over time, and the language used between configurations of members also appeared to become less constrained, rather than shifting towards one designated set of linguistic resources being adopted as an official medium of interaction. Rather than multilingual usage being treated as problematic, we saw evidence of participants’ orientation to exploring the communicative possibilities of the entire available range of languages and language competences.
In short, in this workplace community, this sees a gradual shift away from “language standardization” (Marschan-Piekkari, Welch and Welch, 1999: 379) where management may make efforts to implement a designated corporate language. Many internationalized workplaces have, for example, seen the adoption of English as a corporate lingua franca (e.g. Neeley, 2013; Lønsmann, 2015) in order to manage or streamline communication between members, and maximize efficiency of communication (Steyaert & Janssens, 1997). This was witnessed in the segment from early in the rehearsals. Subsequently, however, as members discovered what other language resources were available within the cohort, they expanded the sets of linguistic resources adopted as accepted workplace practices.

This use of multiple languages is also qualitatively different from the functional multilingualism described by Hagen, where members are deemed to “muddle through, relying on a mix of languages, pidgins and gestures to communicate by whatever means the parties have at their disposal” (in Feely & Harzing, 2003: 45). In this case study, the shift to the use of an expanded set of linguistic resources is not premised on deficiency, with reduced shared linguistic resources forcing members to have to rely on a bricolage of “whatever works.” Such an instrumental – or mechanistic (Janssens, Lanbert & Stayaert, 2004) - conceptualization of language use in this project community does not adequately account for how the members use the wider linguistic repertoire to do important identity, creative and social-relational work, for example in displaying an international mindset, or in be able to express concepts available in a particular language but not another, or organizing hearership within the wider group. These experienced practitioners of temporary, project-focused workplaces explore how far the linguistic horizons of this team stretch, and treat this langscape as containing the available sets of linguistic resources through which to carry out the work.

Much discourse analytic research into workplace interaction has been premised on the centrality of
linguistic resources - spoken as well as written - in how members go about collaborating with others in their work community. This may be the result of the types of international workplace communities that are commonly studied, for example corporate business and educational settings, rather than for example construction sites (although see Kraft, 2017). The example studied here, however, serves to emphasize that work contexts are not only defined by their linguistic hybridity, but they are also visual, olfactory, kinaesthetic, material arenas within which participants submerge themselves in human sociality. In the current case study, we saw that the work-at-hand, here the production of a theater show, is supported through language, but at the same time, the project work provides the members with a robust support structure around which they organize their language practices. With the project work in question here aiming toward the enacted, embodied artefact of theater performance, and a cohort of members that includes highly skilled practitioners in the form of dancers, actors, singers and other physical performers, a choreographer and theater director, much of the interaction revolves around the dialogic negotiation of visual, aural, embodied aesthetics, and as such, resources other than the linguistic are often foregrounded, or indeed central to the practice and objectives of participants.

This challenges us to examine in what ways linguistic resources are employed to facilitate types of work where language is not oriented to as the main modus operandi. Broadening this discussion out, it would appear beneficial to consider the project, the experience, professionalism, and shared professional vision (Goodwin 1994) of the participants in understanding the work at hand that acts as one important resource for securing shared understanding, even in environments where shared linguistic resources are relatively reduced. In this way, the linguistic components in the interactions act as scaffolding, rather than as the end product.

That said, we should be cautious to propose that there is anything fundamentally different between transient project communities such as a theater ensemble and those concerned with other types of
projects. Indeed, we would do well to consider this as simply one example among many transient project communities for which the process of becoming also involves the emerging of particular norms for language use as members discover what is possible with the available repertoires in the cohort.

**APPENDIX Transcription conventions**

The transcription conventions are based on those developed by Gail Jefferson (e.g. 2004). Some are used in modified form for use in the CLAN software tool (MacWhinney and Wagner 2011).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identifier</th>
<th>FRA:</th>
<th>Latched turns</th>
<th>=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pause</td>
<td>(0.2)</td>
<td>Smiley voice</td>
<td>☺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlap markers top</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>≠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlap markers bottom</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>Within word laughter</td>
<td>¶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intonation: rising</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Inbreath</td>
<td>· hhhh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuing</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>falling</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>Accelerated speech</td>
<td>And you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitch shift</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>Gloss/translation</td>
<td>In italics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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