THE DISCOURSE OF
ALL.DEPARTMENT E-MAILS
A case study

Karl-Heinz Pogner & Anne-Marie Søderberg

Associate professor   Associate professor
kp.ikl@cbs.dk   ams.ikl@cbs.dk
phone: + 45 3815 3156   phone: + 45 3815 3204
fax: (45) 3815 3840   fax: (45) 3815 3840

Department of Intercultural Communication and Management
Copenhagen Business School
Dalgas Have 15
DK-2000 Frederiksberg
Denmark

The discourse of all.department e-mails: A case study

Abstract
This paper is based on an explorative case study of all.department e-mails that were sent on the Intranet of a Danish university department. Following a social constructionist approach, our analysis assumes that language use shapes relations, identities, and representations. We thus investigate which social relations are expressed and constructed in the e-mail discourse and how the organizational world of the department is represented in the all.department e-mails. Our analyses of the e-mails show that the managerial voices are dominant as well as the perception of e-mail communication as a tool of information transmission. However, a few e-mails sent by employees without specific organizational functions differ significantly from the "managerial" mails. In these mails employee voices articulate a latent and unfulfilled need for a community and a forum for dialogue. The usage of the all.department e-mail communication is also related to the ongoing change of managing university departments in Denmark.

1. Introduction

Titles like 'Community in Cyberspace' (Smith/Kollock 1999), 'CyberSociety' (Jones 1995) and 'Soziales im Netz' *[Social relations in the Net]* (Thimm 2000) indicate that the focus of research in Computer Mediated Communication (CMC) has moved from technical aspects to questions about the use of new communication technologies and its social implications. Nowadays a considerable part of internal organizational communication takes place as e-mail communication, even though it does not necessarily supersede or substitute more 'traditional' forms of communication such as face-to-face communication, phone calls and different forms of written communication (Garton/Wellman 1995: 437, Kleinberger Günter/Thimm 2000: 262f).

Despite the mentioned change of focus in research and the important role that CMC plays in organizations, there are surprisingly few empirical studies of the use and social impact of electronic mail in organizations (Janich 1994, Ziv 1996, Mulholland 1999 and Kleinberger Günter/Thimm 2000 amongst others). CMC has been studied by linguists as well as sociologists. Researchers with a linguistic background (Janich 1994, Crijns 1999; Handler 2000 and Kleinberger Günter/Thimm 2000) tend to focus on (socio-) linguistic features at a micro-level when studying organizational discourse. Sociologists, on the other hand, tend to study issues such as identity, community, and organization, without relating them to the discursive practices that create identities and constitute the organization's social reality (cf. Garton/Wellman 1995, Holmes 1995, Shulman 1996 and Smith/ Kollock 1999). Taking into account that community, identity, and organization are negotiated constructs; our paper will combine these two perspectives and relate observations at the discursive level to reflections at the organizational macro-level.

In this paper we present results of an explorative case study of the internal e-mail communication at a Danish university department. We focus on how different organizational actors within the department use all.department e-mails. Our working assumption is that language use always shapes identities, relations and representations - and is shaped by them. In our analysis of the e-mail discourse we thus investigate issues such as: Which social relations are constructed between the participants? Which social

identities are set up in the mails? And how is the organizational world of the department represented? These research issues serve as points of departure for the empirical investigation of a text corpus of e-mails sent to all members of the university department.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 offers an outline of a theoretical framework, which conceptualizes organizational discourse as the primary means by which organizational members create their social reality. The following sections describe the organizational context in which the text corpus is embedded (section 3) and characterize participants, topics, text styles, text types, and other features of the all.department discourse (section 4). Section 5 investigates how social relations, organizational identities and social constructions of the organizational world are articulated in the mails. As an intermediate result of our discourse analysis, some characteristics of the predominant views of the organizational world within the text corpus are highlighted (5.1). Since our approach to organizational discourse emphasizes the role of all participants, e-mails that differ from the predominant 'managerial' mails are also analyzed. These e-mails throw light on how some organizational actors use the all.department e-mail system in alternative ways and thus give voice[1] to different perceptions of the department. (5.2). In the concluding section we relate our observations about the e-mail discourse to the ongoing changes of the department's managerial practices.

2. Theoretical commitments

Our understanding of social relations and identities in an organization and our analysis of the all.department e-mails as part of an organizational discourse are informed by a social constructionist approach (cf. Gergen 1999). It rests on the following premises: In their discursive practices[2] people constitute their social relations, identities and their social reality, whereby they maintain or change social structures. This view implies that language is not merely treated as a kind of conduit through which information is transmitted (for a critique of the conduit metaphor cf. Putnam, Phillips & Chapman 1996). On the contrary, discursive practices are seen as constituting social relations, social identities and the social world. In the following, we will take a closer look at the implications of these premises for the understanding of social relations and identities in an organization.

Our approach regards organizations as social entities that emerge in complex interactive processes among the members of the organization:

> […] when we speak of organizational discourse, we do not simply mean discourse that occurs in organizations. Rather we suggest that organizations exist only in so far as their members create them through discourse. This is not to claim that organizations are 'nothing but' discourse, but rather that discourse is the principal means by which organization members create a coherent social reality that frames their sense of who they are. (Mumby/Clair 1997: 181)

---

[1] The communication metaphor 'voice' is based on an interest in the practices and structures that affect which organizational actors can speak, when they can speak and in what way (cf. Putnam/Phillips/Chapman 1996: 389).

[2] We follow Potter and Wetherell, who point out that discursive practices "do not just describe things, they *do* things […] and they have social and political implications" (Potter/ Wetherell 1987: 6).

We claim that discursive practices not only shape organizational structures[3] but are simultaneously shaped by them. In the same way, discursive practices form social relations, social identities, and views of the organizational world and are at the same time formed by them.

In our case study we apply the general assumption that communicating and organizing are interdependent processes to a specific form of electronic communication. In accordance with structuration theory (cf. Rice/Gattiker 2001), we focus on the interplay of social relations, social identities and views of the organizational world articulated in the all.department e-mail communication. We assume that the actual technology on the one hand enables certain forms of discourse, and on the other hand constrains the potential actions of the organizational 'agents':

In structuration theory, and consistent with the more general constructionist perspective, more emphasis is placed on humans (as agents) being both enabled and constrained by technical structures, yet these very same structures are the result of previous actions […] (Shulman 1996: 365).

The social reality of the organization as a symbolic and virtual community is constructed in electronic networks:

(…) reality is not constituted *by* the networks CMC users use; it is constituted *in* the networks. It would be far easier to understand the physical, or hardwired, connections than to understand the symbolic connections that emerge from interaction. (…) Much of our energy has been directed toward understanding the speed and volume with which computers can be used as communication tools. Conspicuously absent is an understanding of how computers are used as tools for connection and community (Jones 1995: 12).

E-mail communication within an organization's Intranet thus enables members of the organization to build up social relations and identities within a dynamic, organizational context in order to create a virtual community and a sense of belonging (cf. Bayum 1995 and Wellman/Gulia 1999). However, it must be emphasized that, from a social constructionist point of view, organizational identities are neither stable nor well-defined entities. On the contrary they must be viewed as products of ongoing construction and negotiation of meaning (Gioia 1998: 24).[4]

According to the social constructionist view, the organizational actors' interpretation and sense-making processes (cf. Weick 1995) must be seen as firmly linked with their identity construction processes. When people (more or less consciously) make sense of themselves and others, as well of the activities taking place in the organization, they ask questions such as 'Who am I?', 'Who are we?', and 'Who are the others?'. Social

---

[3] This understanding of social organizations as discursive phenomena and of the organizing property of communication is developed in Cooren 2000.

[4] We are well aware that the organization's external communication as well as its public image also has an impact on the organizational actors' perceptions and identity (Hatch & Schultz 1997 and 2000). Nevertheless in this paper we restrict ourselves to focus on the internal aspects of organizational identification processes with e-mail communication as a tool to communicate such perceptions and identifications.

constructionism thus emphasizes that constructions of an individual identity as well as an organizational identity are relational: Any identity construction happens in relation to 'the other' that is marginalized or excluded.

In the following analysis of the all.department e-mails, we will examine the discursive constructions of what unites a group of colleagues at their workplace and the perception of what may differentiate the department from others. Finally we will investigate how more emotional statements about organizational membership and commitment (Thimm 2000: 12) are intertwined with these constructions.

3. Empirical material and organizational context

In the following sections we are going to analyze the semi-public[5] all.department e-mails that were sent to the members of a department at a Danish university. There was no list mediator, which meant that by using the address 'all.department' all members of the department could directly send an e-mail to all colleagues at the same time.

The core text corpus consists of 94 all.department e-mails sent in the period from December 1999 to February 2000. Additionally 136 all.university e-mails from the same period have been collected for comparative purposes. Since the department had introduced English as its 'corporate language' for all sorts of internal communication, the majority of the all.department e-mails were written in English; some, however, were written in Danish, and a few were written both in Danish and in English.[6]

The academic staff of the studied department consisted of 44 professors and Ph.D. students and the administrative staff comprised 13 secretaries. These 57 members of the department formed the group of potential recipients and writers of the all.department e-mails. Many members of the academic staff had access to their e-mail from their computer at home via a modem and were thus often part of a virtual rather than a locally based communication network.

4. Description of the all.department e-mails

In order to characterize the form and content of the all-department e-mails in greater detail we will start by answering the following questions: (1) Who were the writers? (2) Which issues and topics are predominant? (3) What are the characteristics of the communication style? (4) What are the prevailing text types? (5) To which extent is intertextuality salient within the text corpus? (6) How are the writers addressed in salutations and greetings?

(1) Participants
The corpus consists of 94 all-department e-mails. 34 mails were written by the academic staff, 60 by the administrative staff. The 34 mails of the academic staff were written by 10 academics (out of a total of 44). The Head of Department sent 15 of the 34 mails, the other 9 academics wrote the remaining 19 mails. The administrative staff wrote 60 mails; almost every secretary wrote one or more mails. The majority of writers – both

---

[5] We use the concept 'semi-public' to indicate that all organizational members have access to this communication system, but nobody from outside the department (or university) can send or receives mails via the all.department list.

[6] We quote the English mails in the original version, but translate the Danish ones.

4

from the academic and the administrative staff - held a specific position such as Head of Department, secretary for the Study Program Director, chair of a committee, organizer of a research seminar, coordinator of a course or an exam etc.

(2) Topics

Many e-mails contain information about decisions made by the Head of Department, the Board of the Department and the Study Board or information about *administrative processes* (example 1 in the appendix). Some e-mails are primarily addressed to the academic staff, i.e. refer to the department as a *unit responsible for research and teaching*. They often inform about academic events like research seminars and Ph.D.-defenses (example 2). Furthermore, a weekly departmental newsletter is sent electronically to all organizational actors within the department as a *workplace*. It primarily informs about issues that might be relevant for their administrative tasks, their teaching and their research. A few e-mails also announce the department's social events (e.g. welcome or farewell receptions) or inform about personal matters (example 3). Finally, many all.department mails refer to technical aspects of the department's *communication system*. Most of these e-mails are sent when delays, obstructions, or breakdowns occur (example 4). This metacommunication serves the purpose of administering the communication systems that gradually have become the backbone of the coordination of the daily work at the department.

(3) Styles

The predominant style of the studied e-mails is factual and often also rather formal (cf. example 3). Most e-mails inform very briefly about a single issue (examples 5 and 6), often in a kind of memo (cf. Mulholland 1999), only a few e-mails contain more emotional expressions and function as reprimands or moral qualms (example 7).

(4) Text types

The all.department e-mail communication functions as a mixture of a bulletin board and a system to distribute memos. Therefore it is not at all surprising that the informative text type is salient: i.e. genres as messages, announcements, warnings, reminders and minutes. However, there are also quite a few texts asking for action. Such texts belong to genres as inquiries, invitations or advertisements of loss. Texts stating one's opinion on visions concerning the department's strategic role or about the department's corporate identity are not found in the corpus.

(5) Dialogical qualities and intertextuality

In contrast to e-mail communication in dyads (cf. Eklundh 1994), the mails in our corpus do not have dialogical qualities. In the whole corpus there are only one mail in which an academic (the Head of Department) sends a reply mail to all members of the department and one single e-mail in which a writer supports a reprimand given by a secretary (example 8). There are neither longer question-answer exchanges (cf. Crijns 1999), nor direct feedback sequences.[7] In addition, the all.department e-mails are

---

[7] We are well aware that recipients of all.department e-mails may reply individually or comment on an e-mail in face to face communication. But these replies are taking place outside the semi-public communication space of the all.department e-mails and thus not part of our study.

characterized by a small number of intertextual features. Neither forwarding nor quoting of all.department mails by paste and copy as point of departure for comments are to be found in the corpus; but there are some mails with links to web sites.

(6) Salutations and greetings
The Head of Department and most of the other academic staff members consistently salute the staff with 'Dear colleagues' and often greet with 'Yours' or 'Best regards' and their first name. Some secretaries in the department mostly chose a more distant form (e.g. 'To the academic staff at the department') and often greet with 'regards'. Other secretaries shift between more intimate or informal forms or use no salutations and greetings at all. The secretaries normally sign with their first name.

Many mails contain an electronic business card with name, academic title, position, address and phone and fax numbers etc. Very often this attached information also appears in less formal mails closed with an informal greeting and the first name of the writer. Markedly often there are no attempts to build up a stronger coherence between the chosen salutations and greetings and the content of the mail framed by these more or less formal or friendly forms of address (examples 9 and 10).

Our preliminary analysis shows the following tendencies: The all.department e-mails are primarily used as a tool for information transmission from holders of specific positions at the department to all other members of the organization. The dominant e-mail text type is the informative one, the mails primarily serve the purpose of running and managing the department as an administrative unit responsible for teaching and research. Since salutations and greetings are not chosen consistently, their usage in itself is not indicative for specific social relations at the department.

5 Social relations, organizational identities, and views of the organizational world
The following discourse analysis of the corpus aims at clarifying how the all.department e-mails contribute to building up social relations and organizational identities, and to constructing communities within the department. For this reason we analyze the references made to the department as a community. We search for traces of a sense of belonging and an emotional attachment to a community, which may further commitment and solidarity.

5.1 The department as an administrative unit
Only few mails refer explicitly to the department as a kind of community. However, a number of all.department mails express, in a more implicit manner, some kind of attachment to the department, but they refer to different understandings of this community.

Some members of the department seem to be united by shared physical facilities (e.g. a meeting room) and technical services (photocopy machines, communication systems). The all.department e-mails referring to these facilities are all sent by the secretaries and Ph.D. students who are working all day in the department. The department's professors show less attachment to the department as a shared locality. They partly teach in other premises, are often on field trips and at conferences, and some of them furthermore

work at home when they are not teaching. For the academic staff the department is not so much a community in terms of place; the department rather tends to function as a virtual social network.

A large number of all.department e-mails refer to the department as a community sharing some communication facilities: An intranet that could be affected by viruses, a mail server facilitating internal and external communication, a home page presenting the department on the Internet etc. However, with the exception of the newsletter, these shared communication facilities are not given much attention as something the staff should feel committed to, neither when it comes to the design nor the content.

Moreover, the department also comprises the academic staff seen as a social group ideally united in a joint effort to develop a research community. The Head of Department only refers explicitly to the department as a research community in 3 of his 15 all.department mails. Two associate professors write a few e-mails linked to these issues and make attempts to appeal to the colleagues' commitment in strategy development and decision-making in research issues. Nobody replies to these invitations with an all.department-mail. In general, the all.department e-mails referring to the research community are mostly formal announcements of research seminars or information about procedures such as how the annual research report should be written.

The academic staff is also responsible for a lot of teaching activities. Schedules for the next term lectures and seminars are sent by all.department e-mails. A few mails contain minutes from meetings in the Study Board or the Study Program Director's annual report. Most of them serve the purpose of broadcasting information about decisions made by the Boards and of ensuring that the ongoing teaching activities are well organized and afterwards controlled and evaluated. This group of mails is characterized by a high degree of formality. In the all.department e-mails there is no appeal to the community of teachers to involve themselves in discussions about the content of the study programs and share experiences with teaching.

Our preliminary analyses show no deliberate efforts of the management to use this form of electronic communication strategically to construct the organization as a community with a 'corporate identity' in a wider sense. The individual organizational actors whose voices are heard refer to the department in very different ways, as a shared physical facility, as a community sharing communication facilities, or as a teaching or a research community. But nobody expresses any ideas about what makes the whole department distinctive from others and how a corporate identity might be constructed.

These preliminary findings thus indicate that hardly any conscious efforts are made to strengthen the ties between the staff of the department and to engage this group in a collective identity work. Of course, it should be taken into account that the Intranet is only one of many ways, in which the staff may interact, build social relations, and construct organizational identities. Ideally, our case study should thus be supplemented with studies of how the all.department e-mails interrelate with person-to-person e-mails, and how Computer Mediated Communication as such interacts with face-to-face

communication at staff meetings, research seminars, receptions or other formal and informal gatherings in the department.

5.2 The department as a common destiny

Until now we have characterized the all.department e-mails as predominantly informative and factual and as focusing on the daily management of teaching and research. However, a very small number of mails in the corpus indicate that at least some members of the staff have a need to express some kind of emotional attachment to the department. In fact, there are three e-mails ("Disaster at the Department", "Administrative assistance", and "Virus alert") that differ significantly from the described e-mails with regard to participants, styles, text types, and topicalizations of the department as a community. These mails refer to the same topics, but they represent both expressive and persuasive text types. In addition the writers do not hold specific functional positions at the department, and they articulate their opinions about departmental tasks and routines. Finally, they express feelings of disappointment and unfulfilled expectations of shared responsibility, solidarity, and support. In general, they refer to the work at the department as a kind of common destiny, and appeal directly or indirectly to the other employees to feel closer attachment to the department as a community.

(1) "Disaster at the Department" (example 11)
A secretary sends an emergency alert with the title "Disaster at department":

This is just to get the weight off my chest, so to speak. Our kitchen has been in an appalling state for a while now. Please, please, please, remember to tidy up after lunch etc. etc. If you notice anyone leaving dirty plates or cutlery in the kitchen then give them a pleasant reminder that plates and cutlery should either be washed up and put away or taken down to the canteen. It would be nice to keep the kitchen clean and hygienic.
Regards,
From a very frustrated user of the kitchen

This e-mail refers to a shared locality, but in contrast to the majority of the mails it uses exaggeration and expresses the writer's feelings. It also contains an urgent request to share responsibility for the state of the kitchen.

(2) "Administrative assistance" (example 12)
A professor describes in an entertaining and self-ironic manner his experiences during the preparation of an oral examination as follows:

Now examinations are a crucial ritual in the education system, and this is clearly recognized by the way in which everyone talks about the green tablecloth and jar of water[8], which the students concerned saw me running around with and eventually laying on the table. Is this really right and proper? Imagine yourself a catholic [...] about to attend communion. How would you really feel about the notion of trans-

---

[8] It is a Danish tradition at oral examinations to cover the table in the examination room with a green cloth made of felt. On this "green table" there is also placed a jar of water for the students and a pot of coffee for the examiners.

substantiation if you saw the priest rushing around in front of you with the altar cloth and a bottle of wine, which he then uncorked in front of you?

The professor's comprehensive story does not only serve the purpose of treating Danish examination rituals ironically. We also interpret it as a way to pour out one's trouble and disappointment about unfulfilled expectations of administrative support in the department's semi-public Intranet:

Yesterday, as we now all know, all the administrators were away – sick, attending seminars etc. It just so happened that yours truly was examining the XXX course yesterday. It also happened that the assigned room had not been prepared in any way (apart from a pot of coffee on the table).

(3) "Virus alert" (example 13)
Another researcher sends an e-mail, which after few sentences reveals itself as a travesty of the frequent warnings of computer virus:

A new virus named 'WORK' is threatening us right now. If you receive 'WORK' in any form, via e-mail, the Internet or transferred from one of your colleagues, then please don't accept it. Those who have already received it are very quickly put in a situation where their leisure time has simply disappeared, and their capacity for thinking does not function very well any longer (…) This virus warning has been sent by Microsoft early this morning. Please send it as soon as possible to all your friends listed in your E-mail address book. If you realize that you do not have any friends among the people listed in your electronic address book, there is a risk that 'WORK' has already infected you and destroyed your life.

In our opinion the purpose of this mail is not only to entertain, but also to send an indirect statement about the strains of work, which he expects many other employees at the department might feel as well. This e-mail thus refers to a feeling of a common destiny, that many employees at the department have a heavy burden of work. That burden might not be visible to the others because especially the teachers and researchers work relatively autonomously and thus do not have a forum to share their experiences of the workload. The e-mail also contains an indirect appeal to reconsider both the individual risk of burnout and the department's collective responsibility to take care of the employees, instead of delegating them still more tasks. "If you receive 'WORK' in any form, via an e-mail, the Internet or transferred from one of your colleagues, then please don't accept it".

The three e-mails analyzed in this section indirectly express latent needs for a community for sharing experiences and getting the colleagues' support. But it should be noted that in the semi-public all.department e-mails such a need is only expressed in exaggerated or ironic forms. University departments are organizations characterized by hierarchy, power and mutual competition. In these organizations the choice of ironic style or cheek in tongue serves as a self-protection in situations where a more explicit 'cri de coeur' for help and support or a more hot-tempered and outspoken criticism would make the writers of the e-mails either more vulnerable or would involve them in an open conflict with the colleagues or the management.

6. Conclusions

We have shown that the all.department e-mails in our text corpus are used as a tool for accomplishing administrative tasks and avoiding functional disturbances. The all.department e-mails are concerned with the daily management of the department. They do not function as a forum for negotiation of what makes this department a community and what makes it different from other departments at the university.

The all.department e-mails are primarily used as a system for the transmission of information that is relevant for the coordination and execution of tasks related to the department's administration, teaching, and research. The discursive practices of the frequent writers follow a concept of communication as a fast and efficient transmission of information from a sender to a recipient using the all.department e-mails as a channel for internal mass information. We have interpreted the few exceptions in the corpus as an indicator of a latent need for a community characterized by closer social relations, dialogue, support, solidarity, attachment and reciprocity (cf. Bayum 1995 and Wellman/Gulia 1999).

This description leads to some concluding remarks about the social implications of this form of internal communication at the studied university department. As concerns the *social relations* the discourse of the all.department e-mail constructs a small group of 'senders' taking initiatives and making decisions at the department and a large group of 'recipients' who have to carry out the decisions made. This results in a monologic top-down structure in the e-mail discourse. The *organizational identities* are also arranged along the same line of division: Among the active 'senders' we typically find the members of the department who have managerial functions, whereas the department's other employees are constructed as a group of passive 'recipients'. However, not all writers seem to accept this functional division.

The division that becomes visible in the e-mail discourse can be seen both as a sign and as a part of the ongoing change in the way universities and departments are managed in Denmark. A model with a more visible and powerful management and a clearer division between managers and employees is replacing the former basically collective and rather egalitarian paradigm of the staff managing itself. The way the all.department e-mail is used and the tacit consent of employees to it seems to reinforce the ongoing organizational change and forces other voices to use ironic text genres - if they do not want to be completely marginalized or silenced. The lack of an unambiguous and unchallenged *view of the organizational world* can be seen as another sign of this ongoing change. We found that the perception of the department was characterized by fragmentation[9]: The different views of the department (a workplace, a communication unit, a research community, a teaching unit; a physical community or a virtual community) are not tied together by a shared perception of the department. A few employees use the e-mail communication to show some dissatisfaction or at least disappointment. Indirectly they express an unmet need for a closer community with a feeling of belonging and a dialogic forum. It seems as if the only point of identity that

---

[9] Parker 2000 studies organizational cultures and identities as "fragmented unities" in which members identify themselves as collective at some time and divided at others.

ties the different perceptions of the organization together is the feeling of a common destiny.

New communication technologies have enabled the development of electronic networks such as Intranets. These networks are part of the technical and social context of the all.department e-mail discourse studied in this paper. Our case study has shown how e-mail communication enables and constrains the social construction of relations, identities and views of the organizational world. Further studies of the department's discourse should investigate the interplay between the studied all.department e-mails and other communication forms in order to consolidate or modify our conclusions about the interaction of the department's communication structures, the fragmented views of the organizational world, and the change of the department's managerial processes.

References

Bayum, Nancy K. (1996): "The emergence of community in Computer-Mediated Communication". In: *Jones (ed.) 1995*. 138-163.

Clegg, Steward R./Hardy, Cynthia/Nord,Walter R. (eds.) (1996): *Handbook of organization studies*. London: Sage. 357-374.

Cooren, Francois (2000): *The organizing property of communication*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Crijns, Rogier (1999): „Die Rolle von 'Does-any-know'-Fragen im (inner-)betrieblichen E-Mail-Verkehr". In: Wieden, Winfried/Weiss, Andreas/Schachermayr, Andreas (eds.): *Internationale Wirtschaftsbeziehungen: Mehrdeutige Kommunikation von Fachwissen* (Göppinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik 665). Göppingen: Kümmerle. 75-88.

Eklundh, Kirsten Severinson (1994): "Electronic mail as a medium for dialogue". In: Van Waes, Luuk/Woudstra, Egbert/van den Hoven, Paul (eds.): *Functional communication quality* (Utrecht Studies in Language and Communication 4). Amsterdam and Atlanta GA: Rudopi. 162-173.

Garton, Laura / Wellman, Barry (1995): "Social impacts of electronic mail in organizations: A review of the research literature". In: Burleson, Brant R. (ed.): *Communication Yearbook 18*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage. 434-53.

Gergen, Kenneth J. (1999): *An invitation to social constructionism*. London: Sage.

Gioia, Dennis A. (1998): "From individual to organizational identity". In: Whetten, Davida./Godfrey, Paul C. (eds.): *Identity in organizations: Building theory through conversations*. London: Sage. 17-31.

Handler, Peter (2000): „Interdiskursive Aspekte zu wissenschaftlichen E-Mail-Diskussionen". In: *Thimm (ed.) (2000)*. 305-319.

Hatch, Mary Jo/Schultz, Majken (2000): "Scaling the Tower of Babel: Relational differences between identity, image and culture in organizations". In: Schultz, Majken/Hatch, Mary Jo/Larsen, Mogens Holten (eds.): *The Expressive Organization: Connecting Identity, Reputation and the Corporate Brand*. Oxford: University Press. 11-33.

Hatch, Mary Jo/Schultz, Majken (1997): "Relations between organizational culture, identity and image". In: *European Journal of Marketing* 31-5/6, 356-365.

Holmes, Michael E. (1995): "Don't blink or you'll miss it: Issues in electronic mail research". In: Burleson, Brant, R. (ed.): *Communication Yearbook 18*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage. 454-463.

Janich, Nina (1994): „Electronic Mail, eine betriebsinterne Kommunikationsform". In: *Muttersprache* 4, 248-259.

Jones, Steven G. (ed.) (1995): *CyberSociety: Computer-mediated communication and community*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.

Kleinberger Günter, Ulla /Thimm, Caja (2000): „Soziale Beziehungen und innerbetriebliche Kommunikation: Formen und Funktionen elektronischer Schriftlichkeit in Unternehmen". In: *Thimm (ed.) (2000)*. 262-277.

Mulholland, Joan (1999): "E-mail: Uses, issues and problems in an institutional setting". In: Bargiela-Chiappini, Francesca/Nickerson; Catherine (Eds.): *Writing business: Genres, media and discources*. London: Longman. 57-84.

Mumby, Dennis K./Clair, Robin P. (1997): "Organizational Discourse". In: van Dijk, Teun A. (ed.) *Discourse as social interaction*. London. Sage. 181-205.

Parker, Martin (2000): *Organizational culture and identity: Unity and division at work.* London: Sage.

Potter, Jonathan/Wetherell, Margareth (1987): *Discourse and social psychology.* London: Sage.

Putnam, Linda/Phillips, Nelson/Chapman, Pamela (1996): "Metaphors of communication and organization". In: *Clegg et al. (eds.) (1996).* 375-408

Rice, Ronald E./Gattiker, Urs E.: (2001): "New media and organizational structuring" In: Jablin, Fredric M./Putnam, Linda L (eds.): *The new handbook of organizational communication: Advances in theory, research, and methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Shulman; Arthur D. (1996): "Putting group information technology in its place: Communication and good work group performance". In: *Clegg et al. (eds.) (1996).* 357-374.

Smith, Marc A./Kollock, Peter (eds.) (1999): *Communities in Cyberspace.* London: Routledge.

Thimm, Caja (ed.) (2000): *Soziales im Netz. Sprache, Beziehungen und Kommunikationskulturen im Internet*. Opladen und Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Weick, Karl E. (1995): *Sensemaking in organizations*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.

Wellman, Barry/Gulia, Milena (1999): "Virtual communities as communities: Net surfers don't ride alone". In: *Smith / Kollock (eds.) (1999)*. 167-193

Ziv, Oren (1996): "Writing to work: How using e-mail can reflect technological and organizational change". In: Herring, Susan C. (ed.) (1996): *Computer-mediated communication: Linguistic, social and cross-cultural perspectives* (Pragmatics and Beyond N.S. 39). Amsterdam and Philadelphia PA: John Benjamins. 243-263.

Appendix

Example 1: Sending the minutes from the Department Board meeting

Subject: Minutes from the Department Board meeting
Resent-From: all.departmentl@uni.dk
Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2000 12:45:04 +0100
From: "Karen Larsen" <xx.department@uni.dk>
Organization: University
To: all.department@uni.dk

Pleace find attach the minutes from the Department Board meeting January 26, 2000.

Regards Karen

Name: Referat 260100.doc
    Referat 260100.doc   Type: Winword File (application/msword)
              Encoding: base64

Example 2: Invitation to Globalization Seminar

Subject: DEPARTMENT GLOBALIZATION SEMINAR
Resent-From: all.department@uni.dk
Date: Wed, 01 Dec 1999 16:43:58 +0100
From: "Donna Donna" <xx.department@uni.dk>
Reply-To: xx@uni.dk
Organization: University
To: all.department@uni.dk

^^^
DEPARTMENT GLOBALIZATION SEMINAR

"Identity Construction and Transformation among
French business elites"

Presentation by: Jette Petersen, Department
(Abstract to follow)

WEDNESDAY, December 8th 1999
14:00-15:30
UNIVERSITY, Address: Room XXXX

 ^^^
Also on December 8th!

"Using Social and Cultural Capital in Conceptualizing Networks of
Relationships"

Presentation by: Martha Sorensen,
PhD Candidate in International Business and German

Abstract
This paper focuses on how networks of relationships might be understood in
economic theory. It is argued on the basis of Storper and Salais (1997) that the economic
theory used to describe relationships and networks of relationships should use
teleological explanations to explain actors' pragmatic actions towards one another.
Furthermore, it is argued that social and cultural capital (Bourdieu 1983) may prove to be
useful in conceptualizing actors' actions in networks in an economic theory that
encompasses the pragmatic characteristics of human actions and distances itself from
traditional rational choice economic theory.

Wednesday, December 8, 1999
10-11:30
UNIVERSITY, Address: Room XXXX

Paper available in Karen Larsen's office in the Department.
^^

Donna Donna
Chair in Communication
DEPARTMENT
University

Example 3: Congratulations

[Original in Danish]

Subject: PETERSON'S BABY
Resent-From: all.department@uni.dk
Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2000 10:10:16 +0100
From: "Karen Larsen" <xx.department@uni.dk>
Organization: University
To: all.department@uni.dk

Jette Petersen gave birth last week to a baby named Elisa. The baby weighs 3650 grams. Jette
has received a bouquet of flowers from the department.

Regards Karen

Example 4: Shutting off the Department's server

Subject: Department's server
Resent-From: all.department@uni.dk
Date: Tue, 14 Dec 1999 13:51:12 +0100
From: "Peter Strand" <xx.department@uni.dk>
Organization: University
To: DEPARTMENT <all.department@uni.dk>

Hej alle sammen

Til orientering vil jeg informere jer, at Instituttets server vil blive lukket
ned kl. 9 i morgen (onsdag d. 14) og ca.1 time frem.. En ny båndstation
skal sættes op.

Mange hilsner
Peter

And now in English

Dear colleagues,

The dept's server will be shut down from 9 o'clock tomorrow morning for roughly an hour.

Regards,
Peter

Peter Strand
Senior assistant
University
Department
Address
Denmark

Phone: +XX XXXX XXXX
Mobile: +XX XXXX XXXX
Fax: +XX XXXX XXXX
Email: XX.department@uni.dk

Example 5: Research Publications

Subject: Research Publications 1999 - Annual Report
Resent-From: all.department@uni.dk
Date: Tue, 14 Dec 1999 13:52:26 +0100
From: "Karen Larsen" <xx.department@uni.dk>
Organization: University
To: all.department@uni.dk

To Department's VIP [Videnskabeligt Personale = academic staff]

Please fill in the enclosed form stating all of your research
publications in 1999. Please return it no later than January 10, 2000.

If you have any problems reading the file, please feel free to contact
me.

Regards,
Karen

Name: årsberetning skema til udfyldning - engelsk.doc
årsberetning skema til udfyldning - engelsk.doc   Type: Winword File
(application/msword)

Example 6: Who has the institutes copy card?

Translation

Subject: Who has the institute's copy card??!!
Resent-From: all.department@uni.dk
Date: Tue, 04 Jan 2000 09:21:11 +0100
From: "Anne Palm" <xx.department@uni.dk>
Organization: University
To: "all.department@uni.dk" <all.department@uni.dk>

Since we have only got 4 provisional copy cards for new copy machines for all members
of department, it is a very disloyal behavior not to return the copy cards after use. The
two [persons] who yesterday borrowed the cards are kindly requested to return them
immediately!!

Anne

Example 7: Are you the thief?

Subject: Are you the thief !!
Resent-From: all.department@uni.dk
Date: Thu, 06 Jan 2000 10:02:10 +0100
From: "Julie Tullin" <xx.department@uni.dk>
Organization: University
To: all.department@uni.dk

Dear all,
Who has my big red dictionary English-Danish ?? Please return it to me
if you are done with it or at least let me know that you are using it !!
Thanks............
Julie

Julie Tullin
University
Address
Tel. +XX-XXXXXXXX
Fax +XX-XXXXXXX

Example 8: Re: Disaster

Subject: Re: Disaster at Department
Resent-From: all.department@uni.dk
Date: Fri, 7 Jan 2000 09:42:47 +0100
From: "John Johnson" <xx.department@uni.dk>
To: xx.department@uni.dk, department <all.department@uni.dk>

Just to say that Peter is completely right. The kitchen has been a
disgusting sight recently. I came in between Christmas and New Year's and
some party had just left everything to rot over the holidays.
Regards, John

Example 9: Finances

Subject: finances 2000
Resent-From: all.department@uni.dk
Date: Mon, 20 Dec 1999 16:18:44 +0100
From: "Sten Dinesen" <xx.department@uni.dk>
To: all.department@uni.dk

Dear colleagues,

Susan and I have made some estimates around the budget for year 2000, and this letter is
our communication of an estimate of financial possibilities - as well as my communication
of the rules I intend to apply regarding discretionary spending.

We will try to apply a financial regime somewhere between the old, more liberal
possibilities - and the new ones, to be in force from 2001, more restrictive.In practice,
that means small reductions in all possible places and a stricter implementation regime.

Individual research support (XXXX-kr.-konto):
down from XXXX p.a. to YYYY p.a. For TAP [adminstrative staff] down to ZZZZ.

Travel support:
each researcher has a right to ONE yearly conference, with paper. A second conference
depends on total spending, etc. The individual research support goes into the financing of
a possible second conference. In May, we ask for individual wishes/applications for
travel for the rest of the year and try to set some priorities inside the department's total
budget.

Study boards:
The budgets for the study programmes will be reduced in the way that the calculation of
hourly wages will be increased to XXXkr./hour - in the spring semester, this will be
compensated by extra money, in the autumn, no compensation.Quantitative consequences
to be calculated and communicated later.

Merry Christmas

Sten

Example 10: Copy cards

Subject: kopikort til de nye maskiner/Copycards for new machines
Resent-From: all.department@uni.dk
Date: Tue, 21 Dec 1999 13:25:15 +0100
From: "Anne Palm" <xx.department@uni.dk>
Organization: University
To: "all.department@uni.dk" <all.department@uni.dk>

Soon the new copy machines will be taken into use - and you will find
that your copy cards no longer work!
The firm supplying us with new cards, haven't yet sent them - they are
delayed!

For the time being, we have only 4 temporary cards for the whole of the Department.
One card is with Susen Sørensen, one with Karen Larsen, one with Dorte
Vestergaard and one with Lone Larsen.

If you need to take copies, please contact one of the above, AND
REMEMBER TO RETURN THE CARD IMMEDIATELY AFTER USE, AS THESE
ARE THE ONLY
CARDS WE HAVE FOR THE WHOLE OF DEPARTMENT!!!!!!!
This is only temporary, and by the middle of January, we should have the
new copy cards, I hope...

I would like to take this opportunity to wish all of you af merry x-mas
and a happy new year

See you all in the new millennium...

 Anne

Example 11: Disaster

Subject: Disaster at the department
Resent-From: all.department@uni.dk
Date: Fri, 07 Jan 2000 07:42:57 +0100
From: "Peter Strand" <xx.department@uni.dk>
Organization: University
To: DEPARTMENT <all.department@uni.dk>

God morning dear colleagues

This is just to get the weight off my chest, so to speak. Our kitchen
has been in an appalling state for a while now. Please, please, please
remember to tidy up after lunch etc. If you notice anyone leaving dirty
plates or cutlery in the kitchen then give them a pleasant reminder that
plates and cutlery should either be washed up and put away or taken down
to the canteen.

It would be nice to keep the kitchen clean and hygienic.

Regards,
From a very frustrated user of the kitchen.

Peter Strand
Senior assistant
University
Department
Address
Denmark

Phone: +XX XXXX XXXX
Mobile: +XX XXXX XXXX
Fax: +XX XXXX XXXX
Email: xx.department@uni.dk

Example 12: Admin. assistance

Subject: Administrative assistance
Resent-From: all.department@uni.dk
Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2000 13:39:17 +0100
From: "Bill Willis" <xx.department@uni.dk>
Organization: University
To: DEPARTMENT <all.department@uni.dk>

Dear colleagues,

This is a little bit tongue-in-cheek, but it has its element of
seriousness, too. Still, please don't take too much offence anyone. I'm
just trying to point out an in-outsider's view of how things in the Dept
can be sometimes...

Yesterday, as we now all know, all the administrators were away -- sick,
attending seminars, etc. It just so happened that yours truly was
examining the XXX course yesterday. It also happened that the assigned
room had not been prepared in any way (apart from a pot of coffee on the
table).

Not unnaturally, both the censor and I felt that we should do something.
I looked for help, and got a little direction from Anne who was the
one person I eventually found in the Dept (even though it was hardly
part of her job description to help me with the task in hand).
Eventually, I was directed via the canteen to the betjentstuen [betjentstuen = caretakers'
office] and got what I had previously been told by several colleagues and external
examiners were absolutely necessary: a green table cloth and a jar of
water with plastic cups (plus paper for the censor and a red sign for
the door saying "Eksamen"). We started our exams 15 minutes late.

Now examinations are a crucial ritual in the education system, and this
is clearly recognized by the way in which everyone talks about the green
table cloth and jar of water... which the students concerned saw me
running around with and eventually laying on the table. Is this really
right and proper? Imagine yourself as a catholic (one of you at least
does not have to do this part of the imagining) about to attend
communion. How would you really feel about the notion of
trans-substantiation if you saw the priest rushing around in front of
you with the altar cloth and a bottle of wine which he then uncorked in
front of you?

I know it was all a terrible misfortune; I know everyone will do their
best to ensure that this never happens again. For the record, I would
like to add that, if this sort of thing ever does [=external examinator] occur again, I will
summarily cancel the exam and ask the censor to go home and do better
things with his (occasionally her?) time.

 Bill

Example 13: Virus alert

<u>Translation</u>

Subject: Virus alert - sorry, in Danish only... :-)
Resent-From: all.department@uni.dk
Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2000 11:54:58 +0100
From: "Rainer Schmidt" <xx.department@uni.dk>
Organization: University
To: all.department@uni.dk

VIRUS ALERT

A new virus named 'WORK' is threatening us right now. If you receive 'WORK' in any form, via an e-mail, the Internet or transferred from one of your colleagues, then please don't accept it.

Those who have already received it are soon put in a situation where their leisure time has simply disappeared, and their capacity for thinking does not function very well any longer.

If you receive 'WORK' via e-mail or any kind of 'WORK' in general, destroy the virus and send a mail to your boss with the following words: "I have had enough. I'm off to the local bar". All forms of 'WORK' should then immediately vanish automatically from your mind. If you receive 'WORK' in a paper copy, just take the file and transfer it to wastepaper basket.

This virus alert has been sent by Microsoft early this morning - please sent it to all your friends listed in your e-mail address book as soon as possible.

If you realize that you do not have any friends among the people listed in your electronic address book, there is a risk that 'WORK' already has infected you and destroyed your life.

Rainer Schmidt <xx.department@uni.dk>
assistant professor
University

Business card

Rainer Schmidt
assistant professor   <xx.department@uni.dk>
University HTML Mail
Address   Conference Software
Address   Default Directory Server
 Denmark
 Department
 Additional Information:
 Last Name   Schmidt
 First Name   Rainer
 Version   2.1