

### Formal Germans and dominant Danes – why you should teach intonation

Text books on Danish as a second language do not explain about intonation, i.e. the characteristic pitch movement patterns throughout an utterance. While non-native intonation does not lead to ungrammaticality, it might lead to judgements about the speaker's personality (Tannen 2011).

In German (and English), the intonation at the end of an utterance is associated with signaling important communicative functions (cf. Selting 1995), while in Danish the slope of the utterance as a whole fulfills that function (Grønnum 2007).

We had native speakers of Danish, German and English record a set of demographic questions. Then we swapped the intonation contours around using PRAAT. In an online survey, two Keepon robots took turns in asking the questions; one used the original questions, the other one non-native intonation. Afterwards, people had to rate the two Keepons with respect to a set of properties, such as how engaging, friendly, polite, dominant or formal the robots were.



The results show significantly different evaluations of the two robots for the German participants (N=45;  $X^2=15.5$ ;  $p = 0.0165$ ) and near-significant differences for the native speakers of English (N=18;  $X^2=10.75$ ;  $p=0.0964$ ). Post-hoc analyses show that Danes perceived the robot with German intonation as formal. In contrast, Germans found the robot with Danish intonation dominant.

Our study shows that the lack of intonation teaching in Danish text books needs to be rectified – or learners risk making the wrong impression when communicating in their new language.

**Keywords:** intonation, Danish, second language teaching

Grønnum, Nina. 2007. *Rødgrød med fløde: En lille bog om dansk fonetik*. København: Akademisk Forlag.

Selting, Margret. 1995. *Prosodie im Gespräch: Aspekte einer interaktionalen Phonologie der Konversation*. Niemeyer: Tübingen.

Tannen, Deborah. 2011. *That's not what I meant! How conversational style makes or breaks relationships*. Harper.

Hur skapade vi en öppen, karriärfrämjande online-portal för svenskstudier i högskolor?

Marjaana Halsas (Haaga-Helia UAS), Teija Lehto (Laurea UAS), Taija Votkin (Aalto University),  
Liisa Wallenius (Haaga-Helia UAS)

Vår undersökning grundar sig på ett nationellt utvecklingsprojekt DIGIJOUJOU som finansieras av undervisningsministeriet i Finland. I det tre år långa topprojektet deltar 12 högskolor och universitet och sammanlagt 52 högskolelektorer i ämnen svenska och finska som andraspråk. Projektets mål indelas i tre huvudkategorier: 1. att utveckla ny digital pedagogik och läroplan för digital språkinlärning 2. att bygga flexibla inlärningsstigar för högskolestuderande samt 3. att öka samarbetet mellan olika högskolor och universitet.

Vi har skapat en öppen, digital materialportal vars syfte är att erbjuda en aktivitetsbank för studier i svenska på nivå B1-B2. Varje uppgift ger mervärde för studerandenas substanskompetens och de branschriktade temana kan tillämpas inom de flesta högskole- och universitetsutbildningar. Uppgifterna följer konsekvent task-based learning, flipped learning, blended learning och CLIL (Content Integrated Language Learning).

I mars 2018 gjorde vi en enkät om handledning och feedback i svenskstudierna för att kartlägga och underlätta planeringen. Vi fick 181 svar från tre högskolor. Enligt resultaten önskade studerandena tydligare uppgiftsinstruktioner också på finska trots målnivån B1-B2. Portalens lättillgänglighet och enkel teknisk konstruktion betonades. Därtill kartlade vi studerandenas it-färdigheter och kompetenser med språkinlärningsapplikationer, online-ordböcker och andra språkportaler samt deras tekniska kunnande med presentationsgrafik, videoinspelningar och virtuella möten, vilket vi beaktat i utarbetandet av portalen.

Under våren 2019 testas portalen och studerandefeedback samlas in konsekvent. Dessutom intervjuas lärarna och feedbacken analyseras.

Resultaten av båda undersökningarna samt en överblick i portalen <https://svenskstudieribuffeformat.com/> presenteras i postern.

## Referencer

DIGIJOUJOU projekt <https://blogs.aalto.fi/digijoujou/>

J. Richards, T. Rodgers, *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

R. Talbert, *Flipped Learning – A Guide to Higher Learning Faculty*. Stylus Publishing, LLC, 2017.

**Nyckelord:** Online learning portal, svenska som andraspråk, fackspråk, branschriktade studier

## “Jeg køre en tur for at besøge dig” - verbal inflection in L1 and L2 Danish

Hansen, J.J., Kristensen, L.B. & Søby, K.F.

*Broken Grammar and Beyond, Department of Nordic Studies and Linguistics,  
University of Copenhagen*

In written Danish, there is a clear distinction between regular verbs in the present tense (inflected with the suffix *-er*) and the infinitive (inflected with the suffix *-e*). In spoken Danish, however, the two word forms are sometimes homophone e.g. *kør-e* ‘to drive’ and *kør-er* ‘drive(s)’, both pronounced [ˈkʰøːɐ̯], causing difficulties in the writing of native speakers (e.g. Blom et al. 2017).

We investigated the frequency of errors in written production of present tense and infinitive in cases of homophony vs. heterophony and compared L1 texts with L2 texts. L1 texts were 36 high school essays (61,803 words in total) and L2 texts were written by 28 native English speakers studying at a Danish language school (5,685 words in total).

Overall, we found more inflection errors in L2 texts than L1 texts. However, homophony-related errors were more pronounced in L1 texts than L2 texts: a potential error analysis (Thewissen 2015) showed an error rate of 23.3% in L1 texts in cases of homophony compared with 0.4% in cases of heterophony. L2 texts showed an error rate of 4.9% in cases of homophony compared with 8.0% in cases of heterophony. The L1 results indicate that L1 speakers of Danish predominantly utilize their phonemic knowledge in writing rather than their morphological knowledge. We discuss these results further and account for other factors correlated with the L2 errors.

### References

- Blom, J.N., Rathje, M., Jakobsen, B. le F., Holsting, A., Hansen, K.R., Svendsen, J.T., Vildhøj, T.W., Lindø, A.V. (2017) Linguistic Deviations in the Written Academic Register of Danish University Students. *Oslo Studies in Language* 9 (3). 169-190.
- Thewissen, J. (2015) *Accuracy across Proficiency Levels: A Learner Corpus Approach*. Presses Universitaires de Louvain (UCL): Louvain-La-Neuve, Belgium.

**Keywords:** Danish verbal inflection; second language acquisition; error analysis; homophony.

**Duels of dual monolingualisms:  
discursive erasure and fractal recursivity in Swedish Higher Education**

The research presented in my poster is an investigation of the extent to which discursive processes within and about Swedish Higher Education are rendering multilingual practices and processes invisible. Previous studies in the field of Language Policy and Planning have focused on the ‘internationalisation’ of Higher Education with a pre-occupation for opposing linguistic systems, for example, Swedish and English. However, as I will argue in my poster presentation, such dualistic thinking (re)produces constructed, essentialising and highly ideologized monolingual categories, while simplifying what is understood by the ‘international’ and ‘national’ in modern HE. Such discursive processes will be discussed in relation to interview-based research carried out in a sciences department at a major Swedish university. The analysis of the participants’ language perceptions draw upon the concepts of ‘erasure’ (Irvine & Gal 2000) and ‘orders of visibility’ (Kerfoot & Hyltenstam 2017) to reveal the positioning and ordering of various practices, bodies and repertoires in an increasingly diverse and multilingual modern university department. In the poster presentation, I will demonstrate and explain the potential inherent in taking a multilingual approach when seeking to better understand and make visible the affordances and constraints that relate to and result from the ‘internationalisation’ of contemporary university life.

**Keywords:** Multilingualism, ‘Internationalisation’, Erasure, Orders of Visibility.

**References:**

Irvine, J. T. & Gal, S. (2000) Language Ideology and linguistic differentiation. In P.V. Kroskrity (ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, politics and identities*. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press. Pp. 35-84.

Kerfoot, C. & Hyltenstam, K. (eds.) (2017) *Entangled Discourses. South-North Orders of Visibility*. New York: Routledge.

Nordand 2019

Maria Kautonen

Poster

Abstract

### L2 pronunciation on different levels of oral proficiency

This paper explores Finnish-speaking learners' L2 pronunciation of Finland-Swedish on different levels of oral proficiency, from A1 to C2 in CEFR. Previous research combining pronunciation and oral proficiency level, yet alone pronunciation analysis of free speech, is scarce (e.g. Piske et al. 2001). Thus, the study provides useful knowledge on pronunciation learning paths that can be used in language learning and assessment.

L2 pronunciation in this learner group is studied in two language tests; assessment of learning outcomes in Swedish and National Certificates of Language Proficiency. The speech samples are analyzed with acoustic and auditory methods. Pronunciation on proficiency levels A1 to B1 (n=68) is analyzed by four listeners with phonetic expertise, and pronunciation on levels B2 to C2 (n=12) by Finnish-speaking and Swedish-speaking university students of Swedish (n=18). Moreover, intonation of speakers on levels B1 and B2 (n=8) is analyzed acoustically by comparing the fundamental frequency of speech and intonation contours with L1 speakers of Finland-Swedish (n=5).

Despite the phonetic similarities between Finland-Swedish and Finnish, the results show that the learners face challenges in L2 pronunciation on both segmental and prosodic level. These challenges with e.g. new sounds and sentence prosody are relatively similar on the different levels, but there is clear improvement in intonation and sentence stress towards a more native-like pronunciation as the proficiency level gets higher. These findings support previous research stating that prosody has an important role in oral skills (cf. Kang 2013).

Key words: L2 pronunciation, Finland-Swedish, oral proficiency

References:

Kang, O. 2013. Linguistic analysis of speaking features distinguishing general English exams at CEFR levels. *Research Notes* 52, 40–48.

Piske, T., MacKay, I. & Flege, J. 2001. Factors affecting degree of foreign accent in an L2: A review. *Journal of Phonetics*, 29, 191–215.

Lina Larsson

Göteborgs universitet

### **Flerspråkiga studenters erfarenheter av akademiskt skrivande inom högskolan**

Inom svensk högskola finns idag tydliga mål för arbetet med breddad rekrytering och breddat deltagande (Proposition 2001/02:15:18). Ur ett flerspråkighetsperspektiv blir det då särskilt intressant hur detta breddade deltagande fungerar på universitetet. Upplever flerspråkiga studenter att de kan delta på samma villkor som modersmålstalare inom sin utbildning och bli en del av den diskurs som utbildningen utgör och då främst i fråga om akademiskt skrivande? Vilka erfarenheter har studenterna av skrivande och vilken stöttning skulle de önska sig? Under våren 2018 genomfördes intervjuer med flerspråkiga studenter inom förskolläraryrket på Göteborgs universitet. Intervjuerna analyserades utifrån teorin New Literacy Studies (Gee 2015) med hjälp av begreppen *sekundär diskurs*, *skriftpraktiker* och *academic literacy* och tolkades i relation till forskning om akademiskt skrivande på ett andraspråk. Undersökningens resultat visar att det är en utmaning för de flerspråkiga studenterna att bli en del av den diskurs som universitetet utgör och att detta leder till svårigheter att både förstå skrivuppgifter och skriva akademiskt på andraspråket. I relation till teori och tidigare forskning (Hyland 2011; Hathaway 2015) blir det tydligt att större kunskap hos universitetslärare om de flerspråkiga studenternas utmaningar, med främst det akademiska skrivandet, skulle kunna underlätta deras studier. Om målet för breddat deltagande ska tas på allvar måste strukturer baserade på forskning om hur akademiskt skrivande kan stöttas, på ett andraspråk och generellt, tydligare implementeras inom universitetets utbildningsprogram.

Nyckelord: *flerspråkiga studenter, akademiskt skrivande, sekundär diskurs, academic literacy*

### **Referenslista**

Gee, James Paul 2015. *Social Linguistics and Literacies. Ideology in Discourses*. London: Routledge.

Hathaway, Julia 2015. Developing that voice: locating academic writing tuition in the mainstream of higher education. *Teaching In Higher Education*. 20:5:506-517.

Hyland, Ken 2011. Writing in the university: education, knowledge and reputation. *Cambridge University Press*: 53-70.

Proposition 2001/02:15. *Den öppna högskolan. Regeringens proposition, Utbildningsdepartementet*.

Nordand 14

København 27. – 29. maj 2019

Abstrakt for Poster

Þórhildur Oddsdóttir, adjunkt i dansk ved Islands Universitet

Brynhildur Anna Ragnarsdóttir, fhv. leder af Sprogcenter for Reykjavíks Grundskoler

### **Gennem nøglehullet**

- et punktnedslag i islandske elevers forståelse af dansk.

SPRoK 2018-2021 er et treårigt Nordplus Sprog samarbejds- og forskningsprojekt, hvor der blandt andet fokuseres på ordforråd i læremidler i dansk som andet eller fremmedsprog i Vestnordens grundskoler, svensk i finsksprogede skoler og dansk i andetsprogs miljøer i Danmark.

På posteren bliver der præsenteret resultater af et forberedende projekt - en pilotundersøgelse forelagt elever i udskolingen i Vestnorden og Finland – her vil der dog kun fokuseres på den islandske del af undersøgelsen, med deltagelse af 80 informanter.

Undersøgelsen går ud på elevernes selvevaluering af ordforrådsforståelse i en tekst der svarer til læseforståelse på niveau A2+ - B1 på *Den fælles europæiske referenceramme for sprog*.

Hele teksten er på 295 ord, mens ordformerne er 175, sværhedsgraden er på højde med en letlæst roman eller et populært ugeblad.

Ordforrådets kilde er en sammenhængende tekst om et emne der ligger inden for elevernes eksplicitte erfaringsregime og de domæner af ordforråd deres sproglige kompetencer kan forventes at rumme. Hvor stor del af ordforrådet markerer eleverne som umiddelbart forstået og hvor stor del af ordforrådet markerer de som slet ikke forstået?

I analysen bliver der fokuseret på hvilke typer ord eleverne forstår/forstår ikke, og hvilke ord får ingen markering. De mønstre der (eventuelt) viser sig – eller mangel på sammen - vil blive visualiseret på posteren, samt fortolkning af hvad der muligvis ligger bag disse mønstre.

Hvor ligger ordforrådet på frekvenslisten? Hvad er der der forvolder størst problemer (systemord, indholdsord, ordforbindelser)?

Nøgleord: frekvens, læseforståelse, ordforråd, selvevaluering

Referencer: Anne Sofie Jakobsen, Birgit Henriksen, Averil Coxhead, Lars Stenius Stæhr, Paul Meara, Paul Nation, CEFR.

Ursula Ritzau

[ursula.ritzau@fhnw.ch](mailto:ursula.ritzau@fhnw.ch)

### **First language assessment materials**

This poster gives an overview of first language (L1) assessment materials from six countries (Australia, Denmark, France, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland) and compares these in terms of aim, structure, languages, and task types.

L1 assessment materials are currently being developed and used in a number of countries, most prominently in Scandinavia. The materials generally aim at assessing literacy and aspects of school experience with newly arrived (often refugee) children and adolescents who are to attend school in the new country.

The L1 assessment materials vary according to national curricula in terms of tasks, languages, and materials (booklet, print-out, online). Some materials are comprehensive, state-funded, and mandatory for all schools (e.g. Sweden), whereas others are restricted in terms of the number of languages (e.g. Australia) or tasks (e.g. France). In some countries, different materials have been produced by different organisations (Norway) or at different points in time (Switzerland).

Until now, no thorough comparison of L1 assessment materials has been published, although there are close ties between some of the materials in terms of structure and individual tasks. Some of the Swedish tasks are also used in the Danish and new Swiss materials, and some Norwegian tasks are used in the new Swiss materials, whereas the Australian, French, and older Swiss sets are unrelated to materials developed elsewhere.

This overview of L1 assessment materials in six countries remedies an empirical gap and opens up for further exchange of practices and research related to the development, implementation, and evaluation of such materials.

**Key words:** First language assessment, newly arrived, school children.

### **References** (materials in alphabetical order by country):

- Australia: FUSE. *First Language Assessment Materials*.  
<http://fuse.education.vic.gov.au/Resource/ByPin?Pin=LM7MBL&SearchScope=All>
- Denmark: Undervisningsministeriet. *Hele vejen rundt om elevens sprog og ressourcer*.  
<https://www.emu.dk/sites/default/files/Helevejenrundsamletmateriale.pdf>
- France: Rafoni, J. C. & Deruguine, N. (2003). *Passerelles en quinze langues. Evaluation-lecture en langue d'origine, cycles 2 et 3*. Paris: SCÉRÉN/CNDP.
- Norway: Nasjonalt senter for flerkulturell opplæring (NAFO). *Kartleggingsmaterieill*.  
<http://nafo.oslomet.no/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/NAFO-kartleggingsmaterieill-nyankomne-minoritetsspr%c3%a5klige-ungdommer.pdf>
- Sweden: Skolverket. *Kartläggning av nyanlända elevers kunskaper*.  
<https://bp.skolverket.se/web/kartlaggningsmaterial/start>
- Switzerland: ESKE. Ermittlung schulsprachlicher Kompetenzen in der Erstsprache  
[www.erstsprachkompetenz.ch](http://www.erstsprachkompetenz.ch)



Katrine Falcon Søby & Line Burholt Kristensen  
Københavns Universitet

Do Germans have an advantage in the L2 Danish classroom? The role of L1 in grammar anomaly production

How much influence does your mother tongue have on languages you acquire later in life? Is there a shared grammar between L1 and L2s? The role of crosslinguistic influence is highly debated, especially when it comes to grammar.

Previously, certain areas of language were believed to be impervious to crosslinguistic influence – e.g. morphology and syntax (Jarvis 2017). Several studies of primarily English as a second language have questioned these claims (Jarvis 2017; Thewissen 2015). In L2 Danish, the role of crosslinguistic influence has not been studied extensively. Danish is, however, an interesting case because of some special grammatical features: e.g. V2 word order, gender and adjective inflection for both attributive and predicative adjectives.

Some of these features occur in German, but not in English. Therefore, we examine the error profiles of two groups of adult L2 Danish learners in a corpus study: 28 L1 English learners and 13 L1 German learners at beginners' level. The corpus consists of written essays from a Danish language school with 7918 words.

We report the types and frequencies of grammar anomalies in the two groups and discuss differences between them. Besides highlighting the role of crosslinguistic influence, this study has consequences for language teaching practices: We account for aspects of Danish grammar that are difficult for both groups and discuss how grammar teaching can be targeted to students with different L1 backgrounds.

#### References

- Jarvis, Scott (2017). Transfer: An Overview with an Expanded Scope. In Golden, Anne; Scott Jarvis & Kari Tenfjord (eds.), *Crosslinguistic Influence and Distinctive Patterns of Language Learning. Findings and Insights from a Learner Corpus*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Thewissen, Jennifer (2015). *Accuracy across Proficiency Levels: A Learner Corpus Approach*. UCL: Louvain-La-Neuve, Belgium.

#### Keywords

Second language acquisition, grammar, error analysis, L2 Danish

Anne-Maj Åberg  
Outi Toropainen  
Sinikka Lahtinen

## Används explicita grammatikregler under skrivprocessen?

I denna fallstudie undersöker vi bruket av explicita grammatikregler i skrivprocessen hos svenskinlärare och finskinlärare i Finland. Forskare har länge debatterat vilken roll explicit och implicit kunskap samt explicit undervisning i grammatik har i språkinläring. Olika åsikter finns om explicit kunskap om regler är till nytta och när dessa regler används i produktionen av andraspråket (Ellis, R. 2015b). Vi är intresserade av om inlärare använder explicita grammatikregler när de skriver och om det finns skillnader mellan målspråken svenska och finska.

I vår fallstudie deltog åtta inlärare av svenska och åtta inlärare av finska på språkcenterkurser vid universitetet. De skrev en text med hjälp av tangentbordsloggningsprogrammet ScriptLog som sparar bl.a. data om pausernas längd och korrigeringar som görs (t.ex. Strömqvist & al. 2006). En retrospektiv intervju om skrivprocessen och det eventuella bruket av explicita grammatikregler utfördes. Texterna, processdata från ScriptLog och intervjuerna analyserades mest kvalitativt.

Våra preliminära resultat visar att det finns skillnader mellan olika inlärare om och i vilken omfattning explicita regler används i skrivprocessen. Några informanter nämner olika regler i intervjun. Andra konstaterar däremot att de inte förlitar sig på några regler utan försöker känna efter om formuleringen låter bra eller rätt (*rule vs feel*, Ellis, R. 2015a).

Ellis, R. 2015a. Form-focused instruction and the measurement of implicit and explicit L2 knowledge. I: Rebuschat, P. (red.) *Implicit and Explicit Learning of Languages*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam. s. 417–441. (EBSCOhost), Hämtad den 13 juni 2017.

Ellis, R. 2015b. *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
Strömqvist, S., Holmqvist, K., Johansson, V., Karlsson, H. & Wengelin, Å. 2006. What keystroke-logging can reveal about writing, *Computer key-stroke logging and writing: methods and applications. Studies in Writing* 18, s. 45–72.

Nyckelord: explicit kunskap, skrivprocess, språkinläring