



LUNAS 2016

L1 and L2 Academic Language Use and
Literacies in Nordic Academic Settings

Book of Abstracts



UNIVERSITY OF
COPENHAGEN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART 1. PAPER PRESENTATIONS

The need for research on academic vocabulary in the Danish context.....	3
<i>Anne Sofie Jakobsen & Birgit Henriksen, University of Copenhagen</i>	
Multiple profiles of timed and untimed writing samples in L2 academic English.....	5
<i>Gabriel Jay Rauhoff, University of Turku</i>	
A Norwegian Bokmål academic vocabulary list.....	6
<i>Ruth Vatvedt Fjeld, Kristin Hagen, Janne Bondi Johannessen & Arash Saidi, University of Oslo</i>	
Collaborative student writing and language ideology.....	9
<i>Janus Mortensen, University of Copenhagen</i>	
Towards a Nordic academic vocabulary list.....	10
<i>Sofie Johansson, University of Göteborg; Kristin Hagen and Janne Bondi Johannessen, University of Oslo</i>	
Regulating English language writing at university – institutional mechanisms and practices.....	12
<i>Anna Solin, University of Helsinki</i>	
Academic vocabulary in low and high stakes essays by CLIL and non-CLIL students at upper secondary level.....	13
<i>Liss Kerstin Sylvén, Eva Olsson, University of Gothenburg</i>	
The necessity of being multilingual: Finland-based scholars reading and writing for research purposes.....	14
<i>Niina Hynninen, University of Helsinki</i>	
Receptive and productive academic language in use: Academic vocabulary as a case study.....	15
<i>Diane Pecorari, Linneus University and Hans Malmstrøm, Chalmers University of Technology</i>	
Coping with English literacy in higher education in Iceland.....	16
<i>Birna Arnbjörnsdóttir and Hafdís Ingvarsdóttir, University of Iceland</i>	
Calling for translation literacy: The use of covert translation in student academic writing in higher education.....	18
<i>Ida Klitgård, Roskilde University</i>	
(Almost) becoming an academic: About the embedded nature of Academic Literacy/ies.....	19
<i>Vibeke Ankersborg and Karl-Heinz Pogner, Copenhagen Business School</i>	
Translanguaging in an English-medium tertiary environment.....	20
<i>Philip Shaw, Stockholm University, Charlotte Hommerberg and Diane Pecorari, Linnaeus University</i>	
Linguistic complexity in academic writing: from dynamic to synoptic?.....	21

Päivi Pietilä, University of Turku

Academic language use in Finnish and English: a contrastive study.....23

Nicole Keng and Heli Katajamäki, University of Vaasa

Academic writing proficiency of Danish university students.....24

Jonas Nygaard Blom, Heidi Jønch-Clausen, Marianne Rathje, Jesper Tinggaard Svendsen, Anna Vibeke Lindø, Bjarne le Fevre Jakobsen, Alexandra Holsting, Thit Wedel Vildhøj, University of Southern Denmark; Kenneth Reinecke Hansen, Metropolitan University College

Phraseology in Scandinavian academic language – a comparative corpus study...25

Ruth Vatvedt Fjeld and Arash Saidi, University of Oslo; Sussi Olsen, University of Copenhagen; Julia Prentice, University of Gothenburg

Engaging with terminology in the parallel-language classroom: teachers' practices for bridging the gap between L1 and English.....27

Hans Malmstrøm, Chalmers University of Technology; Spela Meek and Philip Shaw, Stockholm University; Diane Pecorari, Linnaeus University; Aileen Irvine, The University of Edinburgh

Heritage language students in Danish higher education.....28

Anne Holmen, Centre for Internationalisation and Parallel Language Use, University of Copenhagen

English as an academic language at two Danish BA programmes: Student practices for displaying academic competence.....29

Elisabeth Dalby Kristiansen, Center for Social Practices and Cognition, University of Southern Denmark

English for academic research in a multilingual Swedish university: discipline, identity and engagement.....31

Kathrin Kaufhold, Stockholm University

PART 2. POSTER PRESENTATIONS

The peripheral scientist: struggling with identity, authenticity, and voice in ERPP..33

Birna Arnbjörnsdóttir and Hafdís Ingvarsdóttir, University of Iceland

Attitudes towards English medium instruction at four Nordic universities.....34

Trude Bukve, University of Bergen

Language policy for language use? A study of academic language use at different faculties at University of Copenhagen.....35

Camilla Falk Rønne Nissen, University of Copenhagen

Investigating academic vocabulary in Danish academic writing.....36

Anne Sofie Jakobsen, University of Copenhagen

Student academic writing in Norwegian and English: a fledgling corpus project...37

Marte Monsen and Sylvi Rørvik, Hedmark University of Applied Sciences

Language regulation in academia – the shifting norms of English use.....39

Anna Solin, Niina Hynninen and Hanna-Mari Pienimäki, University of Helsinki

PART 1. PAPER PRESENTATIONS

The need for research on academic vocabulary in the Danish context

Anne Sofie Jakobsen & Birgit Henriksen, University of Copenhagen

Academic vocabulary, an essential part of academic language use, is the words and phrases used more frequently in academic language than in non-academic language. Moreover, academic vocabulary is, as we understand it, a general vocabulary in that it is used across disciplines.

In this paper, we argue that the vocabulary aspect of Danish academic language use has been downplayed in the research and guidance literature on academic language use in the Danish context. We base our argument on an analysis of different guidance literature aimed primarily at students on how to write a good academic paper, and on a review of the existing research on Danish academic language use with a particular focus on writing. We also include research on university didactics and pedagogy in which academic language is not the primary object of investigation, but where it appears as an important factor. Finally, evaluation reports of different kinds are also taken into consideration in our analyses. The analyses will inform our discussion of why we need to focus more on vocabulary in Danish academic language use.

Even though English is used to a very high degree in Danish academia, Danish still functions as an academic language in various scientific disciplines both for teaching and for research. Moreover, Danish is the primary language of instruction in secondary education. A line of studies on academic Danish language use in higher education have focussed on students with Danish as their second or foreign language and their experiences with using Danish as an academic language (e.g. Rektorkollegiet, 2001; Lund & Bertelsen, 2008; Hauksdóttir, 2012; Laursen, 2013; Odgaard, 2014; Møller, 2014). By contrast, only a few studies on Danish academic language use focus on the general student population (e.g. Skov, 2006; Kristiansen, 2010; Skov, 2013), and these are often more focussed on university didactics than academic language use per se (e.g. Knudsen, 2009). A number of evaluation reports also thematise language and academic writing in their evaluations of different study programmes.

Common for all these investigations is that academic writing is the main concern, if not the only concern. Yet, the majority of Danish studies on academic writing actually focus on writing didactics in primary and secondary education and not in tertiary education. As has been pointed out by Lillis & Turner (2001) and, in a Danish context, Knudsen (2009), it does not help that the universities largely fail to explicate the linguistic demands of the academic genres to students. The role of vocabulary in Danish academic language use has rarely been investigated even though lack of a proper vocabulary may constitute a significant barrier for understanding and being able to communicate academic content.

Research shows that lecturers often fail to explicate the criteria of academic writing because they assume the students know what different academic words such as *discuss*, *analyse*, and *describe* signify in relation to communicating the disciplinary content (Laursen, 2013). Danish students are not left completely helpless, though. Some institutions have academic language centres where students can receive guidance, and some study programmes even have an integrated element focusing on academic language in their courses. A majority of students are nevertheless left to general advice

from guidance books on how to write academically, with no or little explicit guidance from their lecturers and their study programmes. We have analysed three examples of guidance literature on academic writing in higher education for this paper. Our analysis centres on how academic language is described and explained, and what significance the authors ascribe language in their advice to the students.

References:

Hauksdóttir, A. (2012): *Dansk som fremmedsprog i en akademisk kontekst. Om islændinges behov for danskundskaber under videreuddannelse i Danmark*. Københavnerstudier i tosprogethed, Vol. 68. København, Københavns Universitets Humanistiske Fakultet.

Knudsen, S. (2009): Har du et problem? En undersøgelse af universitetsstuderendes forståelse, anvendelse og kommunikation af problemorienterede vidensproblemer. *Dansk Universitetspædagogisk Tidsskrift* nr. 7, 49-57.

Kristiansen, B. (2010): Tekstproduktion og vidensproduktion. *Dansk Universitetspædagogisk Tidsskrift* nr. 9, 50-54.

Laursen, K. Å. (2013): *"Det er sprogligt - selv hvor du ikke lægger mærke til det": En empirisk undersøgelse af sproglige og faglige vanskeligheder hos farmaceutstuderende med dansk som andetsprog på Københavns Universitet*. Københavnerstudier i tosprogethed, Studier i Parallelsproglighed, Vol. C4. København, Københavns Universitets Humanistiske Fakultet.

Lund, K. & E. Bertelsen (2008): *Fra Studieprøven til de videregående uddannelser. En undersøgelse af de nødvendige og tilstrækkelige kompetencer*. København: Ministeriet for Flygtninge, Indvandrere og Integration.

Møller, P.H. (2014): *Sproglige og studiemæssige udfordringer hos studerende med dansk som andetsprog – pilotprojekt*. Aarhus, Rådgivnings- og støttenheden, Læse- og skrivevejlederteamet, CUDiM, Aarhus Universitet.

Nagy, W. & D. Townsend (2012): "Word as Tools: Learning Academic Vocabulary as Language Acquisition." *Reading Research Quarterly*, 47 (1), 91-108.

Odgaard, S.M. (2014): *"Det er ikke et sprog, man bare kan samle op på gaden": En undersøgelse af behovet for kurser i akademisk dansk for studerende med dansk som andetsprog på Institut for Tværkulturelle og Regionale Studier på Københavns Universitet*. Københavnerstudier i tosprogethed, Studier i Parallelsproglighed, Vol. C6. København, Københavns Universitets Humanistiske Fakultet.

Rektorkollegiet (2001): *Integration af fremmedsprogede studerende på de lange videregående uddannelser*. København, Rektorkollegiet.

Skov, S. (2006): Hvordan bedømmer man det sproglige i universitetsopgaver? *Dansk Universitetspædagogisk Tidsskrift* nr. 1, 18-25.

Skov, S. (2013): Progression i de studerendes skrivekompetencer. SPOR. Et tidsskrift for universitetspædagogik. 1-8.

Multiple profiles of timed and untimed writing samples in L2 Academic English

Gabriel Jay Rauhoff, University of Turku

This project investigated the relationships between lexis and syntax using cluster analysis with L2 English writing samples produced by L1 Finnish students. The goal of the project was to discover if multiple profiles of timed highly rated student texts emerge from those analyses and how they compare against texts which were written in untimed conditions. As such, the research project was guided by two questions:

- (1) Would conditions of time (versus untimed) texts yield different clusters, thus resulting in different writing profiles?
- (2) What specific comparisons of features found in texts written under different timing conditions are comparable to previous research, which used highly rated timed texts?

Current research supports the idea that the lexis is independent from other linguistic fields in terms of L2 development, especially in the case of English. Jarvis, Grant, Bikowski, and Ferris (2003) have conducted research on linguistic features of highly rated student produced texts using cluster analysis. Not satisfied with the results of the initial study because of less controlled conditions and no analysis on native speakers' writings, Friginal, Li, and Weigle (2014) conducted research using a modified version of Jarvis et al.'s model. These researchers agree that multiple profiles of academic writing emerged from co-occurrences of specific linguistic features identified using cluster analysis.

Both research teams called for some analysis between timed and untimed student-written compositions, as the data sets from their studies feature largely timed essays or tests similar to the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) iBT Independent Writing Task. Students in timed conditions are not privileged to all the components process-based writing entails. Instead, students under timed conditions, such as when a student undertakes the TOEFL, are expected to use a more product-oriented approach to writing. On the other hand, students writing with more lenient timed conditions (e.g. can take the task home) have more flexibility with individual components in the writing process, such as relaxed use of the working memory, external resources, and less cognitive load (Chenoweth and Hayes, 2001; Pappamihiel et al., 2008).

In Jarvis et al. (2003)'s study, texts were found to have specialized variables, such as certain lexical, linguistic, and discourse features that co-occur with one another. In their study, the researchers aimed to discover if multiple profiles of student writing emerged in composition, the researchers used agglomerative hierarchical cluster analysis to determine which profiles contain clusters of linguistic features. By using corpus analysis of two data sets, the researchers discovered that multiple profiles, or clusters of the features mentioned, did in fact emerge with stark differences. Friginal, Li and Weigle (2014) performed similar studies with agreeable results.

The present study was built upon the model developed by Jarvis et al. and Friginal, Li and Weigle (2014). However, instead of just observing the co-occurrences of lexical items with timed highly rated texts, the researcher of the present study compares timed and untimed texts of all scores found within the International Corpus of Learner English's Finnish subcorpus in order to determine if patterns of lexical features co-occur with particular syntactic forms using a deductive approach. By doing so, a better description of writing in

EFL contexts has been developed. The results of this study shed light not only on L2 English composition pedagogy, but could be used to further develop assessment of L2 English texts as well.

References:

Chenoweth, N. A., & Hayes, J. R. (2001). Fluency in Writing. *Written Communication*, 18(1), 80.

Pappamihiel, N., Nishimata, T., & Mihai, F. (2008). Timed Writing and Adult English-Language Learners: An Investigation of First Language Use in Invention Strategies. *Journal Of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 51(5), 386-394. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1598/jaal.51.5.2>

Friginal, E., Li, M., & Weigle, S. C. (2014). Revisiting multiple profiles of learner compositions: A comparison of highly rated NS and NNS essays. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 23, 231-16.

Jarvis, S., Grant, L., Bikowski, D., & Ferris, D. (2003). Exploring multiple profiles of highly rated learner compositions. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12.4, 377.

A Norwegian Bokmål academic vocabulary list

Ruth Vatvedt Fjeld, Kristin Hagen, Janne Bondi Johannessen & Arash Saidi, University of Oslo

In this paper we present our work on creating a Norwegian Academic Vocabulary list for the Norwegian Bokmål variety, a list useful for second language students and native students meeting with academic language for the first time.

A 100-million-word corpus – The Norwegian Academic Bokmål DUO Corpus - was developed as a basis for this work. The corpus contains master's theses, doctoral dissertations, and journal publications from the Oslo University Library archive of digital publications. The documents are from eight faculties and hence cover a wide range of academic text types.

We have experimented with two different methods for constructing a Norwegian Academic Vocabulary list.

- 1) The Gothenburg method described in Carlund et al. (2012)
- 2) The method described in Gardner & Davies (G&D 2013)

Both methods have ways of excluding subject-specific terminology and general high frequency words. Below we briefly summarize the two methods:

The Gothenburg method (GM) uses three steps: *keywordness* and *reduced frequency & range* to remove the subject-specific words and a *stop list* to remove high frequency words.

The G&D method has four steps. The steps excluding subject-specific words are named *range*, *dispersion* and *discipline measure*. To eliminate general high-frequency words a minimum word-selection ratio is used on a reference corpus instead of a stop list.

For each step in the methods above, we have experimented with different input values that gave us different resulting lists. For measuring coverage for the resulting lists, we used two test corpora: a small academic corpus named KIAP (73 000 words) and the fiction part of the LBK corpus (36.5 million words of modern Norwegian fiction).

For the Gothenburg method our experiments showed that the final result is highly dependent upon the stop list – both regarding size and origin. For the G&D method the word selection ratio appeared to be the most crucial. G&D used a ratio of 1.5 for English, while we had to raise it to at least 2.2 for Norwegian.

All our experiments showed that a high coverage in KIAP was followed by a relatively high coverage in LBK-fiction. A manual evaluation of the lists revealed that lists with coverage above about 1.5 in LBK-fiction contained many words that seemed more common than academic. For our purpose we did not want to include too many common words.

Table 1 shows some results:

	Random list	GM-1000	GM-2000	G&D-2.6_0.3_0.6_3.2	G&D- 2.2_0.4_0.6_3.0
KIAP	46.06	7.37	4.89	6.74	8.55
LBK-fiction	67.99	2.07	0.97	1.11	1.89
Difference	-21.93	5.30	3.92	5.63	6.66

Table 1: The first column shows the coverage for a randomly chosen list of words.

Coverage is counted as the percentage of the number of lemmas in the corpus that occur in the list. GM-1000 and GM-2000 are the Gothenburg method applied with stop lists of 1000 and 2000 words extracted from a 700 million word web corpus, NoWaC. G&D-2.6_0.3_0.6_3.2 and G&D- 2.2_0.4_0.6_3.0 show the G&D method with different input values (respectively: ratio, range, dispersion, discipline) with NoWaC as a reference corpus. All lists have 750 words.

As table 1 shows, the G&D lists have the best coverage difference. We therefore decided to use the G&D method for our final academic wordlist. To choose between the different G&D lists was difficult. Even if we had four different input values to play with, it was hard to find the perfect combination of values. All lists seemed to have some unwanted common or subject-specific words. We ended up manually merging the two lists in table 1. The final list has coverage 8.1 in KIAP and 1.3 in LBK-fiction.

Our final list is presented on a web site together with definitions and examples.

References:

Carlund, Carina, Jansson, Håkan, Johansson Kokkinakis, Sofie, Prentice, Julia & Judy Ribeck (2012). An academic word list for Swedish - a support for language learners in higher education In: *Proceedings of the SLTC 2012 workshop on NLP for CALL*, Lund, 25th October, 2012.

Coxhead, A. (2000): A new academic word list. I: *TESOL Quarterly*, 34:2, 213–238.

Coxhead, A. (2011): The academic word list 10 years on: Research and teaching implications. *TESOL Quarterly*, 45:2, 355–362.

Gardner, D. & M. Davies (2013): A New Academic Vocabulary List. In: *Applied Linguistics* 4.

Granger, Sylviane, and Magali Paquot. (2010) In search of a General Academic vocabulary: A corpus-driven study. In *Linguistics (VESPA-LING)* 58: 519-109.

Dan Gusfield. 1997. *Algorithms on Strings, Trees and Sequences*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Hanks, Patrick et al. (1998): *The New Oxford English Dictionary of English*. Oxford.

Hyland, K. & P. Tse (2007): Is there an "academic vocabulary"? In: *TESOL Quarterly*, 41:2, 235–253.

Jansson, H., S. Johansson Kokkinakis, J. Ribeck & E. Sköldberg (2012): A Swedish academic word list: methods and data. In: Fjeld, R. V. & J. M. Torjusen (eds.): *Proceedings of 15th EURALEX International Congress*. Oslo: University of Oslo, 955–960.

Martin, A. (1976). Teaching Academic Vocabulary to Foreign Graduate Students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 10(1): 91-97

Nation, Ian SP. (2001) *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Ernst Klett Sprachen.

Ribeck, Judy, Håkan Jansson & Emma Sköldberg (2014): Från aspekt till övergripande – en ordlista över svensk akademisk vokabulär. In: Fjeld, Ruth og Marit Hovdenak (red.): *Nordiske studier i leksikografi 12. Rapport fra Konferanse om leksikografi i Norden Oslo 13.-16- august 2013*, 370-384.

Web sites:

BNC (British National Corpus): <http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk>

COCA (The Corpus of Contemporary American English): <http://corpus.byu.edu/coca/>

DUO University of Oslo digital publications archive: <https://www.duo.uio.no>

KIAP Corpus: <http://kiap.uib.no/KIAPCorpus.htm>

LBK Corpus: <http://www.hf.uio.no/iln/tjenester/kunnskap/samlinger/bokmal/veiledningkorpus/>

LäSBarT Corpus: <http://spraakbanken.gu.se/eng/resource/lasbart>

Academic wordlist – Bokmål: <http://www.tekstlab.uio.no:4000/>

NoWac Norwegian Web as a Corpus: <http://www.hf.uio.no/iln/om/organisasjon/tekstlab/prosjekter/nowac/>

En svensk akademisk ordliste: <http://spraakbanken.gu.se/ao/index.html>

Collaborative student writing and language ideology

Janus Mortensen, University of Copenhagen

In the last decade, there has been an increase in research devoted to the cultural, linguistic and educational consequences of university internationalization in Europe (e.g. Haberland and Mortensen 2012, Preisler et al. 2011), particularly in relation to the introduction of English as a medium of instruction (EMI) (e.g. Dimova et al. 2015, Doiz et al. 2012). However, one aspect that to some extent remains underexplored is how the introduction of EMI relates to what might be called the sociolinguistics of academic writing (cf. Lillis 2013, Lillis and Curry 2010), particularly from a student perspective.

The present paper addresses this gap by providing a micro-analytical perspective, using methods from Interactional Sociolinguistics, on the process of collaborative writing in English among university students. Based on video recordings of BA student project groups from an international study programme at a Danish university, the paper presents an analysis of a collection of cases where co-production of written language is in evidence.

The analysis particularly explores the extent to which language policing (Blommaert et al. 2009) or language regulation (Hynninen 2013) takes place in the groups as part of their joint writing activities, and discusses the language ideological principles these practices seem to be based on. The paper concludes by linking the analysis and discussion to wider debates at the language ideology/ policy interface in the context of Nordic university internationalization (cf. Mortensen 2014, Mortensen and Fabricius 2014, Salö 2015, Hult and Källkvist forthcoming).

References:

Blommaert, Jan, Helen Kelly-Holmes, Pia Lane, Sirpa Leppänen, Máiréad Moriarty, Sari Pietikäinen, Arja Piirainen-Marsh. 2009. Media, multilingualism and language policing: An introduction. *Language Policy* 8, 3: 203–207.

Dimova, Slobodanka, Anna Kristina Hultgren and Christian Jensen (eds.). 2015. *English-Medium Instruction in European Higher Education*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Doiz, Aintzane, David Lasagabaster & Juan Manuel Sierra (eds.). 2012. *English-Medium Instruction at Universities: Global Challenges*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Haberland, Hartmut and Janus Mortensen (eds.). 2012. Language and the International University. Special issue of *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 216.

Hult, Francis M. and Marie Källkvist. 2015. Global Flows in Local Language Planning: Articulating Parallel Language Use in Swedish University Policies. *Current Issues in Language Planning*. Online ahead of print.

Hynninen, Niina. 2013. *Language Regulation in English as a lingua franca: Exploring Language-regulatory Practices in Academic Spoken Discourse*. PhD dissertation, Department of Modern Languages. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.

Lillis, Theresa. 2013. *The Sociolinguistics of Writing*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Lillis, Theresa and Mary Jane Curry. 2010. *Academic Writing in a Global Context: The politics and practices of publishing in English*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Mortensen, Janus. 2014. Language policy from below: Language choice in student project groups in a multilingual university setting. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 35, 4: 425–42.

Mortensen, Janus and Anne Fabricius. 2014. Language ideologies in Danish higher education: Exploring student perspectives. In Anna Kristina Hultgren, Frans Gregersen and Jacob Thøgersen (eds.) *English in Nordic Universities: Ideologies and Practices*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 193–223.

Preisler, Bent, Ida Klitgård and Anne H. Fabricius (eds.). 2011. *language and Learning in the International University: From English Uniformity to Diversity and Hybridity*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Salö, Linus. 2015. The linguistic sense of placement: Habitus and the entextualization of translangual practices in Swedish Academia. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 19, 4: 511–34.

Towards a Nordic academic vocabulary list

Sofie Johansson, University of Göteborg; Kristin Hagen and Janne Bondi Johannessen, University of Oslo

To support vocabulary acquisition of foreign and second language learners in higher education in three North European countries, partners at three academic institutions set out to create a joint Nordic Academic Vocabulary List. The partners were the University of Copenhagen, University of Gothenburg and the University of Oslo. A collaborating network, named LUNAS (Language Use in Nordic Academic Settings), was formed with support from Nordplus Horizontal.

Previous work in other languages with academic vocabulary lists has been a source of inspiration, Xue and Nation (1984), Coxhead (2000), Granger and Paquot (2010), Gardner & Davies (2013).

In parallel with the joint Nordic word list (Johansson Kokkinakis et al., 2012), two of the three native word lists were compiled, one for Swedish and one for Norwegian. Both are compiled with automatic methods (Jansson et al., 2012).

This paper describes linking the two academic word lists, consisting of 750 and 572 words (lemmas) each. Information regarding part of speech, sense, English translation and language samples are included. The final Nordic word list will include all list items in the Norwegian and the Swedish word list since they are compiled from corpora of various content in several academic disciplines.

In linking the two lists, identical items will be identified, missing entries as well as the computing of frequencies and rank. Unwanted list items such as less common every day words, “picture” ought to be excluded, however some of them have a specific sense in an academic context.

Table 1 displays the top 10 list entries in each language. There are several homonymous list items displaying homography or polysemy as well as items lacking target list translation.

Top 10 Norwegian Academic list		English	Top 10 Swedish Academic list		English
1. mellom			1. dock	29. imidlertid	however
2. forhold	30. förhållande	relationship	2. studie		
3. informant			3. beskriva	8. beskrive	describe
4. ulik			4. social	9. sosial	social
5. oppgave			5. enligt		
6. grad	83. grad	degree	6. innebära	65. innebære	mean
7. blant			7. samt		
8. beskrive	4. beskriva	describe	8. form	10. form	form
9. sosial	5. social	social	9. betydelse	24. betydning	meaning
10. form	8. form	form	10. fall	394. case	case

Table 1. The top 10 list entries in the Norwegian and Swedish Academic word list.

The lists are intended to be used both for electronic purposes as a lexical resource for analysis and for educational purposes.

The Norwegian Academic Vocabulary list: *NAV Bokmål* <http://www.tekstlab.uio.no:4000/>

The Swedish Academic Word list: <http://spraakbanken.gu.se/ao/>

References:

Coxhead, A. 2000. 'A New Academic Word List.' *TESOL Quarterly* 34:2, 2000: 213–238.
Gardner, D. and M. Davies, 2013, A New Academic Vocabulary List, *Applied Linguistics* (2014) 35 (3): 305-327.

Granger, S. and M. Paquot 2010. 'The Louvain EAP Dictionary (LEAD).' In: A. Dykstra and T. Schoonheim (eds.), *Proceedings of the XIV Euralex International Congress, Leeuwarden 6–10 July 2010*. Ljouwert: Fryske Akademy / Afuk, 321–326.

Jansson, H., S. Johansson Kokkinakis, J. Ribbeck & E. Sköldberg (2012). A Swedish Academic Word List: Methods and Data. *Proceedings of the 15th EURALEX International Congress*, 955-960.

Johansson Kokkinakis, Sofie, Emma Sköldberg, Birgit Henriksen, Kari Kinn & Janne Bondi Johannessen (2012), Developing Academic Word Lists for Swedish, Norwegian and Danish - a joint research project. *Proceedings of the 15th EURALEX International Congress*, 563-569.

Sköldberg E., Johansson Kokkinakis S. (2012). 'A och O om akademiska ord. Om framtagning av en svensk akademisk ordlista.' In: *Nordiska studier i lexikografi* 12. Lund: Nordiska föreningen för lexikografi.

Xue, G. and I. S. P. Nation 1984. 'A University Word List.' *Language Learning and Communication* 3, 2: 215–229.

Regulating English language writing at university – institutional mechanisms and practices

Anna Solin, University of Helsinki

English occupies a central place as a language of written communication in Nordic academia. This is not only true of research writing, but also other types of writing, including public relations writing (e.g. websites) and administrative writing (e.g. policy documents and evaluation reports). It is thus important to ask what kinds of Englishes are ratified as acceptable in academia and how L2 English writing is managed and regulated.

This paper looks at practices of regulating English language writing at a large multidisciplinary university in Finland. The data is derived from the project “Language regulation in academia”, ongoing at the University of Helsinki. The project focuses on the dynamic between mechanisms of institutional regulation of English (e.g. the university language policy and the provision of language revision services) and the way individual writers in different contexts experience such regulation. Importantly, the regulation of English use not only concerns language choice (where and when English may and should be used) but also the quality of the English used.

The paper aims to map relatively regularised practices of managing English-language writing in a variety of contexts, with a focus on top-down mechanisms of regulation. Thus, it is interested in centripetal forces which act as a standardising influence. The main types of data are policy documents with a language regulatory intent (e.g. regulations regarding mandatory language revision, language competence requirements) and interviews with administrative staff.

In its analysis, the paper aligns with both discourse studies and sociolinguistics, and particularly the sociolinguistics of writing (see e.g. Lillis & McKinney 2013, Blommaert 2013). This implies an interest in writing as a social practice which involves a variety of participants and sites and complex cycles of production. Writing is also analysed as an object of normative struggle, a practice where competing valuations and ideologies are negotiated.

Interview data have been sought from several levels of university administration, ranging from central administration to faculties and departments. We can assume that a university’s official language policy document is not the only type of regulation relevant to university writing, but that there are a variety of situated practices (e.g. related to particular disciplines) which also need exploring. For example, our data indicate that faculties differ in whether they require doctoral theses to undergo language revision before examination.

The research questions explored in the paper are as follows:

- What kinds of mechanisms of top-down regulation of English-language writing can be identified on different levels of university administration?

- Is there variation across different contexts in what genres are perceived as in need of regulatory intervention (e.g. dissertation, journal article, website)?
- Who are ratified as legitimate language authorities / language brokers for different genres and contexts? (on language brokering, see e.g. Lillis & Curry 2010)

References:

Blommaert, J. (2012). Writing as a sociolinguistic object. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 17(4).

Lillis, T. & Curry, M. (2010) *Academic Writing in a Global Context*. Routledge.

Lillis, T. & McKinney, C. (2013) The sociolinguistics of writing in a global context: Objects, lenses, consequences. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 17(4).

Academic vocabulary in low and high stakes essays by CLIL and non-CLIL students at upper secondary level

Liss Kerstin Sylvén, Eva Olsson, University of Gothenburg

In this presentation, focus is on the use of academic vocabulary among CLIL and non-CLIL students at upper secondary level in Sweden. Research informs us that CLIL, in many cases, is beneficial for the development of the second or foreign language (L2) being used as the medium of instruction (most commonly English) in non-language subjects (e.g., Dalton-Puffer, Nikula, & Smit, 2010; Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010). However, gains are above all found in reading and listening, i.e. so-called receptive skills, and not so much in speaking and writing, the productive skills, which is in line with earlier findings in immersion contexts (Swain & Lapkin, 1982). Moreover, it seems as though the potential inherent in CLIL is not fully utilized as regards academic, school-related language skills (e.g., Dalton-Puffer, 2011; Meyer, Coyle, Halbach, Schuck, & Ting, 2015).

CLIL and non-CLIL education was investigated from a number of perspectives during the large-scale research project Content and Language Integration in Swedish Schools, CLISS (for more information, see Sylvén & Ohlander, 2015). During their three years at upper secondary level, CLIL and non-CLIL students (N = 249) at three different schools were followed. All students were enrolled in theoretical strands, aiming for higher education where demands on academic language are high. Therefore, one of the aspects investigated was the use of academic vocabulary in students' English writing. In order to capture this, students were asked to write a total of four essays during the three-year research period, in addition to their regular school work. These essays have been analyzed using the Academic Word List (Coxhead, 2000) and the Academic Vocabulary List (Gardner & Davies, 2014), and the results show that CLIL students use more academic words in all four essays, i.e., their proficiency in academic language was higher already at the start of CLIL (Olsson, 2016). As these essays were primarily written for the sake of the research project, it is of great interest to investigate whether or not results are similar when analyzing essays written for high stakes tests. Therefore, CLIL and non-CLIL student texts (N = 55), from one of the schools, written for the national test in English are analyzed with the same methods as used for the texts written for the research project.

These students' high stakes essays will be compared with their low stakes texts written at approximately the same time, thereby allowing close and relevant comparisons.

A larger amount of academic words does not necessarily entail better quality essays. Therefore, the texts have been holistically evaluated in order to investigate the extent to which the use of academic vocabulary influences the overall quality of a text. Furthermore, the scores awarded the high stakes tests are used as a factor with which correlation analyses with the number of academic words in the texts are calculated.

The primary aim of the presentation is thus to shed light on the use of academic vocabulary among upper secondary students in CLIL and non-CLIL contexts. A second aim is to delve into possible differences in the use of academic vocabulary in texts depending on whether they are written for low or high stakes purposes. A third aim is to investigate the possible impact of using academic vocabulary has on the overall quality of texts. All results are presented from first, the dichotomy of CLIL vs non-CLIL students, highlighting possible differences between the two groups; second, the gender divide, allowing insights into the role of gender in academic vocabulary proficiency.

The necessity of being multilingual: Finland-based scholars reading and writing for research purposes

Niina Hynninen, University of Helsinki

This paper presentation looks at the reading and writing practices of scholars working at a Finnish university, with focus on the multilingual resources in use, as well as the scholars' orientations to the quality of language, especially when writing for research purposes. The presentation compares the practices of, in particular, historians and geologists, and discusses the role of disciplinary expectations in relation to both the multilingual practices of the scholars and the ways they orient to language quality.

The study is situated within an emerging sociolinguistics of writing (see e.g. Lillis 2013; Lillis & McKinney 2013). This implies an effort to approach writing not simply as text, but as a process. Writing is approached in terms of complex cycles of production, where also reading plays an important role and where different participants may be involved in. From the perspective of multilingual practices, this means paying attention not only to the language(s) a text is written in, but also to the linguistic resources used during the production of the text (see e.g. Kuteeva & McGrath 2014). While there has been much focus on the languages of publication (e.g. Anderson 2012), this presentation broadens the perspective to multilingual reading practices and to different types of research writing.

The approach taken in this study also involves a problematisation of notions such as "standard" and "error" (Lillis & McKinney 2013), which in this presentation is discussed in terms of the ways scholars orient to language quality in their writing and who they construe as relevant language authorities. It is suggested that such language-regulatory orientations are important in considering the challenges scholars may pose, particularly, when writing in an additional language.

The data analysed for the presentation include research interviews with historians and geologists working at a Finnish university. The data have been collected as part of an ongoing ethnographically informed study on scholars' writing practices, with particular

focus on the language regulation of English-medium research writing. The study forms part of the Language Regulation in Academia project at the University of Helsinki (<http://www.helsinki.fi/project/lara>).

The questions addressed in this presentation are:

- What multilingual resources do scholars use in their everyday reading and writing practices?
- Who do they construe as relevant language authorities when writing for different purposes and in different languages?
- In what ways do they orient to the quality of their language, particularly when writing for publication in English?

It will be shown that multilingualism is not only beneficial, but a necessity for the historians and geologists alike. What are different are the forms that multilingualism takes. Preliminary findings also suggest reliance on native speakers as custodians of a language, but also changing orientations particularly to research writing in English. The findings, discussed in more detail in the presentation, are expected to increase our understanding of everyday multilingualism in scholars' reading and writing practices, and to shed light on the importance of multilingual practices in conducting research and disseminating research findings.

References:

Anderson, L. (2012) Publishing strategies of young, highly mobile academics: The question of language in the European context. *Language Policy*, 12: 273–288.

Kuteeva, M. & McGrath, L. (2014) Taming Tyrannosaurus rex: English use in the research and publication practices of humanities scholars in Sweden. *Multilingua*, 33 (3–4): 365–387.

Lillis, T. (2013) *The Sociolinguistics of Writing*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Lillis, T. & McKinney, C. (2013) The sociolinguistics of writing in a global context: Objects, lenses, consequences. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 17 (4): 415–439.

Receptive and productive academic language in use: Academic vocabulary as a case study

Diane Pecorari, Linneus University and Hans Malmström, Chalmers University of Technology

Vocabulary plays a key role in language proficiency, and as a result, academic vocabulary has long been a focus of attention by both researchers and teachers concerned with the development of students' academic literacy skills. Within English for Academic Purposes, this has in part involved the compilation of academic vocabulary lists, such as Coxhead's (2000) Academic Word List (AWL) or Gardner and Davies' (2014) Academic Vocabulary List (AVL). These lists represent a class of words which are important in academic

discourse, but which students may encounter relatively infrequently in other contexts, and have proven to be valuable in a number of ways for both pedagogical and research purposes.

Part of the value of the most recent academic lists stems from the fact that they are the product of corpus investigations, and that they encompass words which are attested in corpora of academic discourse. However, the corpora on which they are based are composed of published academic writing, such as research articles and textbooks. It is however well established that meaningful differences exist among the various academic genres (Biber, 2006) and while students read textbooks, research articles and other published academic texts, the assessment genres they produce have very different characteristics (Nesi & Gardner, 2012). It is therefore possible that existing academic vocabulary lists are more relevant for the development of students' receptive skills, and less so with respect to productive skills.

This paper presents the results of a corpus investigation into university students' productive vocabulary and adopted the method developed by Gardner and Davies (2014) in the production of the AVL. This method involves a comparison of an academic corpus, divided into discipline areas, and a non-academic corpus, to extract vocabulary which can be considered to be an academic core (as opposed to general vocabulary or subject-specific terminology). For the present investigation two corpora were used: the British Academic Writing (BAWE) corpus, consisting of student assessment writing, and a corpus of writing produced by university students in the UK not related to assessment or other formal academic purposes.

An analysis of the relative frequencies of vocabulary in the two corpora resulted in a what can be considered a list of students' productive academic vocabulary. This paper will describe the characteristics of this list, compare it with existing lists, and present pedagogical implications of the results.

References:

Biber, D. (2006). *University language: A corpus-based study of spoken and written registers*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Coxhead, A. (2000). A New Academic Word List. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34, 213–238.

Gardner, D., & Davies, M. (2014). A new Academic Vocabulary List. *Applied Linguistics*, 35, 305–327.

Nesi, H., & Gardner, S. (2012). *Genres across the disciplines: Student writing in higher education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coping with English literacy in higher education in Iceland

Birna Arnbjörnsdóttir and Hafdís Ingvarsdóttir, University of Iceland

Despite many positive implications, the use of English for teaching and learning at Nordic Universities inevitably creates challenges that, to date, have not been reflected in

educational policies. The Nordic countries have experienced increased pressure to adopt English as a language of higher education and Iceland is no exception. A few studies are available about the consequences of using English at tertiary level in Scandinavia. Most of those studies point out that the institutions which have adopted English medium courses and curricula are experiencing language problems. The focus of a handful of those studies has been on examining to what extent students' English reading skills suffice to comprehend their English textbooks (see e.g. Hellekjær, 2008; Jeeves, 2008). Although the majority of courses at Icelandic universities are still taught in Icelandic, over 90 percent of all curriculum material is now in English. It is thus taken for granted that the Icelandic final secondary school exam with only three semesters of English is sufficient to provide Icelandic students with the English reading proficiency to understand academic texts in any subject.

A survey was sent out to all undergraduate and postgraduate students at the University of Iceland to elicit views about the use of English. Responses were received from 1081 students at both levels. The study focused mainly on how students cope with negotiating meaning between a receptive language (English) and the language of production or output (Icelandic). A term for this phenomenon was coined as ***Simultaneous Parallel Code Use*** (SPCU). The study investigated (1) to what extent students at the University of Iceland perceive they are linguistically prepared to access the curriculum in English, (2) what effects, if any, it had on their learning experiences that the textbooks were in English while the lectures and evaluation were in Icelandic (3) what effects this may have on their workload and the nature of their output, and (4) what strategies they use to negotiate meaning between the two linguistic codes they must use simultaneously to master the curriculum.

Students acknowledge that working in English increases their workload and that they must employ different strategies to access the curriculum because it is in English. The vast majority say that they use on-line dictionaries (English –Icelandic) and one third of the respondents write summaries of the English content in Icelandic and almost 60% mentioned creating glossaries with the help of a dictionary. And almost half use Google to translate. It is also noticeable that over 60 per cent of students translate the English text into Icelandic in their mind when reading their textbooks.

All this raises the question of what effect this extra cognitive load may have on the student's in-depth understanding of the text. It seems clear that *Simultaneous Parallel Code Use* is bound to place constraints on the reading process. Furthermore these constraints are added to the general challenges all students face when encountering new concepts, constructs and terminology and a new discourse in a new field of academic study. Those findings pose some critical questions. The first has to do with the depth of students' acquisition of new knowledge, when a good deal of their cognitive and memory capacity is spent on linguistic processing. And secondly what effect it has on students' learning when the input is in another language than the one they are evaluated in (SPCU)? The findings call for the need to investigate further how SPCU affects students learning and how instructors can best support students challenged by this situation.

References:

Hellekjær, Glen Ole. 2009. Academic English reading proficiency at the university level: A Norwegian case study. *Reading in a Foreign Language* October 2009, Volume 21, No. 2 pp. 198–222.

Jeeves, Anna. 2008. "Some words are simply very difficult." Reading proficiency in English. Unpublished MA thesis at the University of Iceland. [http://hdl.handle.net / 1946/10157](http://hdl.handle.net/1946/10157)

Calling for translation literacy: The use of covert translation in student academic writing in higher education

Ida Klitgård, Roskilde University

When Danish university students write essays, project reports, theses or other written assignments in their L1 based on a reading of sources in English as an L2, a covert interlingual translation process takes place when summarising, paraphrasing or synthesising the sources. Unfortunately, due to lacking L2 reading skills as well as general translation competencies, theoretical terms and entire theoretical voices risk being recontextualised in such a way that they are represented in misleading ways (Klitgård 2015). Thus, besides speaking of academic writing as a kind of literacy (Lea and Street 2000), I suggest that we also address the need for translation literacy viewed as both a set of academic study skills, a language awareness learning process and as a discourse practice in the international university context which is increasingly relying on Anglo-American research and foreign theoretical voices translated into English (Harris 2009, 226).

This aspect is surprisingly absent in the literature in EAP (English for Academic Purposes). To fill this gap, I propose that my current study within the recent branch of Translation Studies called TOLC (Translation in Other Learning Contexts) may lend significant light to this problem. TOLC is defined as the use of "translation to acquire linguistic mediation skills and intercultural competence in fields other than Translation Studies" (González Davies 2014, 163).

My paper develops this issue with special attention to the covert translation of theoretical voices in academic student writing. Specifically, in my project, I will organise an electional course at my university in "Translation for Studying and Professional Contexts" in the spring 2016 which will hopefully demonstrate that it is possible to benefit from focused work on translation strategies and competencies when writing from sources. Similar to my other courses in academic English writing, I will give the students three types of written tasks:

- 1) a paraphrase task where they are to paraphrase selected theoretical passages in English into Danish;
- 2) a summary task where they are to summarise a theoretical text in English into Danish;
- 3) a synthesis task where they are to write either an argumentative or an explanatory text based on three theoretical sources. My project is a mixed method study in which I intend to analyse the student texts in terms of any misapprehensions and twisted voices of the source texts.

I argue that translation literacy is needed in teaching academic writing at Danish universities. Mastering translation competencies may facilitate more in-depth

understanding of the data used as well as raise the students' declarative and procedural L1 and L2 awareness. Moreover, translation will no longer be reduced to a technical instrument, but be viewed as an informed way to engage with difficulty and meaning in a multilingual world in general.

References:

González Davies, Maria. 2014. "The Role of Translation in Other Learning Contexts: Towards Acting Interculturally". In Hunscher-Davidson, Séverine and Michal Borodo (eds.) *Global Trends in Translator and Interpreter Training*. London: Continuum: 161-79.

Harris, Suzy. 2009. "Translation, internationalization and the university". *London Review of Education*. 7:3: 223-33.

Klitgård, Ida. 2015. "Using sources in English - writing about them in Danish: In search of Translation Literacy in academic writing". In Génin, Isabelle and Ida Klitgård (eds.) *Translating the Voices of Theory/La traduction des voix de la théorie. Vita traductiva. Éditions québécoises de l'oeuvre*, 8: 134-51.

Lea, Mary and Brian V. Street. 2000. "Student writing and staff feedback in higher education. In Lea, Mary R. and Barry Stierer (eds.) *Student Writing in Higher Education: New Contexts*. Buckingham: Society for Research in Higher and Open University Press: 32-46.

(Almost) becoming an academic: About the embedded nature of Academic Literacy/ies

Vibeke Ankersborg and Karl-Heinz Pogner, Copenhagen Business School

Our contribution aims at investigating how 'peripheral participants' (Lave & Wenger 1991) tackle the interrelation of knowledge and text production in the academic community, and hereby negotiate their identity/ies.

The master thesis is the main academic project (knowledge production) and genre (text production), which university students have to master (in Denmark hereby concluding a five months long project). Students at Business Universities often investigate the practice of managing, communicating, strategizing etc. (relevance) in and about organizations, but they at the same time have to fulfill the expectations of academic communities towards knowledge production *and* text production (rigor).

Since students are not at home with academic (and scientific) writing, they do not label their own process as processes of acquiring academic literacies (Lillis & Scott 2007). Therefore, researchers rarely get a first-hand insight into how novices of an academic community tackle the challenges of knowledge transforming (Bereiter & Scardamalia 1987) and text production; or thinking and writing (Bereiter 1980, Hermanns 1988, Molitor 1984). Our research aims at understanding how these processes are perceived from the students' perspective and how they are shaped by and shaping their identities as (quasi-)academics or (quasi-) scientists.

We have collected the following data: We have monitored students during their knowledge and text production processes- instead of conducting retrospective interviews. We have video- and audiotaped student group discussions while they worked with tools and techniques designed to facilitate idea generation, mind mapping, and knowledge production, sometimes using text as one of these tools. We have also photographed mind maps and the diagrams that resulted from these discussions. These give us a window into student reflection that the students would never offer if we asked them directly .In discourse-based interviews (Odell /Goswami / Herrington 1983.) we ask the students about their choices and challenges regarding the relationship between knowledge production, problem solving (Hayes & Flower 1980), text production and their academic and professional self-images (Author 1 & Author 2 2015). We also have interviewed supervisors / advisers and students about the challenges of supervising and being supervised /advised and attended and taped supervision sessions.

Utilizing methods of qualitative data analysis (using nVivo) like Thematic Network Analysis (Attride-Sterling 2001) and Critical Discourse Analysis (Fairclough 2003), we analyze the negotiations of task, individual, social, i.e. academic and professional identities , and institutional power in order to get closer to the social-interactive nature of (academic) writing (Dyste 2001 og 2006; Nystrand 1989; Author 1 2003 and 2012; Schindler & Siebert-Ott 2013).

At the Lunas conference 2016 we are aiming at discussing how to investigate students' academic text production as one of the key activities of academic Discourse Communities and Communities of Practice (Swales, Pogner), in academic "Discourse and Action Spaces" (Knorr & Author 1 2015) as an important place for negotiating identities (Giddens 1991) in transformational learning (Lillis & Scott 2007).

Translanguaging in an English-medium tertiary environment

Philip Shaw, Stockholm University, Charlotte Hommerberg and Diane Pecorari, Linnaeus University

The Nordic countries have been very much in the vanguard of the recent, worldwide growth in the number of tertiary-level courses taught partly or entirely through the medium of English outside of the traditionally English speaking world (Wächter & Maiworm, 2014), on the national or international scale. The presence of English in the Swedish university context ranges from use of assigned reading in English on courses which formally have Swedish as the language of instruction to courses and indeed entire degree programmes taught exclusively in English. The latter case typically involves the presence of international students, and so the setting is multilingual with English the only available common language. The former, on the other hand, involves a more homogeneous set of linguistic proficiencies and experiences. While some students (or teachers) may be of non-Swedish origins, as a condition of admission, all are expected to be proficient in Swedish and English both.

In many educational settings like these, an ethos of restricting communication to the shared language frequently prevails. However, a relatively recent trend in research on multilingual settings has been to challenge the one-code ethos and to examine the phenomenon of translanguaging, by which participants in an interaction draw on the full

range of linguistic resources available to them (e.g., Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Garcia & Li, 2014)

This paper reports on the findings of two parallel studies in two different educational settings. In the first study, Swedish-language lectures in three disciplines were observed and recorded. Sixteen hours of transcribed speech were analysed to identify the use of English in the lectures. The relatively infrequent, but highly institutionalized, references to English in the Swedish-language lectures serve to tie reading and teaching together, and construct Swedish education as a branch of international learning. In the second study we report on findings from observations carried out in an entirely English-based environment, where the course is taught by a non-native speaker of English to a multilingual student group. These observations concern instances where the teacher's translanguaging skills are put to the test in order to create an inclusive classroom. The observed instances involve the use of metaphors and cultural references intended to explain the lecture content, humour intended to affect the classroom atmosphere and meta-comments on the students' assumed learning process within the frames of the lecture. The findings indicate that the multilingual classroom in Swedish higher education makes, or should make high demands on the university teacher's awareness of and capacity to use translanguaging strategies.

References:

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *Modern Language Journal*, 94, 103–115.

García, O., & Li, W. (2014). *Translanguaging: language, bilingualism and education*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Wächter, B., Maiworm, F., & Academic Cooperation Association. ACA. (2014). *English-taught programmes in European higher education: The state of play in 2014*. Bonn: Lemmens.

Linguistic complexity in academic writing: from dynamic to synoptic?

Päivi Pietilä, University of Turku

Linguistic complexity is one of the main dimensions, together with accuracy and fluency, which are frequently used in the assessment of L2 proficiency and development. Some measures based on *length*, such as the number of words per sentence or per T-unit, can function as indications of overall syntactic complexity, as they do not reveal whether the length of the unit is dependent on the use of, for example, subordination or pre- or postmodification of nouns. The mean length of clause, on the other hand, is a specific measure of subclausal complexity, and, therefore, it can be used to complement the more global measures. Other types of complexity measures include *the amount of subordination* and the *frequency of occurrence* of particular items or structures that are considered to be linguistically sophisticated (see e.g. Ortega 2003, 2012).

According to systemic functional linguistics (Halliday & Martin 1993/1996), ideas are first expressed mainly through coordination, then their logical connections are expressed by

means of subordination, while the most advanced level of language use is characterized by complex phrases and higher lexical density. Subordination, on the other hand, tends to decrease again. This development means a gradual change from a *dynamic style* to a *synoptic style* of expression, typical of both L1 and L2 acquisition. In view of this development, academic texts written by advanced L2 learners could be expected to show a greater proportion of phrasal-level complexification (as indicated by increased length of clause) and a decrease in subordination, compared with lower-proficiency texts (Norris & Ortega 2009). Results congruent with these expectations were obtained, for example, by Bulté and Housen (2015) in their study on the effect of a short intensive writing course taken by adult learners of English.

Students in Departments of English in non-English speaking countries are usually fairly advanced L2 learners and users. In the Finnish context, they first have to pass a demanding entrance examination in which both their language skills and academic aptitude are tested. The studies themselves include various kinds of academic activities (lectures, seminars, exams, assignments, etc.) which, as a by-product, are meant to enhance the students' language skills further. As far as writing skills are concerned, the students are taught courses on Academic Writing, and they get plenty of opportunities to practise their writing skills in various projects, end-of-course exams, essays, seminar papers, and finally in their BA and MA theses.

The present study explores three different types of academic writing produced by Finnish university students of English, in order to discover whether the assignment type influences the style of expression measured on the dynamic – synoptic axis mentioned above. If this is the case, one would expect texts on personal, informal topics to manifest characteristics of the dynamic end of the continuum, whereas more formal assignments would be expected to contain more features of the synoptic style. Moreover, in reference to the CAF framework, a more complex task (such as a research report, as opposed to a personal narrative) could be expected to elicit more complex language, as found, for example, by Ishikawa (2006), whose results showed increased structural complexity along with a more complex task. The findings will be discussed from the point of view of syntactic and lexical complexity in advanced academic writing.

References:

Bulté, B. & A. Housen (2015). Evaluating short-term changes in L2 complexity development. *Circulo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación* 63: 42-76.

Halliday, M.A.K. & J.R. Martin 1993/1996. *Writing Science: Literary and Discursive Power*. London: Falmer Press.

Ishikawa, T. 2006. The effect of manipulating task complexity along the (\pm here-and-now) dimension on L2 written narrative discourse. In Garcia Mayo, M. (ed.). *Investigating Tasks in Formal Language Learning*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 136-156.

Norris, J.M. & L. Ortega 2009. Towards an organic approach to investigating CAF in instructed SLA: The case of complexity. *Applied Linguistics* 30 (4): 555-578.

Ortega, L. 2003. Syntactic complexity measures and their relationship to L2 proficiency: A research synthesis on college-level L2 writing. *Applied Linguistics* 24 (4): 492-518.

Ortega, L. 2012. Interlanguage complexity. A construct in search of theoretical renewal. In Kortmann, B. & Szmrecsanyi, B. (eds). *Linguae and Litterae: Linguistic Complexity: Second Language Acquisition, Indigenization, Contact*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. 127-155.

Academic language use in Finnish and English: a contrastive study

Nicole Keng and Heli Katajamäki, University of Vaasa

At the university level, in many countries, the direction of language courses is moving in the direction of language learning for academic purposes. Academic discourse in writing has been investigated in many studies, and features such as the use of evaluative language (for example, Hyland 2005) and of citation (Harwood 2009; Hyland 1999) have demonstrated a variety of linguistic forms in use. The teaching of a range of common academic features has been widely recommended; such features include the use of formal register, use of passive voice, as well as the avoidance of contractions and question forms. In Nordic countries, university students are typically considered highly fluent in English. However, fluent speech and polished grammar does not mean that the students have developed the academic or technical language proficiency in English needed for higher education or work purposes. Also, academic writing involves a variety of subskills, such as being able to use more appropriate or academic vocabulary, to construct effective cohesive, logical and coherent structure, and to write in a formal and academic style. In terms of vocabulary knowledge, Smith and Keng (2014) found that Finnish students had a significantly higher level of general vocabulary but a lesser knowledge of academic vocabulary level compared to French and Chinese students.

This study aims to investigate the use of academic language features in Finnish and English academic writing courses taught at the University of Vaasa, Finland. The research questions are:

1. What are the common errors Finnish students make in academic writing in English and in Finnish?
2. What are the common features expected to be taught/defined in academic writing courses in English and in Finnish?
3. What are the similarities or differences of academic language use between Finnish students and other non-native English students?

We will firstly analyse the common features and errors students produce in both academic writing courses in Finnish and in English by identifying them from submitted writing assignments. Then, we will compare the findings with the non-native English students' learner corpora data in the BAWE corpus. We will revisit the writing course design to find out what can be changed and to be implemented.

This study will show whether there are any similarities or differences of academic language features use between Finnish students' writing and other non-native English students' in English, by comparing our data with the BAWE corpus. Furthermore, it will allow a comparison of academic language use between Finnish students' first language and English. The results will provide suggestions as to what could be addressed by and

embedded in academic writing courses in Finnish and in English in Nordic university contexts.

Academic writing proficiency of Danish university students

Jonas Nygaard Blom, Heidi Jønch-Clausen, Marianne Rathje, Jesper Tinggaard Svendsen, Anna Vibeke Lindø, Bjarne le Fevre Jakobsen, Alexandra Holsting, Thit Wedel Vildhøj, University of Southern Denmark; Kenneth Reinecke Hansen, Metropolitan University College

"Young students write and reason like eleven year olds." That was the assessment of Kresten Schultz-Jørgensen (2011), censor at the Danish universities KU, RUC and SDU, a couple of years ago – a stance shared by other censors in the media (e.g. Dahl 2013). Within the Danish universities similar concerns have been expressed, especially with regard to the academic writing skills of the students (Hjortdal 2014). But although the criticism has been harsh and the consequences seem serious, the potential problem has had limited scholarly attention in Denmark.

The purpose of our research project is to chart and analyze the academic writing proficiency of newly commenced Danish university students. More specifically, we wish to study the different writing issues that new students are experiencing when trying to break the academic genre code. Thus, we focus on the students' *prerequisites* for academic genre proficiency and flawless language usage. The project builds upon preceding studies in students' writing proficiency in primary and upper secondary school (Krogh et al. 2015), but adds a linguistic focus that is oriented towards text linguistic studies of academic writing (Snow & Uccelli 2009).

Based on an experimental design of an academic writing assignment, we conduct a combined corpus linguistic, functional and orthographic text and discourse analysis of 162 papers written by newly commenced Danish and journalism students at the University of Southern Denmark (data collected in September 2015). The participants have been selected as representative for students who are expected to be proficient in Danish written language at a high level. In the assignment the students (74 Danish and 88 journalism students) were asked to *account for* the most significant concepts in an excerpt from a theoretical academic text on cohesion, subsequently to *analyze* a manipulated news article using the theoretical concepts, and finally *assess* the use of endophora in the news article. After the test the participants were asked to fill out a questionnaire on their writing process, their thoughts on envisaged recipients, etc. Accordingly, the experiment has been designed to test the students' proficiency of three central academic speech acts (accounting, analyzing and assessing) at continual higher taxonomic levels.

Our analyses are divided into three partial projects from which we will present selected results at the conference:

1. an orthographic analysis of the students' spelling and proficiency of Danish written language norms and an analysis of their (sub)conscious attitudes towards deviations from written language norms,

2. a pragmatic analysis of the students' proficiency of academic writing conventions, including academic speech acts, writing positions, quotation techniques and hedging/modality,
3. a comparative corpus linguistic analysis of the academic writing of Danish and journalism students for the purpose of examining if two different mindsets of professional competency make a difference on academic writing routines early in the study.

The three analyses form an empirical basis for discussing the students' prerequisites for academic writing proficiency, including factors that may strengthen or weaken it. This in turn may contribute to a more qualified public debate on academic writing proficiency at the universities, preferably with an eye to *scaffolding* the students in their transition to higher education.

References:

Dahl, H. (2013) "Den massehumanistiske trosbekendelse", <http://www.kommunikationsforum.dk/artikler/hjaelpeloese-studerende-i-videnskabsteoretisk-kaos>, 25.6.2013.

Hjortdal, M. (2014) "RUC's nye rektor: Undervisningen skal vendes helt på hovedet", <http://politiken.dk/indland/uddannelse/ECE2259469/rucs-nye-rektor-undervisningen-skal-vendes-helt-paa-hovedet/>, 10.4.2014.

Krogh, E., Christensen, T.S. & Jakobsen, K.S. (eds.) (2015) *Elevskrivere i gymnasiefag*, Odense: Syddansk Universitetsforlag.

Schultz-Jørgensen, K. (2011) "Den sproglige fascisme breder sig", *Politiken*, 19.02.2011.

Snow, Catherine E., & Uccelli, Paula (2009) "The challenge of academic language", in: Olson, D. R., & Torrance, N. (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Literacy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 112-133.

Phraseology in Scandinavian academic language – a comparative corpus study

Ruth Vatvedt Fjeld and Arash Saidi, University of Oslo; Sussi Olsen, University of Copenhagen; Julia Prentice, University of Gothenburg

In the last few years, several word lists of academic vocabulary have been developed, based on automatic analysis of academic corpora. An important part of accomplished academic writing is however also the mastery of abstract multiword expressions (MWEs), that often have text structuring or modifying functions in academic writing. Such kinds of functional phrases can be called multi-word cohesion markers.

Various studies have pointed at significant differences between L1 speakers and (even advanced) L2 speakers when it comes to the use, processing and mastery of idiomatic multi-word units in a given language (e.g. Granger 1998, Ellis et al. 2008, Ekberg 2013, Li

& Schmitt 2009). It is therefore a reasonable assumption that multi-word cohesion markers with a rather abstract meaning can be problematic for both students with Norwegian, Danish or Swedish as their L2 and L1 students with less experience in academic language use. In the context of compiling academic word- and phrase lists for Nordic languages, a closer investigation of PNPs in Norwegian and Swedish academic corpus material is therefore relevant.

In both Norwegian, Danish and Swedish academic language, several such multi-word cohesion markers consist of preposition+noun+preposition (PNP), like *i forhold til/ iförhållande till* (in relation to) or *på grunn av/på grund av* (because of). A systematic investigation and documentation of such MWEs will make a significant contribution to the documentation of academic vocabulary in general. This project aims to compile an academic phrase-list as a complement to existing vocabulary lists.

Phrases like the PNPs exemplified above, often consist of high frequency words, and will usually be sorted out using a stop list of most common words when compiling academic words from a corpus. Such phrases will therefore not be included in the typical academic word lists. We therefore conducted a preliminary analysis of Norwegian PNPs by means of statistical trigrams of presumptive academic texts in a 100 million word balanced corpus of modern Norwegian called Lexicographic corpus of Norwegian Bokmål (LBK). According to its well-structured balance and annotation, sub corpora can easily be created. The non-fiction part consists to large extent of academic language, and we therefore decided to compare the distribution of some MWEs in the non-fiction sub corpus with those in the fiction sub corpus and compared by means of the frequency of trigrams (cf. Fjeld & Saidi 2015). The extraction of the interesting MWEs were made manually in this preliminary analysis.

Among the 500 most frequent trigrams in non-fiction, we found the 10 most frequent as below, but in the fiction sub corpus there were only found 6 such PNPs among the 500 most frequent trigrams:

freq in non-fiction corpus		freq in fiction corpus	
2	<i>i forhold til</i> (in relation to)	7	<i>ved siden av</i> (in addition to)
6	<i>på grunn av</i> (because of)	46	<i>på grunn av</i> (because of)
11	<i>i løpet av</i> (during)	59	<i>i løpet av</i> (during)
14	<i>i forbindelse med</i> (in connection with)	257	<i>på vei til</i> (headed for)
20	<i>i tillegg til</i> (in addition to)	473	<i>i nærheten av</i> (close to)
31	<i>i form av</i> (as)		no hits
71	<i>i henhold til</i> (according to)		"
78	<i>i motsetning til</i> (as opposed to)		"
84	<i>ved siden av</i> (in addition to; nearby)		"
85	<i>på bakgrunn av</i> (on the basis of)		"

The preliminary analysis of the Norwegian corpus material strengthens our hypothesis that academic texts differs from general language in several ways, not only when it comes to single content words, but also when it comes to multi-word cohesion phrases like PNPs.

To further investigate the use of PNPs in academic Norwegian and Swedish we have conducted an analysis of n-grams for Norwegian using a statistical method (see Gardner and Davies 2013). We are planning on doing this for Swedish as well, using the academic corpus material (Jansson, Johansson Kokkinakis, Ribbeck & Sköldberg 2012) in Språkbanken (the Swedish Language Bank), to be able to compare the results obtained

from the two languages respectively. The aim of this comparative study is both the investigation of the use of a certain type of academic phrases in the two nordic languages, and of their relevance (e.g. in terms of their frequency in the material) for a potential academic phrase lists for Norwegian and Swedish.

Engaging with terminology in the parallel-language classroom: teachers' practices for bridging the gap between L1 and English

Hans Malmström, Chalmers University of Technology; Spela Meek and Philip Shaw, Stockholm University; Diane Pecorari, Linnaeus University; Aileen Irvine, The University of Edinburgh

It is increasingly common for language- and content-learning objectives to exist within the same classroom. This happens in the form of content- and language-integrated learning (CLIL) settings (Coyle 2007), in which the language-learning outcomes are explicit and planned for; while in other settings, language learning is a desired outcome, but expected to happen implicitly. Terminology is an important part of disciplinary knowledge, and a common expectation in settings where an L1 and an L2 are used in parallel is that students will acquire subject terminology incidentally in the L1 *as well as* in English as a result of listening and reading. For this to happen, it is a prerequisite that students notice and engage with terminology in both languages. To this end, teachers' classroom practices for making students attend to and engage with terms are crucial for furthering students' vocabulary competence in two languages (Chaudron, 1982; Lessard-Clouston, 2010).

This paper reports the findings of an investigation into the practices of two teachers in a 'partial' EMI setting. The lectures, which were part of courses in biology and social psychology, were given in Swedish but the assigned textbooks were in English. The lectures were observed and video recordings were made and transcribed. Episodes in which teachers introduced or mentioned subject-specific terminology were identified. A recursive process of analysis resulted in a number of categories of teacher practices.

The findings show that teachers nearly always employ some sort of emphatic practice when using a term in a lecture. However, the repertoire of such practices is limited. Further, teachers rarely adapt their repertoires to cater to the special needs arguably required in partial EMI settings, or to exploit the affordances of these learning environments. Implications for teaching in this increasingly common environment will be addressed.

References:

Chaudron, C. 1982. Vocabulary elaboration in teachers' speech to L2 learners. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 4, 170-180.

Lessard-Clouston, M. 2010. Theology lectures as lexical environments: A case study of technical vocabulary use. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 9, 308-321.

Heritage language students in Danish higher education

Anne Holmen, Centre for Internationalisation and Parallel Language Use, University of Copenhagen

Studies from lower and upper secondary education indicate that students with minority language background underachieve in Danish schools (Elsborg et al. 2005, Danmarks Evalueringsinstitut 2006, Christensen et al. 2014). According to official Danish terminology they are referred to as “bilingual students” – a label which however carries a social stigma for some of the students involved (Holmen 2014). In the US they are often referred to as “generation 1.5 students” (e.g. Hafernik & Wiant 2012) to distinguish them from newly arrived minority students.

No studies have been carried out on their outcome of taking part in Danish higher education, except for statistical studies of access and drop-out rates (Hoff & Demirtas 2009). But anecdotal evidence from interviews with study boards and councilors from across one Danish university indicates that many “bilingual students” are challenged with language-related problems in their study programs and need support to break the academic code (Holmen 2015). Their problems may resemble those of other under-privileged groups who due to a policy of wider participation of students in higher education gain access to university classrooms, but receive little support in their learning efforts. However, for “bilingual students” other factors may also play a role, such as how universities deal with linguistic diversity.

To pursue this, a new study will investigate whether students can profit from their language background when choosing a study program based on their heritage language. A pilot study from University of Copenhagen (reported in Holmen 2015) indicates that when these students experience educational barriers this may be due to the ways in which academic language is conceptualized in modern language programs in higher education. This is in line with e.g. Valdés (2005) who suggests a reconceptualization of academic language learning based on the experience of heritage language learners, van der Walt (2013) who calls for the need to develop multilingual higher education building on teaching practices from bilingual education in schools, or Canagarajah (2015) who argues in favor of a dialogical pedagogy to support students’ academic writing.

The purpose of the present paper is to raise this issue of the learning situation of heritage language students in a Danish university context and to report on the results of the preliminary study in which a small number of heritage students have been interviewed about their study programs, including their experience with curricular language foci and with feedback procedures on their learning process.

References:

Canagarajah, S. (2015). “Blessed in my own way”. Pedagogical affordances for dialogical voice construction in multilingual student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 27, 122-139

Christensen, V. T. et al. (2014). PISA Etnisk 2012. PISA 2012 med fokus på unge med indvandrerbaggrund. KORA

Danmarks Evalueringsinstitut (2006). Gymnasiets tiltag for tosprogede elever.

Elsborg, S. et al. (2005). Muligheder for mønsterbrud i ungdomsuddannelserne. Mønsterbryderprojektet 1-2, Syddansk Universitetsforlag

Hafernik, J. Johnson & F. M. Wiant (2012). Integrating Multilingual Students into College Classrooms. Practical Advice for Faculty. Multilingual Matters

Hoff, J. W. & M. Demirtas (2009). Frafald blandt etniske minoritetsstuderende på universitetsuddannelser i Danmark. Forlaget Politiske Studier

Holmen, A. (2014). "Being Bilingual Means being a Foreigner". Categorizing Linguistic Diversity among Students in Danish Higher Education. Hermes. Journal of Language and Communication in Business. 53, 1-24

Holmen, A. (2015). Linguistic Diversity among Students in Higher Education. A source in a Multilingual Language Strategy? In: Fabricius, A. H & Preisler, B. (eds.). Transcultural Interaction and Linguistic Diversity in Higher Education. The Student Experience. Palgrave Macmillan, 116-140

Valdés, G. (2005). Bilingualism, Heritage Language Learners, and SLA Research. Opportunities Lost or Seized? Modern Language Journal 89, iii, 410-426

Van der Walt, C. (2013). Multilingual Higher Education. Beyond English Medium Orientations. Multilingual Matters

English as an academic language at two Danish BA programmes: Student practices for displaying academic competence

Elisabeth Dalby Kristiansen, Center for Social Practices and Cognition, University of Southern Denmark

An increasing number of Danish and Nordic university programmes are offered in English. Consequently, students are expected to be able to carry out academic activities such as attending lectures, doing project work and writing reports in English rather than their native language.

How does such institutionally implemented changes in teaching and learning environment influence students' everyday academic and linguistic practices? In an attempt to answer that question, this presentation discusses what role language choice and language proficiency play in students' displays of academic competence as they are played out in students' interactions.

Following ethnomethodological and conversation analytic (EMCA) traditions (Garfinkel & Sacks, 1986; Mondada, 2014; Schegloff, 1992), language choice and language proficiency are understood as interactional resources used by students to make themselves recognizable as academically competent participants in the local interactions they are engaged in.

Further, the notions of academic competence and doing being academically competent draw on competence and academic literacy understood as a set of social practices rather than individual skills (Barton & Ivanič, 2000; Lea & Street, 2006). Hence, in accordance with the EMCA approach employed, they are understood as the ability to use specific resources, such as objects, gestures, and language, oral as well as written, in specific ways in accordance with preferred practices in certain academic communities (Goodwin, 1994, 2013).

The data for this presentation consists of video recordings of students' project group meetings at two Danish BA programmes. By means of sequential analysis, systematic practices for using language proficiency and language choice as interactional resources to display academic competence in interaction are identified and described. One group of students consistently uses English in their meeting activities and treats use of Danish as dispreferred. This group of students repeatedly makes language proficiency relevant as a resource for displaying academic competence in activities related to writing. Another group of students conduct meeting activities in both Danish and English, switching between the two languages according to the requirements of the very local interaction. These students do not orient to either language choice or language proficiency as relevant resources for displaying academic competence.

Based on the analyses, possible connections between students' orientation to language choice and language proficiency as relevant interactional resources and the specific requirements of the project they are engaged in, i.e. the production of a written report and/or the designing and construction of a physical object accompanied by a written report.

References:

- Barton, D., & Ivanič, R. (Eds.). (2000). *Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Garfinkel, H., & Sacks, H. (1986). On formal structures of practical actions. In H. Garfinkel (Ed.), *Ethnomethodological studies of work* (pp. 159-193). London: Routledge.
- Goodwin, C. (1994). Professional vision. *American Anthropologist*, 96(3), 606-633.
- Goodwin, C. (2013). The co-operative, transformative organization of human action and knowledge. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 46(1), 8-23.
- Lea, M. R., & Street, B. V. (2006). The "academic literacies" model: Theory and applications. *Theory Into Practice*, 45(4), 368-377.
- Mondada, L. (2014). The local constitution of multimodal resources for social interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 65, 137-156.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1992). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1295-1345.

English for academic research in a multilingual Swedish university: discipline, identity and engagement

Kathrin Kaufhold, Stockholm University

Language policy documents of Swedish universities often support a parallel language use protecting Swedish as a language of science and promoting English as the language of internationalisation (Björkman, 2014). The extent to which English is actually used as medium of publication and postgraduate instruction at Swedish universities depends in part on the discipline with Swedish playing a greater role in the Humanities (Kuteeva & Airey, 2014). This also holds for research-based writing at master's level. Thus master's theses in the Humanities are written in both Swedish and English. To support communication in international settings, universities often provide English for Academic Purposes courses. However, the division between the national language and English might not be as clear. For instance, studies in Nordic countries have shown that students and lecturers use both languages in spoken classroom interactions (e.g. Mortensen, 2014; Pecorari, Shaw, Irvine & Malmström, 2011; Söderlundh, 2012). In this context, the paper investigates a course on English for academic research. The course is obligatory for master's students from across the Humanities at a Swedish university although not all students choose to write their thesis in English. Therefore the course is designed to (1) raise students' awareness of English academic writing in the context of the students' disciplines; (2) apply insights to their own academic writing; and (3) support them in conceptualising their thesis projects.

The paper explores how students develop their discipline-specific genre knowledge in preparation to their master's thesis and how this might be linked to students' perceptions of English for academic writing. To investigate this question in depth, the study takes a qualitative case study approach. 13 participants from three groups were recruited. Their genre-knowledge development and perceptions of their academic English writing was traced based on the comparison of initial statements of aims, final self-evaluations, drafts and the final assignment. In addition, retrospective interviews were held to comment on their text development. Aims, evaluations and interviews were thematically coded. The students' draft texts were compared to trace text trajectories (Lillis & Curry, 2006). Results show that students' perceptions often change from working on language proficiency to a more specific focus on the discursive construction of their research project. Students also negotiate issues of disciplinary and writer identity in the composition of their academic texts. These are more related to dealing with conventions of communicative means in their discourse community and their engagement in the course rather than (inter-)national languages. The paper will conclude by discussing possibilities of a parallel induction in English and Swedish research-based writing.

References:

Björkman, B. (2014). Language ideology or language practice? An analysis of language policy documents at Swedish universities. *Multilingua*, 33(3-4), 335–363.

Kuteeva, M., & Airey, J. (2014). Disciplinary differences in the use of English in higher education: reflections on recent language policy developments. *Higher Education*, 67(5), 533-549.

Lillis, T. M., & Curry, M. J. (2006). Professional academic writing by multilingual scholars: Interactions with literacy brokers in the production of English-medium texts. *Written Communication, 23*(1), 3-35.

Mortensen, J. (2014). Language policy from below: language choice in student project groups in a multilingual university setting. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 35*(4), 425-442.

Pecorari, D., Shaw, P., Irvine, A., & Malmström, H. (2011). English for Academic Purposes at Swedish universities: teachers' objectives and practices. *Ibérica, 22*, 55-78.

Söderlundh, H. (2012). Global policies and local norms: Sociolinguistic awareness and language choice at an international university. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 216*, 87-109.

PART 2. POSTER PRESENTATIONS

The peripheral scientist: struggling with identity, authenticity, and voice in ERPP

Birna Arnbjörnsdóttir and Hafdís Ingvarsdóttir, University of Iceland

Recently scholars have identified challenges faced by non-native scholars who use English for Research Publishing Purposes (ERPP) (Flowerdew, 2013; Lillis and Curry, 2010). Englander and Uzun-Smith (2013) have further argued that writing and publishing in a language different from the one used in one's professional environment may lead to national and individual tension for the "peripheral scientist".

Most of the research on ERPP is based on the experiences of scholars in historically limited English access countries of Eastern and Southern Europe (Lillis & Curry, 2010; Lillis et al, 2010) and Asia (Flowerdew, 2013). The experiences of highly English proficient scholars who work in rich English input environments have received much less attention. This presentation reports findings of studies of the experiences of Icelandic academics on writing English for Research Publication Purposes.

Icelandic scholars work in a rich English input environment and many of them have had their academic training at English medium universities, yet they report challenges that go beyond the practical aspects of writing in a second language such as extra time, effort and expense (Authors, 2013; Lillis and Curry, 2010; Lillis and Curry, 2006)). As in other Nordic countries, Icelandic university lecturers feel the pressure to publish in English and are rewarded with financial bonuses and professional advancement if they publish in competitive international journals. Authors (2013) conducted a survey among academics at the University of Iceland that revealed that over 75% wrote most of their papers in English and in the youngest group the number rose to 100%. Issues such as lack of English writing support, previous academic training and discipline were also identified as factors affecting success in publishing internationally. The surveys were followed by in-depth interviews using a purposive sampling method in order to capture the voices of instructors from different faculties at different stages in their careers. Interviewees were ten faculty members, two from each of the five schools at the University; five women and five men, representing different fields and age groups (Auhtors, 2015).

These initial interviews revealed dimensions in respondents' attitudes and opinions such as psychological tension and conflicting identities that needed further exploration. Therefore ten additional interviews were carried out. Several themes emerged from the additional interviews, highlighting important problematic issues including a broad spectrum of professional, psychological, and cultural dimensions that are under researched in the literature. In this presentation, the identified themes from all twenty interviews will be illustrated and discussed through two illuminating examples from interviewees from different Faculties. The two interviewees express shared views but also different and conflicting views depending on their academic background.

Among the themes expressed in the interviews were those associated with the culture of the particular discipline, intended audience, and personal conflicts and allegiances that lead to struggles related to identity and authenticity in expression and difficulty in developing a personal voice in writing for publication purposes.

References:

Englander, Karen & Uzuner-Smith, Sedef. (2013). The role of policy in constructing the peripheral scientist in the era of globalization. *Language Policy* (1), no p. http://download.springer.com/static/pdf/452/art%253A10.1007%252Fs10993-012-9268-1.pdf?auth66=1363958275_fe1db3990174352bd31d7e501ebdd89f&ext=.pdf Downloaded Nov., 2015.

Flowerdew, John. (2013). Some thoughts on English for Research Publication Purposes (ERPP) and related issues. *Language Teaching*. (1) 1-13.

Authors (2015).

Authors (2013).

Lillis, Th. & Curry, M. J. (2010). *Academic writing in a global context: the politics and practices of publishing in English*. London: Routledge.

Lillis, T., Magyar, A., Robinson-Pant, A. (2010). An international journals' attempts to address inequalities in academic publishing. Developing a writing for publishing program. *Compare*, 40 (6), 781-800.

Attitudes towards English medium instruction at four Nordic universities

Trude Bukve, University of Bergen

The introduction of English medium instruction (EMI) at the Nordic universities has, during the last decade, become the prevalent approach to face the challenges of an internationalised university and labour market. In my research project, I measure students' attitudes towards EMI and national language(s) used in the educational context. The target population in this study are students enrolled in one of the four educational fields; *law, philosophy, chemistry* and *physics*. The survey was distributed in 2015¹. The selection of populations is based on the characterising features of hard pure, soft pure, hard applied and soft applied sciences (Becher 1989; Neumann et al 2002).

In the Norwegian survey², the student group is overall positive towards both EMI and NMI (Norwegian medium instruction), but the students exhibit a slightly more positive attitude to EMI, and its potentially favourable outcomes. Further, these results indicate that "the attitude may not form a simple one-dimensional dichotomy" (Jensen and Thøgersen 2011: 13). That is, it does not seem to be as simple as to just split students into "pros and cons"-groups. Positive and negative attitudes to both mediums of instruction is expressed, both at the inter- and intrapersonal level.

Further, an interesting pattern emerges when comparing students across different disciplinary fields. Based on the theory of socialisation and social identity theory, one can

¹ Sweden is not yet incorporated in this project, but will hopefully be included during the fall semester, this year.

assume that the disciplinary traditions and practises steer students into common practises and ideologies concerning language use and attitudes towards languages. Based on common practices and traditions in the four disciplinary fields selected for this study, one hypothesis could be that students within the natural sciences would, to a greater extent, exhibit positive attitudes towards EMI. But in the Norwegian survey, the results indicate that students, independent of the bachelor programme they are enrolled in, display positive attitudes towards EMI. The differences between educational fields seem to emerge when the positive effects of NMI is highlighted, and when students are asked to assess their own English skills. In this context, the data indicate that students follow the pattern of the theory of socialisation and matched categories (Becher 1989; Neumann 2002), i.e. students within the natural sciences, as well as philosophy, which are exposed to more EMI than law students, rate themselves as more skilled than law students. In the comparative study, incorporating the surveys from Finland, Iceland and Denmark, it will be interesting to find whether these results replicate when comparing countries.

In conclusion, the comparative analysis of the four countries will be examined in light of the language policies both at institutional and national level, in their respective countries. This is to see whether the language politics align with students' attitudes. And if not, are the language policies based on false premises?

References:

Becher, T. (1989): *Academic Tribes and Territories*. Open University Press. Buckingham.

Jensen, C., and J. Thøgersen. (2011). "University Lecturers' Attitudes towards English as the Medium of Instruction." *Iberica* 22: 13–33

Neumann, R., Parry, S. & Becher, T. (2002): *Teaching and learning in their disciplinary contexts: A conceptual analysis*. *Studies in higher education* 27:4, 405-417, DOI: 10.1080/0307507022000011525 Link: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0307507022000011525>

Stets, J.E. and Burke, P.J. (2000): *Identity Theory and Social Identity Theory*. *Social Psychology Quarterly*. Volume 63, Issue 3, 224-237.

Language policy for language use? A study of academic language use at different faculties at University of Copenhagen

Camilla Falk Rønne Nissen , University of Copenhagen

Due to internationalization of Higher Education the amount of courses and programmes taught in English at Nordic universities is increasing. Thus academic interaction and practice at a traditionally non-English-dominant university like University of Copenhagen is increasingly mediated by and in a language, English, which for a majority of the academic population is not their first or best language. Internationalization policy should there for be planned together with language policy, as internationalization implies linguistic changes. A language policy should regulate important language issues in compliance with overall principles, and the principle behind the language policy at University of Copenhagen (and other Nordic universities) is called *Parallel Language Use*, representing an ideal linguistic

situation where both the local language (here Danish) and English are used for academic purposes. Thus university students should be expected to be able to effectively navigate in a range of academic settings in both languages, and that sets certain requirements to the need for academic skills in two languages. Though internationalization seems to equal more English, and leaves us with a question mark on what “two languages” mean for international students.

This poster presents a study of academic language use in courses taught in English with regards to the current language policy and the level of internationalization. It is examined – with a combination of sociolinguistics – which roles the use of the global and the local language, English and Danish respectively, play in social, cultural and academic relations. The ethnographic fieldwork was carried out during a three months period, from the course started to the exam (both oral and written), at different faculties at University of Copenhagen. This was to identify potential disciplinary differences. Furthermore the exam situation is an extreme situation requiring participation, and it should ideally represent the students’ academic knowledge. Thus it is a relevant situation to examine in relation to academic language use.

From participant observation single examples of social interaction are selected for micro-analysis. When exploring “language practices” we build upon the general assumption that language is a part of a bigger social and cultural context, and that the contexts for communication should be investigated rather than assumed. Subscribing to this more holistic view on languages, methodology of linguistic ethnography appears as an obvious choice for research of language use in a social context such as academic settings, and at the same time it gives an opportunity to look at language policy as it occurs in actual language use.

Overall findings of the study suggest that the students use the language they find most effective in the given situation with little concern for language policy, and that the Danish students' attitude towards, including motivation for and use of, English depends on their future job and thereby working language. Findings from the oral exam situation indicate that Danish students found it harder to explain than to describe disciplinary concepts, when speaking English. However, linguistic competence seemed subordinate to communicative competence in regards to academic performance. Findings from the classroom show that English and Danish are used, both academically and socially, by the national students. Danish is, however, only at the Danishspeaking students' disposal, which creates two groups of students and asymmetry on the course. This may shed light on scholarly debate on how Parallel Language Use should be implemented, and which specific linguistic needs the international students may have, while at the same time including a discussion on how to overcome cultural differences in an internationalized classroom.

Investigating academic vocabulary in Danish academic writing

Anne Sofie Jakobsen, University of Copenhagen

In this poster presentation, I will describe the methodological aspects of investigating academic vocabulary in Danish academic writing. Academic language, an essential aspect of academic skills, is an important tool for gaining, sharing and developing knowledge within any field of study, enabling us to develop and convey abstract and technical ideas

and facts about complex phenomena (Nagy & Townsend 2012). Students and academic staff need to master not only a technical vocabulary within their own fields of study, but also a more general academic vocabulary used across disciplines that serves a range of functions in relation to writing as well as to speaking (Coxhead 2000).

Most research on academic language and vocabulary in a Danish context has focused on the development of academic skills in relation to writing scientifically especially in relation to students' academic skills. Very little attention has been paid to the micro level of Danish academic language use, namely the general academic vocabulary that constitutes a significant part of academic language use. A large body of research into English academic vocabulary already exists, partly due to the existence of various corpora of academic English, which enable researchers to investigate, based on authentic language use, the vocabulary inventory of academic English (e.g. Biber 2006).

In Danish, no such corpora exist which may be why very little research on Danish academic vocabulary has been carried out. Moreover, it can be argued that most of our knowledge of Danish academic language use is based on the vast amount of research into English academic language use. In my PhD project, I aim to provide an empirically based description of Danish general academic vocabulary. I make use of a corpus-based approach to identify and describe Danish academic vocabulary in relation to frequency, meaning, structure, function and distribution. The data for my analyses will primarily consist of a corpus of written academic texts authored by expert writers, such as peer-review academic journal articles.

There are several methodological challenges in relation to establishing such a corpus of written academic Danish, and in my poster presentation, I will describe my ongoing corpus compilation and discuss my methods for creating a corpus representative of written academic Danish focussing on the topics of representativeness, balance, size, sampling, mark-up as well as annotation. My poster presentation will also consider different methods of identifying and extracting the academic vocabulary from the corpus.

References:

Biber, D. (2006): *University Language. A corpus-based study of spoken and written register*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Coxhead, A. (2000): "A New Academic Word List." *TESOL Quarterly*, 34 (2), 213–238.

Nagy, W. & D. Townsend (2012): "Word as Tools: Learning Academic Vocabulary as Language Acquisition." *Reading Research Quarterly*, 47 (1), 91-108.

Student academic writing in Norwegian and English: a fledgling corpus project

Marte Monsen and Sylvi Rørvik, Hedmark University of Applied Sciences

In this poster presentation we give an overview of plans for a corpus compilation project comprising student academic writing in L1 Norwegian and L2 English by students attending a master's program at a Norwegian University College. We also present results

from a pilot study of pronoun use and writer/reader visibility. Thus, the proposed poster will be relevant for several of the conference topic areas, especially numbers 1, 2, 3, and 5.

The corpus compilation project referred to above was begun in 2015 and will continue until 2019. During this period, we will collect student texts in L1 Norwegian and L2 English. The texts will be directly comparable, since they will be written by students attending the same or similar courses in a master's program which allows for specialization in either English, Norwegian, or music, with the latter two groups producing texts in Norwegian. The rationale behind the project is a desire for evidence-based conclusions about the acquisition of academic language skills, in order to provide better courses in academic writing for the student group in question. In addition, the insights gained from the study of the material collected for this project will add to those from the relatively few existing studies of student academic writing in Norway that include a contrastive perspective (see e.g. Fossan 2011). A contrastive perspective including texts in the students' L1 is especially valuable when investigating learner language, since it allows the researcher to control for the potential influence of transfer. Existing research on published academic writing in Norwegian and English (see e.g. Fløttum et al 2006) can then serve as a yardstick against which to measure the students' texts, by representing the standards to which they ultimately aspire.

The pilot study is an investigation of a small piece of the above-mentioned corpus, namely 17 student essays (nine in Norwegian and nine in English), written by the students as part of a course on the philosophy of science. The essays range from 2,000 to 2,500 words in length, and cover central questions regarding philosophy in the human sciences. The pilot study focuses on pronoun use in the essays. Since students that are writing in Norwegian within the human sciences are often encouraged to use first-person pronouns in their writing (Rienecker & Jørgensen, 2013), while the opposite is the case for students of English (see e.g. Lysvåg and Stenbrenden 2014), we expected to find a higher frequency of "I" and "my" in the Norwegian texts, but this was not the case. In the cases where students have used "I" or "my", it is often the result of hedging, as in "My interpretation of this [...]" (Norwegian, our translation).

Both in Norwegian and English essays we find the first-person plural pronoun used to refer to unspecified people or people in general. Only in a few cases does "we" refer to researchers, indicating that the master's student considers herself to be a researcher. "You" is sometimes used to refer to people in general, while "one" ("en" or "man" in Norwegian) might refer to both researchers and people in general. There is a tendency that "one" is used more often in English than in Norwegian, which may indicate an attempt on the part of the students to comply with the demand for a more impersonal style in English and a recognition of the fact that discourse communities have different conventions (cf. Hyland 2001: 209).

References:

Fossum, H. (2011). *The Writer and the Reader in Norwegian Advanced Learners' Written English : A corpus-based study of writer/reader visibility features in texts by Norwegian learners of English and native speakers of English*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Oslo.

Fløttum, K., Dahl, T. & Kinn, T. (2006). *Academic Voices: Across languages and disciplines*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Hyland, K. (2001). "Humble servants of the discipline? Self-mention in research articles." *English for Specific Purposes* 20: 207-226.

Lysvåg, P. & Stenbrenden, G.F. (2014). *Academic Writing in English. A practical handbook*. Oslo: Cappelen Damm Akademisk.

Rienecker, L. & Jørgensen, P. S. (2013). *Den gode oppgaven: Håndbok i oppgaveskriving på universitet og høyskole*. Oslo: Fagbokforlaget.

Language regulation in academia – the shifting norms of English use

Anna Solin, Niina Hynninen and Hanna-Mari Pienimäki, University of Helsinki

This poster describes an ongoing research project situated at the Department of Modern Languages, University of Helsinki, entitled "Language regulation in academia". The three-year project began in January 2015 and explores the various practices through which English use is regulated in Finnish universities. Language regulation is being enacted for example when we discuss how international applicants' language skills should be tested, when we evaluate the quality of research writing and when we debate whether university administration can use English as a working language. Thus, regulation can concern both language choice (which languages may and should be used in a given setting) and the quality or correctness of the language used.

In today's multilingual universities, the most public debates concern language choice, but many other language regulatory processes are of equal interest. Much of the previous research has explored the institutional level, often with a focus on language standards and policies and the top-down regulation they represent. There is also a wealth of research on language choice in higher education and attitudes towards the use of English in Nordic settings (e.g. Haberland & Mortensen 2012; Hultgren et al. 2014; Kuteeva 2014). Our main objective is to map the diversity of forms and mechanisms of regulation as well as to explore the dynamic between macro-level regulation and more local, situated forms of regulation. We approach the different contexts we study with an ethnographic orientation, aiming to gain long-term access and an in-depth understanding of practices and experiences of regulation.

The empirical studies focus on the University of Helsinki, an officially bilingual university (Finnish – Swedish) with an increasing amount of English-medium teaching and research. The focus of the project is the dynamics between top-down regulation (such as language policy documents, language competence requirements and language revision services) and the experiences of individual members of staff (including research writers, press officers and administrators).

Our main research questions are:

- What kinds of mechanisms of institutional regulation of English can be identified on different levels of university organisation?
- What kinds of established practices of regulating English writing are in place in different contexts?

- What kinds of regulatory notions are construed by university staff, particularly regarding which norms are relevant for which uses of English?

The main types of data we are in the process of collecting include interviews, observations of text production and revision processes and document data (e.g. policy documents, guidelines and samples of English-language writing; see <http://www.helsinki.fi/project/lara>).

References:

Haberland, H. & Mortensen, J. (eds) (2012) Language and the International University. Special Issue, *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 216.

Hultgren, A., Gregersen, F. & Thøgersen, J. (2014) *English in Nordic Universities: Ideologies and Practices*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kuteeva, M. (2014). The parallel language use of Swedish and English: The question of “nativeness” in university policies and practices. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 35(4).