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Abstract
This thesis investigates the command 8th-graders in Arabic home language instruction have of written Modern Standard Arabic and if the type of instruction they have received and/or contact with written Arabic affect their performance. Background chapters discuss variables connected to the Arabic language (diglossia, research on reading and writing in Arabic) and variables connected to HLI in Sweden (set-up, steering documents).

The testing material consisted of a translation test from Swedish to Arabic combined with a questionnaire that addressed various factors of relevance to language acquisition.

The translations were analysed on three levels: (1) handwriting, (2) spelling and (3) morphosyntax. The main result of the analysis was that the participants were highly heterogeneous: some participants produced incomplete translations in handwriting that was barely legible, whereas others had good results for all measures. Many of the participants relied on a phonological strategy for spelling. For example, even short, high-frequency words such as personal pronouns and prepositions had not been spelled correctly.

The results for handwriting, spelling and morphosyntax were checked against the variables (1) years of HLI, (2) extra instruction in Arabic outside of HLI and (3) contact with written Arabic in the free time. The results for the effect of participation in HLI were inconclusive. However, many, but not all, of the participants with good results on the translation test had received extra instruction in Arabic, either in Sweden or prior to coming to Sweden. Reading Arabic in the free time was not in all cases connected to good results, but not reading Arabic in the free time was in most cases connected to a low command of written Arabic. Regarding these results, it is suggested that additional factors (motivation, support from the family, etc.) could be at play.

Previous research has addressed the question of heterogeneity in HLI classes. The findings of this thesis illustrate how great the heterogeneity can in fact be, and thus have implications for the set-up of Arabic HLI in Sweden.
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List of abbreviations

The abbreviations below that are not grammatical in character are commented on in the Introduction.

1 first person
2 second person
3 third person
ACC accusative
AP active participle
ART article
ATTR attribute
DA Dialectal Arabic
DEF definite
FEM feminine
FUT future tense
GEN genitive
HLI Home Language Instruction
HLP Home Language Pupil
HLT Home Language Teacher
[+HUM] human
[-HUM] non-human
IMPERF imperfect
INDEF indefinite
JUSS jussive
L1 First Language
L2 Second Language
MASC masculine
MSA Modern Standard Arabic
NEG negation
NOM nominative
PERF perfect
PL plural
PRON SUFF pronominal suffix
SG singular
**Transcription and transliteration**

In the present study, both transcriptions and transliterations are needed to describe the data. The transcription system EALL is used with the exceptions of ḫ for ﻲ (from DMG) and ẗ for ُ transliterating (from ISO 233:1984) (Reichmuth, 2011). In addition, some non-standard signs are employed in the transliterations to underline visual similarity between Arabic graphemes: a̍ for ا, a͗ for أ, a̹ for إ and y/acmb for ى.

**Transcriptions** are used in two ways:

1. To transcribe Arabic words that have not been produced by the participants. These transcriptions are written in italics.
2. To represent individual phonemes. Phonemic transcriptions are annotated with the solidus: /…/.

**Transliterations** are grapheme to grapheme representations and are used to describe the written production of the participants. Transliterations are annotated with the reverse solidus: \…\.

A complete list of transcriptions is provided below. Transliterations are given when they diverge from the transcriptions.
## Transcription

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic grapheme</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ā</td>
<td>a'/u</td>
<td>á</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ā</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ā</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dh</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dh</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>š</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭ</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḡ</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ū</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y/i</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ְā</td>
<td>ְā</td>
<td>ְā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a/-at</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*double consonant*
Introduction
Introduction

According to estimates Arabic is on the verge of replacing Finnish as the second largest language in Sweden with regard to the number of mother tongue speakers. Whether it is Arabic or Finnish that is the second largest language in Sweden is not our main concern here, but rather that Arabic has a strong presence in Sweden. Yet, as of now we have little knowledge of most aspects of Arabic in Sweden. It is the intention of this work to contribute to one field, that of home language instruction in Arabic for heritage language pupils.

In Sweden, pupils who have a parent or care-giver with a mother tongue other than Swedish, and who use this other language for everyday communication, are entitled to home language instruction (HLI). The language within HLI with the largest number of participants is Arabic. However, no studies have up to now investigated the acquisition of Arabic by the pupils in HLI in Sweden. I therefore intend to present in this study a first attempt to gather empirical data on the written production of Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) by home language pupils (HLPs). As with any first attempt, I hope that the methods and results of the study can serve as a starting point for future research.

The aim chosen for the study is to investigate what command 8th-graders (14-15-year-olds) in HLI have of written MSA and whether variables connected to the amount and type of instruction as well as contact with written Arabic affect their performance. The questions to be addressed are:

1. **To what extent do 8th-graders in Arabic HLI master:**
   a. The Arabic script?
   b. Spelling in Arabic?
   c. Basic MSA morphosyntax?

2. **Can the pupils’ performances be explained by the following factors:**
   a. Years of participation in HLI?
   b. Extra instruction in Arabic outside of HLI?
   c. Contact with written Arabic?

The thesis is roughly structured in the following way: background, method, analyses and discussions of the results from a translation test, and concluding discussion.

---

1 The lack of language statistics in Sweden is discussed in 2.2.3.
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Background
Based on the above-mentioned focus of investigation, the written production of MSA by HLPs, we can deduce that at least two types of variables need to be addressed:

1. Variables connected to the Arabic language.
2. Variables connected to HLI.

As a consequence, the two first chapters of the thesis are dedicated to Arabic and HLI respectively in order to define the topic and illustrate the “fuzzy linguistic situation” of the title. The chapters can be read by anyone with a wish to learn about the Arabic language situation and HLI in Sweden. The chapters can furthermore be relevant to other languages in HLI with diglossia and/or a non-Latin script, for example Suryoyo.

Chapter 1 Arabic diglossia and the Arabic script presents factors specific to Arabic likely to be of relevance to the study: (1) the concept of diglossia and (2) the acquisition of the Arabic script.

To start with diglossia: diglossia refers to a linguistic situation where two (or more) language varieties co-exist but are used in different contexts. One variety, the informal variety, is acquired in a naturalistic setting and is the actual mother tongue. The other variety, the formal variety, is learned at school and is not the mother tongue. In the case of Arabic, the formal variety is the variety that is encoded in script. It is furthermore the formal variety that is the target language of HLI. Research on diglossia is presented in this chapter to provide a description and a deeper understanding of the linguistic situation and the difficulties diglossia presents to the language learner.

In 1.2 The Arabic script, a basic description of the writing system is given followed by reviews of research on script processing and writing acquisition. It is noted that the Arabic script is in fact visually demanding to process and that children learning to write the Arabic script progress more slowly than has been seen in studies on writing in the Latin script.

Chapter 2 Home Language Instruction and Arabic as a minority language presents and discusses HLI in Sweden; the historical background, set-up, positive effects of HLI and challenges connected to HLI. In addition, there is a presentation of documents that regulate HLI, the steering documents. This presentation includes step-by-step comments on the wording of the steering documents that are concerned with how languages such as Arabic, where diglossia and/or a non-Latin script prevail, are to be handled.
Introduction

To round up this chapter, we will discuss some issues concerning Arabic as a minority language. It starts with a general discussion on the possibilities of minority language speakers to retain and develop their minority language. We then continue to Arabic as a minority language, with the emphasis on Arabic in the EU. This section includes a review of research on Arabic HLI from the Netherlands. Although Arabic HLI in the Netherlands is not entirely comparable to the situation in Sweden, this research is relevant, since among other things it discusses the connection between the level of acquisition of Arabic in HLI and various background variables. The last part is devoted to Arabic in Sweden. It comments on language statistics in Sweden and discusses the number of mother tongue speakers of Arabic in Sweden. It furthermore introduces the issue of parent-initiated extra instruction for pupils with an Arabic background, a variable that can affect language acquisition by Arabic-speaking pupils.

Method
Chapter 3 Method presents the research questions, discusses the choice of participants, describes the testing material and explains how the data have been analysed. The testing material includes a translation test from Swedish to Arabic and a questionnaire that addresses different factors of relevance to language acquisition.

Analyses and discussions of the results from the translation test
Chapter 4 Analysis of the translation test: script and spelling and Chapter 5 Analysis of the translation test: MSA morphosyntax and notes on translation contain analyses and discussions of the data from the translation test on three levels: handwriting, spelling and command of morphosyntax.

The analyses in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 focus primarily on linguistic aspects. This could be of special interest to linguists and Arabic language specialists, since the analyses are rather detailed and contain many examples from the translation tests.

Chapter 6 Explaining variations in writing, spelling and production of MSA morphology connects the results on the translation test to the type and amount of instruction, as well as the input of written Arabic.

Concluding discussion
Chapter 7 Conclusion and Discussion sums up and contextualises the results of the study.
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Terminology
Before we continue, some brief notes on the use of terminology are given below:

_Dialectal Arabic_ (DA) is used to denominate informal Arabic due to its being in clear contrast to MSA, even though “dialect” might carry negative connotations. Other abbreviations in the literature are: SAV (Spoken Arabic Vernacular: Saiegh-Haddad, 2007) and SA (Spoken Arabic: Ibrahim & Aharon-Peretz, 2005). When different spoken varieties are referred to, they will be specified in the sections concerned.

_First Language_ (L1) and _Mother Tongue_ are used interchangeably, meaning the first language(s) a child acquires in a naturalistic setting. Note that a person can have more than one first language.

_Home Language_ (HL) is used for immigrant languages taught within the framework of _Home Language Instruction_. In the case of Arabic, it is of importance to distinguish between L1 and HL, since the children do not actually study their L1 as an HL. The literature sometimes features _Heritage language_, but its use is far from clear-cut. In some articles, it refers to the language spoken by an ethnic minority, in others to the language taught in _Heritage Language Programs_ (García, 2009: 60).

_HOME LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION_ (HLI) rather than the Swedish term _Mother Tongue Instruction_ is preferred in this thesis, since HLI seems to be widely accepted in the literature and since even the homepage of the Swedish National Agency for Education shows inconsistency regarding the English translation of the Swedish term _modersmålsundervisning_, “mother-tongue instruction”.

_Home Language Teacher_ (HLT) and _Home Language Pupil_ (HLP) are coined in analogy with _Home Language Instruction_.

_Lgr11_ is the established abbreviation of _Läroplan för grundskolan, förskoleklassen och fritidshemmet 2011_ (Curriculum for the compulsory school, preschool class and the recreation centre 2011).

_Modern Standard Arabic_ (MSA) is used for the formal variety of Arabic. Another common abbreviation in the literature is LA (Literary Arabic: cf. Ibrahim & Aharon-Peretz, 2005).
Introduction

Second Language (L2) denotes all languages learned after the first language. No distinction is made between L2s and foreign languages.

Skolverket/The Swedish National Agency for Education. The Swedish term Skolverket is used for references published by the agency, whereas the National Agency for Education refers to the agency itself.

Steering Documents are used as an umbrella term for The Education Act, curricula, syllabi, ordinances, regulations, general recommendations and commentary material issued by Parliament, the government and the Swedish National Agency for Education.
Chapter 1
Arabic diglossia and the Arabic Script
Chapter 1 Arabic diglossia and the Arabic Script

The present thesis has an empirical framework and the two first chapters comprise factors thought to be of relevance for the focus of investigation: the written production of basic MSA (see 1.1.1) by HLPs. Of course, it would be possible to include even more factors, but that is beyond the scope of this study. The intention here is to paint a broad picture to be used as a point of reference for discussing the findings.

Chapter 1 introduces language-specific variables shown to affect children learning to read and write in Arabic: diglossia and the Arabic script. The chapter is structured as follows:

1.1 Diglossia
1.2 The Arabic script
1.3 Relevance to the present study

1.1 Diglossia gives an account of diglossia, that is, the difference between formal Arabic and informal Arabic. Research investigating diglossia’s impact on children’s reading acquisition is reviewed.

1.2 The Arabic script presents the Arabic writing system and reviews research on reading and writing in Arabic.

The final part, 1.3 Relevance to the present study, sums up the chapter and underlines some points of specific interest to this study.

1.1 Diglossia
This section is concerned with the Arabic language situation, a situation that is characterised by diglossia. Note that anything more than a short exposé on Arabic diglossia is beyond the scope of this study. In this context, diglossia’s impact on children learning to read and write is of interest, not diglossia as a field of research. This part contains the following sections:

1.1.1 What is diglossia?
1.1.2 Research on diglossia’s impact on the acquisition of MSA
1.1.3 Bridging diglossia?
Chapter 1 Arabic diglossia and the Arabic Script

1.1.1 What is diglossia?

*Diglossia* as a term for designating co-existing language varieties was introduced in relation to the Greek language by Psycharis\(^2\) in 1888 (Dichy, 1994). Marçais (1930) later applied the term to the split between different varieties of Arabic. More recent discussions on diglossia in the Arab world, however, start with an article by Ferguson (1959).\(^3\) This article describes a relatively stable linguistic situation where two different language varieties are used depending on context and function. The varieties are designated high (H)/low (L), using (H) for formal contexts and (L) for informal contexts. What Ferguson described was not a modest difference between dialect and a standard language but a difference more similar to that between two languages, albeit closely related. The differences between varieties affect phonology, lexicon and morphosyntax. (L) is acquired naturally whereas (H) is learned through formal instruction.

The explanation Ferguson offered as to why diglossia evolved within some languages was that (H) would be associated with a written (religious) work that took on the role of a linguistic matrix. (H) would function as the bearer of culture. In his paper, Arabic was discussed as one of the languages affected by diglossia. In the case of Arabic, the Quran functioned as the linguistic matrix.

In this thesis, the formal variety of Arabic, (H), is termed MSA (Modern Standard Arabic) whereas the informal varieties, (L), are referred to as DA (Dialectal Arabic). To avoid terminological confusion, I will take the liberty of using DA and MSA in reviews of previous research even where other terms have been chosen to designate the language varieties.

Arabic dialects are spoken in a vast area ranging from Morocco to Iraq, and even to Central Asia. Arabs from different parts of the Arabic-speaking world will in many cases not be able to communicate when using their dialects. They might not understand each other at all. It is sometimes argued that MSA can in such instances function as a medium for communication, given that the interlocutors have had the proper training (Versteegh, 2001:189-191). They might on the other hand choose to employ another language than Arabic for their conversation.

One sociolinguistic phenomenon of interest not further discussed in this study is the difference in status of various DAs. There is a common tendency in rural areas to aim for an urban dialect. In fact, an

---

2 Alternative spellings of the name are sometimes seen, e.g. Psychari and Psichari.
3 Since Ferguson’s article was published in 1959 Diglossia in the Arab world has been the subject of a vast body of research. Cf. Hallberg (2016: Chapter 2, Arabic as diglossia) for a penetrating discussion on previous research.
urban high-status dialect might function as a medium for conversation rather than MSA or, let us say, English or French (cf. Bassiouney, 2009, on levelling).

The Arabic language situation cannot, however, just be described as a clean-cut split between MSA and DA. Depending on several factors such as the subject for conversation and the geographical background and educational level of the interlocutors, MSA and DA are mixed in a pragmatic manner. Whether this code switching is rule-bound to the extent that it can be regarded as a variety in its own right is the subject of a significant body of research that will not be reviewed here (cf. Mejdell, 2011). Suffice to say that among the terms used for designating the mixed “variety” are Educated Spoken Arabic and Formal Spoken Arabic (Ryding, 1991).

Diglossia can also be put in a wider sociolinguistic, or even socioeconomic, context. Maamouri (1998), in a rather polemic discussion paper, describes the state of affairs of education in the Arabic-speaking world. In addition to criticising badly functioning educational structures, he identifies MSA itself as “the gatekeeper which limits upward socioeconomic mobility” and that “The expansion of a standardised code through education encourages uniformity not only of language but also of culture and ideology.” (1998: 11). Maamouri furthermore points out that the diglossic situation varies between different Arabic countries with varying evaluation standards, resulting in fact in the existence of different varieties of MSA.

For the framework of the present thesis, the following points are essential:

• There is a considerable linguistic distance between the informal (DA) and the formal (MSA) language that affects the domains of lexicon, phonology and morphosyntax.
• Children acquire the informal language, the dialectal variety, in a naturalistic setting.
• Children learn the formal language, the standard variety, in school through instruction.
• A large number of Arabic dialects can be found in the Arabic-speaking world.
• Arabic dialects are not always mutually intelligible.
• “Pure” MSA is rarely, if ever, encountered in everyday conversations.

4 In the paper, Maamouri differentiates between different Arabic-speaking countries and presents statistics from individual countries.
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1.1.2 Research on diglossia’s impact on the acquisition of MSA

The previous section presented Arabic diglossia briefly. For the work at hand, however, it is not sufficient to state that a diglossic linguistic situation exists in the Arabic-speaking world. What is of interest is diglossia’s possible impact on the acquisition of MSA by native Arabic speakers, since this would also affect Home Language Pupils (HLPs) in Sweden and have pedagogical implications.

Psycholinguistic studies employing different methods in fact agree that MSA is processed as an L2 rather than an L1. Below, psycholinguistic research on the impact of Arabic diglossia is reviewed. The section is rounded off by presenting and discussing an interview study that investigated Arab children’s attitudes and experiences with meeting a different language variety at school.

Eviatar & Ibrahim (2000) tested three groups of kindergarten pupils and 1st-graders on language arbitrariness, phonological awareness and vocabulary. These groups were composed of 40 Arabic-speaking children, 40 Hebrew monolingual children and 36 Russian-Hebrew bilingual children. Note that the Arabic-speaking children were not designated monolingual or bilingual since they were in fact in contact with different varieties (DA and MSA) of Arabic.

The results of the Russian-Hebrew bilinguals and the Arabic-speaking children showed the same tendencies in the tasks testing language arbitrariness and phonological awareness, and they performed better than the Hebrew monolinguals in these tests. The Hebrew monolinguals, on the other hand, had the highest scores in the vocabulary tests (spoken Hebrew) both in kindergarten and in 1st Grade. The Arabic-speaking children, who were tested in DA, performed almost as well as the Hebrew monolinguals in kindergarten but had not improved their results by the 1st Grade. The Russian-Hebrew bilinguals were tested in spoken Hebrew and got lower scores than the monolinguals. By the 1st Grade their performance had improved so that it matched the results of the Arabic-speaking 1st-graders. Eviatar & Ibrahim find that these results support the claim that bilinguals are at a disadvantage when it comes to vocabulary tests comparing bilinguals to monolinguals, since their competence is underestimated; their vocabulary is in fact larger than the tests reveal but is distributed across more languages.

In the end, the results lead the researchers to suggest that the Arabic-speaking children had developed metalinguistic abilities matching bilingual children due to the children’s processing an L2, “that exposure to literary Arabic [MSA] requires the same intensive language analyses as those demanded of children exposed to languages as different as Russian
In other words, due to contact with varieties of Arabic and the linguistic distance between the varieties, the Arabic-speaking children performed in a manner similar to the bilingual children, which indicates that MSA functions as an L2, not as an L1.

In a semantic priming study, Ibrahim & Aharon-Peretz (2005) tested 48 DA-speaking pupils in the 11th and 12th Grades who were equally proficient in Hebrew and MSA. The aim of the study was to investigate how DA and MSA were represented “in the memory of the adult native Arabic system” and if it did “entail a cognitive-linguistic system in which both forms of Arabic are represented jointly in a single lexicon” (2005: 55). Hebrew, an L2 for the participants, albeit a language they were highly proficient in, was included in the test as a means of comparison. In the first experiment, pupils were presented with spoken one-word primes in DA, MSA and Hebrew respectively. DA pseudo-words were also included as primes. The targets were in DA and furthermore divided into words semantically related or semantically unrelated to the prime. The pupils would then get to listen to a target in DA and were instructed to press a button if the target matched the prime, and the reaction time (RT) was measured. In the second experiment of the study the prime was in DA and the target in DA, MSA, Hebrew or in the form of a pseudo-word. The results, among other things, showed quicker RTs to semantically related targets independent of the language of the prime or target. The writers suggest that this connection might be emphasised due to the similar morphological structure of the Semitic languages of the study. In addition, according to the researchers, in agreement with other studies, the primes in DA were followed by faster RTs than primes in one of the L2s. The main discovery of the study, however, is the similarity in priming patterns between Hebrew and MSA, leading the writers to conclude that MSA is represented as a L2 in the cognitive system of the adult Arabic speaker.

Furthermore in a series of studies (e.g. 2003, 2004, 2005, 2007, 2011; Levin, Saiegh-Haddad, Hende & Ziv, 2008), Saiegh-Haddad has shown diglossia to affect children’s learning to read and write.

Saiegh-Haddad 2003 covers many aspects of diglossia relevant to reading acquisition. Based on “the hypothesis that reading acquisition is grafted onto oral language skills” (2003: 431), Saiegh-Haddad 2003 investigated the impact of diglossic variables on initial reading acquisition. By diglossic variables she meant “linguistic structures that survived in MSA but disappeared from colloquial Arabic” (2003: 433). Differences in phonology, syllabic structure, inflections, word order and lexicon between MSA and DA were described and Saiegh-Haddad remarked that digloss-
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Arabic diglossia’s impact on initial reading acquisition “has not yet attracted sufficient empirical attention” (2003: 434).

The question investigated in the study was: if and how two basic reading processes, phonemic awareness and pseudo word decoding, were affected by the diglossic variables. Preschool and 1st Grade Arabic native children were tested. The results revealed that both groups had problems isolating MSA phonemes, both in initial and final position. MSA phonemes embedded in MSA syllabic structures were found to be even more difficult to isolate. The 1st-graders outperformed the younger children in every task, probably due to their greater exposure to MSA. The conclusion of the study was as follows:

[…] Arabic native children are required to simultaneously master the representation of a set of diglossic structures that are not available to them from their oral language experience and to discover how these structures are mapped onto the specific orthography. The present results show this task to remain a serious challenge for children even at the end of the first grade. (Saiegh-Haddad, 2003: 444)

Finally, we have the children’s perspective on diglossia. In an interview study, Khamis-Dakwar (2005) asked DA-speaking children, 30 children in Grades 1-3 in a Palestinian village school, about their attitudes towards learning MSA in school. The answers varied. Khamis-Dakwar presented quotes from the children concerning MSA.

It [MSA] is not easy. It is all about pronunciation. I transform a word back to Ammiya [DA] during reading so that I can understand it.
(comment from a 6-year-old, 2005: 81)

When I read Fusha [MSA] I understand directly what I am reading, but when I write I think in Ammiya [DA].
(comment from a 6-year-old, 2005: 81)

Ammiya [DA] and Fusha [MSA] do not differ much, that’s why it’s easy. I think in Ammiya before I write, I later transfer to Fusha. Sometimes, while reading I feel I am going back to Ammiya.
(comment from a 7-year-old, 2005: 82)
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The quotes illustrate the school situation of children in a diglossic context. We should keep in mind that this is the real-life representation of the research results: children’s daily struggle with a code that is not their L1 and how this cognitive challenge is likely to interfere with their attainment of knowledge.

1.1.3 Bridging diglossia?
The present thesis does not intend to suggest whether teaching DA or MSA, in the Arab world or in Swedish HLI, is the correct pedagogical approach. We also need to remember that the thesis is ultimately concerned with DA-speaking children studying MSA in Sweden, not in the Arab world. In Sweden, diglossia will not cause delayed learning since Swedish, not Arabic, is the main medium for learning. However, if MSA is the variety to be taught, some research shows that there are methods that might help bridge the linguistic distance between DA and MSA. This research might thus be of interest for the Swedish context.

According to Levin, Saiegh-Haddad, Hende & Ziv (2008) and Saiegh-Haddad (2011) many Arab preschool children have a very limited experience of informal literacy in the home. This was manifested in, for example, a low awareness of the function of the letters and of the writing direction, and poor letter-naming skills compared to results from international research. The lack of literacy activities in the home was named as a factor further aggravating the negative impact of diglossia and delaying the literacy development of the children. In the words of Saiegh-Haddad (2011: 52):

[...] the widespread low levels of proficiency in the written code and the high rates of illiteracy, together with abject poverty and low socio-educational background results in children beginning the process of literacy acquisition with little or no knowledge about the basic prerequisite language and literacy skills that form the infrastructure of reading development.

In an attempt to raise children’s awareness of literacy, Levin, Saiegh-Haddad, Hende & Ziv (2008) launched an intervention programme involving 145 (30 of whom were to be tested) Israeli Palestinian kindergarten pupils (mean age 5:5) from low socioeconomic backgrounds and a control group of 30 children. The programme was

5 The pedagogical implications raised by children not knowing Swedish well enough to follow the instruction in school is not discussed in this thesis.
conducted over a period of 7 months. In their article the authors discuss how early literacy is connected to literacy later in life and comment on the low results for reading comprehension achieved by Arabic 4th-graders in PIRLS 2001. Diglossia and the Arabic writing system (the writing system is discussed in 1.2) were named as partial explanations of these results. The researchers acknowledged the importance of teachers in promoting early literacy. Accordingly, teachers in the intervention programme were given special training, forming a study group that held regular meetings once a month with the researchers. For 25 minutes every week the children in the intervention programme participated in literacy-related activities such as games with letter cards, rhyming words and playing with phonological segmentation. The groups of pupils were small and special attention was given to forming groups that functioned well. The intervention group and the control group were tested on letter naming, alphabetic awareness and phonological awareness in a pre-test and a post-test. Both groups had low results on the pre-test. On the post-test, however, the intervention group had improved greatly in all three measures. An interesting finding was that the intervention group had started naming letters by their MSA names; pre-test mean results were 3.21 per cent to post-test 61.79 per cent. The control group’s mean results went from pre-test 2.74 per cent to 10.83 per cent. Letter naming is thought to be an important factor when it comes to reading in Arabic and will be further discussed in 1.2.3. In short, the letter names in MSA actually start with the phoneme they mark, which is not always the case with DA letter names.

The researchers attributed the positive results of the intervention group to various factors:

- Teachers were professionally empowered.
- The groups of children were small and homogenous.
- The activities were semi-structured, making them more open to adaptation to the children’s needs.
- A limited set of skills was trained, but many other skills were ignored.

Another intervention programme involving Arab preschool children in Israel was described by Najjar & Jarjoura (2014). An e-book with funny exercises showed promising results with regard to increasing phonological awareness in the experimental group. At the time of writing this thesis, there was hardly any research at all concerned with Arabic e-books for children and the matter will be left for now.
Abu-Rabia (2000) had the same starting point as Levin, Saiegh-Haddad, Hende & Ziv (2008), namely that diglossia has a negative effect on literacy in the Arab world. He referred to research emphasising the importance of well-functioning early literacy acquisition and that poor readers will rarely catch up. Abu-Rabia commented that children are not being read to in preschool and that, due to diglossia and a belief that MSA is too burdensome for young children, “young children are deprived of knowledge and skills that are believed to aid transition to literacy” (2000: 148). Thus the shift to MSA when entering school is abrupt.

Abu-Rabia set out to test whether increased input of MSA during preschool had an effect on children’s reading comprehension in Grades 1 and 2; 282 children from an Arab village in Israel were divided into a test group and a control group. For two years in preschool, both groups attended three approximately 30-minute long meetings per week with activities such as singing and storytelling. The test group’s meetings were in MSA whereas the control group had meetings in DA. Half of the test group and half the control group were tested for MSA reading comprehension in Grade 1 and the rest of the groups were tested in Grade 2. The results did indeed show that exposure to MSA in preschool had positive effects on reading comprehension in Grades 1 and 2. Abu-Rabia concluded the article by recommending policy makers that early exposure to MSA ought to be implemented in preschool.

A similar conclusion was drawn in a study by Leikin, Ibrahim and Eghbaria (2013); 30 Arab kindergarten children age 5;3-5;8 years were instructed to retell two narratives, one told in MSA and one in Palestinian Arabic. The children could retell the stories in whatever language variety they chose. Even though the children start to learn MSA formally on entering school, they already have contact with MSA both through activities in the preschool and at home. The parents of the children filled in questionnaires regarding the amount of exposure to literary Arabic at home, whereas MSA activities in preschool were determined by the curriculum.

Based on an analysis of the linguistic and narrative structure of the discourse, it was concluded that the children had understood the DA story somewhat more accurately than they understood the MSA story. On the other hand, the researchers pointed out, it was highly interesting that the preschool children were in fact able to retell the MSA story coherently and that they even used MSA words themselves, implying that they had already started to acquire MSA
informally. This finding gave a possible explanation of greater awareness among Israeli-Palestinian parents of the importance of MSA input in the home. Since acquiring a written language is an accumulative task with clear connections between early development and ultimate outcome, that is, poor readers tend to remain poor readers, the researchers suggest that strengthening the informal acquisition of MSA by young children is a path that should be further explored.

If the articles above are compared, we can observe that both the semi-structured sessions focusing on literacy activities (Levin, Saiegh-Haddad, Hende & Ziv, 2008) and the MSA meetings (Abu-Rabia, 2000) showed positive effects. On the other hand, it could naturally be argued that linguistic activities and/or an increased amount of input would help the acquisition of any L2. And the research presented in the previous section clearly shows that MSA is not the L1 of DA speakers.

If instead we turn to DA, another possibility for bridging diglossia could be, according to Maamouri (1998), to employ the dialect as a medium for initial reading acquisition. As related above, Maamouri names diglossia as one of the factors preventing social change and progress in Arabic-speaking countries. He suggests that “Storybooks in colloquial Arabic could be used in an intergenerational approach to Arabic first literacy acquisition.” since “The high illiteracy rate among Arab parents is an obviously significant obstacle to creating an early literate environment for a young child.” (1998: 63). The benefits of this approach would be that (1) even parents with a limited education may be able to read the Arabic script well enough to read stories in DA, thereby (2) creating an early literate environment in the home and (3) allowing the child to learn to read and write in the L1. When the child is already familiar with the written form, MSA could be introduced.

Maamouri, however, comments on the lack of research on the early linguistic development of Arabic-speaking children and states that “a comparative study of early reading acquisition in colloquial [DA] and in fusha [MSA] seems necessary” (Maamouri, 1998: 63).

An example of the opposition to introducing DA in educational milieus in the Arab world is provided by a recent event. On 2 August 2015, a Lebanese francophone newspaper, L’Orient-Le Jour, reported that the Algerian Minister of National Education, sociologist Nouria Benghebrit, had proposed that dialectal Algerian Arabic be used in the first two school years. Benghebrit was following the advice of literacy experts in an attempt to improve educational achievement among
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Algerian pupils. The proposal resulted in a heated political and ideologi‐
cal debate. Religious scholars even said that introducing DA into the
school system was like going back to the era of colonisation, when the
favouring of DA was to the detriment of Arabic [i.e. MSA]. DA in the
classroom was proclaimed to be a threat to the purity of the language.
That a research-based proposal aimed at facilitating pupils’ cognitive
development was met with such fierce opposition illustrates how compli‐
cated the question of language varieties can be.

In a study involving Greek, one of the other languages discussed
by Ferguson (1959), a somewhat different approach to bridging diglossia
was taken.7 As a part of an intervention study, the researcher (Yiakoumet‐
ti, 2007) developed a textbook in Cypriot dialect (CD) on everyday
subjects known to the pupils. The textbook was intended to function as a
medium for making the dialect-speaking pupils aware of linguistic
differences between CD and Standard Modern Greek (SMG). The
hypothesis was that pupils would be able to incorporate the instruction
rather than trying to understand the content and the language of the
book.

The participants were 92 11-12-year-olds from one rural and one
urban area in the Larnaca district. The programme took place over a
period of three months. Teachers were specifically instructed for the
programme and the children were to be taught 45 min/day using the
textbook, thereby replacing 50 per cent of the regular language classes.
The effect of the programme was measured by written pre-tests and post-
tests in the form of essays. The tests were measured for interlingual (i.e.
non-standard traits transferred to the standard variety) errors. The results
showed, among other things, that explicit use of the dialect in the class‐
room helped pupils distinguish between the two codes and actually
reduced dialectal interference.

To my knowledge, no similar study has at the time of writing this
thesis been conducted in an Arabic-speaking setting.

7 “What the long-term diglossia and associated influence from a written language have
meant for Greek is the emergence of dialect differences that are not just regional
(geographic) in nature. Rather, there are important socially based distinctions that have
been fed by diglossia and by associations between conservative social and political
attitudes and conservative linguistic usage on the one hand, and progressive attitudes and
innovative linguistic usage on the other. Thus, within Greek one has to reckon with
mixing of varieties and borrowing among them of both a regional and stylistic/social
nature.” (Joseph & Tserdanelis 2003: 824). Note that this could just as well have been
written about Arabic.
Chapter 1 Arabic diglossia and the Arabic Script

1.2 The Arabic script
As was previously stated, diglossia and the Arabic script are thought to affect the acquisition of MSA. Diglossia was discussed above and we now turn to the Arabic script. This section starts with a brief description of the Arabic writing system as a point of reference for the discussions to come in the review of research in the subsequent sections.8 This section is organised as follows:

1.2.1 Brief notes on the Arabic writing system
1.2.2 Research on the Arabic writing system
1.2.3 Research on reading in Arabic
1.2.4 Research on processing the Arabic script
1.2.5 Research on writing in Arabic

Before we continue, a couple of points regarding the focus of the review of research should be made. The present study has an empirical approach. Participants were tested in a written Swedish to MSA translation test (the method is described in detail in Chapter 3). Thus studies concerned with the production of written MSA should be of greater value to the analysis of the data than studies on reading. On the other hand, reading and writing are closely connected, like two sides of a coin, and some valuable insights may be drawn from research on reading acquisition. The intention of this section, however, is not to provide a comprehensive review of research, since the learning situation for Arabic-speaking children in the Arab world and Arabic-speaking bilingual children growing up in societies where Arabic is a minority language is clearly quite different with regard to the quantity of language input in the environment and instruction of Arabic at school. Nevertheless, developmental theories for reading and writing in Arabic, including language and script-related challenges, are relevant to the analyses of the present thesis.

1.2.1 Brief notes on the Arabic writing system
Before the review of research commences, a general introduction to the Arabic writing system will be provided.

The Arabic writing system is a so-called abjad writing system, an alphabetic script which does not include signs for vowels. In Arabic,

---

8 This is not the place to give an account of the development of the Semitic languages and how Arabic and its writing system are related to other Semitic languages and Semitic scripts. The interested reader might like to consult Versteegh (2001) for an overview on the subject.
however, some consonant graphemes, *matres lectionis*, also function as markers for long vowels. Thus long vowels and consonants are indicated in the script, but not short vowels. Short vowels can be added by a set of diacritics but are generally only applied to certain genres (the Qur’ān, for example, is always provided with short vowels) and in schoolbooks for children learning to read.

For the trained reader of Arabic, not being perfectly certain about what short vowel to insert in a word will probably not impede the understanding of a text. The regularity of Arabic morphology with its recurring patterns will often support the reader in inserting the correct short vowels in a word although lexical knowledge is often involved.9 Problems can above all arise if the text is to be read aloud.10 Short vowels at the end of nouns and verbs carry syntactical information, such as case and mood. A correct syntactic analysis of a clause is therefore necessary to be able to add the correct end-vowels. However, when reading aloud, case endings and markers of mode indicated by short vowels are often dropped.

Several of the characters are identical in shape and are only distinguished by diacritic dots. Characters differ slightly in form depending on their position in a word: initial position, medial position or final position. There is, however, no distinction between lower-case and upper-case letters.

As a rule, Arabic script is cursive, but some letters can only be connected to the preceding character, not to the character following.

The Arabic characters are not used in compounds; rather, the correspondence between (MSA) consonantal phonemes and graphemes is quite transparent. In other words, there are no digraphs such as “th” in English ‘they’ or ‘think’, since these two phonemes would correspond to two different graphemes in Arabic: fricatives ذ, د and ف, ت.

Furthermore, as Taouk & Coltheart (2004) remark, letter-naming in MSA is transparent. The initial phoneme of the names of the letter

9 Verbs, for example, change their so called “stem vowel”, i.e. the vowel connected to the second radical of the verb. A verb in the perfect tense, كتب, *kataba* ‘he wrote’, is conjugated يكتب, *yaktubu* ‘he writes’ in the imperfect tense. The verb كملك, *malaka* ‘he ruled’, on the other hand, is conjugated يملك, *yamliku* ‘he rules’. In a script without vowels, the above Arabic words would appear as follows when transliterated: ktb, yktb, mlk, ymlk. This means that you have to know your MSA to be able to read aloud. Parkinson (1993) in a study on the knowledge of MSA among Egyptians found that his test subjects did not necessarily know the MSA stem vowels of يكتب, *yaktubu* ‘he writes’; rather, many of them proposed *yaktabu*.

10 An amusing example of the difficulty of reading Arabic was at the time of writing available on YouTube. In a clip from December 2009, Lebanese Prime Minister Saad Hariri in an address to the Lebanese Parliament was having a really bad vowel-day, much to the delight of the rest of the Parliament.
corresponds to the phoneme represented by the letter. Let us take ‘f’ as an example: the English name of the letter is ‘ef’, but the Arabic (MSA) name is ‘fā’'. Taouk & Coltheart suggest that this factor facilitates children’s early deciphering of words. By naming the letters, they can make out the sounds of the word, even if the short vowels are written with diacritics.

1.2.2 Research on the Arabic writing system

An important point needs to be made here: there is a lack of studies on reading and writing in Arabic (Koda, 2008). The ample research on the Hebrew script is often used as a complement and as a means of comparison based on some fundamental similarities: both scripts codify Semitic languages and have root-based morphologies, share a right to left writing direction and indicate short vowels through a complimentary system (cf. Hansen, 2008). However, the Arabic script and the Hebrew script do in fact differ in one significant respect: the Hebrew script is not cursive. In addition, the Hebrew language is not diglossic.

When we talk about reading and writing in Arabic, it is complicated to distinguish between difficulties inherent in the writing system itself and difficulties relating to diglossia. As shown in the section on diglossia, diglossia can be investigated by oral tests not involving writing. Studies concerned with DA-speaking children’s learning to read and write in MSA will, on the other hand, have to take into account the possible impact of diglossic variables on the performance.

1.2.3 Research on reading in Arabic

Learning to read the Arabic script is connected to some specific difficulties, but there are also positive sides to the script. Below, I review a study on reading in Arabic. Thereafter, some general points concerning how the Arabic script is processed are presented. However, psycholinguistic studies from the Arab world (e.g. Saiegh-Haddad, 2005, on children’s phonological processing and phoneme-grapheme and grapheme-phoneme conversions, the role of short-term memory, etc.), though highly interesting, are not included in the presentations.

Concerning children learning to read in English, Harris & Coltheart (1986) suggested the following stages.12

---

11 For comprehensive reviews of research on reading and writing in Arabic, cf. Ibrahim (2013); Fragman (2014).
12 Different terminologies have been used for the developmental stages by different scholars in the field of reading acquisition (cf. Mohamed, Elbert & Landerl, 2011).
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1. The discrimination-net phase, where children recognise a small number of words on sight without much analysis involved.
2. The phonological recoding phase, during which the children start segmenting words and interpreting graphemes into phonemes. This phase is only applicable to scripts that have a phoneme-grapheme connection, like Arabic, Hebrew and Latin.
3. The orthographic phase, which is reached when reading has been automated and words are read as units without segmentation.

Taouk & Coltheart (2004) set out to test the universality of the stages of reading acquisition among children learning to read the Arabic script. In a description of the Arabic script, Taouk & Coltheart (2004: 30-33) point out some aspects that could in fact make Arabic easier to process than English. The following are some of the positive aspects of the Arabic script included in their presentation:

- The Arabic script has a shallow orthography when fully vowelled, as for example in schoolbooks for young children.
- The names of the letters start with the actual phoneme. This is thought to make it easier for children to decode a grapheme.¹³
- The Arabic script has a clear consonantal phoneme-grapheme correspondence, with no compound graphemes; e.g. phoneme, think, shy.
- Arabic spelling is highly regular and consistent, which makes pronunciation easy as opposed to words with irregular spelling in English.
- Arabic has no heterographic homophones, i.e. words that are pronounced in the same way but spelled differently; sail-sale.
- Arabic (MSA) in general has a regular morphology with morphological patterns recurring, facilitating spelling and reading.

The aspects above lead Taouk & Coltheart to suggest that, since phonological decoding in Arabic is more transparent than in English, it should in theory be easier to learn to read in Arabic than in English.¹⁴ Taouk &

¹³ It should, on the other hand, be noted that this is true for MSA, but not necessarily for DA, since, due to diglossia, the letters have different sets of names. For example Najjar & Jarjoura (2014: 325) comment that the letter “m” is called mim in MSA, but im in DA [in Najjar & Jarjoura’s transcriptions].
¹⁴ To design an experiment to test this claim would, however, be more or less impossible, they state. Establishing paired groups of participants with regard to various background factors would be the greatest difficulty.
Coltheart, however, point out some complications connected to reading and writing in Arabic:

- Owing to diglossia, children are learning to read and write in a variety they do not actually speak. One consequence concerning phonological recoding is that although the phoneme-grapheme correspondence in Arabic (=MSA) is clear, the phonemic repertoire between MSA and DA differs.
- The system for supplying short vowels above the script is potentially cognitively demanding, no matter how phonologically transparent.
- Allographic variants of letters, i.e. different letter shapes depending on position in word, may reduce recognisability and thus slow down reading acquisition.
- Making the transition from vowelled to unvowelled script can be challenging.

To the list above can be added that when words are not supplied with diacritics for short vowels, different words can have the same graphic representation: كتب = kataba, “he wrote”, katiba, “it was written”, kutub, “books”, etc.

The participants in Taouk & Coltheart’s study were 75 Australian-Arab bilingual children in Grades 3, 4 and 6, aged (mean) 8, 9 and 11. The children lived in Australia and received Arabic instruction for half an hour three to five times a week. The children had received Arabic instruction since preschool; 10 Arabic-English bilingual adults were in addition recruited for one part of the study.

The study comprised three experiments. The first and the second experiment are included in the presentation below. In the first experiment, the bilingual children from Grades 4 and 6 were asked to read four different lists of words: (1) vowelled non-words, (2) incorrectly vowelled real words, which meant that they were in fact non-words, (3) unvowelled non-words and (4) unvowelled rare real words. The vowelled words were scored according to the correct pronunciation of both vowels and consonants, the unvowelled words only for consonants. The older children scored higher on all lists, meaning there was a Grade effect. One result, namely that the younger children scored 6.8 per cent lower on List 2 than List 1, compared with 0.8 per cent for the 6th-graders, led Taouk & Coltheart to suggest that the younger children relied on some specific salient features to read words, that is, they employed the discrimination-net strategy for reading.
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The second experiment targeted phonological versus whole-word approaches to reading. The adult participants and the 6th-graders were tested in this experiment. A handwritten list of 25 real words, correctly spelled but with “position-illegal” letter forms, was compiled. The participants were scored on accuracy and reading speed. The results were interesting. For reading accuracy, both groups scored a mean 73 per cent correct. The 6th-graders, however, outperformed the adults for reading speed. The mean time was 105.28 seconds for the 6th-graders to 174 seconds for the adults. According to Taouk & Coltheart, the results indicate that the children are using a phonological recoding strategy for reading whereas the adults have reached the orthographic phase in their reading, that is they are using a whole-word strategy.

Naturally, the bilingual pupils in Australia cannot be expected to perform in line with Arabic-speaking children in the Arab world. On the other hand, this result can be of interest for the Swedish context, even though the children in the present study are 14-15 year old 8th-graders in HLI. Note in addition that the Swedish HLPs receive less instruction per week, approximately one hour (Skolverket, 2008).

1.2.4 Research on processing the Arabic script
This section briefly introduces research concerning how the Arabic script is processed: the impact of short vowels on understanding, reading speed and reading accuracy, and if the writing system’s complexity affects the reading acquisition. The analysis of the data of the present study does not specifically address these research questions and a comprehensive review of research is thus not motivated. Yet, as these questions are believed to be relevant when discussing the general set-up of Arabic HLI, an outline is provided below.

One research question that has aroused some attention is the role of short vowels. Even though a text in Arabic supplied with short vowels is orthographically transparent, it is at the same time cognitively demanding to process. There is, in short, more information to be taken in and interpreted. Ibrahim (2013) points out that studies investigating the effect on reading speed and reading accuracy in voweled and unvowelled script are inconclusive and even show contradictory results that can only in part be explained by the different research methods employed for testing. The common tendency seen in the research, however, is that vowels increase reading accuracy and understanding but result in a slower reading speed.

Hansen (2008) suggests that not only the short vowels but also the general visual complexity in the form of ligatures and diacritic dots, contributes to slowing down processing texts in the Arabic script. Later
studies (Taha, 2016; Ibrahim, 2013) support her discussion on the visual complexity of the Arabic script and refer to this visual complexity as “orthographic density”. Whatever the underlying reason, it is nevertheless firmly established that reading speed in Arabic is slower than has been found in comparable tests for languages written in the Latin script (cf. Fragman, 2014; Mohamed, Elbert & Landerl, 2011; Abu-Rabia & Taha, 2006, on children’s reading speed).

1.2.5 Research on writing in Arabic

A limited number of studies have looked into Arabic pupils’ writing. To my knowledge, no longitudinal studies have been conducted at the time of writing this thesis.

Azzam (1993), in a cross-sectional study involving pupils in Grades 2-6 in Abu Dhabi, investigated the developmental stages of learning to read and write in Arabic. It should be noted here that Azzam’s study was a pioneer work. In her own words:

A review of the literature on Arabic language learning, with regard to reading and spelling difficulties, reveals that available research focuses primarily on the linguistic aspects of the process, mostly in terms of grammar and orthography [...]. Difficulties and complexities of the Arabic language are listed and discussed with very little, if any, empirical support. The problem is compounded by a vacuum in the areas of cognitive theories, theories of language acquisition, reading and writing models, testing materials, etc. as they relate to the Arab world. Thus the information provided in the literature is limited in both quantity and quality, leaving a tremendous gap in our knowledge.

(Azzam, 1993: 155)

Azzam attempted to investigate where the two literacy skills, reading and writing, developed simultaneously and where they diverged; in other words, to what extent they were interdependent. Based on the developmental stages suggested for English and research on interaction between the literacy skills, Azzam hypothesised that the nature of the scripts would result in a slightly different development. For example, the transparent consonantal grapheme-phoneme correspondence in Arabic would facilitate early reading by use of an alphabetic strategy. On the other hand, Arabic spelling has features that are context-sensitive and require
explicit knowledge of grammatical rules for spelling. These features were hypothesised to be difficult to master.

Although a different terminology is used in this article than in Taouk & Coltheart (2004) above, the basic premises are the same. Children learning alphabetic scripts start with a whole-word approach, where they perceive words as pictures and/or notice salient features in them. They then proceed to segment the words, converting phonemes into graphemes and graphemes into phonemes. When they finally reach a stage of automatisation, segmentation becomes redundant. In Azzam’s terminology, these stages are referred to as logographic, alphabetic and orthographic, whereas Taouk & Coltheart favoured the discrimination-net phase, the phonological recoding phase and the orthographic phase. In her adaptation of the framework to Arabic, Azzam introduces a fourth phase to cover the context-sensitive rules for spelling that exist in Arabic: the grammatical/semantic phase.15

Azzam tested 150 children aged 6-11 for reading and spelling 50 words imbedded in 25 sentences. The lists were adapted to suit different Grade levels. The errors were classified according to type. However, the classification of spelling errors into categories, though meticulous and illustrated with examples (1993: 380-382), mixes error types that relate to mastery of the writing system, ability to convert (MSA) phonemes into (MSA) graphemes, knowledge of orthographic rules for writing and knowledge of context-sensitive rules. Furthermore, Azzam assigns each misspelled word to only one category (1993: 361), while stating that a word can contain more than one type of error. Even though an elaborate explanation is given for the hierarchies used for classifying the errors, some error types override others according to this system, and a full description of the errors involved is not supplied. Azzam’s categories do not provide specifics on exactly what graphemes were sensitive to misspellings. Thus it is difficult, for example, to see if consonants that have different representations in DA and MSA are misspelled more often. “Soft vs hard consonants”, referring to non-emphatic and emphatic pairs, are listed as an error type but do not serve to fully cover errors based on different phonemic repertoires in DA and MSA. Similarly, Azzam has a category for added letters but does not distinguish between consonants and graphemes used for indicating long vowels. If short vowels are marked as long, it would be valuable to know the position of this particular spelling error. If a grapheme used for indicating a long vowel is added within a word, the error would be phonological, that is,

15 The results regarding reading and the interdependence between reading and writing are not commented on, since the present study focuses on writing.
caused by an inability to convert an MSA phoneme into a grapheme. On the other hand, if a grapheme for a long vowel is added to the word ending, the error could instead be orthographic or context-sensitive. No matter how elaborate the classification system is, Azzam’s results are difficult to use for a detailed comparison of data, but they still provide us with insight into the stages of learning to write and read in Arabic.

Concerning the results for handwriting, Azzam states that in Grade 2 “Errors relating to the mechanical skills of writing were also prominent: handwriting, in terms of letter formation, was poor; segmentation errors consisted mostly of breaks in the cursive flow of the script; the selection of the appropriate letter shape depending on its position in the word was inconsistent; and new letters were invented.” (1993: 364). As for the pupils in Grade 3 “Handwriting errors, in terms of letter formation, were relatively prominent.” (1993: 364). Also in Grade 5 (no specifics are given about Grade 4; the general errors are said to be on a par with those seen among the pupils in Grade 3) problems with letter formation were seen. The comments on the results for Grade 6 do not mention handwriting errors, and we may assume that they were no longer salient.

Continuing to spelling, Azzam found that even though there was a clear Grade effect on the achievement of the pupils, spelling errors persisted across Grades. The improvement concerned quantity, not quality; in other words the error types showed a similar distribution for different Grades. Azzam suggests that pupils in Grade 2, and to some extent in Grade 3, use logographic strategies for reading and writing. A reliance on the alphabetic strategy for reading and writing was seen in all Grades. Azzam infers that context-sensitive rules had not been fully introduced to the pupils by Grade 6. Even more, it was evident that by Grade 6 pupils had not moved on to the orthographic phase of reading and writing and the pupils did not seem to have started using grammatical and semantic skills. Thus the fourth stage proposed by Azzam, the grammatical/semantic phase, had definitely not been reached.

Abu-Rabia & Taha (2006) confirmed Azzam’s results that Arabic-speaking pupils reach the orthographic stage of writing late; 288 Arabic-speaking pupils in Grades 1-9 from schools in Northern Israel were tested for spelling. Lists of high-frequency words, 24-45 words long depending on the Grade, were compiled for each Grade, and the words were dictated to the participants.

Abu-Rabia & Taha (2006: 172-173) use a different system for classifying the spelling errors than Azzam. Their system contains fewer categories, but the categories systematically target the process behind the
Handwriting, on the other hand, is not included in their classification. Azzam’s list of error types could be translated into Abu-Rabia & Taha’s system, but because she prioritised between the errors, only listing one error per word even when more were present, a direct comparison of the results cannot be made. Since Abu-Rabia & Taha do not state otherwise, I assume that they did not prioritise between errors, listing all occurrences even though they do not provide frequencies but percentages. Abu-Rabia & Taha classify errors according to the following seven categories:

1. Phonetic errors: the inability to convert a phoneme into the proper grapheme. Abu-Rabia & Taha specify three types of phonetic spelling errors within the category: (1) incorrect spelling of emphatic and non-emphatic pairs, (“soft vs hard consonants” in Azzam’s terminology, 1993: 378), (2) confusion between long and short vowels and (3) dialectal interference, i.e. when a word is spelled as it is pronounced in DA, not MSA.

Before we move on to the next category, I will comment briefly on the vowel error type. Abu-Rabia & Taha give few details regarding the extent to which long vowels are written for short vowels and short vowels for long vowels. They do, however, add that this confusion of vowels sometimes occurs at the word endings, and in such instances long vowels tend to be used for short vowels.

2. Semiphonetic errors: The orthographic representation of a word does not match the word phonologically. The main phonological-orthographic chunk of a word is produced, but phonemes have been added, omitted or substituted. The result is an approximation of the target word.

3. Dysphonetic errors: “when words are spelled incorrectly in more than one phoneme and when the spelled orthographic chunk does not represent most of the phonemes in the target words. […] there is no internal lexical representation.” (2006: 173). Abu-Rabia & Taha exemplify this error category with رففت, rifrat, a non-word, for the target word فكرة, fikra, idea. They refer to this example as a “pseudo-homophone”.

4. Visual letter confusion. Arabic has a number of graphemes with the same basic shape, but distinguished by the placing or number of dots. A change in the placing or number of dots will thus
result in a grapheme that does not represent the dictated phoneme.

Azzam (1993) places the treatment of dots in different categories: additions, omissions, sequencing (i.e. mixing up the number of dots on graphemes with a similar shape placed after one another), and inversions (i.e. incorrect placing of the dots).

5. Irregular spelling rules. Irregular spelling rules refer to context-dependent rules for spelling out certain phonemes. Phonological knowledge does not suffice to spell these phonemes correctly.
7. Functional word omission.

If we look closer at the categories and exclude 6 and 7, the omissions, we are left with the following: Are the participants able to convert (MSA) phonemes into graphemes and do they master the rules for irregular spelling?

Abu-Rabia & Taha showed phonological spelling errors to be dominant across all Grades included in the study. The results indicated that even in Grade 9 the pupils had not moved on from the phonological to the orthographic stage of writing. The researchers suggest that diglossia is part of the explanation as well as difficulties inherent in Arabic orthography. In addition, the writers refer to their own research (Abu-Rabia & Taha, 2004), which indicated that the Hebrew and the Arabic scripts “[…] make heavy demands on the visuo-spatial processing of letters, roots, affixes, and short vowels posted on and/or under the letters, and of letter similarities.” (2006: 180). Both diglossia and the complexity of the script are thus thought to slow down the development of writing in Arabic.

Fragman (2013, 2014) gave further support for the idea that diglossia affects spelling. Fragman (2013) investigated the written production of a specific set of phonemes, some of which are realised differently in the DA of the Negev Bedouins than in MSA; 347 Negev Bedouin pupils in Grades 2, 4 and 6 were tested for their production of these phonemes, not spelling in general. Fragman developed three tasks: (1) real word dictation of eight words, (2) pseudo-word dictation of eight words and (3) a real word recognition task in which the participants were given pairs of words and instructed to mark the correctly spelled word.

The results confirmed, among other things, that differences in the phonemic repertoire between DA and MSA still interfered with spelling
in Grade 6 and in fact little progress was found between pupils in Grade 4 and Grade 6.

The studies above return to the question of diglossia’s impact on reading and writing in Arabic. Even though there is the already mentioned clear correspondence between consonantal grapheme and phoneme in Arabic, it should be emphasised that this is only true for the phonemic repertoire of MSA, not for different varieties of DA. These results can be compared to Saiegh-Haddad’s (2003, see 1.1.2); preschool and 1st Grade children have difficulty in isolating MSA-specific phonemes. It seems logical that it is difficult to spell something you do not have a clear representation of.

1.3 Relevance to the present study
Arabic literacy is not the focus of the present study and the research review did not set out to be comprehensive but rather to provide an outline of the challenges that mother tongue speakers of DA face when they start to learn how to write in Arabic.

If we sum up the chapter, the following points are highly relevant to discussions to come concerning Arabic HLI in Sweden.

- MSA is not the L1.
- Diglossia interferes with learning to read and write in Arabic.
- The Arabic script is cognitively demanding to process.
- To fully master spelling in Arabic, explicit knowledge of context-sensitive rules are required.
- Children learning to read and write in the Arabic script progress more slowly that children learning to read and write in the Latin script.
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In the previous chapter it was established that variables relating to (1) the Arabic language and (2) home language instruction in Sweden would provide an empirical framework for the thesis. The previous chapter reviewed and discussed research on Arabic diglossia and the Arabic writing system, and this chapter is consequently concerned with Swedish HLI and Arabic in Sweden. It is structured as follows:

2.1 Home language instruction
2.2 Arabic as a minority language
2.3 Concluding picture: “a fuzzy linguistic situation”

2.1 Home language instruction provides an overview of Swedish home language instruction, including steering documents and organisational and pedagogical factors. Issues concerning home language in general and Arabic as a home language in particular are discussed.

2.2 Arabic as a minority language establishes that the Arabic-speaking group is actually the Arabic-speaking groups, since Arabic-speaking immigrants not only have different geographical backgrounds but in addition speak different varieties of Arabic. This section also describes the general trend of minority language children to become increasingly dominant in the majority language, and how the language learning possibilities of minority language pupils differ from those of the majority language pupils. Given that there is no research on Arabic HLI in Sweden, a subsection presents some studies on Arabic HLI in the Netherlands. The section is rounded off with a brief discussion of Arabic as a minority language in Sweden and parent-initiated extra instruction for children with an Arabic background.

2.3 Concluding picture: “a fuzzy linguistic situation” sums up the discussions in Chapter 1 and Chapter 2.

2.1 Home language instruction
In order to further illustrate “the fuzzy linguistic situation” of the title, this section treats different elements relating to Swedish HLI. It is structured as follows:
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2.1.1 The historical background of HLI in Sweden

Hyltenstam & Tuomela (1996), Tuomela (2002), Hyltenstam & Milani (2013) and a report from The National Agency for Education (Skolverket, 2008) on HLI. Since there is no research on Arabic as an HL, general findings from research on HLI are presented without reference to individual studies. Nor will various debates and political turns be described in detail. Here, the outline of HLI in Sweden is intended to provide a background for discussions on the Arabic HLI set-up.

2.1.2 The current set-up of HLI

2.1.3 Positive effects of HLI

2.1.4 Factors complicating HLI

2.1.5 The steering documents governing HLI

This part of the thesis depends largely on Hyltenstam & Tuomela (1996), Tuomela (2002), Hyltenstam & Milani (2013) and a report from The National Agency for Education (Skolverket, 2008) on HLI. Since there is no research on Arabic as an HL, general findings from research on HLI are presented without reference to individual studies. Nor will various debates and political turns be described in detail. Here, the outline of HLI in Sweden is intended to provide a background for discussions on the Arabic HLI set-up.

2.1.1 The historical background of HLI in Sweden

Hyltenstam & Tuomela (1996) provide a historical perspective on HLI in Sweden and demonstrate how its history is connected to tendencies in society. In 1950, 3 per cent of the Swedish population were immigrants, increasing to 10 per cent in 1993. HLI was started up in Sweden in order to support the linguistic and ethnic identity of immigrant children. According to Hyltenstam & Tuomela, HLI functioned as a substitute marker for people’s attitudes towards immigration; in other words, people that were opposed to immigration criticised HLI instead and people positive to immigration were also simplistically pro HLI. Tendencies in society’s attitude towards immigration varied over different periods and the attitude towards immigration left its mark on the view on HLI and the resources allocated to it.

Until the 1970s the attitude was that immigrants should be assimilated into Swedish society, but from the 1970s to the 1980s a pluralistic view dominated, in the late 1980s with a greater emphasis on integration. The 1990s saw growing demands for assimilation. Hyltenstam & Tuomela (1996: 12) point out that these tendencies were the official attitudes of society and probably not representative of the view of the general public, where assimilation was rather thought to be the favoured perspective.

If we turn to HLI, it becomes clear how the (official) attitudes over time are reflected in the organisation and prioritisation of HLI.

16 By the end of 2015 17 per cent of the Swedish population was born abroad (www.scb.se/sv_/Hitta-statistik/Artiklar/Finland-och-Irak-de-tva-vanligaste-fodelse‐landerna-bland-utrikes-fodda/, retrieved 2017-06-07).
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Period of assimilation, -1970s
1968 was the starting point for HLI in Sweden. It was not, however, obligatory for the municipalities to organise HLI.

Period of pluralism, 1970s-1980s
The Home Language Reform [Hemspråksreformen] meant that the municipalities were obliged to arrange HLI. The municipalities were recompensed with earmarked money.

Period of pluralism + integration, 1980s-1990s
From 1985, HLI was subject to the restrictions that one of the parents was required to speak the language and that the language should be used by the child for everyday communication.

Period of integration ≈ assimilation, 1990s
From 1991, the municipalities were not obliged to arrange HLI unless there was a minimum of five pupils in the municipality who wished to study the language, and from 1993 the municipalities no longer received earmarked money for HLI.

2.1.2 The current set-up of HLI
According to the Education Act (SFS 2010:800: 10. 7§), pupils who have at least one caregiver with an L1 other than Swedish and who use this other language for everyday communication, are entitled to HLI.

The School Ordinance (SKOLFS 2011:185: 5. 7§-13§) provides further details on the responsibilities for the authorities charged with organising the instruction, the conditions pupils need to fulfil to be entitled to participation and some guidelines relating to how the instruction can be organised.17

For a start, the municipalities need only provide instruction if a minimum of five children in the municipality wish to participate in the instruction of a particular language and the municipality is able to secure a suitable teacher for the task.

HLI can be offered to the pupils either within or outside of the regular school schedule, that is, as an additional subject. If the pupils participate in the instruction outside of the regular schedule, the manda-tor (i.e. schools, but ultimately the municipalities) is only obliged to provide instruction for a total of seven years in compulsory school

17 Special regulations apply to speakers of the National Minority Languages, but those regulations are not discussed here.
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(Grades 1-9), unless the pupil is deemed to be in need of additional instruction.

Families register their children for participation after being informed by the mandators. According to The National Agency for Education (Skolverket, 2008) procedures for reaching out to families with information about HLI differ. In line with this, The National Agency for Education (Skolverket, 2008) reported that the level of prioritisation of HLI varied between different municipalities. For example, schools with a large body of pupils with an immigrant background tended to have a more structured approach towards bilingualism. In other words, the way HLI is organised across the country can vary.

Once a pupil has enrolled in HLI for a specific year, attendance is compulsory. That said, it is still possible to join HLI in different Grades as well as to participate in one year but not another.

To conclude with an example from the municipality of Stockholm concerning the actual organisation of HLI, HLI is arranged in at least two different ways: Some schools with large groups of HLPs of specific languages sometimes employ HLTs to work locally in the schools, while schools with smaller groups of home language pupils employ ambulant HLTs by the hour from Language Centre Stockholm [Språkcentrum Stockholm].

2.1.3 Positive effects of HLI
Hyltenstam & Tuomela (1996: 36-44) reviewed findings from within the field of Second Language Acquisition research that motivate HLI for bi-/multilingual children. The following positive results were found:

HLI as a support for developing the L1
Children that speak a minority language will not develop their L1 in the same way that children speaking the majority language do. The minority language is naturally less present in society, which means that the children do not get the same amount of language contact with the L1 and thereby limited opportunities to hear and use the language. In addition, they will not employ the L1 in as many different domains as the children speaking the majority language. Participation in HLI can help the children to further develop their L1 and to attain knowledge of more language domains.

In this context, Hyltenstam & Tuomela also remark that society’s attitudes toward the minority language affect the children’s motivation to use and learn it. The possibility to study the L1 within the framework of
HLI helps to raise the status of the language, maybe resulting in increased interest among the children in learning more about the HL.

**HLI as a support for learning Swedish**
The development of language and cognitive abilities go hand in hand. Knowing concepts in an L1 is believed to facilitate learning them in an L2 (cf. Cummins, 1979). It becomes a matter of renaming familiar items rather than processing a new concept and naming it at the same time. Note that Hyltenstam & Tuomela do not advocate that children should first learn their L1 before Swedish is introduced. They argue that children can acquire languages simultaneously.

**HLI as a support for attainment of knowledge**
Some children who speak a minority language may enter school with a command of Swedish that is insufficient for acquiring knowledge. To ensure that cognitive development is not hampered, children should have the opportunity to learn in their L1 while their Swedish is expanding.

**HLI as a support for developing identity**
Hyltenstam & Tuomela remark that if it is considered desirable (i.e. according to official policy) for persons with immigrant backgrounds to connect to the culture of the country of emigration, HLI can play an important role since language and culture are closely linked.

**HLI as a support for upbringing**
Children who do not get support for developing their minority language have been observed to shift to using the majority language to a great extent. If the parents in their turn do not learn the majority language, communication becomes difficult in the families. HLI then becomes a tool for enabling the families to function well.

There is, however, a question mark attached to one of the most positive and encouraging results for HLI. According to the report from The National Agency for Education (Skolverket, 2008), pupils who participated in HLI had high grades in Swedish and English, higher even than pupils with a Swedish background. Though these results were of course encouraging, The National Agency for Education (Skolverket, 2008) questioned whether approximately one hour (= 60 min.) of instruction per week could really have so great an effect. Other factors such as parental support did not suffice to provide an explanation for the finding. The National Agency for Education (Skolverket, 2008) suggested that the
pupils in HLI could be academically resourceful pupils with a capacity to participate in additional activities. That is, The National Agency for Education (Skolverket, 2008) could not attribute the excellent results of the pupils to participation in HLI; rather, it was perhaps excellent or highly motivated pupils who were the ones to participate in HLI. On the other hand, it was argued that if it was even possible that HLI had such a favourable effect on the results, the subject should be supported to a greater extent.

2.1.4 Factors complicating HLI
The discussion below about HLI is not language-specific but rather a review of issues that have been discussed concerning HLI as a whole (Hyltenstam & Tuomela, 1996; Tuomela, 2002; Hyltenstam & Milani, 2013; Skolverket, 2008) with a couple of additions that have emerged during the work on this thesis. Some possible implications for Arabic as a subject are incorporated into the presentation. It should, however, be emphasised that the discussion below represents general trends and that the way schools and municipalities prioritise and organise HLI varies. The following factors are nevertheless singled out as complicating HLI:

- Status of HLI
- Organisational factors
- Teachers’ training
- Teachers’ work situation
- Content of the instruction
- Assessment
- Lack of appropriate textbooks and teaching aids
- Lack of research on the effect of HLI on language proficiency
- Lack of statistics

Status of HLI
The status of HLI has at times been low and its presence in the school system repeatedly up for debate. In the presentation below of other factors complicating HLI, the low status of the subject is overall present serving as a likely explanation of why the challenges that HLI meets have not yet been satisfactorily resolved.

18 Since this thesis is ultimately concerned with how pupils write Arabic and what factors affect their writing, sociological theories that discuss power asymmetries are not presented.
Organisational factors
It used to be quite common for HLI to be arranged after the regular school day. This does not increase the motivation of the children to participate; they have to stay in school when their friends go out to play. In the HLI classes that were part of the present study, some were scheduled within the regular timetable, others were not.

Furthermore, HLI classes have at times in some schools not been allocated proper classrooms. In this context, a reflection on the situation seems motivated. Anyone entering into a regular classroom in a Swedish school is likely to find the walls covered with posters related to the subject and the pupils’ recent work on different themes. Not all HLTs have the possibility to create such pedagogically motivating learning environments for their pupils.

Another known difficulty is the heterogeneity of the groups of pupils. This, however, is not strictly an organisational issue and is revisited below. Teaching pupils from different Grades in the same class can, however, be considered an organisational, or even economic, factor. The teacher teaches one group instead of several. It is not self-evident that age and level-mixed groups have a negative impact on the pedagogical content of the instruction. However, different levels of proficiency paired with the limited time for instruction probably do not allow the HLTs to organise their instruction in an optimal way.

Teachers’ training
There is a shortage of trained HLTs. Between 1977 and 1987, a two-year HLT programme [Hemspråkslärarlinjen] existed that only admitted students qualified to study at a university level and who had good knowledge of the target language and of Swedish. According to Hyltenstam & Tuomela (1996: 51), 1,301 teachers were trained before the programme was cancelled.

In a report from The National Agency for Education on education for bi-/multilingual children in Sweden, it was stated that in the year of 2000, approximately 2,300 HLTs worked in schools in Sweden. Concerning their training, close on 300 had graduated from the HLT programme, more than 300 were trained teachers with some other type of training, around 600 had pedagogical training of some kind and a little more than 1100 teachers lacked pedagogical training (Skolverket, 2002: 61).

In 2008, the report from a commission on teachers’ training in general in Sweden also touched on the training of HLTs (SOU 2008: 109). It stated that no HLTs had been trained since 1991. At the time of
writing, a number of initiatives for competence development of HLTs have been launched. In addition, some HLT training programmes for specific languages have been started up at different universities. As of now, little is known about the outcomes of these programmes. However, information about the teachers’ training programme for Arabic at Malmö University is available.

Since 2005, Malmö University has given Arabic with a didactic orientation as a self-contained on-line course within the framework of the teachers’ training programme. By October 2013, a total of 55 students had enrolled in this programme. Of these, 13 had graduated, 23 had terminated their studies and the remaining 19 were still in the programme.19 It goes without saying that these students cannot meet the need for qualified Arabic HLTs in Sweden.

One issue that further complicates this question is a decree issued by the government in 2012 that all teachers were required to obtain a certificate of qualification [lärarlegitimation]. By July 2015, only qualified teachers were to be eligible for regular employment and to be allowed to grade pupils. Some groups of teachers, among them HLTs, were, however, exempted from this requirement. It can be argued that this decision sends out unfortunate signals regarding the importance of the subject.

Teachers’ work situation
Some teachers report a sense of not being perceived as part of the regular teaching staff and that there is a lack of cooperation with the other teachers. This brings us back to the question of the subject’s status, but it is also a consequence of many teachers being ambulant.

Working as an ambulant teacher may deprive the teachers of the opportunity to be part of local collegial networks and can in addition be quite stressful. One Arabic HLT with long experience whom I talked to some years ago told me that at one point he had been working in ten different schools per week.

Content of the instruction
The syllabus for HLI covers many different aspects. Not only are the pupils to study the target language, they are also to learn about history, religion and culture. A fundamental question was raised by Hyltenstam & Tuomela (1996), but it still remains unanswered: What is the intended learning outcome of HLI? Are the pupils supposed to become balanced bilinguals, even though the amount of instruction is limited? To what extent should cultural aspects (e.g. history, religion) be included in the

19 Information supplied by Sandra Alfelt, Malmö University, 2013-10-02.
Chapter 2 Home Language Instruction and Arabic as a Minority Language

instruction? In the report from The National Agency for Education (Skolverket 2008: 40) some of the HLTs who were interviewed confirmed that the learning outcomes listed in the syllabus were unrealistic in relation to the time they had at their disposal for teaching the pupils.

Hyltenstam & Tuomela (1996) furthermore called for a discussion on how languages with coexisting varieties should be managed within HLI.

Assessment
There is one common syllabus for all languages taught within HLI in compulsory school. The grading criteria provided in the syllabus are general and intended to be adapted locally to different languages. How these grading criteria are interpreted locally most likely differs, since we know that the HLI set-up differs between municipalities.

Lack of appropriate textbooks and teaching aids
There is a shortage of teaching material produced for the specific needs of HLPs. It is possible that online resources have improved somewhat, but in the past it has been common for imported textbooks to be used.

Multiple problems have been associated with the use of imported textbooks. For a start, the proficiency levels in the L1 are lower among HLPs than pupils in the countries where the books were produced. As a result, lower-level textbooks developed for younger pupils are used even in higher Grades. It can be plain boring for a 14-year-old to have to read a text intended for an 8-year-old.

In addition, the contents of the books are not in line with the Swedish curriculum and pedagogical tradition. Garefalakis (1994), in his dissertation on Greek HLI, reported that the imported teaching materials emphasised Greek traditional values that were not compatible with the Swedish curriculum and, furthermore, were quite foreign and unappealing to the pupils who had grown up in Swedish society.

In my own Master’s thesis (Walldoff, 2008), I carried out a content analysis of four imported Arabic textbooks from Jordan and Lebanon. The most important finding was that the books promoted gender stereotypes. Males were quantitatively overrepresented, connected to activities outside of the home, and were specified as having various occupations. Women were associated with the domestic domain, and the only occupation women held in the four books was teaching. This finding is in direct opposition to the wordings of the curriculum which state that in the Swedish school, gender stereotypes should be actively counteracted.
But the picture is even more complex. In talks I had with Arabic HLTs, they reported that, in order to match the heterogeneous levels of proficiency of the pupils, they copied pages from different textbooks and gave them to the pupils to read and do the exercises. This procedure was rather time consuming for the teachers and, in addition, always working with black-and-white photocopies is not motivational for the pupils and gives a disorganised impression. That this situation is not unique for Arabic was confirmed in an overview of HLI conducted by the municipality of Nacka in 2008. In interviews, parents and children questioned why there were no proper textbooks, only photocopied material (Nacka kommun, 2008: 7).

**Lack of research on the effect of HLI on language proficiency**

Little is known about the effect that HLI has on language proficiency in the target language. Abrahamsson & Bylund (2012), commented that research on HLI in Sweden has in fact focused on sociopolitical aspects, not on language proficiency.

To my knowledge, no longitudinal studies on development in the target language have been conducted on any language taught in HLI in Sweden.

**Lack of statistics**

During the work on this thesis, the section for statistics at The National Agency for Education was very helpful in providing me with the information I asked for. Certain statistics that would have been useful were unfortunately not available. The National Agency for Education can provide statistics for the number of participants in HLI of different languages for different Grades. However, the National Agency for Education does not provide statistics for flow across Grades. To clarify, if 50 pupils are registered as studying Arabic in the 1st Grade and 50 the year after in the 2nd Grade, we do not know if the 50 pupils in the 2nd Grade are the same pupils or if some have opted from the 2nd Grade while others have signed up for instruction. There is no way of knowing about the continuity or lack of it.

To better understand the mechanisms regarding pupils’ participation in HLI over the years, specific sets of statistics would be highly desirable. The HLI situation is unique in that pupils can register for participation in different years. In the case of Arabic, and other immigrant languages that are increasing rapidly in schools, it would, for example, be of great value to see if the influx of recent arrivals with a
higher proficiency level in the target language of HLI affects the participation of pupils who have grown up in Sweden.

2.1.5 Steering documents
The steering documents were briefly touched upon above. This section presents the steering documents governing Swedish compulsory schools. After a general outline of the steering documents, the documents relating to HLI in compulsory schools will be reviewed with the focus on how language varieties and non-Latin scripts are discussed.20

The education of children in Swedish compulsory schools (Grades 1-9; 6/7-16-year-olds) is regulated at different levels and by various authorities and bodies.

- Parliament
- The Government
- The National Agency for Education
- The municipalities and independent schools
- The schools

At the top level, Parliament passes the Education Act (2010:800). One step down, the Government regulates education through the Curriculum for the compulsory school, preschool class and the recreation centre 2011 (Skolverket, 2011a) including course syllabi. Henceforth this curriculum is referred to as Lgr 11. The National Agency for Education then formulates grading criteria, issues regulations and general recommendations and prepares material to help teachers interpret the wordings of the curricula and syllabi. The steering documents are then meant to be deconstructed and interpreted locally by teachers and teams of teachers to adapt the contents to pedagogical practice. The purpose of these collegial discussions is to ensure equality in the education system; in other words, all pupils in Sweden are entitled to equal education. The role of the municipalities and the independent schools is to “allocate resources and organise activities so that pupils attain the national goals” (Skolverket, 2010: 2).

20 Regulations concerning schools for children with special needs, schools for the Sami and independent schools are not included in the presentation.
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Table 1. Steering documents and issuing authorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steering document</th>
<th>Issuing authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Education Act</td>
<td>Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricula, including syllabi</td>
<td>The Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinances</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulations</td>
<td>The National Agency for Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General recommendations</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary material</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HLI is part of the Swedish school system and the steering documents that govern the entire school system also govern HLI. In the context of the present thesis, it is of special interest to see what the steering documents stipulate concerning HLI in general, and in particular concerning languages with coexisting language varieties and languages that are not written in the Latin script. The steering documents were investigated starting with the general formulations high up in the hierarchy and continuing down to the more detailed commentaries intended for practical guidance. The steering documents discussed below are:

- The Education Act
- The Curriculum
- Commentaries

The Education Act

The main wording of the Education Act (SFS 2010:800) concerning HLI reads:

Mother tongue tuition
7 § A pupil with a guardian with a different mother tongue than Swedish shall be offered home language instruction in this language provided that 1. the language is the language for everyday communication in the home; and,
2. the pupil has a basic knowledge of the language.
(Chapter 10, Compulsory School 2010:800, my translation)

There is a clear complication here if we look at the Arabic diglossic language situation. Since MSA is the target language of Arabic HLI in Sweden, Arabic-speaking pupils:

21 Several of the steering documents reviewed lacked official English translations at the time of writing.
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1. do not use the language (MSA) for everyday communication in the home.
2. do not necessarily have a basic knowledge of the language.

The Education Act, however, is intended to be all-embracing and therefore cannot cover all possible aspects of different subjects in school. In order to find more details, we need to look at the curriculum, Lgr 11.

The Curriculum
A new curriculum, Lgr 11 (Skolverket, 2011a), recently replaced the older one from 1994. Lgr 11 is divided into three sections:

1. The fundamental values and tasks of the school
2. Overall goals and guidelines
3. Syllabi

The syllabus for HLI is of interest for the present study. At first glance, the contents of the syllabus for HLI seem very extensive in view of the limited amount of time scheduled per week (1 hour/week according to Skolverket, 2008). Moreover, there are few references to different language varieties and languages written in other scripts than Latin. In the section Core content: years 1-3, we find the following passage among the requirements for “Reading and writing”:

Direction of reading and forms and sounds of written characters in comparison with Swedish.
(Skolverket, 2011a: 84)

Commentaries
For more information on how non-Latin scripts and diglossic languages are to be treated, we turn to the commentaries: Commentaries on the syllabus for mother tongue tuition [Kommentarmaterial till kursplanen i modersmål], (Skolverket, 2011b). These commentaries discuss many different aspects of HLI such as culture, identity and multilingualism. Here, the focus will be on some specific wordings relating to language.

Concerning the significance of the mother tongue as a basis for learning in other school subjects, the following is stated:

Research shows that learning a new language is facilitated if you also have good knowledge of the mother tongue.
(Skolverket, 2011b: 7, my translation)
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However, the review of research on diglossia (see 1.1.2) made it clear that MSA, the target language of HLI, is in fact not the mother tongue of speakers of Arabic. On the contrary, that MSA is the medium for instruction in the Arab world was rather seen as a complicating factor.

The commentaries also elaborate on the question of writing direction, which was mentioned in the syllabus, by stating:

The pupils whose mother tongue has a different reading direction than Swedish need to develop an awareness of this so that their reading acquisition is not hampered. This item is only included for Grades 1-3 since it is reasonable to assume that once the pupils have learned it, it is knowledge that persists. Pupils who start participating in the mother tongue tuition in higher grades naturally need to be made aware of this when they start the subject.
(Skolverket, 2011b: 12-13, my translation)

It is interesting that writing direction is singled out as a potential complication in the context of learning an entirely new script.

Concerning norms of written language, we find the following in the commentaries:

Instruction needs to take into consideration the written norm of the mother tongue and those pupils whose mother tongue is not (strongly) supported by a tradition of writing. The step from oral to written language can in the latter instance be a long one. It may also be that the written language is not at all based on the language that the pupils speak.
(Skolverket, 2011b: 12, my translation)

More about language varieties can be found in a passage in the section on pronunciation:

In Grades 7-9 the pupils will meet different spoken varieties of the mother tongue [sic]. These can include dialects as well as different linguistic variants. Developing a greater awareness of different spoken varieties of the language makes it possible to notice differences between, for example, the formal language and the regional varieties.
(Skolverket, 11c: 15, my translation)
Chapter 2 Home Language Instruction and Arabic as a Minority Language

Although this text makes a clear reference to language varieties and norms of written language, the wording is neutral and it seems at times ambiguous. The information is given without discussing the possible implications. If the HL is studied to support cognitive development, does the interdependence theory (Cummins, 1979) necessarily apply when “the written language is not at all based on the language that the pupils speak” (Skolverket, 2011b: 12), i.e. when the language they study at school is not their actual mother tongue? The text does not elaborate on this issue.

The neutral formulations continue in the section entitled “Assessment in the mother tongue according to the special characteristics of the language” [Bedömning i modersmål efter sitt språks särdrag], (Skolverket, 2011b: 24-25). The teachers are to assess their pupils’ achievements based on a perceived level of difficulty of individual languages. Languages written with a non-Latin script and typologically distant from Swedish are considered more difficult than languages written in a Latin script and closely related to Swedish. But no specifics are given. In other words, the criteria in the syllabus are intended to be general and suitable for adaptation to different languages. Accordingly, the commentary concludes with the remark:

This means that pupils with different mother tongues may have progressed differently but can still be assessed as if they had reached the same grade.

(Skolverket, 2011b: 25, my translation)

The National Agency for Education (Skolverket, 2013) has produced a commentary that remarks further on the commentaries above. This discusses how the wording in the syllabus concerning knowledge requirements for Grade 6 is to be understood regarding Arabic, Finnish and Somali. In a short explanatory text about Arabic, MSA is mentioned and it is explicitly stated that MSA is not the mother tongue of anybody (2013: 7). However, the commentary does not elaborate on the status of MSA or on the issues discussed above, but it provides tools for analysing texts written by the pupils in terms of structure of text, syntax and linguistic variation.

As mentioned earlier in this chapter (see 2.1.4), Hyltenstam & Tuomela (1996: 101), albeit in relation to an earlier syllabus, requested that the aims of HLI be clarified: Is it intended to support ethnic identity or cognitive development or both at different times in the instruction? The contents of the instruction also needed to be considered, and the
choice of language variety was pointed out as one part of the contents that called for a thorough discussion. The current syllabus with accompanying commentaries still does not manage to elucidate these matters in a satisfactory way.

2.2 Arabic as a minority language
This chapter is rounded off with some relevant points regarding what it entails to be a speaker of a minority language. It is not intended to provide an overview over Second Language Acquisition research concerning language contact and language change, nor to present different models for bilingual language programmes. Instead, the aim is to emphasise that Arabic as a minority language is a complex notion, and that, as a consequence, the HLPs’ varying backgrounds and language use might affect their acquisition of MSA. The section is structured as follows:

2.2.1 Speaking a minority language
2.2.2 Arabic as a minority language in the EU
2.2.3 Arabic as a minority language in Sweden

2.2.1 Speaking a minority language establishes some general tendencies concerning language use, language contact and language change among minority language speakers.

2.2.2 Arabic as a minority language in the EU starts with a note on the status of Arabic as a minority language in the EU. It furthermore discusses how different waves of immigration to the EU and the US have taken place from the Arab world and that the Arabic-speaking group is in fact the Arabic-speaking groups. In addition, some findings from research on language use among Arabic speakers in the US and in the EU are presented. One section is dedicated to research on HLI and mosque schooling in the Netherlands. Even though the Dutch situation is not entirely similar to that in Sweden (to be explained below), the reports on HLPs’ achievement in HLI in the Netherlands may at least serve as a point of reference.

Finally, 2.2.3 Arabic as a minority language in Sweden discusses Swedish language statistics, as well as parent-initiated extra instruction for children with an Arabic background.

2.2.1 Speaking a minority language
Acquiring a minority language as an L1 differs in many ways from acquiring an L1 that is the majority language. From the time it enters school, if not sooner, a child will spend most of its time in an environ-
ment where the majority language has a dominant position. The child will communicate less in its L1 than a child who speaks the majority language. As the child gets older, the majority language tends to become increasingly dominant in the repertoire of the child. It will not only learn the majority language, but also learn in the majority language. In addition, other psychological and sociological factors will influence the use of the language: the status of the minority language in society, interest in the language in the minority community, identification with the country of origin, to mention just a few (cf. Ellis, 2008: Ch. 7; Extra & Yağmur, 2004).

Decreased contact with the L1 results in incomplete language acquisition or attrition. Various linguistic domains, such as morphology, syntax, phonology and, particularly, the lexicon, are susceptible to attrition. The degree of attrition, however, will vary among speakers; some will not necessarily make overt errors but will at the same time diverge from the language use of non-attrited speakers with respect to frequency of use of specific structures (Bylund 2008: 1-8).

2.2.2 Arabic as a minority language in the EU
This section draws a broad picture of Arabic as a minority language in the EU. Some references to research from the US and Australia are also included as a supplement.

The status of Arabic
As described by Extra & Gorter (2001), in a historic perspective, speakers of regional minority languages in Europe have in many cases been subject to various restrictions (for example, they have been forbidden to speak the language) and the languages have had a low status compared to the language of the majority. The UN and the EU have worked actively since the end of WWII to legislate on the promotion of regional languages and strengthen language rights for the speakers of regional languages. Thanks to this support from the EU and local movements, the general development in the EU has been towards a higher status for (at least some) regional languages, and towards language revitalisation, visible for example in the existence of bilingual programmes for education.

On the other hand, immigrant minority languages, non-European languages in particular, have not received similar encouragement. They have been branded as ‘new’ minority languages compared to the ‘historic’, regional minority languages. Immigrant minority languages tend to have a low status in society and the promotion of these languages...
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is limited. Concerning the division of minority languages into ‘new’ and ‘historic’, Plann (2009: 381) comments on the case of Arabic in Spain:

Arabic is not merely a language of immigration; it is one of Spain’s historic minority tongues, part of its ‘cultural heritage’, and another ‘other Spanish language’.

However, Arabic is clearly considered to be one of the ‘new’ minority languages, and as such tends to receive limited attention and support from the policy-makers.

Arabic-speaking groups
If we look at Arabic as an immigrant language, it is questionable whether any generalisations should be made. Over time there have been different waves of emigration from different parts of the Arab world to different countries in the world. Different Arabic communities have developed over time. The Arab American Institute Foundation presents an overview of the distribution of various descents of Arab Americans. Lebanese Americans are said to be the largest group, but in some areas other groups of Arabs are dominant, such as Moroccans in Arizona and Syrians in Rhode Island.22 Regarding how immigration differs over time, the Lebanese Americans provide a good example. The Lebanese have immigrated to the US in at least two main periods: in the late 1800s/early 1900s and after the war in 1975.

Immigration from Arab countries to different parts of the EU has followed different patterns, resulting in different constellations of Arabic-speaking immigrants. As has been discussed above in connection with diglossia, Arabs do not even have the same L1 but speak different varieties of DA. Furthermore, immigrants from Arab countries are not necessarily mother tongue speakers of Arabic. De Ruiter, Saidi & Spotti (2009: 15) point out that in Europe more than 50 per cent of the Moroccan immigrants have Amazigh as their mother tongue, but they usually have some knowledge of DA. The picture is quite complex.

It can also be of some relevance to note that language vitality in different Arabic-speaking groups can have an effect on language proficiency. Albirini (2013) compares Egyptian and Palestinian heritage speakers in the US. The results show that the Palestinian heritage speakers had a higher command of Arabic (DA). Albirini suggests that this probably relates to an increased amount of input and output by the

group due to positive attitudes and a higher degree of identification with their origin.

Language use and language vitality
Regarding language use among minority speakers of Arabic, the same trend that can be found in research on immigrant minority languages is also seen in the case of Arabic in Europe: Children tend to become increasingly dominant in the majority language. Children have a fairly good command of speaking and understanding DA. They speak Arabic with their parents, but to a lesser extent with their siblings (De Ruiter, Saidi & Spotti, 2009).

Clyne & Kipp’s (1999) study on the linguistic behaviour of immigrant families from Egypt and Lebanon in Australia shows a similar result. Children and mothers spoke Arabic to each other, whereas fathers and children included a mixture of Arabic and English to a greater extent. Some DA-speaking parents chose English for the communication with their children in order to practise their English. It was also noted that the children mainly spoke English to one another.

Arabic HLI in the EU
Countries, and in some cases even provinces within the same country (e.g. Germany), in the EU have different policies regarding language instruction for minority language pupils. The same complications that have been reported from the Swedish HLI context have been observed in the rest of the EU where pupils have been offered HLI:

- Status of HLI
- Organisational factors
- Teachers’ training
- Teachers’ work situation
- Content of the instruction
- Assessment
- Lack of appropriate textbooks and teaching aids
- Lack of research on the effect of HLI on language proficiency

As for Arabic HLI, the question of what variety to teach has been debated. MSA has in most cases been the target language of the instruction. There have nevertheless been projects involving writing in the dialects, for example in Germany, and in France different varieties of DA can be studied (De Ruiter, Saidi & Spotti, 2009).
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Arabic HLI and mosque-schooling in the Netherlands

One country with extensive experience of Arabic HLI is the Netherlands, and we also have research on the outcome of the instruction. Since studies on the proficiency of pupils in Arabic HLI in Sweden are entirely lacking, research from the Netherlands is included as a point of reference. Here, it should immediately be noted the Swedish and the Dutch contexts are not identical. Immigration to Sweden from Arab countries has not been dominated by one country (see 2.2.3). In the case of the Netherlands, however, Moroccans form the largest group of immigrants from an Arab country due to labour migration in the 1960s and 1970s (Van Meeteren, Van de Pol, Dekker, Engbersen & Snel, 2013). However, being from an Arab country does not necessarily mean having Arabic as a mother tongue. According to De Ruiter & Spotti (2010), 40 per cent of the Moroccan community in the Netherlands had Moroccan Arabic as a mother tongue compared to 60 per cent for Amazigh. However, both pupils with Moroccan Arabic as their mother tongue and pupils with Amazigh as their mother tongue have participated in Arabic HLI. In the same way as in Sweden, the target language of HLI has been MSA.

The Dutch studies on the effect of HLI on MSA proficiency tested various dimensions of MSA command and employed different methodologies. As the present thesis is concerned with MSA spelling and morphosyntax in particular, the review of the research results below focuses on these two aspects rather than on, for example, word decoding and reading comprehension, which are not included. In addition, some of the studies have addressed a background variable that is included in the analysis of the results of the present study: extra instruction in Arabic outside of HLI. This extra instruction can have been received either in Morocco prior to arrival in the Netherlands or in the form of community-based teaching in the Netherlands.

In a study by Aarsen, De Ruiter & Verhoeven (1992, reviewed in De Ruiter, Saidi & Spotti, 2009) 81 pupils in the last years of primary school were tested for MSA proficiency. The result for spelling and syntax were described by the authors as low. For spelling the mean correct score was 26 per cent and for syntax 24 per cent. Due to the low mean percentages in these tasks, they were excluded from the analysis of correlations with the background variables of years of HLI, home language (Amazigh and Arabic) and peer language. 24 of the participants were designated as higher Grade entrants (HGEs), meaning that they had
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gone to school in Morocco prior to moving to the Netherlands. The children who had all their schooling in the Netherlands were referred to as 1st Grade entrants (FGEs). Though the HGEs had higher scores in all the language tests (oral DA and written MSA) than the FGEs, the correlation was not statistically significant.

A follow-up study (Aarts, De Ruiter & Verhoeven, 1993, reviewed in De Ruiter, Saidi & Spotti, 2009) included 242 HLPs in the Netherlands and 222 children in Morocco in the late years of elementary school. The tests targeted both oral DA and written MSA. Spelling was again shown to be a major challenge. The pupils in the Netherlands had a mean result for spelling of 30 per cent, but spelling was also difficult for the pupils in Morocco even though their scores were higher. As in the previous study, the pupils in the Netherlands were divided into FGEs and HGEs. The HGEs in this study performed better in the language tests than the FGEs. The results for spelling were 35 per cent for the HGEs compared with 29 per cent for the FGEs.

The background variables that were found to influence the results for the written MSA tasks (N.B. not only spelling) were cultural orientation, support and stimulation from the parents, Arabic instruction outside of the school and school characteristics: Pupils who went to ethnically diverse schools performed better than pupils in schools with a higher percentage of pupils with a Dutch background.

According to Saidi (2001) learning conditions for many HLPs were less than ideal. Consequently, he considered the low results for MSA proficiency reported in other studies to be somewhat misleading as they registered the results of pupils that had not followed the instruction for a steady period of time. Thus Saidi chose to investigate the MSA proficiency of pupils who, in contrast, had participated in HLI for a longer, uninterrupted period of time, namely 7-8 years. The participants in his study did indeed perform better than what had been reported in previous studies, and Saidi concluded that under the right circumstances, HLI could in fact have good results. De Ruiter & Spotti (2010), however, point out that Saidi’s study accounts for the exception rather than the rule.

HLI was not the only source of MSA learning in the Netherlands. De Ruiter, Saidi & Spotti (2009) state that many children with a Moroccan background attended community-based Arabic instruction in mosques, which allowed them to become part of the religious community. De Ruiter, Saidi & Spotti remark that little was known about the contents of this instruction. In one study (Driessen, 1990, reviewed in De Ruiter, Saidi & Spotti, 2009), the instruction was reported to have a positive effect on the language proficiency of HLPs. However, in two
other studies (Aarts, De Ruiter & Verhoeven, 1993, reviewed in De Ruiter, Saidi & Spotti, 2009; Saidi, 2001) no such correlation was found.

2.2.3 Arabic as a minority language in Sweden
This section addresses two aspects of Arabic as a minority language in Sweden that are relevant to the present study: language statistics and extra instruction in Arabic for children.

Language statistics
Sweden does not compile official language statistics. Linguist Mikael Parkvall has, however, tried to calculate the number of mother tongue speakers of different languages. In 2006, approximately 93,000 persons were L1 speakers of Arabic. Of these, a quarter came from Iraq and a third from Lebanon (Parkvall, 2009). Parkvall’s (2016) updated numbers for Arabic from 2011-2012 gave 155,000 speakers of Arabic. The numbers have, however, increased dramatically since 2011-2012 due to the war in Syria. According to the Swedish Migration Agency, 16,317 Syrians applied for asylum in Sweden in 201324, and 30,583 in 201425. From January to October 2015, the number of Syrians applying for asylum was 38,63626. In the same period (2013-October 2015), 17,323 Iraqis applied for asylum, as did some thousands of people from other Arab countries. Regardless of whether all these asylum seekers will obtain permanent residence permits or not, and if we take into account that they are not all necessarily L1 speakers of Arabic, it is nevertheless obvious that the number of Arabic-speaking people in Sweden has increased massively over the last ten years.

Extra instruction in Arabic
We will now briefly return to the findings from the Netherlands, where mosque-schooling in one study, but not in two others, had a positive effect on the MSA proficiency level. Bouakaz (2007), in an ethnographic study, investigated parental involvement in school and in supplementary schooling outside of the regular timetable in the Malmö area in southern Sweden. The teaching in the supplementary schooling was lead by

parents. There, pupils received extra instruction in various school subjects and help to do their homework. They were also taught Arabic, culture and religion. A comment from a father involved in the teaching activities explains why the parents have their children attend supplementary schooling:

We arrange many different activities for the children. These activities are often carried on by us parents so as to give our children what the school fails to teach them. The lessons in their mother tongue that the children receive at school are not enough and the teachers there are often not qualified enough, or they speak dialects that our children have difficulties in understanding. We do this teaching because we feel our children need to learn two sides of things, the Swedish side and their parents' side. [...] The children often have difficulties with their homework and want also to learn better Arabic. We do our best to arrange either with some student or with persons who are good in Swedish to help the children with their homework.

(Bouakaz, 2007: 225)

Another study (Tvingstedt, 2011) of an Arabic-Swedish bilingual programme also mentions what Bouakaz refers to as supplementary schooling. Tvingstedt (2011: 91), however, uses the term *eftermiddagsskola*, “afternoon school”. 98 pupils in Grades 1-4 participated in a bilingual programme in the city of Malmö. A questionnaire on various background factors and language contact was distributed to the parents, and 85 out of 98 families responded to the questionnaire. According to the responses, 21 of 85 pupils attended afternoon school. Of these, 14 pupils went to afternoon school four times/week and seven pupils went once or twice times/week. Tvingstedt provides some additional information about the organisation of the afternoon schools: They offer two hours of instruction four times/week to children aged 6-14.

It would be of great interest to learn more about these kinds of teaching activities and what effect they have on the pupils' academic achievement in school. For the present study, it is above all relevant to acknowledge that some pupils may be receiving extra instruction in Arabic in addition to HLI. In fact, one HLT I talked to said that if pupils scored really well on the test, I could be sure they attended Quran school, since the timetable did not allow the HLIs to teach them that much. This
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comment may reveal more about what this specific teacher thought was the aim of the teaching activities outside of school, but it serves to show that there is an awareness among HLTs that pupils are receiving extra instruction in Arabic.

2.3 Concluding picture: “a fuzzy linguistic situation”
The aim of the first two chapters of this thesis has been to provide an empirical framework for the analysis of data and discussions that come later in the study, and to contextualise the learning conditions for pupils in Arabic HLI in Sweden. It was shown that many different factors can be assumed to help create “a fuzzy linguistic situation” for pupils studying Arabic in HLI. Some of these factors are specific to the Arabic language (diglossia, non-Latin script), others concern the general pedagogical and organisational problems connected with HLI. Some final points of “fuzziness” were included that concerned the language use of minority language pupils.

To summarise, the following points in particular need to be taken into account when we analyse and discuss the written MSA production of HLPs:

Different origins and L1s
The pupils in Arabic HLI in Sweden may come from, or may have parents that come from different Arab countries. This means that pupils in the same HLI class can in fact have different DAs as their mother tongues.

Writing in Arabic
Acquiring the Arabic writing system was shown to be complicated for several reasons. The writing system is difficult to process, and spelling in Arabic on a more advanced level includes mastering context-sensitive rules. Writing in Arabic is further complicated for L1 speakers of DA(s) by the linguistic distance between DA(s) and MSA.

In Sweden, the Arabic script is not present in the environment (street signs, etc.), not even in ethnically diverse areas, to the same extent as in the Arab world. In other words, there is a limited amount of basic written input in the environment for children to decipher as children tend to do when they become aware of written language.

MSA as a target language in HLI
It was discussed how the target language of HLI is MSA, a variety shown by research to function as an L2 for speakers of DA. In Sweden, some
pupils may have participated in HLI for several years, from preschool onwards, whereas others may have joined the instruction in later years. In addition, the pupils have arrived in Sweden at different ages and may have joined HLI in different years. This means that some pupils may have received MSA instruction in their country of origin. There is furthermore the possibility that some pupils participate in community-based extra instruction in Arabic.

**HLI**

As for HLI, it is known that it faces organisational as well as pedagogical challenges. The steering documents were scrutinised in detail for wording that related to languages with diglossia and/or non-Latin writing systems. The steering documents were found not to take diglossia and non-Latin writing systems into account in a satisfactory way. Teachers or groups of teachers were expected to interpret the steering documents locally. This strategy may work, but it opens the door to arbitrariness, especially with regard to learning outcomes and assessment (and as a consequence grading).

**Arabic at home**

On a personal level, we can furthermore assume that language use (DA and MSA) and input vary in different families. Even if Arabic (i.e. DA) is the dominant language spoken in a certain family, this does not necessarily mean that there will be plenty of MSA input. Nor do we know how input of DA input affects learning MSA.
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The first chapter presented research on questions relating to the Arabic language. Chapter 2 addressed the set-up of the Swedish home language instruction and it also discussed the linguistic environment of minority language children and findings on language practices in minority language families.

With this background, we now move on to the aim of the thesis, namely to answer the following questions:

1. **To what extent do 8th-graders in Arabic HLI master:**
   a. The Arabic script?
   b. Spelling in Arabic?
   c. Basic MSA morphosyntax?

2. **Can the pupils’ performances be explained by the following factors:**
   a. Years of participation in HLI?
   b. Extra instruction in Arabic outside of HLI?
   c. Contact with written Arabic?

In order to be able to answer these questions, several issues need to be taken into account. It is clear that testing the pupils’ command of written MSA presents some specific difficulties. At least three different types or classes of difficulties are connected with testing:

1. **Difficulty of defining adequate informant groups** (discussed in 3.1 Participants)
   - age
   - gender
   - background
   etc.
2. **Difficulty of testing knowledge** (discussed in 3.2 Language test)
   - actual testing of language skills
   - testing of MSA for HLP’s
   etc.
3. **Difficulty of assessing relevant factors that influence the results** (discussed in 3.3 Questionnaire),
   - external factors
   - internal factors.
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The issues outlined above are discussed in more detail in the following sections:

3.1 Participants
3.2 Language test
3.3 Questionnaire
3.4 Procedure for data collection

Methodological considerations are discussed in the relevant sections.

3.1 Participants
The main aim of the study is to determine the degree to which HLPs master the Arabic script, spelling in Arabic and basic MSA morphosyntax, and whether instruction and/or input of written Arabic can be linked to the pupils’ proficiency levels. As was established in 1.1.1, different varieties of spoken Arabic (DA) are acquired naturally, whereas the standard variety (MSA) is employed in formal settings and is learned at school. The target language of HLI in Swedish schools is, to my knowledge, MSA. Which pupils, then, would be most suitable to test for command of MSA?

Below, various aspects relevant to defining the sample are discussed in the following sections:

3.1.1 Selection by Grade
3.1.2 Selection by geographical region
3.1.3 Contact with schools and teachers
3.1.4 The sample
3.1.5 Excluded from the sample
3.1.6 Background information about the participants

3.1.1 Selection by Grade
Children in Sweden who are entitled to HLI can participate in the instruction from preschool onwards. It was, however, deemed reasonable to conduct the study on older pupils who had had the chance to participate in HLI for a long period of time, thereby acquiring MSA and developing their written Arabic. Testing older pupils would furthermore collect data from pupils with varying experiences of HLI; some pupils

27 No teacher I have talked to has mentioned DA as being intentionally included in the instruction. Even though it is sometimes used for explanations, it is not a target language in its own right. Note, however, that I have not talked with any teachers about HLI for preschool children.
could have started taking HLI classes quite recently whereas others may have participated in HLI since preschool. Here was an opportunity to test whether the number of years of participation in HLI had an effect on the command the pupils had of written MSA.

It was furthermore convenient to have somewhat older pupils participate in the study as they would be capable of filling in a questionnaire in Swedish about their background, language contact and so on. Having the pupils fill in the questionnaires themselves would minimise the risk of external influence on the answers. In the Swedish school system, 9th Grade is the last year of the compulsory school and to test 9th-graders would have been preferable. The ninth year, however, has a very busy schedule with final exams and various sorts of deadlines, so it was concluded that securing the participation of 9th-graders might prove difficult. In the end, 8th-graders were chosen for the study.

3.1.2 Selection by geographical region
Since there are many Arabic HLPs in the Stockholm area and I myself am based at Stockholm University, inquiries for participants were made solely in the Greater Stockholm area. Consequently, all participants in the study went to schools in this particular area. Of course we cannot know to what extent they are representative of all pupils in Arabic HLI in Sweden.

3.1.3 Contact with schools and teachers
The initial inquiries for participants went out to people with different functions in the education system: administrators working with HLI in different municipalities and HLTs whose contacts had been provided by other researchers. The procedure was quite time-consuming and the persons I approached showed limited interest in participating in the project. A researcher in Sweden does not have the authority to demand the cooperation of municipalities and schools. Consequently, we should be aware that researchers working in related fields run the risk of recycling schools and teachers with a positive attitude towards participating in research, but we cannot know how problematic this is, since researchers do not disclose in what schools the data have been collected. In the end, one educational administrator enabled me to get into contact with Arabic HLTs employed in her section and in addition recommended me to contact the headmaster of a school that had employed an HLT locally in that particular school. Furthermore, one HLT recommended to me by another researcher stated that she was willing to let her pupils participate in the study.
3.1.4 The sample

No measures were taken to secure the participation of a certain number of teachers and to relate the results of the translation test to individual teachers. The intention was only to gather enough participants for the study; a little more than 30 pupils was deemed to be a suitable number for statistical reasons.

When six HLTs had agreed to let their pupils participate in the study and 47 pupils were said to be willing to participate, further inquiries for participants ceased. After this, however, two HLTs, for reasons unknown, changed their minds and stopped returning my e-mails, resulting in nine fewer participants. At the time of the actual testing, the number of participants turned out to be further reduced to 26. In the academic year of 2013-2014, 2,362 pupils in the 8th Grade in Sweden participated in Arabic HLI. The sample of 26 pupils made up 1.1 per cent of all 8th-graders in Sweden that participated in Arabic HLI.

During the testing, however, two participants claimed that they could not write Arabic and two others, despite the instructions given to the teachers, were recent arrivals with a limited command of Swedish. In the end, 22 pupils (0.93 per cent of all 8th-graders) could be included in the analysis of both the translation test and the questionnaire.

Moreover, there is a possibility that the pupils who agreed to participate in the study were more confident about their command of Arabic; in other words, maybe only the “better” pupils would feel comfortable about being tested. This might result in a test bias, with the participants receiving better scores on the translation test than the entire population would have. Without anticipating future discussions, it can, however, be stated that the heterogeneous results do not suggest that pupils with a lower level of attainment opted out from participating.

One possibility would have been to embark on an additional round of enrolling participants. This, however, was not considered practical. It was a matter of time and timing. Late in the Spring semester of 2013, a pilot study (16 participants) was conducted to ensure that the testing material was appropriate for the age group targeted. The regular test round was conducted late in the Spring semester of 2014. To enrol more participants and conduct an additional round of data collection at some other point during the school year would mean testing pupils that had not received a steady period of instruction during the 8th Grade. It is known that HLPs choose to join the instruction in different years, and that they were indeed likely to have varying commands of written

---

28 Information supplied via e-mail by the National Agency for Education (2015-01-15).
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Arabic. Testing participants at different times during the school year also meant adding yet another factor that could affect the results.

3.1.5 Excluded from the sample
The pupils who agreed to participate in the study were not pre-tested in any way. Pupils with reading and writing impairments known to the teachers were, however, not asked to participate in the study, since other factors would then be at work than those of interest to the study. Furthermore, teachers were asked to exclude pupils with a supposedly insufficient knowledge of Swedish to be able to complete the questionnaire on their own. The pilot test in June 2013 had in fact shown that recent arrivals to Sweden sometimes participated in HLI. One pupil had only been in Sweden for three months and for this particular pupil the questionnaire in Swedish was simply too demanding.

3.1.6 Background information about the participants
The information in this section is based on the responses to a questionnaire the pupils filled in as a part of the study. The questionnaire itself is presented in 3.3. This section presents data on the background of the pupils and their parents.29 The questions relating to the pupils are: sex, age, age on arrival in Sweden and country of birth. The information provided concerning the parents is: Arabic-speaking parent/s of the pupil, national background of the parents and level of education of the parents. All questions were answered by all 26 participants. Note, however, that only 22 were included in the analysis of the translation test: two participants stated that they could not write in Arabic, and two participants were recent arrivals.

Sex of the participants
More girls than boys participated in the study; 16 girls compared to 10 boys. According to The National Agency for Education30, on October 15th 2013, in the 8th Grade 1,257 girls (53.2%) compared to 1,105 boys (46.8%) participated in Arabic HLI. Thus, the difference in the sample is larger than in the national statistics. However, during the data collection, the HLTs did not indicate that boys opted out from participating in the study.

29 The percentages in the tables in this section are rounded off, so the sum may not be exactly 100.
30 Statistics provided on request from the National Agency of Education via e-mail, 2015-01-15.
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Table 2. Sex of the participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age of the participants
16 of the participants (61.5%) were 14 years old and 10 (38.5%) were 15 years old. The mean age was 14.38.

Table 3. Age of the participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Country of birth
More than 50 per cent of the participants were born in Sweden. One participant, however, had given the year of arrival in Sweden as 13, but the country of birth to be Sweden. This could be a mistake or it could mean that the participant was born in Sweden, left and later moved back. Regarding the pupils who had been born in another country, five different countries were given as countries of birth. Most of these pupils were born in Iraq.

Table 4. Country of birth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Age on arrival in Sweden
14 participants, more than 50 per cent of the respondents, indicated that they arrived in Sweden at the age of 0 (Table 5). Pupils born in Sweden were asked to mark this alternative, but 15, not 14, participants gave Sweden as their country of birth (cf. Table 4). The remaining 12 participants had arrived in Sweden from the age of 1 to 14. The mean age on arrival was 3.75 (SD 5.01). Given that the age of starting school is approximately 7, that would mean that eight pupils had arrived in Sweden sometime after that point.

Table 5. Age on arrival.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arabic-speaking parent
One question asked about Arabic-speaking parents; only one mother was given as not Arabic-speaking. This is in line with Parkvall (2009: 91), who notes that Arabs in Sweden tend to marry other Arabs.

It is, however, of interest here to know what the participants interpreted as Arabic-speaking: knowing how to speak Arabic or being a mother tongue speaker of Arabic? In many countries with Arabic as an official language, there are also mother tongue speakers of other languages, who in addition to their mother tongue speak or have even been educated in Arabic.

The question should have been formulated differently for a more reliable set of responses: “What is the mother tongue of your mother/father?”.
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Origin of the parents
Iraq was the most common country of origin. All in all, the mothers came from ten different countries. The mother who was indicated as not speaking Arabic came from Eritrea.

More than 50 per cent of the fathers came from Iraq; in total, nine different countries were given as the countries of origin for the fathers.

Table 6. Origin of the parents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Father</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of education of the parents
Concerning the question of education, an unexpected response was very common; level of education unknown. The level of education for 38.5 per cent of the mothers was unknown. For the fathers, the percentage was even higher, 46.2 per cent. The question was changed after the pilot study to incorporate vocational education after talks with the participants, but this change was clearly not sufficient. It is possible that the pupils did not know how to translate the educational background of the parents into a Swedish context. That the parents entirely lacked education was not an option in the questionnaire.

It would have been desirable to be able to compare the level of education of the parents with the results on the translation test. With such a high level of uncertainty, this was regrettably not feasible.

The levels of education given in the responses allow limited room for analysis due to missing responses. More mothers than fathers had
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only gone to elementary school, five to one, but on the other hand more mothers than fathers had a high level of education, five to three.

Table 7. Level of education of the parents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Father</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper secondary school</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concluding remarks
Though most of the pupils were born in Sweden, almost half of them were not. They had arrived in Sweden at different ages, eight of them at some point after the age children in Sweden enter the compulsory school system. The children who were not born in Sweden came from five different countries, Iraq being the most common country of birth.

As for the mothers and fathers, taken together they came from ten different countries. If the percentages for mothers and fathers are put together, Iraqi backgrounds dominate with 52 per cent. Syria as a country of origin came in second place with 13.5 per cent.

Regrettably, the level of education of the parents was not obtained in many cases due to an inadequately formulated question in the questionnaire and cannot therefore be used in the analyses and discussions.

3.2 Language test
The following sections discuss and motivate the choice of test for eliciting data, present the material for testing, and outline the items included in the analysis:

3.2.1 Productive task
3.2.2 Translation test
3.2.3 Choice of testing material
3.2.4 The original text
3.2.5 Adaptations of the text for the test
3.2.6 Targeted structures and outline of the analysis
3.2.1 Productive task
A productive task was chosen. As stated earlier, the target language of HLI is, as far as we know, MSA, but MSA is not used in daily speech. Furthermore, there were indications that children in HLI only practised speaking MSA to a limited extent and that the classes involved the teacher speaking and the children doing reading and writing exercises. The practice the pupils actually got to speak the target language, MSA, was furthermore thought to vary due to the attitude of individual teachers towards MSA and DA. Writing Arabic (i.e. MSA), however, was certainly taught and practised in all HLI classes, so written Arabic was suitable for testing.

Bearing the differences between MSA and DA in mind, it was moreover relevant to investigate whether the participants could produce MSA, the target language of HLI. A grammaticality judgement test involving structures where MSA and DA diverge and converge would be a convenient tool for this kind of investigation. However, being able to identify MSA forms, or being able to pick the correct form when given multiple choices, is very different from being able to produce MSA.

3.2.2 Translation test
A written translation test allows for the elicitation of comparable sets of morphosyntactic structures and diminishes the risk of avoidance strategies.

The translation process itself, however, entails certain complications. Translation is, of course, not a plain matter of language production. It is a matter of assimilating a material, processing it, possibly restructuring it and then reproducing it in a new form. Translation is demanding on different levels in that many choices have to be made even to translate seemingly simple sentences. The translator has to find appropriate equivalents for the words in the original text and a more advanced translator has to make stylistic choices.

Furthermore, it should be emphasised that a translation test is not free language production and that interference from the source language is a possible test bias. In this case, however, securing comparable sets of data was deemed more important than risking transfer effects and other translation items in the test.

---

31 The indications are based on hearsay from several students studying Arabic at Stockholm University and on observations of HLI classes in a student paper (Assafi & Jolly, 2008). There is of course nothing that says that this occurs in all HLI classrooms. It was established in 2.1.4 that HLTs had varying qualifications, a fact that probably leads to teachers using different methods in their teaching.
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One last important question needs to be addressed before we move on to the question of the testing material. If Swedish is taken as a starting point for testing Arabic, is this not an example of a Eurocentric outlook? One might argue that it in fact is, but in this case it can be sanctioned by the wording of the syllabus that pinpoints comparisons between Swedish and the mother tongue as part of the course.

Evidently, a more varied test battery including a combination of oral and written tests would have supplied more extensive sets of data. It was nevertheless believed to be advisable to have a short session for data collection. One short session would not tire the pupils and would probably minimise the risk of drop-outs or losing potential participants from the start.

To sum up, bearing in mind that no previous research was available on the command of MSA that Arabic HLPs in Sweden had, a translation test was deemed to provide a good starting point for gathering information. The translation test would provide an initiatory insight into the participants competencies and strategies in the following domains:

- Writing in the Arabic script
- Spelling in Arabic
- Producing basic MSA morphosyntax

Below, the material chosen for the translation test is discussed and the components for measurement are outlined.

3.2.3 Choice of testing material

Earlier contacts with HLTs suggested that the pupils’ command of Arabic varied greatly. The teachers’ approach to handling the variation was to pick out study material appropriate for the level of each individual pupil. Thus a big challenge in constructing a translation test for presumably heterogenous groups of pupils was to avoid both ceiling and floor effects.

The material ultimately chosen for the translation test was a text from a primary level Lebanese textbook; Al-qawāīdu l-mušawwiqatu li-ṭ-ṭullābi Part 2 (2004: 131). Based on earlier communication with an HLT, the level of the book was said to match that of a pupil in the 6/7-9 Grades who was born in Sweden or had moved to Sweden as a young child. The purpose of targeting the level of acquisition of pupils who had not received Arabic instruction in the Arab world was to avoid floor effects in the test results.

75
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A pilot test conducted in June 2013 confirmed that the level of difficulty was indeed suitable for testing pupils with varying levels of written MSA.

3.2.4 The original text
Below, a brief presentation of the original text is provided. The next section, 3.2.5 Adaptations of the text for the test, describes how the text was modified to broaden the morphological content.

Wording of the original text

رزق باسر حديقة الحيوان. رأى باسر قزًا يجلس في جحش أمو. أعطى باسر موزًا للقرز، قشر القرز الموزة وأكلها.

شاهد حارس الحديقة القرز بيأكل الموزة. قال الحارس لباسر:

- لا تطعم القرز. هذا ممنوع.» قال باسر للحارس:

- أنا أسف. لم أكن أعرف أن إطعام القرز ممنوع. في الحارة القارية

S毛主席 at the zoo. Yāsir saw a monkey sitting in its mother’s arms. Yāsir gave a banana to the monkey. The monkey peeled the banana and ate it. The zoo guard saw the monkey eating the banana. The guard said to Yāsir: “Do not feed the monkeys. It is forbidden.” Yāsir said to the guard: “I am sorry. I did not know that feeding the monkeys was forbidden. Next time I will feed the giraffe.”

Length of text
The Arabic text is 56 words long when pronominal suffixes and proclitic prepositions are counted as words in their own wright. The definite article is not counted. The text consists of 12 sentences with a mean word count of 4.7. The sentences are 2-8 words long.

Difficulty of theme and vocabulary
The text is transparent. The vocabulary consists largely of concrete nouns with the exception of one verbal noun, إطعام, “feeding”. Several words are repeated in the text.
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Morphology
Morphologically the text contains variation in the verb forms with regard to stem forms, tense, mood, aspect, and person. Parts of the verbal system differ between DA and MSA, so verb forms may be a good indication of the level of command the pupils have of MSA and if they are able to distinguish between MSA and DA.

Sentence types
Both verbal and equational sentences are found in the text. The sentences are short and direct with one exception; a compound verb phrase followed by a subordinate clause with an *idāfa* (genitive construction) in an equational sentence:

"I did not know that feeding the monkeys [was] forbidden".

3.2.5 Adaptations of the text for the test
The text was slightly modified to broaden the morphological content. Detailed grammatical explanations are provided in connection with the analysis. The following alterations were made to the text:

1. The boy’s name was changed into a girl’s name, Salma, thereby enabling the elicitation of verbs in the feminine singular as well as a feminine predicative adjective. Singular masculine forms were already covered by the words “monkey” and “guard”.

2. The name of the child was substituted for a personal pronoun in a couple of sentences. MSA is a pro-drop language and it was of interest to see if the participants would produce overt pronouns despite this.

3. The singular “guard” was changed into the plural in order to elicit a broken plural (BP), i.e. a non-catenative plural formation. In addition, if the pupils chose to employ SVO-word order, they would have to conjugate verbs in the masculine 3rd person plural according to the rules for verbal agreement.

4. The change of “guard” into the plural did not eliminate the presence of a verb in the masculine 3rd person singular. The sentence “The guard said to Yāsir.” was altered to “One of the guards said to Salma.”. Thus, the masculine singular verb was retained.

5. An attribute, “big”, was added to the plural form “monkeys” to test the pupils’ knowledge of agreement rules for non-human ([\-HUM]) plurals; these agree with the feminine singular in verbs
and adjectives, both in the attributive and the predicative position.

6. An introductory sentence was added intended to elicit an adverb (“a lot”) which in written Arabic contains a specific orthographic feature.

7. The word “giraffe” was changed into “elephant”, since several participants in the pilot study did not know the word for “giraffe” in Arabic.

The processed text reads as follows in the Swedish test version and in an English translation:


Salma likes animals a lot. One day she visited the zoo. She looked at the big monkeys. She saw a monkey sitting in its mother’s arms. Salma gave a banana to the monkey. The monkey peeled the banana and ate it. The zoo guards saw the monkey eating the banana. One of the guards said to Salma: “Do not feed the big monkeys. It is forbidden.” Salma said to the guards: “I am sorry. I did not know that feeding the monkeys was forbidden/it was forbidden to feed the monkeys. Next time I will feed the elephant.”

An Arabic version is not supplied at this point since the pupils may produce different, yet correct, translations.

3.2.6 Targeted structures and outline of the analysis

The pupils were asked to translate the adapted text from Swedish into Arabic. The translations were analysed according to three major domains:
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- Script
- Spelling
- Morphosyntax

Due to the nature of the language test, one final item needs to be commented on:

- Translation

Chapters 4 and Chapter 5 present and discuss the results in detail with examples and grammatical descriptions. Below, a general outline of the items included in the analysis of the translations is provided.

**Script**
The script is analysed based on the use of ligatures and how well the letters are shaped. Note that aesthetic quality is not the main concern here, but rather legibility. The handwriting of the participants is divided into three categories: low, medium and high. Examples of the participants’ handwriting are provided in Chapter 4.

**Spelling**
In 1.2.5 Research on writing in Arabic, all the reviewed studies (Azzam, 1993; Abu-Rabia & Taha, 2006; Fragman, 2013, 2014) used dictation: the task was to transform spoken language into written language. I have instead chosen a translation test in order to elicit complete sentences. By employing a translation test as a tool, I cannot use terminology intended to describe challenges connected with transforming spoken language into written language, for example the category of dysphonetic spelling errors in Abu-Rabia & Taha (2006). The spelling errors are instead divided into three major categories that will be explained in detail in the analysis of spelling:

4.2.2 Orthographic spelling errors
4.2.3 Vowel length spelling errors
4.2.4 Consonant spelling errors

In order to register interpersonal and intrapersonal variation, I have chosen to list all the spelling errors rather than, like Azzam (1993), prioritising between error types. Thus words may combine several kinds of incorrect spellings and, as a consequence, a repeated irregular spelling is counted as several misspellings even though it could be seen as one
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error. Consequently, the total number of incorrectly spelled words can be lower than the number of incorrect spellings. An example can be given using the word exchange. The rendition *ekschaange would give one irregularly spelled word that contains two incorrect spellings; -ks- and -aa-. This approach, to list all errors, was considered reasonable since a participant could potentially produce different versions, correct and incorrect, of the same word in the translation, or the same type of error in different words.

Furthermore, in the analysis of spelling, a highly normative approach was used. Orthographic features that may not be obligatory in handwriting are included in the analysis. This approach was necessary to fully register the competence of pupils who actually did spell MSA according to a high stylistic norm.

Another issue to be addressed was whether or not to test the pupils’ ability to indicate short vowels correctly. Azzam (1993) included short vowels in her study; for the sake of comparison, asking the pupils to indicate short vowels would have been preferable. It was, however, believed that if the participants were asked to indicate short vowels in their translations, that would slow down their writing speed considerably, thereby affecting the small degree of spontaneity that might be possible in a translation test. Moreover, the short vowels at the end of words are in general grammatically redundant and as such are dropped in most (spoken) formal and informal situations. In addition, working as a teacher of MSA at the university, I have met students who say that they never understood the function of the short vowels when as children they participated in HLI. One last important point that should be made concerning the short vowels is that we do not know what the teachers teach and require. In the instructions for the translation test, no reference to short vowels was made at all. The pupils were free to follow their own choice.

The analysis of the translation test is qualitative, since only a few items (level of handwriting, number of words in the translation, percentage of incorrectly spelled words) lend themselves to a directly quantitative approach. A participant who has only translated a few words that she/he knows well can, for example, avoid making any spelling errors, whereas a participant who has completed the entire translation test may end up with a translation with several irregular spellings. In addition, the translation test was open in the sense that the participants were not instructed to use a specific set of words in their translations. The translations vary as to the choice of vocabulary and structures. The data are
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thus not always directly comparable. A pure “right” and “wrong” approach would be misleading.

Throughout the analysis of the responses to the translation test, the Arabic words are presented thus: regular spellings of targeted words are first given in the Arabic script without short vowels, then transcribed into italic with the correct vowels inserted and finally translated into English with the translation between quotation marks. As for the responses of the participants, they had to be coded differently. Since the pupils were not asked to supply the Arabic translation with short vowels, their responses are transliterated, that is, given a letter-by-letter rendering.

Morphosyntax
The following morphosyntactic traits in the translations are analysed in Chapter 5:

5.1 Word order
5.2 Overt pronouns
5.3 Verbs
5.4 Adjective agreement
5.5 Possessive constructions

Dialectal influence on MSA morphosyntax is included in the analysis of the above features. However, dialectal influence can only be detected when a structure (phoneme, morphology, lexicon) diverges between MSA and DA. There are naturally cases where MSA and DA do in fact converge, since they are Arabic varieties. Consequently, a “third category” should be subsumed: “common Arabic”, where neither DA nor MSA are marked. In such instances, relevant information for making the distinction between MSA and DA is not provided. In the analysis of the translation, only marked DA structures could be commented on.

Notes on translation
The final item included in the analysis is translation. Translation skills, however, are not the focus of the study. This section serves rather as a comment on the difficulties inherent in this kind of test: transfer from the language of the original text, to name one. This category investigates the pupils’ translations of the lexicon and semantics involved in the test. Translation of the following categories is discussed:
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5.6.1 Words
5.6.2 Syntax
5.6.3 The translation of dependent prepositions
5.6.4 Idiomatically incorrect translations

3.3 Questionnaire
The questionnaire is constructed to provide information about the background of the pupils, their contact with DA and MSA and their experience of participating in HLI. In the analysis, some variables in the questionnaire are checked against the results of the translation test. Below, the themes included in the questionnaire are briefly outlined and the structure of the analysis is presented.32

3.3.1 The content of the questionnaire
Not all questions and responses are analysed in the present work, since our main concern here is to investigate whether different kinds of instruction and contact with written Arabic have an impact on the written production of the HLPs. The data that are not treated in the thesis will form the basis of an article (Walldoff, forthcoming). Below, I will nevertheless comment on the composition of the questionnaire and specify where the responses are used in the thesis (see 3.3.2). The questions included in the questionnaire can be roughly divided into three major themes:

• Background of the pupil
• Contact with Arabic
• HLI

Background of the pupil is intended to supply descriptive data, such as age on arrival in Sweden, country of origin and whether both parents speak Arabic. A more open approach to possible family constellations was not taken. All the questions focus on mothers and fathers. This approach was deliberately chosen for two reasons. To start with, the questions for these 14-15-year-olds were intended to be simple in order to minimise the risk of any misunderstandings, especially since their knowledge of Swedish might vary. Secondly, research on language contact and language shift in immigrant families often discusses what languages are used with different family members (see 2.2.2). Asking explicitly about mothers and fathers would allow the results of the present thesis to be compared with previous research.

32 The questionnaire is available in Swedish and English in the Appendix.
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The following section, Contact with Arabic, looks into the interaction the pupils have with written and spoken MSA and DA in their everyday life.

The third section, HLI, seeks to investigate why the pupils participate in HLI, how many pupils go to the same HLI class and how many years the pupils have participated in HLI. The section also seeks to clarify what languages are used in the HLI classes; DA, MSA or Swedish. A question regarding the variety of Arabic the pupils think should be taught in HLI is also included. Rouchdy (2002) showed that MSA functioned as an important cultural symbol for the Arabic community in Dearborn. Even though MSA is not the actual L1 of the pupils, the possible status of MSA as a cultural symbol should not be neglected, especially since the syllabus seeks to embrace both culture and language acquisition. Given the view, in many circles dominant, that the standard variety of Arabic and not the dialects is the “right” Arabic, it is also interesting to find out the pupils’ view on the status of the various Arabic varieties.

3.3.2 Structure of the analysis of the questionnaire
The responses to the questionnaire are included in Chapters 3 and 6.

3.1.6 Background information about the participants provides descriptive statistics. One item, country of origin of the pupil or his or her parents, is relevant to the analysis of spelling and morphosyntax, since some spelling errors or deviations from MSA morphosyntactic rules could possibly be a result of DA interference.

In Chapter 6 Explaining variation in writing, spelling and production of MSA morphology, questions concerned with language instruction, language input and language contact are related to the results of the translation test. Since the sample was non-random and in addition rather small, a tentative approach has been adopted in the analysis; observed tendencies in the data are discussed instead of correlations.

Reference is on occasion made to the dialectal background of the participants in the analyses in Chapters 4 and 5 when dialectal interference is suspected.

3.4 Procedure for data collection
It has been mentioned that schools with large groups of HLPs of specific languages sometimes employ HLTs to work exclusively in the school, while schools with smaller groups of HLPs employ HLTs by the hour from language resource centres (see 2.1.2). For this study, both Arabic teachers working for a language resource centre and teachers employed
as resident home language teachers were approached. They were informed of the purpose of the study, how the testing was to be organised and what the project would require from them, namely to work as intermediaries between their pupils, the parents and me.

The teachers who agreed to participate in the project helped to distribute a letter of information and a consent form to the pupils and their parents. The information and the form were in Swedish and Arabic (MSA), since the language background of the parents was not known at this stage. The information presented to the parents explained the aims of the study, that the participants were guaranteed anonymity, that participation was voluntary, that the children would be able to terminate their participation in the testing at any point and that the data would be used for research purposes only. The forms were signed by the parents and collected when testing took place. One pupil had forgotten the form at home but still wanted to participate in the study. The HLT called the pupil’s mother and it was confirmed that the pupil was allowed to participate. Several of the consent forms were only signed with the guardian’s first names. However, the HLTs could guarantee that these forms were signed by the guardians and not by the pupils. A couple of signed forms had been lost among the HLTs’ papers, but as both pupils and teachers guaranteed that the forms had been signed by the guardians in question, the pupils were allowed to participate.

In order not to disturb the schedule of the participants, testing took place during the regular HLI classes and in classrooms at the pupils’ schools. The teachers introduced me to their pupils and then left the classroom. I presented the reasons for the study and repeated the ethical information given in the letter of information that had been distributed earlier; that participation was optional, that they were guaranteed anonymity, that they were at liberty at any point to terminate their participation and that their responses would only be used for research. In addition, I assured them that their teachers would not be allowed to look at what they had written.

The translation test was given before the questionnaire on all occasions, to get the most of the participants’ concentration. The translation test and the questionnaire were marked with numbers and no names were given at any point. After the questionnaire was filled in, the pupils were compensated for their time with a movie ticket and were free to leave. It would have been preferable to have the participants wait in peace and quiet until all of them had finished. During the pilot study, however, it had become evident that some pupils required considerably less time than others to perform the tasks and that the not so quick pupils
found it embarrassing to have their classmates wait for them to complete the tasks. Furthermore, there had been instances when participants who had finished early disturbed those who were still writing.

In connection with the data collection, I sometimes engaged in informal conversations with teachers and pupils. In the thesis, I refer to these conversations when they provide information relevant to the study (e.g. different kinds of extra instruction in Arabic).
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To recapitulate what was presented in Chapter 3, 26 pupils participated in this two-part study consisting of a translation test and a questionnaire on various background factors and language use. The present chapter and Chapter 5 analyse and discuss data from the translation test with reference to previous research on diglossia and writing in the Arabic script. Chapter 6 relates the results of the translation test to the variables of language instruction and contact with written Arabic. Thus the analyses of the data from the translation test are spread over three chapters:

4 Analysis of the translation test: script, spelling and translation
5 Analysis of the translation test: MSA morphosyntax and notes on translation
6 Explaining variation in writing, spelling and production of MSA morphology

Chapter 4 is organised in the following way:

4.1 Script
4.2 Spelling

4.1 Script assesses the command the participants have of the Arabic script. This measure can provide an indication of the practice the participants have had in writing in Arabic.

4.2 Spelling analyses the types of spelling irregularities found in the responses. The spelling errors are classified as orthographic irregularities, vowel irregularities and consonantal irregularities. It is suggested that orthographic irregularities, in accordance with Azzam (1993, see 1.2.5), result from an insufficient knowledge of context-sensitive rules. Irregular spelling of consonants and vowels (except for word-final vowels) is, however, above all assumed to stem from a phonological approach towards spelling and, in some cases where consonants are involved, DA interference with the production of MSA.

4.1 Script
The participants’ handwriting is categorised according to three levels: low, medium and high. This categorisation was made by weighing some traits of the handwriting such as letter shape and correct use of ligatures.
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Aesthetic quality was not a measure, since a skilled writer does not necessarily write beautifully. In addition, in the same translation some words could be written quite legibly whereas others demanded a collective effort to decipher.

Table 8. Command of the script and number of translated words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>IL</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>NT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P13</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P17</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P18</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P19</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P20</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P21</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P22</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P23</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P24</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P25</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P26</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twelve participants had well-developed handwriting, five were on a medium level and five had a poor command of the Arabic script (Table 8). Incorrect ligatures are one of the traits measured in categorising the

---

33 P4 and P5 were recent arrivals with insufficient knowledge of Swedish. P13 and P16 did not do the translation test because they said that they could not write in Arabic.
34 The Swedish text had a word count of 80 words.
level of handwriting. This is listed in the table since it is quantifiable as opposed to the general measure: shape of letters. Incorrect ligatures are frequent in the two participants, P10 and P11, whose handwriting was considered to belong to the low level. In addition, these two participants left out many words from their translations, indicating that the task was difficult for them.

The participants who had a good command of the script tended to leave out fewer words. P21 stands out as the one with a medium level of handwriting but with many words missing from the translation. All in all, most of the pupils wrote quite legibly.

Translations of the sentence *En dag besökte hon djurparken*, “One day she visited the zoo”, illustrate the differences in command of the script (Pictures 1-3).

**4.2 Spelling**
Different kinds of irregular spellings occur in the responses. The results are presented in four subgroups: one quantitative overview and three qualitative analyses. The results are discussed in the following four sections:
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4.2.1 Irregular spelling (quantitative)
4.2.2 Orthographic spelling errors (qualitative)
4.2.3 Vowel length spelling errors (qualitative)
4.2.4 Consonant spelling errors (qualitative)

Before discussing the different kinds of spelling errors encountered in the data, an overview of the issues related to spelling is presented (Table 9).

Table 9. Spelling.
Number of irregularly spelled words (I), orthographic spelling errors (O), vowel length spelling errors (V), consonant spelling errors (C), number of words in the translations (W) and percentage of irregularly spelled words per entire translation (I%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>I%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P19</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=22</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1420</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mean)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In the translation test, few irregularities were found that did not appear to stem from challenges associated with orthography, vowel length, choice of consonant (minimal pairs or dialectal transfer) or uncertainties concerning MSA morphology. These, however, are included in the total number of incorrectly spelled words. To provide one example, P22 had left out the diacritical dots on ساهمت and instead written ساهمت. Azzam (1993) listed these kinds of errors but did not specify whether the missing diacritical dots affected graphemes that were sensitive to dialectal interference. I have chosen not to include them in the analysis, mainly because these irregularities were rare but also because they are difficult to systemise and explain. Missing dots could point to challenges connected with the writing system but might just as well be the result of a participant not proof-reading the translation.

4.2.1 Irregular spelling

Analysing the spelling errors presented some challenges. For a start, there were instances where some pupils’ limited command of the writing system made an analysis of the spelling complicated. In such cases, the analysis is based on my interpretation of the words that were targeted in the translations. Furthermore, focusing on the total number of incorrect spellings would give an unbalanced picture of the pupils’ production; the more words a participant writes, the more words can be misspelled. To counterbalance this, the number of words containing at least one spelling error was divided by the total number of words in each translation. The downside to this approach is that avoidance strategies could possibly lead to fewer words being incorrectly spelled. It can, however, be noted (see Table 8) that there is a clear connection between the level of handwriting and the number of words missing from the translation; most participants with well-developed handwriting left out fewer words. The results (Table 10) also show great variation in the percentage of incorrectly spelled words, 1 to 87 per cent.

Table 10. Spelling and level of handwriting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>I%</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1 further illustrates how handwriting and spelling errors correspond.

**Figure 1.** Level of handwriting and percentage of incorrectly spelled words.
Two observations can be made here:

1. The participants are highly heterogeneous with regard to writing and spelling in Arabic (i.e. MSA).
2. There is a clear correlation between the level of handwriting and the percentage of incorrectly spelled words in the responses. It seems reasonable that a good command of the script should be connected to other skills such as spelling: Practice results in better handwriting, and practice itself involves reading and looking at words.

4.2.2 Orthographic spelling errors
Hansen (2008: 5-7) discusses the imprecise use of the terms “script”, “orthography” and “writing system” in linguistic literature. She defines orthography as “the language specific characteristics of written language, thus both linguistic structure mapped by the writing system and specific spelling rules” (2008: 7). To give an example, English and German are both written in the Latin script, but according to different systems: If we write ‘die’, the ‘-ie’ is pronounced \[aı\] in English, but \[i:] (DEF ART FEM SG and DEF ART PL; “the”) in German. In line with Hansen, orthographic spelling errors mean violations of context-sensitive rules for spelling and incorrect rendering of words that have a fixed spelling that requires specific knowledge of the word. In short, instances where phonological skills will not suffice to spell a word correctly.

Production of the following orthographic features is discussed in this section:

4.2.2.1 The spelling of hamz
4.2.2.2 The marking of indefinite accusatives
4.2.2.3 The word ending of verbs in the feminine singular
4.2.2.4 Word-final a vowels

These kinds of irregular spellings were given separate entries in Azzam’s (1993) categorisation. The spelling of hamz and the marking of indefinite accusatives are clearly features that require specific knowledge of rules for writing and grammar (see 4.2.2.1 below). However, Azzam does not comment on the fact that the kind of spelling errors that can be encountered in, for example, the production of word endings of verbs in the feminine singular, and the indication of a vowels as word endings in the nominal system are error types where the phoneme-grapheme correspondence is not evident but depends on grammatical knowledge. As for Abu-
Rabia & Taha’s (2006, see 1.2.5) classification system, they call one category *Irregular spelling rules*. Although they provide few examples in their article, they distinguish between decoding errors and errors that depend on irregular spelling rules. The error types that in the present study are referred to as orthographic are thus assumed to correspond to a large extent to the *Irregular spelling rules* category in Abu-Rabia & Taha.

4.2.2.1 The spelling of *hamz*

*Hamz* is the Arabic word for the glottal stop. In Arabic, *hamz* is a phoneme in its own right. *Hamz* can either be part of a root, for example ‘-k-l (root meaning related to “eating”), or the result of a morphological pattern, for example 1st person singular verbs are prefixed with a *hamz* in the imperfect.

The difficulty lies in the way *hamz* is represented as a grapheme in the Arabic script. The rules for representing *hamz*, a historical artefact, are complicated, and in some instances depend on the surrounding vowels. As a grapheme, *hamz* is referred to as *hamza*. *Hamza* has several forms:

- Independent: <ء>
- Augmented with supporting graphemes: <ئ>, <ؤ>, <إ>, <أ>

It is of interest to notice here that particles and one type of preposition in particular written with the *hamza* have a fixed spelling and do not change graphically, for example أن, 
مان, ‘an, “that”; إلی, إلی, ‘alā, “to”. As far as these particles and prepositions are concerned, it should be easier to retain a visual memory of the words, thereby facilitating spelling. In contrast, other words, especially verbs, undergo changes due to orthographic, morphophonetic rules. To explain the rules for indicating *hamza* in detail is beyond the scope of the present work.35 A couple of examples with common verbs and the definite article will, however, illustrate the challenges the *hamza* presents to visual memory.

The verb سألا, سألا, “he asked” (3 SG MASC PERF) has a *hamz* as the middle radical. In this first example, the letter ل, *alif*, is used as a “chair”, a grapheme supporting *hamza*. If the verb is changed into the passive, it becomes سيل, سيل, “[he/it] was asked”. Similarly, the verb قرأ, قرأ, “he read” (3 SG MASC PERF) is written in the following way if the singular is changed into the plural: قَوْرَأَ, قَوْرَأَ, “they read”. Here, the *alif* at the end is another purely orthographic feature; it has to be written but is not pronounced. Further-

35 Haywood & Nahmad (1965: 199-201) can be consulted for a description.
more, in Arabic, the proclitic definite article -ال، al-, is also subject to specific phonological and orthographic rules. Sometimes the 'ال is spelled with a hamza, sometimes not. A simplified explanation for indicating the definite article with hamza would be that the 'ال will be supplied with hamza and pronounced with a short a vowel when it is clause-initial. Otherwise, there will be no hamza and while the 'ال in most cases would be written, it will have only an orthographic and grammatical function. The preceding vowel will instead be pronounced. The examples above show that 'ال as a grapheme can represent hamz [’] or the vowels [a], [ā] or [i], but in addition it also functions as a grammatical marker with no phonetic value. The point is further addressed below (see 4.2.2.2 The marking of indefinite accusatives).

Turning to the translation test, an incorrect rendering of hamza is above all seen in the spelling of the verb اَرُ, ra’ā, “to see”. The verbs “to see” and “to look [at]” were present in the following clauses:

C3 “she looked [at]”
C4a “she saw”
C7a “they saw”

The targeted forms of the verb found in the responses were as follows:

- اَرُ, ra’ā, “he saw”, (3 SG MASC PERF)
- اَتُ, ra’at, “she saw”, (3 SG FEM PERF)
- اَرُ, ra’aw, “they saw”, (3 PL MASC PERF)

In many cases, alternative translations of the verb “to see” were chosen. The verb was produced 35 times in the responses; nine times the spelling was entirely correct and seven times the middle hamza was not indicated but the form was otherwise correct. Table 11 presents the irregular spellings. Only the targeted verb form is commented on, not if the verb form is syntactically correct with regard to person, number and gender.

---

36 The 3rd person singular masculine perfect verb form is used as a main entry for Arabic words, not the infinitive. اَرُ, ra’ā, then literally translates “he saw”, but since it is intended as a general entry and not as a conjugated form, it is given the infinitive translation “to see”.
37 The verb “to look (at)” was sometimes translated as اَرُ, ra’ā, “to see”.
38 There is no singular masculine form in the clauses in English (or Swedish), but in Arabic the word order affects the number of the verb. In the VS word order, the verb is in the singular even when the subject is plural.
39 The ‘ال at the end of the plural form is an orthographic feature not to be pronounced.
Table 11. Irregular forms of verb رأى.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target form</th>
<th>Irregular form</th>
<th>Transliteration of irregular form (participant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>رأى</td>
<td>رئى (P22)</td>
<td>رْئ (P21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رئى</td>
<td>رأى (P9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رأى</td>
<td>رئ (P21x2, P22)</td>
<td>رْئ (P8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رئى</td>
<td>رئ (P25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رئى</td>
<td>رأى (P3, P6, P23x2)</td>
<td>رْأ (P19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رأى</td>
<td>روأ (P20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>روأ</td>
<td>روأ (P23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>روأ</td>
<td>روأ (P25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>روأ</td>
<td>روأ (P14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The forms رأى and رئى are interesting, since the incorrect letter is used for hamza. The middle radical is written with the letter ʻayn <ع>, which as a grapheme used for the word-initial position, <ـع>, resembles hamza <ء>. In this specific case, the participants may have mixed up graphemes due to their graphic similarity. If we use Abu-Rabia & Taha’s (2006) terminology, this could be a case of similar letter confusion or a semi-phonetic error.

It should be noted that even P20, a participant who had attended school in an Arab country and had only lived in Sweden for two years and whose translation was almost perfect, failed to produce a correct spelling of رأى in clause 7. P20 wrote روأ.

As a point of reference, P4, a very recent arrival who did not qualify for the study due to insufficient knowledge of Swedish, did spell the verbs correctly in clauses 4 and 7.

The verb is admittedly difficult to spell in that it contains both a hamza and a long vowel. At the same time, the verb “to see” is a basic word and, as such, highly frequent, even though other verbs, such as ُأَعُف in for example Levantine Arabic, may be used in DA. It should, however,
be noted that, as the example from P20 showed, even pupils who have gone to school in Arab countries can have difficulty spelling this word.

Similarly, the verb يأكل, يأكل, “he/it eats/is eating” (3 SG MASC IMPERF) in C7 presented the participants with something of a challenge. In 21 responses (one participant had not translated the sentence), seven had written orthographically correct forms, three had targeted the perfect rather than the imperfect and eleven had produced orthographically incorrect forms. The irregular imperfect forms in the responses are shown in Table 12.40

Table 12. Irregular forms of the verb يأكل.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target form</th>
<th>Irregular form</th>
<th>Transliteration (participant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>يأكل</td>
<td>يأكل</td>
<td>yākl (P23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>يأكل</td>
<td>يكل</td>
<td>yyll (P2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>يكل</td>
<td>يكل</td>
<td>ykl (P6, P21, P22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>يكل</td>
<td>يكل</td>
<td>ykl (P18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>يكل</td>
<td>يكل</td>
<td>ykl (P25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>يكل</td>
<td>ييكَّا</td>
<td>ywkā (P10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>يكل</td>
<td>يَّاكَّا</td>
<td>y a̍kwa (P19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>يأكل</td>
<td>تكَّول</td>
<td>tkwl (P7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>يأكل</td>
<td>تكَّول</td>
<td>tkwlw (P12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The irregularities are of various kinds. يأكل merely misses the hamza but is otherwise correct. In يكل, the hamza is indicated on the wrong supporting grapheme. يكل and يكل lack any indication of the hamza, something that could indicate DA influence, and the form يكل in addition contains a long vowel for a short one. يكل and يكل were produced by participants who do not master the basics of the writing system and contain several irregularities. To mention one, the Arabic grapheme <ل>, ل, assuming it was targeted in the first place, is rendered with the graphically similar grapheme <ل>, ل. The last two examples, تكَّول and تكَّول, are prefixed by t-, which indicates 2nd person forms or the feminine singular. The hamza is not indicated and incorrect vowel length, long for short, is present in the spellings. The question of long vowels being used to spell short vowels is addressed below (see 4.2.3.2).

40 A complete list of the responses with the verb يأكل, including the subject of the verb, is presented in Table 21.
The targeted verb forms with hamza in the translation test did not have hamza as an initial grapheme. Word-initial hamza is more consistent and easier to spell in that it does not change graphically depending on the surrounding vowels. Moving on from the verbs, it was noticed in the analysis of the translation tests that many of the pupils tended to indicate word-initial hamza on the ‘alif quite haphazardly. Some graphically consistent words, especially the preposition ِلإ, ‘ilā, “to” (see Table 30), were more often written with a hamza than words with hamza as the first radical and verbs in the 1st person singular imperfect. In newspapers and books, the standard for printed, unvowelled MSA texts seems to be to mark hamza. For handwritten Arabic, and the test was obviously written by hand, the standard for indicating hamza may, however, vary.

4.2.2.2 The marking of indefinite accusatives
Written Arabic uses diacritic markings for short vowels, but short vowels are only indicated in certain genres such as books for children. There is, however, also a system for marking case endings with short vowels. The indefinite case endings (for some categories of words) are marked by a doubling of the graphemes used to indicate the short vowels. This is another orthographic convention and the morphemes are pronounced -un, -an and -in. In Arabic grammar this is called tanwīn, “nunation”.

Table 13. Tanwīn.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Morpheme</th>
<th>Arabic vowelled</th>
<th>Arabic unvowelled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| nom  | -un      | “
| acc  | -an      | ِل ل; ِل ل; ِل ل; ِل ل |
| gen  | -in      | “ | “ |

As shown in Table 13, case endings are commonly not indicated in unvowelled written Arabic, nor are the morphemes necessarily pronounced in spoken MSA (cf. Hallberg, 2016). Some categories of nouns, adjectives and participles are, however, orthographically marked with an ‘alif when (1) indefinite and (2) in the accusative state.

41 Hallberg (2016) investigated how/if the case endings were indicated in spoken MSA by participants in a political interview programme on Al Jazeera. The persons in Hallberg’s sample were highly competent speakers of MSA, but had varying approaches to the way they treated the case endings, even though some patterns were detected. 42 The singular feminine ending تامربتا and hamza on the line are not marked orthographically with ‘alif. Diptotes do not take nunation at all.
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In the translation test, C4 (see below) contains at least one indefinite accusative (ـّوطه, qirdan, “monkey”) that should be orthographically marked, two if “sitting” is translated with an active participle (جالس, jālisan; or قادا, qā’dan) rather than a finite verb.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Marked case</th>
<th>Alif</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>قرد جالس</td>
<td>qrd jāls</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>(القرد يجلس)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>(القرد جالس)</td>
<td>jālīs</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>(قرد يغع)</td>
<td>qrdūu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>قرد جالس</td>
<td>qrdā</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>قرد جالس</td>
<td>qrdā jāls</td>
<td>ACC 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>قرد - قرد</td>
<td>qrdūu</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>قرد جالس</td>
<td>qrd jls</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td>قرد - كرد</td>
<td>krd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43 At first glance it would seem that the word has been orthographically marked for an accusative, but both the following verb in the feminine and this specific translation taken as a whole reveal that it is more likely an attempt to indicate the feminine singular phoneme a.
Few pupils (P13, P18 and P20) mastered the orthographic convention of marking the accusative with the 'alif. Again variability is visible in the production. Some participants left the words unmarked for case, something that would orthographically indicate that either the nominative or the genitive case was targeted. Others explicitly marked the words for the nominative case by supplying the double u diacritics, or, in the case of P19, spelling the nominative case ending with a phoneme to grapheme approach rather than with double u diacritics. An interesting example concerning the way case is marked is provided by P14. Both words were marked with double a diacritics, but without the orthographic 'alif. P14 has made a correct syntactic analysis of the clause, but did not master the spelling convention for the words involved, leaving out the 'alif. Marking the accusative with double short a vowels would, on the other hand, be correct for other types of words. P25 also identified the accusative object, but did not know how to convey the morpheme in writing and wrote the word ّوطهك 4 نء m نبءلأئئ y ـّوطهرفئ f ّوطهبءئن 4 نئ f نءفبء ، kyrdan\. It is incorrectly spelled with the wrong initial consonant, ك، \k\, instead of گ، \g\, and contains a vowel length error; ـ، \i\, where the vowel should be short. As for the accusative ending, it was spelled phonologically; ُ، \an\, an, for orthographically correct ا، \a\. The examples provided by P14 and P25 are quite interesting. They indicate a grammatical competence that is higher than they are able to produce in writing.

\footnote{P19's response also contains a grapheme used for indicating a long u vowel and the word ending corresponds with the concatenative masculine plural formation. My interpretation is that the target was the nunated singular form, but we may be seeing a transfer error: P19 producing a familiar suffix.}
Furthermore, one of the functions of indefinite accusatives is to create adverbs. Though indeclinable, these adverbs are also orthographically marked with ‘alif. The derived adverbs in the indefinite accusative have a tendency to become lexicalised and as such have a stable orthography. C1 contains the adverb كثيرة, كثير, ktyrāā, “a lot”. Table 15 presents the production of the adverb in the translation test.

Table 15. Orthographic marking on the adverb كثيرة.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Marked case</th>
<th>‘Alif</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>كثيرة</td>
<td>ktyrāā</td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>كثيرة</td>
<td>ktyrāā</td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>كثيرة</td>
<td>ktyrāā</td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>جيدة</td>
<td>jddāāa</td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>كثيرة</td>
<td>ktyrāā</td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>كثيرة</td>
<td>ktyr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>كثيرة</td>
<td>ktyr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12</td>
<td>كثيرة</td>
<td>ktyr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P13</td>
<td>كثيرة</td>
<td>ktyrāā</td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14</td>
<td>كثيرة</td>
<td>ktyrāā</td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P17</td>
<td>كثيرة</td>
<td>ktyr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P18</td>
<td>كثيرة</td>
<td>ktyrāā</td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P21</td>
<td>كثيرة</td>
<td>ktyr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P22</td>
<td>كثيرة</td>
<td>ktyr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P26</td>
<td>كثيرة</td>
<td>ktyr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though the word was left out by eight participants, the participants appear to know the correct spelling of this highly frequent adverb to a greater degree than the structures presented in Table 14. As was discussed above in connection with the rendering of hamz (4.2.2.1), this might also be an indication that high-frequency words that change little...
graphically are more easily retained than words that change graphically. That said, the word was not orthographically marked by all pupils and even when marked correctly, the word could display other irregularities such as incorrect vowel length or choice of consonant (/t/ for /ṯ/, a common DA trait).

P14, who was mentioned in connection with Table 14, wrote correctly. Thus P14 is not unfamiliar with the spelling convention.

It should also be kept in mind that there is a limited amount of input of indefinite accusative endings available to any speaker of Arabic. The case endings are rarely pronounced in MSA. The indefinite accusative ending only occasionally occurs in (spoken) DA, mostly in loans from MSA. Here, as a matter of fact, is an instance of the written language diverging from spoken varieties (i.e. something is to be written that is not pronounced) and in addition introducing a specific orthographic trait that is syntax dependent.

4.2.2.3 The word ending of verbs in the feminine singular

The third orthographic feature to challenge some pupils was to indicate the ending for the 3rd person singular feminine perfect; /-t/. Morphologically the phone /t/ in Arabic, in MSA as well as in DA, can represent several different morphemes:

1. Verb ending: 3rd person feminine singular perfect /-t/ marked with the grapheme <ت>.
2. Nominal ending: feminine singular /-a(t)/ marked with the grapheme <ة>, called tā'-marbūṭa.

To continue to the test results, 8 participants (P8, P12, P13, P14, P17, P18, P19 and P22) had used tā'-marbūṭa as a verb ending in the 3rd person singular feminine perfect at least once. To give one example, P12 translated “she saw” in C4 with شافت. Since the tā'-marbūṭa is only used for the nominal system, the regular <ت>, t, should have been chosen for the feminine verb ending. The two features of the tā'-marbūṭa that may explain the confusion are:

46 The [t] in the morpheme /-a(t)/ is only realised in given contexts (in the construct state; followed by case vowel).
47 The verb شافت, “she saw”, is DA, not MSA, and should be شافت, šafat.
1. The phonological aspect, i.e. it is pronounced [t].
2. *Tā’-marbūṭa* is connected with the feminine singular dimension [+ FEM SG].

Interestingly enough, based on my experience of teaching MSA at university level, students studying Arabic as a foreign language and with no prior knowledge of the language usually have no difficulty in grasping the difference in use of *tā’-marbūṭa* and *tā’. I assume that university students either have a better knowledge of grammatical categories or approach the script graphically rather than phonologically. In contrast, the responses of the HLPs suggest that many of them rely on a phonological approach to writing; that is, they write the Arabic they know and since they are aware that a “t” at the end of a word can be written either ة or ـّ، the outcome can be mixed up.

*Tā’-marbūṭa* is further discussed below in connection with the question of how to mark word-final a vowels in the nominal system.

### 4.2.2.4 Word-final a vowels

Word-final a vowels comprise the phonemes /-a/ and /-ā/, both pronounced [a] with no distinction in vowel length in the final position.

Since the most common use of *tā’-marbūṭa* is in feminine singular nouns, adjectives and participles, this use is very transparent, given that the pupils understand the category. There are, however, feminine nouns ending in a long a vowel. The spelling of these words can usually be explained by the radicals of a word or by certain morphological patterns.

Table 16 below lists irregular spellings of final a vowels. The examples will not be scrutinised in detail, since they basically illustrate one thing: Some participants appear to have written the words phonologically but lack a visual memory of the words. Note that what is interpreted as being the targeted form is not necessarily the syntactically correct form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant (P), clause (C), target form (T), written form (W), diacritic for tā’-marbūṭā (DTM), tā’-marbūṭā for short vowel (TMSV), tā’-marbūṭā for ‘alif (TMA), ‘alif for ‘alif maqṣūra (AAM), ‘alif for short vowel (ASV) and ‘alif for tā’-marbūṭā (ATM).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

48 The name *Salmā*, was not included. The spelling would entirely depend on familiarity with this specific name, since feminine endings on names vary; 16 participants produced 10 different incorrect spellings of Salma.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>DTM</th>
<th>TMSV</th>
<th>TMA</th>
<th>AAM</th>
<th>ASV</th>
<th>ATM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>C12</td>
<td>Asaf</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Ahdai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C15</td>
<td>Sufa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Hija</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hija</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hizn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Al-sura</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C15</td>
<td>Al-akhir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>C6</td>
<td>Qasra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C12</td>
<td>Asaf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C15</td>
<td>Sufa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Qudra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mura</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mura</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Qubar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C12</td>
<td>Asaf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C15</td>
<td>Al-qadima</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>C15</td>
<td>Al-akhir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Hinta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Hilal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>(+ hamza)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Yara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Hija</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hija</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td></td>
<td>El-yara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td></td>
<td>El-yara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asaf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P17</td>
<td>C12</td>
<td>Asaf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Qalal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P19</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Hija</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ulah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Al-khwa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hija</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

49 Only P1 and P20 supplied the 'alif with the diacritic madda. The use of madda will not be commented on further.

50 It is unclear what the final 'alif in 'alhrya means.
The results from the translation test gave various irregular spellings of word-final /-a/:

- Diacritics for tā'-marbūṭā
- Tā'-marbūṭā for short vowels
- Tā'-marbūṭā for 'alif
- 'Alif for 'alif maqṣūra
- 'Alif for short vowels
- 'Alif for tā'-marbūṭā

The different kinds of irregular spellings found in the translations point towards the diacritic used for short a vowels and above 'alif being used as defaults for spelling out /a/. It was mentioned above (see 4.2.2.3) that tā'-marbūṭā was used by some participants to write word-final  of verbs. Tā'-marbūṭā was, however, only used by three participants (P2, P3 and P17) to mark a word-final a vowel. P17’s response could in addition suggest a gender error, but it is impossible to say. Tā'-marbūṭā was instead spelled with either diacritics for short a vowels or 'alif. A couple of translations of the noun phrase /al-marra at-taniya/al-’uḫrā, “next/another time” in C15 are given below to illustrate the challenges met by the participants.
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P6 marked both the feminine singular noun ﺷﺮـّمٰلا and its agreeing adjective ﺛـّثـّاـئـٰنٰیٰـا، with the diacritic fatha rather than the correct tā’-marbūta. This is a directly phonological spelling. The feminine singular morpheme [-a] is marked, but not according to the convention for writing.

P3 for the same phrase wrote ﺷﺮـّمٰلـٰا ﺛـّثـّاـئـٰنٰیٰـا. Here, the first word should have been written with tā’-marbūta and the second with ّـاًیـٰلااًیـٰلا. A word that was often spelled irregularly was the 3rd person singular feminine personal pronoun ﺣـٰيٰةٰ, ّـاًیـٰلااًیـٰلا, “she”. Since MSA is a pro-drop language, personal pronouns are redundant and accordingly not all participants produced personal pronouns in verb clauses. Examples of the irregular spellings that were found are given as a point of reference even though it is not possible to make a general comparison among participants. P3 wrote ﺣـٰيٰـاًیـٰلااًیـٰلا, ّـاًیـٰلااًیـٰلا, P9 ﺣـٰيٰـاًیـٰلااًیـٰلا, ّـاًیـٰلااًیـٰلا, P6 ﺣـٰيٰـاًیـٰلااًیـٰلا, (which makes little sense, but eraser marks suggest that tā’-marbūta was the earlier version), and P11 produced ﺣـٰيٰـاًیـٰلااًیـٰلا, ّـاًیـٰلااًیـٰلا, marking the final a vowel with an ّـاًیـٰلااًیـٰلا. This finding is to some extent surprising when connected to Table 10, which listed the percentage of irregularly spelled words paired with the level of handwriting. P11 had the highest percentage (87%) of irregularly spelled words, P12 had the second highest percentage (80%) and P19 came in third (78%). P3, however, had well-developed handwriting and 28 per cent of irregular spellings in total. P9 had only 11 per cent of irregular spellings and performed very well on the test in general.

Even if we take into account that MSA is a pro-drop language, the personal pronouns have of course high frequency. The finding that some participants cannot spell such a high-frequency word as ّـاًیـٰلااًیـٰلا goes against the argument that high-frequency words should be easier to spell. On the other hand, this is in line with the tendency towards a phonological approach to spelling seen in many of the participants.

A certain degree of intrapersonal variability in the regular and irregular production of a vowels at the end of words was noted in at least some participants (cf. P3’s translation of “the next time”), suggesting that these pupils were encoding the words over and over again. In other words, their spelling has not been automatised.

One final observation can be made concerning final a vowels. Some participants supplied ّـاًیـٰلااًیـٰلا with ّـاًیـٰلااًیـٰلا on the prepositions ﺟـٰلـٰا (P3: ﺟـٰلـٰا, P23: ﺟـٰلـٰا) and ﺟـٰلـٰا (P3: ﺟـٰلـٰا, the verb) (P3: ﺟـٰلـٰا) and the name ﺟـٰلـٰا (P1, P3, P14: ﺟـٰلـٰا). ّـاًیـٰلااًیـٰلا, the short line above ّـاًیـٰلااًیـٰلا
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maqṣūra, is used instead of regular ‘alif in a limited number of words and can in addition be added to ‘alif maqṣūra, as the participants have done. This usage of ‘alif sikkīn in ‘alif maqṣūra is redundant, and it is not obvious why the participants chose to indicate it. Phonology, however, is not at work here.

4.2.3 Vowel length spelling errors
In the Arabic script, spelling out long vowels is compulsory and they are marked with matres lectionis, that is, consonant graphemes with an additional function to mark long vowels. A very limited number of words are exceptions to this general rule. Short vowels, on the other hand, are facultative and marked with diacritical marks. These are used sporadically, as mentioned mostly in certain genres, and at times for disambiguation.

In the present study, vowel length misspellings are placed in a separate category from consonant misspellings and orthographical misspellings. It was assumed that an error in vowel length could point to the problem of how to indicate a vowel in writing rather than a lack of knowledge of the phonological value of a (spoken) vowel. Word-final a vowels were discussed in 4.2.2.4.

The vowel length errors to be analysed are:

4.2.3.1 Marking of the long vowel omitted
4.2.3.2 Short vowels marked as long

4.2.3.1 Marking of the long vowel omitted
In the responses, phonemically long vowels were occasionally omitted. This error, however, was far less common than short vowels marked as long, as discussed below. Table 17 lists the findings regarding omissions. Some words contain additional irregularities (script, spelling, translation, morphology) that are not commented on in this context. The irregular spellings are paired with what, based on the context and given spellings, are assumed to be the targeted, correct forms of the words.

Table 17. The marking of the long vowel omitted.
Participant (P), clause (C), target form (T), written form (W). Omitted grapheme: ل، ن، ّ. The word contains an additional irregularity (ُ).

51 The word حيوانات، haywānāt, “animals” is not included in the Table. In this context, the ability to indicate long vowels in writing is of interest. However, with two consecutive long vowels, the length of the first vowel is reduced.
The participants who had omitted the marking of the long vowel all had a low (P7, P10, P11, P19 and P25) or a medium (P12, P21, P22 and P26) level of handwriting. Since problems with marking long vowels are only

52 P10 may have targeted the perfect verb, جلس, "he sat", and not the active participle, جالس, in which case the produced form does not lack a marked long vowel.

53 The plural form that P25 seems to have targeted, حارسون, is incorrect. The plural for حارس, "guard" is not formed by suffixation but by a change of the morphology; حراَّس.
seen in the responses of the participants with a poor command of the writing system in general, this finding implies that difficulties with marking long vowels are connected with early developmental stages of writing (or learning to write) in Arabic.

4.2.3.2 Short vowels marked as long

In the responses, short vowel phonemes were frequently marked with matres lectionis (w, y, ِ). Whether this is because the short vowels are considered long or because some of the participants do not know how to mark (short vs. long) vowels in Arabic is difficult to say. It can be added that this is common in writing foreign words in Arabic, often in names. Thus an analogy can be drawn with marking short vowels as long. Table 18 lists the cases where short vowels were marked with matres lectionis. Here too, some words contained other irregularities (script, spelling, translation, morphology).

Table 18. Short vowels marked as long.
Participant (P), clause (C), target form (T), written form (W). Inserted grapheme: ى، و، ي. The word contains an additional irregularity (*).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>C8</td>
<td>نئـّوطه</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>كاثراً</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>زاتراً</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>البكر</td>
<td>قشر</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>لـ</td>
<td>تكـ</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>البكر</td>
<td>قشر</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9</td>
<td>البكر</td>
<td>قشر</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>تحيب</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>حدِّيَّة</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>القدر</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>والديتها</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>عاطف*</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>القدر</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>القدر</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>الحرس*</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9</td>
<td>توكيل*</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
<td>الحرس</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12</td>
<td>أسفا*</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14</td>
<td>القدر</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P10</th>
<th>C5</th>
<th>ل.</th>
<th>إلى</th>
<th>إلى</th>
<th>إلى</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C15</td>
<td>القدرة</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>عاطف</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15</td>
<td>القدرة</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>عاطف</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>ل.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>إلى</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>L.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>إلى</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
<td>L.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>إلى</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| P11 | C3  | أكورد | * | x |
| P12 | C1  | سالم | * | x |
| C1  | نحب | * | تحب | x | x |
| C2  | تهار | * | نتاهر | x | x |
| C3  | القرد | * | الكيردود | x | x |
| C4  | أمه | * | مومه | x | x |
| C5  | القرد | * | القردود | x | x |
| C5  | سالم | * | سالما | x | x |
| C5  | موز | * | موزون | x | x |
| C6  | القرد | * | القردود | x | x |
| C6  | الموز | * | الموزور | x | x |
| C6  | اكثه | * | اكتهاء | x | x |
| C7  | القرد | * | القردود | x | x |
| C7  | تفاكل | * | تفاكل | x | x |
| C7  | الموز | * | الموزور | x | x |
| C8  | واحد | * | واحد | x | x |
| C9  | تفاكل | * | تفاكل | x | x |
| C9  | تفاكل | * | تفاكل | x | x |
| C10 | القرد | * | القردود | x | x |
| C10 | إمبو | * | إمبوغ | x | x |
| C11 | سالم | * | سالما | x | x |
| C11 | مياة | * | مياة | x | x |
| C11 | ل. | * | نمل | x | x |
| C12 | أسف | * | أسف | x | x |

| P13 | C1  | سالم | * | x |
| C5  | سالم | * | سالم | x | x |
| C8  | سالم | * | سالم | x | x |
| C11 | سالم | * | سالم | x | x |
| C14 | أنهو | * | أنهو | x | x |

| P18 | C18 | سالم | * | x |
| C2  | يوم | * | يوم | x | x |
| C3  | تناقر | * | تناقر | x | x |
| C3  | علا | * | علا | x | x |
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54 P19's handwriting is difficult to read, and it is possible that the ﺮ, \m, rather than ﺭ, \q, is actually an attempt to write ﺱ, \k. P19, however, has produced \k legibly in other parts of the translation. This consonant error is discussed in 4.2.4.

55 Note that the interpretation of the target form of this word is based on P19 repeatedly mixing-up voiced and voiceless pairs.

56 Note that P22 in fact inserts a long vowel in an incorrect position, thereby changing the syllabic structure. This is not strictly speaking the same type of vowel error as the rest listed in Table 18.
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One first observation that can immediately be made in Table 18 is that most words are marked with an asterisk, indicating the presence of additional irregularities (script, spelling, translation, morphology) other than the target for analysis: marking short vowels as long.

More participants made the spelling error of marking the short vowels with *matres lectionis* than the above-described error of omitting the *matres lectionis*, 13 participants compared to 9. Here, some participants with a good command of the script (P2, P3, P6, P13 and P18) have produced an error. The words they produced contained no or only minor additional irregularities. P2 gave the preposition "لي", with a long vowel and as an independent preposition rather than writing the proclitic -ِل, "to". P13's errors all occurred in the spelling of the name "سلمى", Salma.

The remaining participants who marked short vowels with *matres lectionis* were the same ones who omitted *matres lectionis*. The exception was P26, who only omitted *matres lectionis*, but did not mark short vowels with *matres lectionis*.

Concerning this error of indicating short vowels with *matres lectionis* in different words, it should be noted that the choice of vowel quality (u, i or a) tended to be correct. The correct indication of vowel quality, but with *matres lectionis* for short vowels, might suggest that the pupils are using a phonological method for writing, where they expect each phoneme to be marked with a grapheme. The presence of y, w and á does not then necessarily imply length but above all points to an uncertainty regarding how to write in Arabic. In other words, the written language has not been automated by these participants. This interpretation is further strengthened by a tendency for intrapersonal variability; the same word, or words with the same morphological patterns, were in some cases spelled in different ways by the same respondent.

Abu-Rabia & Taha (2006, see 1.2.5) list in their classification of errors the confusion of short and long vowels as a phonetic error along with incorrect spelling of emphatic and non-emphatic pairs, and phonemes sensitive to dialectal interference. As I commented in the

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C12</td>
<td>اسمها</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13</td>
<td>اسمها</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14</td>
<td>أعرف</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14</td>
<td>ماءهم</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15</td>
<td>سا وماهم</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 13 96 48 30 20 3
Chapter 4 Analysis of the translation test: script and spelling

review of their study, they give few details about this vowel confusion except that it sometimes occurs in word endings, and that in such instances long vowels tend to be used for short vowels. It is thus difficult to judge whether the findings of the present study agree with the results from their study. In the present study, long vowels are used to spell out short vowels in all positions, not only in word endings.

4.2.4 Consonant spelling errors
To recapitulate what was said in the review of previous research (see 1.2.5), consonant misspellings primarily stem from diglossia, graphic similarity of the letters, and the decoding of minimal pairs. In the data from the translation test, relatively few incorrect spellings of consonants were detected compared to orthographic and vowel errors. The irregularities found in the present study can mostly be explained by contrasts in the phonemic repertoire between MSA and DA. The responses to the questionnaire regarding the place of origin of the participants or their parents confirmed that the consonant spelling errors observed were most likely examples of dialectal interference. However, only a limited number of words targeted in the translation test included phonemes that have different realisations in DA and MSA.

The first phoneme, and its rendition in writing, to be investigated is the MSA ovalar stop /q/. In DA Arabic, however, it is pronounced in at least three different ways depending on dialectal affiliation:

1. As the ovalar stop in MSA, /q/
2. As a glottal stop = hamz, /’/
3. As /g/

In the translation test, the word قرد qird, “monkey”, and plurals قرد qird, qirada, and قورد qurūd, were repeated in the text in seven clauses: C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, C9 and C14. Table 19 below presents how the participants have spelled the words. Words containing incorrect consonants for ق are transliterated under the Arabic words. Additional irregularities are left without comment.

57 Graphic similarity was not a major source of error in the present study apart from hamza, ـ, being confused with ’ayn, ع, in a couple of instances.
Chapter 4 Analysis of the translation test: script and spelling

Table 19. Incorrect rendering of ق in ـّوطهراـ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant (P) and clause (C).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لـّوطهراـ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अक्रड</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لـّوطهراـ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अक्रड</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لـّوطهراـ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अक्रड</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لـّوطهراـ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अक्रड</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Irregular spellings of the grapheme ق were produced by four participants: P11, P12, P19 and P25. In most instances, the choice of grapheme was <ك> (word-initial form ك، “k”). It is not possible, however, to relate this choice of consonant to the dialectal reflexes of ق listed above. P11 has a Syrian dialectal background, P12 an Algerian, P19 an Iraqi, and P25 comes from Jordan. A possible explanation is that they all speak Bedouin dialects and are targeting <g> in their spelling. In Iraq, at least, [g] can be spelled ك، i.e. with a line above, and this line is often omitted. However, if Table 10 is consulted, these four are actually the ones with the highest percentage of irregular spellings taken together. Here, the incorrect rendering of ق may be explained by a limited command of the Arabic script in general and an insufficiently developed knowledge of phoneme-grapheme correspondence. Not only do they fail to produce the targeted grapheme; in addition, the renderings of the whole words show intrapersonal variation in spelling. P12 even varied in the choice of grapheme: <ك> in C3 and C9, but <ق> in C4, C5, C6, and C7. P19 also needs to be commented on separately. P19 wrote <ك> for the initial grapheme but also <ط>, which marks the velarised alveolar stop /ṭ/, in C4, C7, C9 and C14. This form could be a not fully developed way of writing ك, but it looks distinctly like ط.

ق was also expected in C8 (“One of the guards said to Salma:”) and C11 (“Salma said to the guards:”) in the verbs قال, قال، قال, “he said”, and قال، قال، قال, “she said”. The word-initial grapheme in this common verb was not a problem for most participants, including P7 and
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P25, P11, however, gave the forms لکل, \kl and لکلت, \kl t, and P19 produced لکال, \kál and لکالفنءـّوطه, \kál v. Note that P19 chose voiced /d/ for voiceless /t/ at the word ending. P19’s use of voiced and voiceless pairs appears to be quite random throughout the response.

Table 15 above presented the spellings of the adverb ٌنئّوطه،،،هیارف،،،. The transliterations show that P12, P17, P21 and P26, 4 out of 13 participants who translated the word, had spelled it with the voiceless (denti-)alveolar stop لئنءـّوطه،،،هیارف،،،, rather than the voiceless dental fricative لئنءـّوطه،،،هیارف،،،. Even though the similarity in letter shape could explain the misspelling, this is a clear example of contrast in the phonemic repertoire between DA and MSA, as /t/ is one reflex of /ṯ/ seen in several dialects.

The last word where dialectal interference was expected was نضفءفنبءلأبلأٰلأنئّوطه،،،هیارف،،،, ءضن, “arms, lap” in C4. P2 (Iraqi background) spelled the word نذفءفنبءلأبلأٰلأنئّوطه،،،هیارف،،،, ḥḍ̣n, in Iraqi dialect, these two MSA phonemes, /ḏ̣/ (voiced velarised alveolar stop) and /ḏ̣/ (voiced velarised dental fricative), are both realised as /ḏ̣/. P7 and P26 (also Iraqi background) spelled it نضفءفنبءلأبلأٰلأنئّوطه،،،هیارف،،،, ḥḍ̣n; /ḏ̣/ is the unvelarised pair of /ḏ̣/.

To be able to write the words discussed above, the pupils have to know the correct MSA pronunciation and be able to transfer the MSA-specific phoneme to a grapheme. They cannot rely on their knowledge of the spoken language and a phonological approach to spelling. These are clear cases of irregular spellings that originate from the differences between DA and MSA; in other words, dialectal interference with the spelling (cf. Fragman, 2013).

In addition to the consonant errors described above, there were approximately (the words were in some cases difficult to decipher) ten miscellaneous errors that were not related to orthography, vowels or word endings: P7, P11, P19, P21 and P26 had made errors such as writing the letters of the root in the incorrect order in a word, leaving out a letter in a word, or producing words that were structurally similar to the target words, but in fact non-words (dysphonetic errors in Abu-Rabia & Taha’s terminology). These errors are not listed in this section but are commented on when encountered, primarily in the analysis of morphosyntax.

I end this section with a comment on one particular participant, P19. P19 produced an approximative spelling, among others concerning voiced and voiceless pairs, throughout the entire translation task. It is evident that P19 has difficulty in transferring spoken language into writing. Nevertheless, irregularities like those produced by P19 make us wonder about the spoken language of the pupil in question. P19 was a bit reluctant to do the translation test, since she had only participated in
HLI for three years (in Grades 5, 6 and 8) and did not feel entirely comfortable about writing Arabic. She also added that she was in fact a mother tongue speaker of Kurdish, not Arabic. That might explain the phonological uncertainties present in her translation. On the other hand, the results could be explained by an inadequate command of the writing system, since she had participated in HLI for only three years. If we return to Table 9, which quantitively lists all spelling errors per type, 11 of 22 participants did not make any consonant spelling errors at all. P11, who was born in Sweden of Syrian parents, and P19 together produced 50 of the total of 77 consonant spelling errors. Both of these participants had a poor command of the script.
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In the previous chapter, the participants’ command of the Arabic writing system and spelling was analysed and discussed. This chapter focuses on the production of MSA morphosyntax and in some instances comments on the presence of dialectal influence on morphosyntax. In addition, it contains a section that describes the translations from a semantic point of view. Unidiomatic translations of, for example, prepositions indicate that interference from the Swedish text may have found its way into the translations. The chapter is structured in the following way:

5.1 Word order
5.2 Overt pronouns
5.3 Verbs
5.4 Adjective agreement
5.5 Possessive constructions
5.6 Notes on translation

5.1 Word order
Word order was not discussed in the review of previous research on Arabic in Chapter 1 but will be introduced briefly in this section. A thorough review of the research was deemed redundant since the results of the translation test suggest that interference from Swedish might rather be the source of subject-verb-object (SVO) word order.

MSA has the basic pattern of verb-subject-object (Badawi, Carter & Gully, 2004: 344), VSO, whereas the word order generally suggested for DA is SVO. Research on the acquisition of DA as an L1 usually tends to take SVO as a starting point in analyses of the development of word order among L1 DA children. It should, however, be noted that a general complication for research in this field is the lack of data on frequencies of word order in DA (cf. Brustad, 2000: 318) or indeed in MSA. Interestingly enough, both Khamis-Dakwar (2011) and Friedmann & Costa (2011) base their analyses on SVO being the more frequent word order in Palestinian Arabic. Aljenaie & Farghal (2009), writing on Kuwaiti Arabic, are rather more guarded: “On the other hand, colloquial varieties are argued to have a SVO basic word order […], although the VSO word order also obtains in many of them […].” (2009: 495). In yet another article it is stated that “because VSO seems to be dominant in Palestinian Arabic, the overuse of VSO by these [heritage] speakers is caused by overgeneralisation rather than by transfer. However, this conclusion must
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remain tentative awaiting further research on word order in both native Palestinian and heritage speech.” (Albirini, Benmamoun & Saadah, 2011: 282).

Research has indeed shown that different word orders are used systematically (cf. Owens, Dodsworth & Rockwood, 2009; Dahlgren, 2010), but they depend on different grammatical properties and the narrative structures involved. It would seem that the question of word order in DA has not been properly sorted out and that empirical, quantitative data are missing. Brustad (2000: 320) sums up the situation:

If patterns can be established correlating the frequency of a given word order with a particular type of text, it may be that Arabic has more than one basic word order, one for each type of discourse.

To return to the present study, the test results reveal a preference for SV over VS. Six clauses with overt subjects other than pronouns could be translated either with VS or SV. VS was used 17 times (13%) and SV 110 times (87%). Table 20 illustrates how the use of VS/SV word orders was spread across participants. The use of VS is not restricted to the more competent writers but rather points to variation.

Table 20. Spelling, handwriting, word order and overt pronouns. Percentage of irregularly spelled words (I%), level of handwriting (H), verb-subject word order (VS), subject verb word order (SV) and number of overt pronouns in the translations (OP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>I%</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>VS</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>OP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Furthermore, the use of SV and VS in the translations does not seem in any way to be connected with the information structure of the story. There is little variation in the word order and SV is dominant. A plausible explanation is that pupils are influenced by the word order in the Swedish original. It is noted below (see 5.6) that some participants employed a word-for-word strategy in their translations.

If, on the other hand, it really is the case that SV is the basic, unmarked word order in DA, then we may be seeing transfer from DA to MSA. Here, we nevertheless need to keep in mind that there seems to be an agreement in word order between Swedish and DA contra perceived word order in MSA. A double effect of both Swedish and DA on the word order may have tipped the balance for SVO. It may also be that word order is not emphasised in HLI as a trait that distinguishes MSA from DA and that SV word order is considered acceptable in HLI. At this point, the question has to be left unanswered.

5.2 Overt pronouns

MSA is a pro-drop language and personal pronouns are as a rule not indicated in unmarked verb sentences. They are mainly used for emphasis. The pronouns are usually redundant due to MSA verb morphology which covers number (singular, dual, plural), gender (feminine, masculine) and person (1st, 2nd, 3rd).

In the Swedish original text for the translation test, the personal pronoun *hon*, “she”, features three times:

C2 “One day she visited the zoo.”
C3 “She looked at the big monkeys.”
C4 “She saw a monkey sitting in its mother’s arms.”

In the translations the name Salma was sometimes replaced by a pronoun, resulting in translations with the personal pronoun occurring not three but four times. Table 20 above relates the presence of overt pro-
nouns to the participants’ general achievement on spelling and level of handwriting.

Interestingly enough, overt pronouns were present in the translations both of some of the participants who had a good command of written MSA and of some who found the task to be more of a challenge. There is as of now no way of knowing if the presence of overt pronouns reflects the language use of the participants or if it is connected to the translation process.

5.3 Verbs
MSA’s verb morphology is extensive. Verbs are conjugated according to the basic categories of aspect-tense and mood. There is also an intricate system of number (singular, dual, plural), person (1st, 2nd, 3rd) and gender (feminine, masculine). The translation test in the present study does not cover all these dimensions, but some items have been singled out for analysis. The grammatical features included in the analysis here are:

5.3.1 Aspect-tense
5.3.2 Mode
5.3.3 Finite verb replacing the infinitive

The verb system is a domain where differences between MSA and DA are visible in the morphology. In addition, varieties of spoken Arabic and MSA diverge in their ways of expressing mood and aspect-tense (Brustad, 2000: 141-143). It must be emphasized here that the present study is concerned with MSA, the target language of HLI, and does not focus on verbs in particular. Even a brief overview of the differences between the verb systems of MSA and varieties of spoken Arabic is beyond the scope of this study. Instead, differences between MSA and DA are treated when they are encountered in the data.

5.3.1 Aspect-tense
In line with Badawi, Carter & Gully (2004: 362-371), tense is understood as a categorisation of MSA verbs into the perfect tense, the imperfect tense and the future tense. Morphologically, two different verb-stems are used to form the tenses: (1) the perfect stem for the perfect and (2) the imperfect stem for the imperfect and the future. The perfect forms for person and number are indicated by suffixation, whereas the imperfect and the future employ prefixes (alternatively a particle in the case of the future), or, in some forms, circumfixes.
In addition, MSA has a dual aspectual system that shows whether an action is completed (perfect aspect) or is continuous/habitual (imperfect aspect). Depending on the context, aspect can be expressed by a single verb form or by compound tenses. Due to this possibility of combining tenses to convey aspect, aspect-tense was chosen as the heading of this section. The findings in the translations concerning the perfect aspect, the imperfect aspect and the future tense are discussed below.

5.3.1.1 Perfect aspect
The perfect tense corresponds to the perfect aspect, denoting a completed action in the past. The following verbs in the text target the perfect:

- **C2** besten hon “she visited”
- **C3** hon tittade på “she looked at”
- **C4a** hon såg “she saw”
- **C5** Salma gav “Salma gave”
- **C6a** Apan skalade “The monkey peeled”
- **C6b** [apan] åt “[the monkey] ate”
- **C7a** Djurparkens vakter såg “The zoo guards saw”
- **C8** En av vakterna sa “One of the guards said”
- **C11** Salma sa “Salma said”

Writing the perfect was not expected to be problematic for the pupils since DA and MSA to a larger extent converge regarding the interpretation of the perfect aspect and the morphology of the verbs included in the text. MSA and DA perfect verbs can, however, diverge in the pronunciation due to differences in the phonemic repertoire and the treatment of short vowels. The basic morphology is more or less the same, however, and since short vowels were not required to be indicated, dialectal influence on short vowels should not be visible in the script provided that the participants know how to distinguish between short and long vowels.

As predicted, most of the participants who translated the verbs above chose correctly to write them in the perfect form. P25 wrote the 3rd person feminine singular imperfect ُتَرَى instead of the perfect ُتَرَى in C2. P3 and P26 both produced mixed verb forms in C3, combining the perfect 3rd person feminine singular suffix -t with the imperfect 3rd person feminine singular prefix -ت; نَظَرَت for correct نَظَرَت, for correct نَظَرَت, نَظَرَت, نَظَرَت.

58 Note that what is of interest to us here is the choice of aspect-tense, not whether the spelling is correct.
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tafarrajat. Apart from these errors, the perfect was correctly chosen where required.

One last comment may be added concerning the perfect. In C3 and C4, P2, P9 and P13 introduced the verbs with the particle la-qad.

This construction is called Marked perfect and the particle is employed to reinforce the perfect aspect of an event (Badawi, Carter & Gully, 2004: 366). It is difficult to say why these specific clauses should be interpreted as marked perfect in relation to the narrative as a whole. A possible explanation might be that this is an example of overuse of a recently learned grammatical feature. Another possibility is that the particle is used without necessarily expressing marked perfect; perhaps these participants are trying to mark their translations for MSA. At this point we do not know.

5.3.1.2 Imperfect aspect
The imperfect is formed by a prefixed imperfect stem, in some forms paired with a suffix. Unlike the perfect, the imperfect can have different morphology in MSA and DA. Furthermore, spoken varieties can differ, both from MSA and from one another, in the way progressive or continuous actions are expressed. However, the translation test targeted a limited set of imperfect forms, only four. A comprehensive description of ways of expressing the imperfect aspect in different dialects will not be provided. Instead, the four occurrences in the translation are discussed in their own right, and irregular or dialectal forms are explained by some examples from the translations.

The following cases of the imperfect aspect were expected to be found in the translation test:

C1  Salma tycker mycket om djur.
    “Salma likes animals a lot.”
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C4  Hon såg en apa **sitta** i sin mammas famn.
“**She saw a monkey sitting** in its mother’s arms.”

C7  Djurparkens vakter såg apa **äta** bananen.
“The zoo guards saw the monkey **eating** the banana.”

C13-14  *Jag visste inte att det var förbjudet att mata aporna.*
“I did not know** that it was forbidden to feed** the monkeys.”

The imperfect aspect is conveyed in different structures in the clauses. In C1 the imperfect aspect in Arabic is targeted in the imperfect indicative verb of a main clause, and in C4 and C7 it takes the form of circumstantial qualifiers. As for C13, the target is a compound verb phrase expressing a past continuous aspect. C14 can be approached in different ways, either by retaining an infinitive in the translation, or by the introducing an imperfect verb. The data are analysed as follows:

- 5.3.1.2.1 Imperfect indicative
- 5.3.1.2.2 Circumstantial qualifiers
- 5.3.1.2.3 Past continuous aspect
- 5.3.1.2.4 Translation of the infinitive

5.3.1.2.1 Imperfect indicative
C1 is not syntactically demanding and the imperfect aspect is transparent: “Salma likes animals a lot.” = Salma is in the habit of liking animals. In this example, a verb in the imperfect is expected. The clause was translated by all the participants, probably a combined effect of it being first in the test, its uncomplicated syntax and its basic, common vocabulary. All the participants translated the verb with a verb in the imperfect. Two participants, wrote DA verb forms with a b prefix rather than MSA: 

- ﻭد ﻁ ﻪ ﻫ ﻲ ﻡ “she likes/you like” (P17) and 
- ﻭد ﻪ “he likes/I like” (P19), the translation depending on what vowels are intended. The participants who chose an MSA verb all targeted the correct person, 3rd person singular feminine. Some spelling errors, mainly of the vowel type, were seen, but will not be discussed further here.

5.3.1.2.2 Circumstantial qualifiers
C4 and C7 are in fact a doubling of the same structure; the object of the main clause is the head of the participle and the action expressed by the participle is simultaneous to that of the main clause. The Arabic gram-
matical term for this type of construction is ḥāl, “circumstance”. Badawi, Carter & Gully (2004) refer to it as circumstantial qualifiers. Circumstantial qualifiers “may be a participle, noun phrase, verbal sentence, [or] prepositional phrase” (2004: 579). It is beyond the scope of this study to provide a comprehensive description of circumstantial qualifiers; the analysis focuses on the structures that were actually found in the translations.

For pragmatic reasons, the Swedish versions of C4 and C7 contain nexus infinitives rather than active participles (Teleman, Hellberg & Andersson 1999: 576). Neither the English nor the Swedish version use finite verb forms in this specific context. The participants had to interpret the clauses and were not supported by the presence of a finite verb. In C4 and C7, the continuous aspect in the nexus infinitive (or in the participle of the English version) can be indicated in different ways in MSA, either by a participle in the accusative state or by a verb in the imperfect. A couple of examples from Haywood & Nahmad (1962: 394) will serve to explain the constructions. The examples have been slightly modified. In the transcription, case endings are given after a hyphen.

1. جاءَ حَسَنُ رَاكِبًا
jā’a ḥasan-un rākib-an
came PERF Ḥasan NOM riding AP ACC
“Ḥasan came riding.”

2. جاءَ حَسَنُ يَرَكَبُ
jā’a ḥasan-un yarkabu
came PERF Ḥasan NOM [he] rides IMPERF
“Ḥasan came riding.”

3. رَأَىْتُ حَسَنًا رَاكِبًا
ra’aytu ḥasan-an rākib-an
[I] saw PERF Ḥasan ACC riding AP ACC
“I saw Ḥasan riding.”

4. رَأَىْتُ حَسَنًا يَرَكَبُ
ra’aytu ḥasan-an yarkabu
[I] saw PERF Ḥasan ACC [he] rides IMPERF
“I saw Ḥasan riding.”

In examples (1) and (2), the circumstantial qualifier refers to the subject of the sentences. The masculine name Ḥasan, the subject, is marked with
a nominative ending, -\textit{un}. The case ending is marked with double diacritics representing short u vowels and is pronounced -\textit{un}. The imperfect aspect is conveyed either by means of a verb in the imperfect (2), agreeing with the head in number and gender or by an active participle, also agreeing in number and gender. However, the active participle does not agree in case. Circumstantial qualifiers are marked with the accusative state in the indefinite. In examples (3) and (4), Hasan is not the subject but the object of the sentence. As such, the name receives the accusative ending -\textit{an}. The ending in this context (masculine singular of a specific group of words) is written with double diacritics used for marking short a vowels with the addition of the orthographic feature of an 'alif at the end. The diacritics are facultative, but the 'alif is obligatory even in texts with no diacritics. Examples (3) and (4) structurally mirror the construction in C4. In the analysis below, some attention will be given to how the accusative object in the main clause is rendered in the translations. Especially in connection with the translations featuring the active participle as a circumstantial qualifier, it is of interest to see if the participants know how to mark both the object and the participle according to the orthographic rules.

Table 21 shows the distribution of the constructions in C4 and C7. The Table includes both the objects of the main clauses and the rendition of the imperfect aspect following the head: in both cases the word قورد, \textit{qurd}, “monkey”.

Table 21. Production of the imperfect aspect.
Active participle (AP), imperfect verb (IMPERF) and perfect verb (PERF).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>C7</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>IMPERF</th>
<th>PERF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td>قرود جيالس</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>C7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td>قرود يبكل</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C4/C7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td></td>
<td>قرود جيالس</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>C7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td></td>
<td>قرود يبكل</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C4/C7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td></td>
<td>قرود تقعد</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C4/C7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td></td>
<td>قرود يبكل</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>C7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td></td>
<td>قرود</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td></td>
<td>قرود جيالس</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td></td>
<td>كرود يبكل</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

59 The marking of indefinite accusatives was discussed in 4.2.2.2. The findings and discussions in that section are repeated here to some extent, but from a different angle: use of participles and rules for agreement.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Translation Test</th>
<th>C7</th>
<th>C4/C7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P12</td>
<td>القردُ يأكل</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P13</td>
<td>القرد يأكل</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14</td>
<td>القرد يأكل</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>C7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P17</td>
<td>القرآن يأكل</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P18</td>
<td>القرآن يأكل</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P19</td>
<td>القرآن يأكل</td>
<td>C4/C7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P20</td>
<td>القرد يأكل</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C4/C7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P21</td>
<td>القرد تأكل</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C4/C7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P22</td>
<td>القرآن يأكل</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C4/C7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P23</td>
<td>القرآن يأكل</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>C7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P24</td>
<td>القرد يأكل</td>
<td>C4/C7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P25</td>
<td>القرآن يأكل</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>C7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P26</td>
<td>القرآن يأكل</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>C7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 22 21 19 9 27 4

Most of the participants have translated the targeted structures with four out of 44 occurrences missing. Four of the translations (three for C7, one very dubious one for C4) appear to be verbs in the perfect but could also be explained by challenges relating to spelling, that is, difficulty in conveying the active participle or the verb forms in script. The overall result, however, is that the participants interpreted and translated the imperfect aspect correctly. The irregularities linked to spelling were discussed in the previous chapter and are not our main concern here. The possibility of expressing the circumstantial qualifier by means of an active participle was found in nine instances in the translations and only in C4, not in C7. The verb in C4, jalasa, is intransitive, whereas ’akala in C7 is transitive. Though permissible according to the grammar books, the imperfect aspect for transitive verbs is more likely to be given as imperfect verbs, not as participles. For the intransitive verb in C4, however, a participle would be preferred. It should also be emphasised that this is an instance of DA and MSA converging, not necessarily in morphology dependent on dialectal background but in the treatment of aspect.

**Accusative object (C4)**

In C4, the targeted noun is indefinite, even though several participants (P2, P3, P12, P21, P22) wrote it in the definite form. The noun is in addition an accusative object. The indefinite accusative ending for most singular nouns and some plural nouns is -am. How this ending is to be indicated in writing however varies between different nouns. Here, as an indefinite object of a specific group of nouns, this word requires an
orthographic marking of the case ending in the shape of the letter ‘alif; ـّوطهرق
qirdan.

a. Identified accusative and case marked correctly
Three of the participants (P7, P13, P20) used the obligatory orthographic object marking, ‘alif. P13 and P20 have in addition added the diacritics to the accusative case ending: ـّوطهرقنئ. However, it becomes apparent when looking more closely at P7’s entire translation that this participant is in fact targeting an a vowel for the word ending, not an accusative. P7 has repeatedly given ‘alif as the feminine singular ending of nouns. Furthermore, in P7’s translation, the imperfect verb following the noun is in the feminine 3rd person singular, confirming that a feminine ending of the noun was targeted. Lastly, P7 also wrote the definite noun in C7 with the same ending although it marks indefinite accusatives, and again wrote the verb in the feminine form. The difficulty of indicating a vowels at the end of words was discussed above (see 4.2.2.4). Given this, only P13 and P20 have correctly identified and marked the accusative object according to orthographic rules.

b. Identified accusative and case not marked correctly
Interestingly enough, P8 and P14 did not use the orthographic ‘alif marking on the object but supplied it with the double diacritics for short a vowels that go with the ‘alif; ـّوطهرق. In other words, they identified the object and knew its MSA pronunciation, but the orthographic rule is not followed. P25 also identified the object, but spelled the indefinite accusative ending with a purely phonetic approach; ـّوطهرقn. The -an here is realised by a short a vowel followed by the letter nūn (n).

c. Incorrect case marked on the object
P6, P9, P12, P19 and P23 indicated the accusative object, definite or indefinite, as a nominative with endings containing u vowels instead of a vowels.

d. No indication of case on the object
The remaining participants who wrote the object in the targeted indefinite form (P1, P10, P11, P17, P18, P24 and P26) did not indicate any case endings on the word.

Active participles as circumstantial qualifiers (C4)
To return to the question of active participles being used in C4 as circumstantial qualifiers, they are supposed to agree with the referent in
number and gender. In this specific context, the same case is intended for both the referent and the active participle. This, however, is not agreement in case, only in gender and number. The accusative case in circumstantial qualifiers is mandatory irrespective of the function of the head. In nine of 19 translations of “sitting”, participles were used.

a. Correct accusative marking on the participle (C4)
P18 supplied the participle with an orthographically correct case ending, but left the object in its bare form with no case ending indicated,

b. Incorrect accusative marking on the participle (C4)
P14 indicated the accusative on the participle with double diacritics for a vowels, without supplying the orthographic ‘alif. The same strategy was employed for marking the accusative object; In all the translations, only P14 marked both the object and the participle as indefinite accusatives, though incorrectly spelled.

c. Incorrect case marked on the participle (C4)
P23 marked both the object and the participle with nominative endings;

d. No indication of case on the participle
Six of the participants (P1, P3, P8, P17, P25 and P26) left the participle unmarked for case. Of these, P8 and P25 had marked the accusative, though in an incorrect way, on the preceding object.

These findings on the marking of the accusative point back to the discussion concerning spelling in general; the participants have a phonological approach to writing. The varying treatment of case endings points to uncertainty regarding the function of case endings. Indicating the accusative case ending for these kinds of nouns requires a grammatical analysis and explicit orthographic knowledge. As was mentioned above (see 4.2.2.2) even when MSA is read aloud or spoken case endings are often left out.

Imperfect verbs (C4 and C7)
Nine participants chose to translate “sitting” in C4 with an imperfect verb and nine conveyed the imperfect aspect by means of an active participle. In the translations of C4, the imperfect verbs were morphologically correct. The only spelling error was found in P19, who produced
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a verb with an incorrect consonant; يبلس، \\yilis\\ for correct يبلس، \\yilis\\.

As for C7, all the participants but three (P11, P13, P17) translated “eating” with an imperfect verb. MSA and DA converge in this construction, the continuous aspect of transitive verbs, and the imperfect was expected.

5.3.1.2.3 Past continuous aspect
In Swedish and English, C13 and C14 read:

C13-C14
\textit{Jag visste inte att det var förbjudet att mata aporna.}

“I did not know that it was forbidden to feed the monkeys/ feeding the monkeys was forbidden.”

Contrary to English, Swedish does not morphologically mark aspect, but aspect can be implied by the context. \textit{Jag visste inte}, “I did not know”, is in the past tense and is not marked for aspect. It can either be interpreted as a punctual event or as a continuous one: “Yesterday I did not know” vs. “During that time I did not know”.

Given that the translation test was an open one, the choice of vocabulary and syntax can vary to some extent. One possible MSA translation can, however, be provided as a point of reference:

C13-C14

\textit{لم آكن أعرف أن أطعام القرود ممنوع}

In Table 22 below, the translations of both C13 and C14 are given as full sentences in order to provide a complete overview of the constructions. The clauses, however, will be analysed separately.

Table 22. Aspect in the translations of C13 and C14.
Response (R), past continuous aspect in C13 (PC), perfect aspect in C13 (PA)\textsuperscript{60}, imperfect verb in C13 (IMPERF), finite verb in C14 (FIN), noun in C14 (N), indicated structure (x) and response missing (-).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>IMPERF</th>
<th>FIN</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>لم آكن أدرى أن أطعام القرود ممنوع</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>أنا لم أعرف أن أطعام القرود ممنوع</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{60} “Perfect aspect” was given as a common denominator rather than “perfect verb”, since DA and MSA employ different verb stems to express negated perfect aspect.
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As mentioned above, the original Swedish wording of C13 read: *Jag visste inte*, “I did not know”. The verb is in the past tense and is not marked for aspect. In Arabic, on the other hand, the aspect is expected to be continuous. In order to produce the past continuous, a compound verb phrase consisting of the past copula verb *بِنَاقِمْ* (*kāna*), “was”, followed by an imperfect verb, can be employed. The compound is negated by لَمْ (*lam*), followed by the short imperfect verb form, the jussive. In this context, it is the copula verb that is to be given in the jussive form.

```
لَمْ أَكَنْ أَعْرِفْ 
lam NEG 1SG JUSS 'a'rif 1SG IMPERF
```

“not I was I know = I did not [use to] know”

The past continuous aspect in C13 was expected to be challenging to translate since the negation and verb forms required for the verb phrase are MSA-specific and demand explicit knowledge of MSA. Table 22 shows that 13 responses actually did target the past continuous aspect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>MSA Morphosyntax</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>لاَ مَا أَكَنْ أَعْرِفْتَ مَوْعِدَ المَرْفَعَةَ</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>إذاً لاَ أَعْرِفْتُ مَوْعِدَ المَرْفَعَةَ</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>مَا أَكَنْ أَعْرِفْتَ مَوْعِدَ المَرْفَعَةَ</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>إِنْذَٰلَا أَكَنْ أَعْرِفْتُ مَوْعِدَ المَرْفَعَةَ</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td>اِنْ مَا أَعْرِفْتُ مَوْعِدَ</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P13</td>
<td>لاَ أَكَنْ أَعْرِفْتُ مَوْعِدَ</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14</td>
<td>إذاً لاَ أَكَنْ أَعْرِفْتُ مَوْعِدَ المَرْفَعَةَ</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P15</td>
<td>ماَ أَكَنْ أَعْرِفْتُ مَوْعِدَ المَرْفَعَةَ</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P16</td>
<td>إِنْذَٰلَا أَكَنْ أَعْرِفْتُ مَوْعِدَ</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P17</td>
<td>لاَ أَكَنْ أَعْرِفْتُ مَوْعِدَ المَرْفَعَةَ</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P18</td>
<td>إِنْذَٰلَا أَكَنْ أَعْرِفْتُ مَوْعِدَ</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P19</td>
<td>لاَ أَكَنْ أَعْرِفْتُ مَوْعِدَ المَرْفَعَةَ</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P20</td>
<td>لاَ أَكَنْ أَعْرِفْتُ مَوْعِدَ</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P21</td>
<td>لاَ أَكَنْ أَعْرِفْتُ مَوْعِدَ المَرْفَعَةَ</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P22</td>
<td>إذاً لاَ أَكَنْ أَعْرِفْتُ مَوْعِدَ المَرْفَعَةَ</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P23</td>
<td>لاَ أَكَنْ أَعْرِفْتُ مَوْعِدَ</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P24</td>
<td>إذاً لاَ أَكَنْ أَعْرِفْتُ مَوْعِدَ المَرْفَعَةَ</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P25</td>
<td>لاَ أَكَنْ أَعْرِفْتُ مَوْعِدَ</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P26</td>
<td>لاَ أَكَنْ أَعْرِفْتُ مَوْعِدَ المَرْفَعَةَ</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 22 13 4 2 9 8

As mentioned above, the original Swedish wording of C13 read: *Jag visste inte*, “I did not know”. The verb is in the past tense and is not marked for aspect. In Arabic, on the other hand, the aspect is expected to be continuous. In order to produce the past continuous, a compound verb phrase consisting of the past copula verb *بِنَاقِمْ* (*kāna*), “was”, followed by an imperfect verb, can be employed. The compound is negated by لَمْ (*lam*), followed by the short imperfect verb form, the jussive. In this context, it is the copula verb that is to be given in the jussive form.

```
لَمْ أَكَنْ أَعْرِفْ 
lam NEG 1SG JUSS 'a'rif 1SG IMPERF
```

“not I was I know = I did not [use to] know”

The past continuous aspect in C13 was expected to be challenging to translate since the negation and verb forms required for the verb phrase are MSA-specific and demand explicit knowledge of MSA. Table 22 shows that 13 responses actually did target the past continuous aspect.
compared to only four perfect verb forms and two imperfect verbs. Not all of the targeted forms of the past continuous aspect, however, are correct. Furthermore, some of the constructions were given in DA, not MSA.

a. Past continuous correct (MSA)
P1, P9, P14, P18 and P24 produced entirely correct compound verb phrases. P8 did not give the negation, but the forms were otherwise correct and indicated a past continuous event, albeit not negated: كُنْتُ أَلْمَ, "I was I know = I knew".

b. Past continuous incorrect (MSA)
The rest of the participants who targeted the past continuous aspect with a compound verb phrase (P6, P13, P17, P21, P22, P25) produced verb phrases with incorrect compounds of negations and verbs. P13 produced the correct verbs for the compound, but used the negation لا, rather than لام.

The remaining participants also employed incorrect negations, either لّا (P21, P22 and P25, although P25 wrote it in an incorrect form: لّا لّا) or, in the case of P6, لّا لّا. Whether P6 targeted لّا, لام, or the negation لّا لّا, it is impossible to say. Furthermore, P6, P21, P22 and P25 did not put the copula verb in the jussive but used the perfect form. To give an example, P22 wrote أنا لّا كنت أعرف, "I was not know = I knew". The negation لّا does not negate the perfect, but imperfect verbs. This usage points to uncertainty regarding the MSA-specific negation لام and the MSA morphology involved. Furthermore, the choice of the copula in the perfect, كُنْتُ, might indicate dialectal interference in that it resembles a dialectal structure. Compare the example given below in c., which gives the structure in (one variety of) DA.

c. Past continuous correct (DA)
P17 stands out because this participant produced a pure DA compound verb phrase; أنا ما كنت أعرف, "I was not know = I knew". The b prefix on the verb definitely shows that this is DA.

d. Perfect aspect correct (MSA/DA)
In Arabic, a simple negation of the Swedish past tense verb visste, “knew” would only give a perfective aspect. P2 and P20 gave such translations in MSA: أنا لّا لم أعرف, "I was not know = I knew". P2 and P20, however, used the MSA-specific construction with the negation لام followed by an imperfect verb. P26 negated the perfect verb by means of
the negation ما, màn, mà, and kept the perfect form. This is an accepted MSA form but could also be the result of dialectal influence.

e. Perfect aspect incorrect (DA)
P11 negated a perfect verb with a dialectal (Syrian and Iraqi) negation مو, mà, which is not used for verbs but for noun phrases61. P11 did not master the rules for writing; with the correct ligatures, the phrase should look as follows: انأ مو عرفت.

f. Imperfect verb correct (MSA)
The use of a verb in the imperfect is a translation error. “I knew not = I did not know” is transformed into “I know not = I do not know”. Salma has just been told that it is forbidden to feed the monkeys, so replying to the guards that “I do not know” is illogical. Whether the error comes from an inattentive reading of the Swedish sentence or a lack of grammatical competence it is impossible to say. Nevertheless, P7 produced a correct (negation + choice of verb) MSA verb phrase: انأ لا عرفت.

g. Imperfect verb incorrect (MSA)
P19 also produced a verb phrase that was possibly intended to be the imperfect: انأ لا عرفت. The verb عرفت, ʻrf, however, is given in a form that is not marked for the 1st person singular either by a prefix (方言, ʻrf) to mark it for the imperfect or a suffix (方言, ʻrf) to make it a perfect verb. Only the choice of the negation لا leads us to guess that the imperfect could be the targeted form.

h. Other
P3 misinterpreted the sentence completely and wrote: نعم بلفعل, ñm blf\l, “Yes, indeed”. Correctly spelled it is بالفعل, bálf\l. The rendering can be explained by a not very thorough reading of the Swedish. Jag visste was read Ja visst, “Yes, indeed”.

To sum up this section, most of the participants targeted the past continuous aspect, regardless of the Swedish original verb being in the past tense. In contrast to other findings in the analysis (prepositions, overt pronouns, etc.) this was a case where most of the participants did not resort to a word-for-word translation of the Swedish text. This indicates

61 To give an example: هو سي المصدر, “He [is] not present.”.
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that they do interpret aspect in Arabic as being different from the
Swedish tense system. The challenges when producing the compound
verb phrase were thus related to form, variety, grammar and spelling
conventions.

5.3.1.2.4 Translation of the infinitive
The original Arabic text contains a verbal noun in C14: ٍّٔ٦٢٤١١١٣٤٠٠٩٨٧، ٓ٢٤١١١٣٤٠٠٩٨٧، “feeding”. This was rendered by an infinitive in Swedish "att mata” "to
feed".62 This section is concerned with how the participants chose to
translate this infinitive

C14 is the subordinate clause in the sentence
لم أكن أعرف أن إطعام
القرود ممنوعٍ,
"I did not know
that feeding the monkeys [was] forbidden. The Arabic word order in
both the main and the subordinate clause is unmarked. If the subordi‐
nate clause is turned into an independent nominal sentence, the Arabic
would read إطعام القرود ممنوعٍ,
ٓ١٣٤٠٠٩٨٧، “feeding [of] the
monkeys [is] forbidden”. In written Swedish, however, the more un‐
marked word order and syntax is to introduce an anticipatory IT: Det är
förbjudet att mata aporna., "It is forbidden to feed the monkeys.” The
Swedish version chosen for the full sentence was Jag visste inte att det var
förbjudet att mata aporna., “I did not know that it was forbidden to feed the
monkeys.” Thus the word order of the Swedish sentence in the transla‐
tion test differs from the Arabic original with regard to the placing of
the predicative complement (“forbidden”).

Before discussing the different ways in which the participants dealt
with the translation of the infinitive, a short remark on tense sequence
and copula will clarify the syntax of the subordinate clause. English and
Swedish both use tense sequence.

Present tense:  I know that the house is big.
Past tense:  I knew that the house was big.

The past tense of the main clause is transferred to the copula in the
subordinate clause. In MSA, however, to employ tense sequence in the
copula is redundant and may even indicate a marked condition.

أعرف أن البيت كبير
"I know that the house [is] big.”

62 Swedish does have verbal nouns, but they are primarily used in highly formal contexts
and are not appropriate here.
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In the two first examples, the copula is understood by the syntax of the subordinate clause. The explicit perfect copula in the last example, bearing in mind that MSA is a language that marks aspect on verbs, could be interpreted as meaning that the condition in the subordinate clause is no longer valid. The house was big in the past, but this is no longer the case.63

P6, P7, P9, P17 and P21 translated the clause by inserting the past copula, whereas the other participants were not influenced by the Swedish original on this point. Moreover, the past copula, , puts the predicative in the accusative. The word “forbidden”, , should thus be in the accusative and as it is indefinite, it should be marked with an , . None of the participants who chose to use the past copula had indicated the predicative with an accusative ending.

To continue to the translation of the infinitive of C14, different approaches were observed. If the infinitive was not translated into a verbal noun (“the feeding”), a finite verb had to be employed and that would be connected to a person, a small deviation from the Swedish text. As described above, the syntax and word order of the Swedish text could be challenging since they do not admit a word-for-word translation; instead the clause needs to be restructured.

a. Correct translations of the infinitive with a verbal noun
P1, P2, P20 and P24 produced target-like translations with a restructured word order in the subordinate clause. Some minor spelling errors were made. P1, P2 and P24 wrote , instead of the correct , . Apart from that, the subordinate clauses were syntactically correct and the four participants did not give the copula in the clause. P20 produced a subordinate clause with no errors whatsoever, even indicating the doubling of the in the conjunction: , “that feeding of the monkeys [was] forbidden”.

63 The copula is not indicated for the present in Arabic, only for the past (perfect).
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P9 spelled and used the verbal noun in MSA correctly but did not introduce the subordinate clause with the conjunction ّنأ، 'anna.
P14 did not translate the adjective “forbidden” with ممنوع، mamnūʕ. Instead, a static verb، لا يجوز، “not to be allowed”, was chosen. P14 followed the Swedish word order, putting the noun phrase with the verbal noun last in the clause. In doing so and by supplying the conjunction with an anticipatory subject, the syntax of the subordinate clause became marked: هنأ لا يجوز أطعام القرود، “that it is not allowed feeding the monkeys”. Thus the clause contains a doubling of the subject. Like P1, P2 and P24 above, P14 had spelled أطعام، ‘iṭʻām, with a hamza on the ʼalif rather than under it: ماعطإ.

Interestingly enough, the participants who produced verbal nouns in their translations are the same ones who produced the MSA-specific negated jussive verb form described in the previous paragraph.

b. Incorrect translations of the infinitive with a verbal noun
P23 also restructured the word order in the translation but encountered some difficulties with the forms involved: أنا أطعام القرود ممنوع، \‘an\a \‘alṭʻa̍m a̍lqrwd mmnwʻ. The conjunction أن is written أنا، “I”. Similar spelling errors have been described above and are thought to originate from a phonological method of spelling. In this case, familiarity with spelling the pronoun may serve as an explanation. The conjunction is of course also of high frequency. The word أطعام، \\‘tam, followed by the noun ماعط، \\‘am, “food”, not “feeding”. The word ماعطلا، \\‘am, probably means ماعطهورقلا، “the monkeys”. In Arabic, the first part of a genitive construction is not marked for finiteness and the definite article -لا، \\‘al on أطعام، \\‘tam is grammatically incorrect.

c. Correct translations of the infinitive with finite verbs
Of all the participants who opted for finite verbs, only P18 produced a context-appropriate, correct MSA verb: وهنا ممنوع أن أطعام القرود، \‘anhw mmnwʻ an ʼata̍m a̍lqrwd، “that it [is/was] forbidden that I feed the monkeys”. P18 retained the Swedish word order and seems to have chosen the 1st person singular imperfect “I feed” rather than the verbal noun “feeding”. The general meaning of the verbal noun is lost in this translation but it is grammatically correct. P18 made an error in the spelling of وهنا، \‘anhw, which should be أن وهو، \‘annahu. The form is the conjunction ّنأ، 'anna, “that”, followed by a suffixed pronoun، هو، "he/it". The spelling produced by P18 has a grapheme (matres lectionis) used for the long u vowel though the vowel is phonemically short. These
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kinds of spelling errors were discussed in 4.2.3 Vowel length spelling errors. In this specific case, it could be that the form of the 3rd person singular masculine pronoun \(\text{\textit{huwa}}, \text{huwa}, \text{“he”},\) has interfered with the spelling.

d. Incorrect translations of the infinitive with finite verbs
P3, P6, P17, P19, P22 and P26 produced clauses that were influenced by the Swedish word order and included imperfect verbs rather than infinitives in their translations. P7 and P13 also chose translations with imperfect verbs but put the predicative complement last in the clause, so they did not stick to the Swedish word order. All the verbs targeted by the participants here differed in number and person. In fact, they produced morphologically incorrect forms that are difficult to analyse since in many cases it is not clear what the targeted forms are, due to imprecise spelling. Without going into detail, P6 and P22 appear to have targeted 1st person singular verbs, P3 the 2nd person singular feminine, P7 and P13 the 2nd person masculine, P26 the 3rd person singular masculine, and P17 may have targeted a DA 1st person plural. What form P19 intended is unclear.

e. Other
P11, P21 and P25 produced incomplete clauses and the infinitive was not translated.

Returning to the question of aspect, it should be noted that none of the participants targeted perfect verbs for translating the infinitive. The translation of the infinitive was included in the section for imperfect aspect based on the findings in the responses of both finite and infinite translations. What is of interest here is that the participants did not analyse the infinitive as a past, punctual event but rather as an ongoing action.

It was observed during the analysis that the results regarding the command of the jussive, an MSA-specific verb form, correlated with the use of verbal nouns in the translation of the infinitive and also with restructuring the word order. If we again consult the results regarding spelling and handwriting (Table 23), it is evident that the participants who had the better results for spelling also tended to master the jussive, restructure the word order and produce verbal nouns. Not surprisingly, handwriting, spelling and command of MSA (here: jussive and word order) seem to go hand in hand.
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Table 23. Spelling, handwriting and aspect in the translations of C13 and C14.

Percentage of irregularly spelled words (I%), level of handwriting (H), correct use of negation + jussive (NJ), “Arabic” word order in C14 (AWO), “Swedish” word order in C14 (SWO), verbal noun for the infinitive (VN), finite verb for the infinitive (FV), response missing/incomplete clause (-) and targeted form unclear (?).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>I%</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>NJ</th>
<th>AWO</th>
<th>SWO</th>
<th>VN</th>
<th>FV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>(x)64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P21</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P22</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P25</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P19</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.1.3 Future marking

Only one clause (C15) in the translation test targeted the future tense. The verb is: “[I] will feed”. The future tense in MSA can be marked either by an independent particle، sawfa، or by a proclitic particle، s، preceding an imperfect verb stem. It is also possible for a verb in the imperfect to be used in a future sense, provided that the context clearly indicates a future meaning (Badawi, Carter & Gully, 2004: 365-366).

64 P23 produced a noun but not the correct verbal noun.
Only two of the participants, P10 and P12, did not translate the verb at all. C15, “Next time I will feed the elephant.”, is the last clause in the test but it was usually translated even by the participants who chose to skip other clauses.

Table 24. Irregular production of the future tense.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>سوقه أطعم</td>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>ها اعتم 65</td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>سنغطيرم</td>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td>راح اعمي</td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>IS, IM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P13</td>
<td>ساكل</td>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P17</td>
<td>راح اكل</td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P18</td>
<td>سأاعي</td>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P19 (66)</td>
<td>ساقياكم؟</td>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P21</td>
<td>اكل</td>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>IMP/(PERF)</td>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P22 (65)</td>
<td>عملهم الطعام؟</td>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>IS, IM, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P23</td>
<td>سوف اعطي اكل</td>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>IS, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P25</td>
<td>سا و تاضعي</td>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>IS, IM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P26</td>
<td>اكل</td>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. MSA future marking correct
Seven (P1, P3, P6, P9, P14, P20, P24) of the 20 translations had entirely correct MSA verb forms that contained no irregularities whatsoever concerning spelling and/or morphology.

b. MSA future marking incorrect
Two common roots relating to food are َُتَم and ُكُل. Spelling irregularities affecting the production of ُحمزة (see 4.2.2) were quite common, since the targeted verb morphology (1st SG IMPERF) is indicated by a prefixed ُحمزة and the root ُكل has ُخامز as the initial radical. It was previously mentioned (see 4.2.2.1) that there appear to be different standards concerning whether ُخامز needs to be indicated above or below the ُالف.

65 P7 wrote the letters in an incorrect sequence.
66 P19 and P22 did not have full command of the script and their translations were difficult to interpret. The shapes of the letters are indistinct and different graphemes appear to have been mixed up. Professor Elie Wardini and Dr Tania Al-Saadi were consulted and they agreed with the interpretation given in Table 24.
or not. In less formal contexts, it is not necessarily marked and this may just be a question of style. What, however, are not a question of style are the incorrect forms for writing hamza found in P8, P22 and P25. Furthermore, P2 and P19 spelled the independent future particle sawfa incorrectly.

P7, P11, P18 and P25 made consonant spelling errors by writing non-emphatic ُ, ِ, instead of the correct ﺪ, ی, in the root ﺪ. The verbs contain additional spelling errors of the types described in 4.2. These will not be addressed further here.

As a last point for comment, some translations (P11, P22 and P25) show problems related to end vowels of verbs. This suggests that they are uncertain of the verb morphology involved. P11 and P25 have ended the 1st person singular imperfect verbs with ﺪ, ی, ی, instead of a short ی vowel. This could be a DA link vowel or a case of mixed-up forms. P22’s translation was difficult to decipher; ﺪ، ی. In analogy with other spellings in P22’s translation, it is apparent that P22 mixes up ُ, ی, ی, (hamza) and the initial form of ﺪ, ی, ی. The verb in its default form (3rd person masculine singular perfect) is ﺪ، ی, “he gave”. The targeted 1st person singular imperfect form is ﺪ، ی, “I give/am giving”. The long ی vowel at the end is missing from P22’s translation. The correct form, though incorrect in this context, and its pronominal suffix is ﺪ، ی. Verbs containing long vowels in the roots are admittedly difficult to spell.

c. DA future marking
P7, P11 and P17 made a correct analysis of the tense of the clause but did not indicate the future tense according to the MSA system. Instead they wrote dialectal forms of future particles: َ (P7) and را (P11,P17).

c. Imperfect verbs
P22 and P26 produced verbs in the imperfect. The future meaning of the clause is made obvious by the adverb (“next time”) and in this context an imperfect verb would be acceptable. P21 most likely targeted the 1st person singular imperfect but had difficulty in writing the word. The verb taken out of the present context would be interpreted differently, either as the 3rd person singular masculine perfect or a non-causative form of the 1st person singular imperfect. The meaning would then be “I eat/am eating” rather than “I feed/am feeding”.

d. Circumlocutions
P22 and P23 produced circumlocutions; “I give food” instead of “I feed”.
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5.3.2 Mode

The translation test only included one verb that was not indicative, the negative imperative “Do not feed!” in C9. The negative imperative is expressed by the negation lā followed by a verb in the jussive form. As mentioned above, the jussive is an apocopate form of the imperfect verb stem. In the present context, the targeted form is a negative command directed at the 2nd person feminine. The imperfect ending of this form is -īna (\(\text{tuṭʻimīna}\), \(\text{tuṭʻimī}\), “you feed”), but the jussive form is abbreviated to -i (\(\text{tuṭʻimī}\)).

The participants approached the verb phrase in different ways; some negated verbs with the meaning “to feed”, others employed circumlocutions combining the verb “to give” either with “food” or “banana”. Since the structure of interest here is the production of the negative imperative directed at the 2nd person feminine, variations in the translation or spelling irregularities are not discussed, only the verb forms and the negation. The translations are listed below in Table 25.

Table 25. The negative imperative.
Response (R), correct response (C), incorrect negation (IN), incorrect person (IP), incorrect mode (IM), response difficult to interpret (?).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>IM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>لا تطعُعي القرود الكبيرة</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>لا تطعُعي القرود الكبيرة</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>لا تطعُعي القرود الكبيرة</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>لا تُعُني القرود الكبار</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>الابْتِكَالِ الْقُرِودِ الكبيرة</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>لا تطعُعي القرود الكبيرة</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>لا تطعُعي القرود الكبار</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>لا تُعُني القرود الكبيرة</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td>لا تعمي القرود الكبير</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12</td>
<td>لا تَبَكْئِكِ القرود الكبير</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P13</td>
<td>لا تَبَكْئِكِ القرود الكبيرة</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14</td>
<td>لا تطعُعي القرود الكبيرة</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P17</td>
<td>لا تَبَكْئِكِ القرود الكبار</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P18</td>
<td>لا تطعُعي القرود الكبيرة</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P19</td>
<td>لا تعمي التفاح بالطرابل</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P20</td>
<td>لا تطعُعي الطعام إلى القرود الكبيرة</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P21</td>
<td>لا تطعُعي القرود الكبير</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P22</td>
<td>لا تطعُعي القرود طعام</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Of the 22 participants who completed the test, 11 produced verb phrases with the negation \( lā \) followed by a verb in the jussive form. P10 skipped the sentence altogether. The translations of P11, P19 and P25 were difficult to interpret. The remaining translations involved different kinds of irregularities.

a. Incorrect negation
P7 produced the correct verb form but instead of the negation \( َلا \), wrote \( َلاا \). P25 produced a negation that looks like \( اـل \), but the initial grapheme, reading right to left, is supplied with a hamza, \( أ \), and the ligature is incorrect. Since the letter lam cannot function as a chair for hamza the combination cannot be reproduced on a computer. A transliteration gives \( \l'a̍ \). If instead we interpret the form as having the grapheme order of alif and lam with an incorrect ligature, an alternative transliteration would be \( َتَكَكَلَو \). P21 did not write the correct negation but rather prefixed the verb with -ل, \( ل\).

b. Incorrect person
P1 wrote a correct negation and a correct jussive verb but chose the 2nd person masculine plural form for the verb: \( ِتَكَكَلَو \). P12 also appears to have indicated the 2nd person masculine plural of the verb, but the verb was incorrectly spelled. A long vowel was given for a short one, the hamza was not indicated, and the verb did not end with an 'alif, an orthographic feature that is obligatory for this verb form: \( ِتَكَكَلَو \), \( ِتَكَكَلَو \), \( اَلْمَكَٰكَلَو \) for correct \( ِتَكَكَلَو \).

P21 and P24 seem to have targeted the 2nd person masculine singular instead of the feminine form since the final -ي is not given. P21 wrote \( ِتَكَكَلَو \), \( ِتَكَكَلَو \) for correct \( ِتَكَكَلَو \), \( ِتَكَكَلَو \).

c. Incorrect mode or DA
Lastly, the only ones who missed the targeted jussive verb were P22 and P26, who wrote what could be interpreted as the MSA imperfect verb ending -ينا, instead of the jussive-ي. However, both P22's and P26's
parents come from Iraq and in Iraqi DA -īn is in fact the correct verb ending in this context. Thus we have either an incorrect MSA form or a correct Iraqi DA form. In the comments below, I will treat the verbs as incorrect MSA. P22 used a circumlocution “give food” for “to feed” and wrote “you give” (2 SG FEM IMPERF) for jussive form. P26 gave the form “to give” (2 SG MASC IMPF). Just as P12 above, a long i vowel was used for a short i vowel. Even though the spelling is incorrect, it shows that the participants knew what type of vowel went with the form: i, not a or u.

As for P12, whose translation was described in paragraph b., an alternative interpretation with a short final u vowel would give the 2nd person singular masculine imperfect.

If the results for the negative imperative are regarded as a whole, many participants in fact seem to have targeted the correct structure. The explanation might be that this is a structure in which DA and MSA in many cases converge.

5.4 Adjective agreement
Arabic adjectives agree in both the attributive and the predicative positions with the possible exception of finiteness. The features interacting morphologically are number, gender, case, finiteness and humanness. The test contained few adjectives, three predicative adjectives and three attributive adjectives. Attributive adjectives were more of a challenge to the participants than predicative adjectives (Table 26). Some participants had in addition either avoided the adjectives or not translated entire clauses that included adjectives. Predicative constructions and attributive constructions are discussed below in separate paragraphs.

Table 26. Incorrect or missing adjectives.
Participant (P), number of incorrect attributive adjectives (ATTR), incorrect predicative adjectives (PRED) and number of adjectives missing (M).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P</th>
<th>ATTR</th>
<th>PRED</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

67 Based on oral communication with Dr Tania Al-Saadi.
5.4.1 Predicative constructions
The translation test included three predicative constructions:

C10 “It is forbidden.”
C12 “I am sorry.”
C14 “that feeding the monkeys [was] forbidden.

The construction in C14 was discussed in 5.3.1.2.4 and here we will focus on C10 and C12. The predicative adjectives in C10 and C12 are passive participles in Arabic. In Arabic, participles are declined as nouns but when used as adjectives agree with the head as adjectives. The sentence “It [is] forbidden.” is constructed with a masculine singular pronoun and a masculine singular predicative. “I [am] sorry.” refers to Salma. The sentence should be two-part, consisting of the 1st person singular pronoun and a feminine singular predicate. A feminine ending on the predicate was required for the construction to be correct. Note that spelling and translation are not discussed here. Different renderings of the feminine ending tа́-mа́rbutа were discussed above (see 4.2.2.4).

DA and MSA concur in the treatment of masculine and feminine singular predicates, so these constructions were not expected to cause any difficulties for the participants. Some errors, however, were found.

68 P14 wrote a verb phrase instead of an adjective in C14 (see 5.3.1.2.4 a.)
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a. Feminine ending missing (C12)
P21 did not mark the feminine ending on the word “sorry”. P21 did not write the entire clause, which consisted of the pronoun “I” and the predicative “sorry”, but only “sorry”; أسف، آسف. Since the pronoun is missing, this is not necessarily an agreement error.

b. Circumlocutions
P26 wrote a verb “I apologise”; أنا أعترف، أنا أعترف. 

انأ نءـّوطهعأ
FW سف. While the translation is acceptable, it is not exact. Note the incorrect order of the letters in P26’s translation.

P11 used the same strategy, but with a dialectal prefix on the verb: انل نءـّوطهعب m رذفئبنبءلأئئ
FW سف بثتمر. Due to P11’s hand writing the translation was difficult to decipher. The pronoun is spelled incorrectly. Since the letter ‘alif cannot be connected to the following letter; a ligature in fact gives the reading l. Furthermore, the verb did not contain a dbh but rather a letter that looked like a filled m (بم).

c. Predicative structures missing
In a couple of the translations the predicative structures were missing. P10 did not translate the structures at all and P25 did not translate C10.

5.4.2 Attributive constructions
The attributive adjective phrases in the test were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phrase</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C3 and C9</td>
<td>de stora aporna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15</td>
<td>næsta gång</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The attributive adjective agreement in C15 did not result in varying translations concerning agreement. The noun ماررا, marra, “time”, is feminine singular and takes an adjective in the feminine singular. The targeted adjective in the phrase was ثانية, فاني, thaniyya, “second/next”. As for the spelling, exchanging t for f was not the only instance of P19 not producing the targeted grapheme.

In C3 and C9, however, the property of humanness was a challenge to some of the pupils. In MSA, plurals that do not refer to humans ([-HUM]) take adjectives in the feminine singular. The targeted adjective in the phrase was كبيرة, kabīra, “big”. Eight participants (P1, P2, P3, P8, P13, P14, P18 and P20) produced translations that followed the MSA
norm. Note that spelling was not taken into account provided the feminine ending was indicated in some way.

Table 27. Incorrect rendering of attributive plural [-HUM] adjectives.\(^{69}\)

When correct and incorrect forms were produced by the same participant, irregular forms are marked with asterisks (*) to distinguish them from correct forms. Word missing (-) and form agreeing with the given noun, though incorrectly translated with a singular (...).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>C9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td><em>كبيرين</em></td>
<td><em>كبيرين</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td><em>كيرة</em></td>
<td><em>كبيرين</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td><em>كيا</em></td>
<td><em>كيرة</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>(كبير)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><em>كيرا</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12</td>
<td>(كبير)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P17</td>
<td><em>كبار</em></td>
<td><em>كبار</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P19</td>
<td><em>كيرا</em></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P21</td>
<td><em>كبر</em></td>
<td><em>كبار</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><em>كبار</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P23</td>
<td><em>كبار</em></td>
<td><em>كبار</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P24</td>
<td><em>كبار</em></td>
<td><em>كبار</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P25</td>
<td><em>كبير</em></td>
<td><em>كبير</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P26</td>
<td><em>كبيرين</em></td>
<td><em>كبيرين</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Masculine plural [+HUM], correct plural form, incorrect use

One form found in P9, P17, P22, P23 and P24 is the plural, كبار، kbare\(^{69}\). This plural is incorrect when the target variety is MSA. For many dialects, however, both the feminine singular and plurals agree with [-HUM] plurals (cf. AVIA, 2007). Thus the participants have produced adjectives that are correct in dialectal usage but incorrect in MSA. The use of this plural form may be an example of DA transfer.

b. Masculine plural form [+HUM], incorrect plural form

P6, P7 and P26 wrote كبيرين، kbyryn\(^{70}\), at least once. The -m ending is a concatenative mode for deriving [+HUM] masculine plurals. Some adjectives allow a concatenative derivation, others are formed by differ-

---

\(^{69}\) The definite article has been excluded in the examples to facilitate discussion of the forms.

\(^{70}\) The spelling can very well be an incomplete letter rather than an incorrect spelling of the word.
ent morphological patterns applied to the root. Ultimately, the plural formations in MSA rely on lexical knowledge. For this particular word, noncatenative plural formations, *kibār*, or *kabarā’,* are given in the dictionary (Wehr, 1979). In other words, P6, P7 and P26 have produced a plural that would have been incorrect even if the referents had been human. Albirini & Benmamoun (2014), in a comparative study on plural formation by L1, L2 and heritage language speakers, found that L2 learners tended to overuse the concatenative sound masculine plural. That pupils in HLI chose this plural formation was unexpected considering that the adjective is highly frequent.

c. Masculine singular
The last form found in the translations was different spellings of masculine singular, *kabīr*. P10 spelled it correctly, *kbyr*, and did not in fact produce a noun in the plural but wrote the singular, *ṭlaʾ ṭaḥbīr*, “the big monkey”. P12 also wrote a noun in the singular in C3, and the adjective, *ḥbyrā’,* with short vowels indicated, does agree with the head. P25 produced plural nouns in C3 and C9 and supplied the adjective in C3, though incorrectly spelled, with a feminine ending: *ḥbyrā’* but in C9 gave the singular, *kbyr*. Masculine singular adjectives do not agree with plural nouns and the form is incorrect in this phrase, whether the target variety is MSA or some sort of DA.

d. Other
P19 translated “the big monkeys” with *ṭlaʾ ṭaḥbīrā’,* The targeted phrase was possibly *ṭlaʾ ṭaḥbīrā’.* Whether the participants produced adjectives that are correct according to the MSA norm regarding humaneness or not, one interesting observation can be made from the results: the presence of intrapersonal variability. Of the 14 participants listed in Table 27, four chose different adjective forms for the same construction and five had only translated the adjective in one of the two clauses. In the entire sample, eight participants (P1, P2, P3, P8, P13, P14, P18 and P20) wrote the two instances of the [-HUM] plural adjective according to the MSA norm. Thus the translations show both interpersonal and intrapersonal variability.
5.5 Possessive constructions

The targeted possessive constructions in the translation to be discussed here are:

C2: 
حديقة الحيوانات
hadiqat l-ḥayawānātī,
garden DEF ART-animals-GEN
“the zoo”

C4: 
خسن أمه
ḥiḍn 'ummihi,
lap/arms mother-GEN-PRON SUFF
“its mother’s arms”

C7: 
حراس حديقة الحيوانات
harrās ḥadiqat l-ḥayawānātī,
guards garden-GEN DEF ART-animals-GEN
“the zoo guards”

Both synthetic and analytic possessive constructions were found in the translations. The synthetic possessive construction links two or more elements together by juxtaposition. The first element, the possessed, is not marked for finiteness, only for case. Since case depends on syntax, case is not marked on the first element of the examples given above. The second part of the construction, the possessor, can be marked for finiteness and takes the genitive case. Analytic possessive constructions instead connect the elements by the insertion of a particle or a preposition between independent elements. If translated into English, “the man’s house” would be an example of a synthetic possessive construction with two nouns annexed by a genitive ending, whereas “the house of the man” would be the analytic version with two independent noun phrases connected by “of”.

---

71 The targeted partitive constructions in C2 (“one day”) and C8 (“one of the guards”) were in some cases translated by means of possessive constructions. These cases are not addressed in this section. A possessive construction was also targeted in C14: ماعطإـّوطهورقلا
iṭʻām l-qurūdi,
“feeding the monkeys[+GEN]”. Since the verbal noun of the clause was sometimes translated with a finite verb form, the construction was instead treated in 5.3.1.2 Imperfect aspect.

72 In the original text (see 3.2.4) the singular form الحيوان was used. Most of the participants, however, showed a preference for the plural; in consequence the plural is included in the examples.
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According to Boumans (2006: 214), “In Classical Arabic, analytic constructions are limited to a few rare syntactic contexts, but both constructions coexist in nearly all contemporary Arabic vernaculars.”

Even though there were few possessive constructions in the translation test, it was of interest to see how the participants treated them. It should, however, be noted that in the case of C2, \textit{ḥadīqaẗ l-ḥayawānāt}, “the zoo”, this construction could be considered a lexical unit and may thus have been learned by the participants as a lexical item.

\textbf{a. Correct synthetic possessive constructions}

P1, P2, P3, P6, P8, P13 and P24 encountered no problems with translating any of the possessive constructions in C2, C4 and C7.

With the exception of a couple of minor circumlocutions, C4, “his/its mother’s arms”, was correctly rendered by all participants. C4 contains three elements: two noun phrases and a pronominal possessive suffix. It is plausible that synthetic constructions involving “his/its mother” are familiar to the participants from DA and MSA.

\textbf{b. Correct analytic possessive construction}

Only one participant, P6, made use of the analytic possessive. C2 was translated with \textit{\textipa{a\textipa{ḥ}dyq\textipa{ṭ} \textipa{a\textipa{ḥ}hay\textipa{w}n\textipa{a}t}}, “the garden [belonging] to the animals” and C7 with \textit{\textipa{\textipa{ḥ}rr\textipa{a\textipa{s} \textipa{ḥ}dyq\textipa{ṭ} \textipa{a\textipa{ḥ}hay\textipa{w}n\textipa{a}t}}}, “the guards [belonging] to city [of] the animals”. One interesting observation can be made here. P6 translated “garden/city of the animals” differently in the two clauses. In C2, the analytic possessive was used to translate “the zoo”, but in C7 “the zoo” was a synthetic compound whereas the noun phrase “the guards” was attached to “the zoo” by particle \textit{li-} (though incorrectly spelled with a long vowel). In other words, P6 knows how to form both possessive constructions.

\textbf{c. Synthetic possessive constructions, mixed production}

The possessive construction in C2, “the zoo”, was correctly given by the participants except P9, P12 and P19, who supplied both parts of the constructions with the definite article, thereby violating the rule for annexation both in MSA and DA. To give an example, P9 wrote \textit{\textipa{ḥ\textipa{dyq\textipa{ṭ} \textipa{a\textipa{ḥ}hay\textipa{w}n\textipa{a}t}} for targeted حديقة الحيوانات}, “the zoo”. Interestingly enough, P9 correctly indicated some short vowel signs, including a genitive \textit{-i} on “the animals”.

C7, “the zoo guards”, demanded the annexation of three noun phrases; “guards” + “garden” + “the animals”. Incomplete translations with one element missing were seen in P3, P14, P20, P22, P25 and P26.
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Most commonly, “the animals” were left out. P3, for example, wrote ﺣاﺮس ﺛﺪي، “guard of the garden”, giving a singular “guard” for the targeted plural “guards”.

P7, P9, P17 and P19 resorted to translations that mirrored the Swedish word order (djurparkens vakter, lit. “the animal park’s guards”) by putting the guards last in the construction when it should have been the first element. P17 wrote ﻣﺪﻳﻨﺔ ﺛﺪي ﺛﺪي ﺛﺪي, “city [of] the animals the guards”. This word order does not make any sense in Arabic. Apart from the difficulty in producing the genitive chain with three elements, P17 produced an incorrect concatenative plural form for “guards”. Concatenative and internal plural formations were discussed briefly above (see 5.4.2).

In addition, P7, P9, P17 and P19 all produced at least one error involving definiteness in their translations of C7. One complicating factor in the translation of C7 could be lexical and/or morphological uncertainties concerning the plural noun “the guards”. In several cases it was translated with incorrect plural forms or given in the singular.

d. Missing or incomplete
P10, P11 and P21 did not translate the constructions or produced incomplete translations.

5.6 Notes on translation
As commented on earlier (see 2.3), MSA is the target language of HLI, but not a language the pupils in HLI necessarily speak. There are no studies on classroom practices in the Arabic HLI apart from a handful of student papers from various Swedish universities and colleges. We do not know to what extent pupils in HLI speak MSA in class, nor do we know what attitudes the HLTs have to what variety of Arabic should be spoken in class. Research on this is clearly needed. The responses to the questionnaire of the present study confirmed that not all pupils practised spoken MSA in class. Only four (P1, P8, P14 and P19) of 26 pupils said they often spoke MSA in class.
Furthermore, we do not know to what extent pupils in HLI practise speaking MSA in class, nor do we know to what extent they practise writing and translating.

Before commencing the analysis, we should remember that even competent writers may not be good translators. The translation test is not a clear-cut language test. It is a translation test that aims at investigating the command the participants have of written MSA. The sections below are concerned with the ways the participants approached the task: What parts were translated with ease and what parts appear to have been more challenging? The discussion involves different issues related to translation such as lexical knowledge and interference from the Swedish text. The focus, however, is not on different grammatical aspects since morphosyntax was analysed earlier in this chapter. The analysis of translation-related issues is arranged according to the following broad categories:

5.6.1 Words
5.6.2 Syntax
5.6.3 Dependent prepositions
5.6.4 Idiomatic errors

**5.6.1 Words**
The participants were asked to underline words they did not know and to leave those words out from their translations. They tended to follow this instruction more often when it concerned singular words that were unknown to them but not when syntax presented a problem. Apart from P10, P11, P12 and P21, the participants produced more or less complete translations and the vocabulary was not challenging to them. In fact, P1, P2, P3, P6, P8, P13, P14 and P17 excluded no words in their translations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSA</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 28. Pupils’ spoken MSA in class.*
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Table 29. Number of words not translated.\(^{73}\)

Clause (C), Swedish word (SW), English translation (EW), number of times excluded (NE) and participant(s) excluding the word (P).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>EW</th>
<th>NE</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>mycket</td>
<td>“a lot”</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>P7, P9, P11, P19, P20, P23, P24, P25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>djur</td>
<td>“animals”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>“one”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P10, P21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>dag</td>
<td>“day”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>besökte</td>
<td>“visited”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P10, P21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C2</td>
<td>hon</td>
<td>“she”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P10, P21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>djurparken</td>
<td>“the zoo”</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P10, P11, P21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>stora</td>
<td>“big”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>sitta</td>
<td>“sit”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P11, P12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>“in”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>sin</td>
<td>“its”</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P10, P11, P21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>mamma</td>
<td>“mother’s”</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P10, P11, P21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>famn</td>
<td>“arms”</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P11, P19, P21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>gav</td>
<td>“gave”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P12, P21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>till</td>
<td>“to”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>apan</td>
<td>“the monkey”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>skalade</td>
<td>“peeled”</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P10, P12, P21, P22, P23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>bananen</td>
<td>“the banana”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>och</td>
<td>“and”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>åt</td>
<td>“ate”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P10, P22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>den</td>
<td>“it”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P10, P22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>djurparkens</td>
<td>“the zoo(s)”</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P10, P11, P12, P18, P21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>vakter</td>
<td>“guards”</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>P10, P11, P12, P18, P21, P22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>sög</td>
<td>“saw”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>apan</td>
<td>“the monkey”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>åta</td>
<td>“eat”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>bananen</td>
<td>“the banana”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>“one”</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P10, P11, P21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>av</td>
<td>“of”</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P10, P11, P21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{73}\) Due to morphological differences between Swedish and Arabic, some independent words in Swedish are morphemes or suffixes in Arabic. Such cases are commented on in the footnotes.

\(^{74}\) The personal pronouns hon, “she”, in C2 and jag, “I”, in C13 and C15, are given in parenthesis since they are included in the verb when translated into Arabic. But when the verbs are not translated, neither are the pronouns, so it is still counted as a missing word.

\(^{75}\) In Table 29, the English translations are as far as possible direct translations of the Swedish words. Here, a Swedish infinitive, for example, is translated with an English infinitive rather than a participle.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vaktna</td>
<td>the guards</td>
<td>4 (P10, P12, P21, P22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mata</td>
<td>feed</td>
<td>1 (P10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inte</td>
<td>not</td>
<td>1 (P10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>1 (P10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stora</td>
<td>big</td>
<td>4 (P10, P12, P19, P22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aporna</td>
<td>the monkeys</td>
<td>1 (P10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>det</td>
<td>it</td>
<td>5 (P10, P11, P21, P25, P26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>är</td>
<td>is</td>
<td>5 (P10, P11, P21, P25, P26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>förbjudet</td>
<td>forbidden</td>
<td>3 (P10, P21, P25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>till</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>2 (P21, P22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vaktna</td>
<td>the guards</td>
<td>4 (P10, P12, P21, P22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jag</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>2 (P10, P21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>är</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>2 (P10, P21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ledsen</td>
<td>sorry</td>
<td>1 (P10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>var</td>
<td>was</td>
<td>5 (P10, P11, P12, P25, P26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>förbjudet</td>
<td>forbidden</td>
<td>2 (P10, P12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>att</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>6 (P10, P11, P12, P21, P25, P26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>det</td>
<td>it</td>
<td>6 (P10, P11, P12, P21, P25, P26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nista</td>
<td>next</td>
<td>3 (P10, P11, P12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gång</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>3 (P10, P11, P12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ska</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>2 (P10, P12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jag</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>2 (P10, P12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mata</td>
<td>feed</td>
<td>2 (P10, P12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elefanen</td>
<td>the elephant</td>
<td>4 (P10, P11, P12, P22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The words left without translations in Table 29 can be assumed to belong to at least three different categories:

1. Mistakes
2. Lack of knowledge of the vocabulary involved
3. Giving up on a clause

76 The copula is only given in Arabic when negated or used for the past. The copulas in C10, /det/ är, “it is, and /jag/ är, “I am”, in C13 are given in brackets.
77 Due to tense logic, this past tense copula is redundant in Arabic.
Chapter 5 Analysis of the translation test:
MSA morphosyntax and notes on translation

To start with the mistakes, there are instances where a word that is repeated in the test is translated in one place but left out in another. For example, in C3, P11 is the only one who did not translate “big”, whereas in C9 it was left out by P10, P12, P19 and P22. In other words, the vocabulary is known to the participants but for some reason (lack of concentration? translation artefact?) it has been left out.

Concerning insufficient knowledge of vocabulary as a reason for not translating a word, “the guards” in C7, C8 and C11 was repeatedly excluded by P10, P12, P21 and P22. They appear not to know this word.

Finally, some missing translations seemed to depend on participants giving up on entire clauses when they could not grasp the syntax or did not know a particular word. That could account for the missing translations of even high-frequency conjunctions in C14, a syntactically complicated clause.

5.6.2 Syntax
Proceeding to syntax, the Swedish text was not demanding and, as predicted, most participants had only minor problems with the syntax, with the exception of C13-C14.

C13-14  Jag visste inte att det var förbjudet att mata aporna

لَمْ أَكُنْ أُعْرِفْ أَنَّ إِطَامَ الْفِرْوْدِ مَمْتَعٌ

lam 'akun 'aʻrifu 'anna 'iṭʻām l-qurūd mamnū‘;

“I did not know that feeding the monkeys [was] forbidden”.

The translation demanded a compound verb phrase in the main clause (C13) and restructuring affecting both word order and the parts of speech involved in the subordinate clause (C14). The clauses are analysed in detail in 5.3.1, where the translation of verb aspect is the subject of discussion.

In the analysis, one question emerges: To what extent does the syntax of the Swedish text influence the Arabic produced by the pupils? Some participants’ translations of C2, C13 and C14 bear evidence of having been influenced by the Swedish word order. Possible Swedish influence on word order and the use of overt pronouns were discussed in 5.1 and 5.2.

5.6.3 Dependent prepositions
The participants frequently translated dependent prepositions or prepositions introducing indirect objects with a word-for-word strategy instead of choosing the idiomatically correct prepositions in Arabic. It is then
plausible that there is a certain degree of transfer from Swedish to Arabic in several of the translations. In some cases, DA influence may also be at work and at times DA coincides with Swedish rather than MSA.

The clauses that included verbs and dependent prepositions were:

C3  *Hon tittade på...*  
“She looked at...”  

C5  *Salma gav en banan til till apen.*  
“Salma gave a banana to the monkey.”  

C8  *En av vakterna sa till Salma...*  
“One of the guards said to Salma...”  

C11  *Salma sa till vaktarna...*  
“Salma said to the guards...”  

The potential challenge in the translation of C3 lies in the meaning of the prepositions in Arabic and Swedish. Swedish preposition *på* means “on”, but the Arabic preposition *ilā* means “to”. As for C5, C8 and C11, the Swedish preposition *till* is independent, whereas the Arabic dependent preposition for verbs *naḏara* and *qāla* is the proclitic *li-* . Here, however, there is no difference in the meaning of the prepositions, “to”, only in form. After the Table, the results are discussed clause by clause.

**Table 30. Verbs and dependent prepositions.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant (P)</th>
<th>Clause (C)</th>
<th>Incorrect use of preposition or transitive verb (IU)</th>
<th>Correct use of preposition or transitive verb (CU)</th>
<th>Verb (V)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>على نظرت</td>
<td>نظرت</td>
<td>شاهدت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5 Analysis of the translation test:  
MSA morphosyntax and notes on translation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P3</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>علىٰ</th>
<th>نظرت*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>علىٰ</td>
<td>نظرت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>علىٰ</td>
<td>رأت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>تَنْظَرَتْ</td>
<td>علىٰ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>رأت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>تُبِيعُت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>غَيْرُتُ</td>
<td>عَلٰ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>شَفَة*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P13</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>رَأَت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>شاهدة*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P17</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>علىٰ</td>
<td>تَضْرَبَت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P18</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>علىٰ</td>
<td>تَضْرَبَت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P19</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>عَالٰا*</td>
<td>تَنَافَرْت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P20</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>شاهدة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P21</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>علىٰ</td>
<td>رَعْت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P22</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>شاهدة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P23</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>رَأَت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P24</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>رَأَت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P25</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>علىٰ</td>
<td>تَفَارِجَت*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P26</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>علىٰ</td>
<td>تَنَفَرَت*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P1</th>
<th>C5</th>
<th>إلىٰ</th>
<th>أعَطْت</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>ل</td>
<td>أعَطْت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>أعَطْت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>ل</td>
<td>أعَطْت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>إلىٰ</td>
<td>عَقَاط*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>ل</td>
<td>أعَطْت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>إلىٰ</td>
<td>أعَطْت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>عَطَات*</td>
<td>إلىٰ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>عَتْ*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>ْ</td>
<td>عَتْ*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P13</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>ل</td>
<td>أعَطْت*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>أعَطْت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P17</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>إلىٰ</td>
<td>أعَطْت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P18</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>لا*</td>
<td>أعَطْت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P19</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>لا*</td>
<td>أعَطْت</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P20</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>ل</td>
<td>أعَطْت</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

78 P11 had a very low command of the script and the targeted form is difficult to decide. P11 has a Syrian background and the DA verb assumed to be targeted, ُتَطَاوْلَ ع/تَطَاوْلَ ع, does employ the preposition ُبَلَى, "on". The preposition for the corresponding verb in MSA, ُتَطَاوْلَ ع would be ُبَلَا, "to". In other words, if DA is intended by this incorrectly spelled verb, the preposition is correct; if MSA is intended, the preposition is incorrect.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P21</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P22</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P23</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>إلى*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P24</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>أعتب*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P25</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>يلى*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P26</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>إلى*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>C8</td>
<td>قال*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>C8</td>
<td>قال*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>C8</td>
<td>قال*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>C8</td>
<td>قال*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>C8</td>
<td>قال*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>C8</td>
<td>قال*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>C8</td>
<td>قال*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>C8</td>
<td>قال*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td>C8</td>
<td>كل*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12</td>
<td>C8</td>
<td>قال*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P13</td>
<td>C8</td>
<td>قال*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14</td>
<td>C8</td>
<td>قال*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P17</td>
<td>C8</td>
<td>قال*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P18</td>
<td>C8</td>
<td>قال*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P19</td>
<td>C8</td>
<td>قال*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P20</td>
<td>C8</td>
<td>قال*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P21</td>
<td>C8</td>
<td>قال*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P22</td>
<td>C8</td>
<td>قال*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P23</td>
<td>C8</td>
<td>إلى*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P24</td>
<td>C8</td>
<td>قال*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P25</td>
<td>C8</td>
<td>إلى*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P26</td>
<td>C8</td>
<td>قال*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>C11</td>
<td>قال*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>C11</td>
<td>قال*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>C11</td>
<td>قال*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>C11</td>
<td>قال*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>C11</td>
<td>قال*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>C11</td>
<td>قال*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>C11</td>
<td>قال*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>C11</td>
<td>قال*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td>C11</td>
<td>كل*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12</td>
<td>C11</td>
<td>قال*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P13</td>
<td>C11</td>
<td>قال*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| P14 | C11 | قاللا | ل | 
| P17 | C11 | قاللا | إلى |
| P18 | C11 | قاللا | إلى |
| P19 | C11 | كلا* | 
| P20 | C11 | قاللا | ل | 
| P21* | C11 | - | - |
| P22 | C11 | - | - |
| P23 | C11 | - | إلى |
| P24 | C11 | قاللا | ل |
| P25 | C11 | قاللا | إلى |
| P26 | C11 | إلى |

Prepositions in C3
Since no specified set of Arabic words was given for the translation test, the choice of translations varies. Different verbs of perception, not all semantically acceptable in the context, were employed for the translation of "she looked at" in C3. The Swedish preposition på semantically has a wide range of meanings depending on the context, but concrete translations of the preposition are “on” or “at”.

Some verbs were transitive; شاهدت, šāhadat, وأت, ra‘at, فئبنءـّوطهأر, ra‘at, فئبنءـّوطه , šāfat. P7 and P21 nevertheless constructed او‘ات with the preposition على, ʻalā, “on/at/over, etc.”. P9, P13, P23 and P24, however, employed the right strategy, using no prepositions in their constructions. Intransitive نظرت, naḏarat, was incorrectly constructed with ʻalā rather than إلى, ʻilā, “to” by P1, P3, P6, P17 and P18.

Another intransitive verb, تُرِجَت, was correctly constructed with ʻalā by P8, P25 and P26. Here, Arabic and Swedish use a preposition with the same meaning, “on/at”.

What should be noted in the translations of C3 is that the only preposition used for all translations, whether correct or not, is ʻilā. We may thus be seeing a transfer effect from the Swedish text.

Prepositions in C5
In C5, all participants except one targeted the verb أُعِطت, ʻa‘at, “she gave” to translate “[Salma] gave to”. As for the preposition, seven of them opted for the correct preposition لـ, ʻil-, and seven picked إلى, ʻilā, both meaning “to”. Five participants constructed the verb without any preposition.

79 P21 and P22 did not translate the indirect object.
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Prepositions in C8 and C11

C8 and C11 both meant the verb-preposition “said to”. In 23 cases the correct preposition *li-* was given and in 19 instances *ilā*. P1, P12, P18, P19 and P25 used different prepositions for C8 and C11, indicating that their use of prepositions was not stable.

It seems somewhat surprising that common verbs are not connected with the correct preposition (Table 30), that this has not been automated. In the case of ‘*aţat* and *qāla/qālat*, it is tempting to speculate that this could be a case of hypercorrection. The same dependent preposition, *li-*, is used both in MSA and in DA with the verbs. Could it be that the participants linked *li-* to DA and *ilā* to MSA and in their attempt to target MSA chose the incorrect preposition? Though hypercorrection is a weak explanation, it cannot be ruled out. We may, on the other hand, be seeing a transfer effect that relates not to meaning but to form. The Swedish text gives an independent preposition, so in the translations independent prepositions rather than proclitics are given.

To return to the question of spelling, Table 30 serves to illustrate that many participants have difficulty in spelling even high-frequency words like prepositions.

5.6.4 Idiomatic errors

There are two cases of idiatically incorrect translations. These occur in clauses C12 (“I am sorry.”) and C1 (“Salma likes animals a lot.”).

In Swedish, *ledsen* can mean both “sad” and “sorry” depending on the context. In C12, P2, P3 and P24 produced word-for-word translations of the Swedish *Jag är ledsen*, “I am sorry”, with the Arabic *ḥazīna*, “sad”, rather than the idiomatically correct *‘āsifa*, “sorry”. The translations give the impression that the pupils did not really think about the intention of the line. In this context, Salma is clearly apologising to the guards. She is not sad because she received a reprimand. In contrast, P20 produced the idiomatically correct translation *‘āsifa* and added *ḥazīna* in parenthesis, revealing that P20 was aware of two possible translations. Of the remaining participants, one did not translate the word, four opted for translations containing verbs, and 13 wrote different forms of *‘āsifa*.

One other idiomatically incorrect translation was produced by P6 in C1 “Salma likes animals a lot.” P6 wrote *‘addā*, “very”, instead of idiomatically correct *kittira*, *kaftiran*, “much” / “a lot”. *‘addā* functions as an adverbial intensifier whereas *kittira* is a quantitative adverb. In Swedish, *mycket* has both functions depending on the context. P6 appears to have translated *mycket* with a word-for-word strategy.
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The two previous chapters analysed and discussed the results of writing, spelling, translation and morphosyntax. The major finding in the analyses was variability; between pupils but also in the production of individual pupils. The present chapter generalises the findings and discusses them in relation to the participants’ responses to the questionnaire. The chapter is outlined as follows:

6.1 Variation in command of the script
6.2 Variation in spelling
6.3 Variation in the production of MSA morphology
6.4 Conclusion

The results of script, spelling and morphosyntax are compared to the measures in the questionnaire that targeted language instruction and language input:

- Years of participation in HLI
- Extra instruction in Arabic outside of HLI
- Contact with written Arabic

A comment on extra instruction in Arabic
Pupils who had received extra instruction included two groups:

1. Pupils who had arrived in Sweden after school age from Arab countries and could be assumed to have received instruction in Arabic prior to their arrival.
2. Pupils who had received extra instruction in Arabic in Sweden outside of HLI.

There is, of course, the possibility that recent arrivals also received extra instruction in Arabic in Sweden after their arrival. Since the recent arrivals (P3, P17, P20 and P24) performed on a par with the other pupils who had received extra instruction, they were, for the sake of readability, not singled out to form a separate group. Furthermore, it must be noted that the responses for age on arrival and number of years of HLI do not

---

80 There is a general trend in Swedish schools for girls to outperform boys. Gender, however, is not included in the discussion, since it was established after analysis that difference in gender could not explain the results.
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add up for P18. She indicated that she arrived in Sweden at the age of 8 or 9 [sic]. She is now 14. At the same time she marked that she had participated in HLI in Grades 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8. Most likely she has indicated all the years she has had instruction in Arabic, either in Sweden or Iraq.

Concerning extra instruction in Arabic in Sweden outside of HLI, it was brought to my attention that several of the Arabic-speaking pupils attended Islamic study groups outside of school and that this education included language instruction in Arabic (cf. 2.2.3). The organisation of these study groups varied. One participant told me that her mother was a teacher of Arabic and that some families used to meet at their place and read the Quran together. Another participant went to formally arranged classes. Since the Arabic of the Quran has greater morphosyntactic similarities to MSA than DA, reading the Quran can potentially lead to an increased input of structures beneficial to producing MSA. As for Arabic-speaking Christians, some churches use an Arabic version of the Bible whereas others have Aramaic as the liturgical language.

6.1 Variation in command of the script
The analysis of the handwriting showed that the participants varied greatly with regard to their command of the script. Some translations contained letter forms and words that would not have been legible had not the targeted structure been known from the Swedish text. Handwriting was graded as high, medium and low based on letter shapes and use of ligatures, not aesthetic quality.

Since written language is not acquired naturally, but needs to be learned, it is of interest to see the impact instruction has had on the performance of the participants. In this study, all participants had participated in HLI, but it was also known that some participants had received extra instruction in Arabic, either in the Arab world or in their free time. In 6.1.1, the level of handwriting is checked against the number of years of HLI and whether the participants have received extra instruction in Arabic. The results are discussed in 6.1.2.

6.1.1 Level of handwriting, HLI and extra instruction in Arabic
Figure 2 illustrates how command of the Arabic script is connected to years of participation in HLI. The numbers given inside the scatter plot are participant identifications that allow us to track the participants for different measures.
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**Figure 2.** Level of handwriting and number of years of HLI.

**Figure 3.** Level of handwriting and extra instruction in Arabic.
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Figure 2 presents a dispersed picture. The amount of HLI does not appear to go hand in hand with command of the script. The responses to the questionnaire may, however, to some extent explain the picture, since the participants were asked whether they had received any instruction in Arabic apart from HLI. The analysis of Figure 2 and Figure 3 addresses the effect HLI and extra instruction appear to have on the participants’ command of the script.

2-5 years of HLI and high command of the script
Four of five of the participants (P3, P17, P20 and P24) who wrote well after relatively few years of HLI were, according to the responses to the questionnaire, recent arrivals with schooling from the Arab world. The remaining participant (P2), however, indicated that she was born in Sweden. P2 had not received extra instruction in Arabic.

2-5 years of HLI and low command of the script
In contrast, P7 and P19, who had participated in HLI for three years and had a low command of the script, were not recent arrivals. Neither of them had received any extra instruction in Arabic.

7-10 years of HLI and high command of the script
Seven participants (P1, P6, P8, P9, P13, P14 and P18) who had participated in HLI for 7-10 years had a well-developed handwriting. Of these participants, only P13 had not received extra instruction in Arabic.

7-10 years of HLI and medium command of the script
Five participants (P12, P21, P22, P23 and P26) had a medium command of the script after 7-10 years of HLI. P21, P22 and P23 had received extra instruction but P12 and P26 had not.

7-9 years of HLI and low command of the script
Three participants (P10, P11 and P25) had participated in HLI for 7-9 years and had a low command of the script. P11 wrote that he had received extra instruction whereas P10 and P25 had not.

6-8 years of HLI and no command of the script
It was mentioned before that two participants (P15 and P16) stated at the time of testing that they could not write Arabic. They nevertheless filled in the questionnaire and according to their responses they had participated for eight (P15) and six (P16) years in HLI. Neither of them had received any extra instruction in Arabic.
6.1.2 Discussion: level of handwriting, HLI and extra instruction in Arabic

Even though the questionnaire did not go into detail on the quality or amount of extra instruction of Arabic, the results indicate that extra instruction may be an important factor that affects the pupils’ writing acquisition. At the same time, as the example of P13 showed, continuous participation in HLI can have good results even for pupils who have received no extra instruction. Furthermore, the combination of extra instruction and HLI seems to have a favourable effect.

6.2 Variation in spelling

In 4.2 spelling errors were categorised as orthographic, vowel or consonant errors and analysed in detail. In addition, the percentage of words containing at least one spelling error was computed for each translation. The results revealed intrapersonal and interpersonal variation in spelling. Here, the variation seen in the responses is addressed and attempts are made to explain the variation.

In 6.2.1 intrapersonal variation in spelling is discussed briefly. Section 6.2.2 thereafter addresses interpersonal variation. The results for spelling are checked against variables that relate to instruction and contact with written MSA. Finally, the findings on spelling are summed up and discussed in 6.2.3.

6.2.1 Intrapersonal variation in spelling

In the analysis of irregular spelling found in the responses, an important observation was made: Some participants repeatedly displayed heavy reliance on phonological methods for spelling. Even the production of high-frequency words such as the 3rd person singular feminine pronoun هی، hiya, “she” and prepositions that vary little in form were affected.

This “reinventing” of the words with each occurrence resulted in intrapersonal spelling variations.

This intrapersonal variation was not analysed or quantified on an individual level, but a suggestion can be made regarding the underlying mechanisms. The results agree with previous studies on spelling in Arabic (see 1.2.5); the pupils have not yet fully acquired the written language and they are dependent on a phonological rather than a whole word method for writing.

6.2.2 Interpersonal variation in spelling

As with script, spelling is likely to be connected to formal instruction and familiarity with reading and writing, remembering that spelling in
Arabic, especially certain words, presents some extra challenges. It was already established in 4.2.1 that the level of handwriting of the participants and the percentage of incorrectly spelled words went hand in hand. This was expected, since more developed writing would indicate more practice and, as a consequence, better spelling.

Thus to explain the interpersonal variation seen in the responses, it is of interest to look at the instruction in Arabic the participants have received (HLI and extra instruction) as well as the contact they have with written texts according to their responses to the questionnaire. In 6.2.2.1 *Spelling and instruction in Arabic*, the measure of percentage of incorrectly spelled words in individual translations is compared with the instruction factor:

- Spelling and years of participation in HLI
- Spelling and extra instruction in Arabic

In 6.2.2.2 *Contact with different types of text and spelling* the contact the participants have with written Arabic (the variety was not specified in the questionnaire) is connected to the results for spelling. The measures to be discussed are:

6.2.2.2.1 Overview: contact with different types of written Arabic
6.2.2.2.2 Contact with number of types of written Arabic and spelling
6.2.2.2.3 Contact with different types of written Arabic and spelling

6.2.2.1 *Spelling and instruction in Arabic*

All participants in the study evidently participated in HLI. Since it is possible to join HLI in different years, there was, however, the possibility that the participants had participated in HLI for varying amounts of time. The first question of interest, then, is whether a longer period of participation in HLI leads to better spelling.

As for instruction in Arabic outside of the HLI classroom, two sorts of instruction were known to exist: (1) instruction in Arabic in Arab countries, (2) instruction in Arabic outside of school in Sweden. The questionnaire did not include any detailed questions regarding the amount, quality or organisation of any extra instruction in Arabic. That remains to be investigated by future research. In the present context, it is only noted if a participant has received extra instruction. The second
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question to address is whether extra instruction in Arabic results in better spelling or not.

Figure 4 below shows how many years the participants have participated in HLI and if they have received extra instruction. Note that 26 participants are included, that is, also the participants who were either recent arrivals with a limited command of Swedish (P4 and P5) or who said they could not write Arabic (P15 and P16). In the sample of participants whose translations were included in the analysis, eight had not received extra instruction in Arabic whereas 14 had. The mean number of years of participation in HLI was 6.38 years (n=26, SD=2.94).

![Figure 4. Years of HLI and extra instruction in Arabic.](image)

Below, the impact that different kinds of instruction, HLI and extra instruction have on spelling is treated in separate sections and then brought together in a concluding discussion.
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Figure 5. Spelling and years of HLI.

Figure 6. Spelling and extra instruction in Arabic.
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Spelling and years of participation in HLI
Figure 5 presents a similar picture to Figure 2 that related spelling to HLI. There is no evident connection between participation in HLI and the result for spelling. As with the different levels of command of the script observed among the participants, the variation in spelling can, to some extent, be explained by extra instruction in Arabic. Figure 6 shows how spelling and extra instruction in many but not all cases go hand in hand.

More than 50 per cent incorrect spelling and extra instruction in Arabic
P11 stands out as the participant with the largest percentage of incorrectly spelled words. Yet P11 has received extra instruction. It was shown above (see 4.1) that P11 had a low command of the script even after nine years of HLI. Thus in the case of P11, other factors may be at work. Participants with reading and writing impairments known to the teachers were not allowed to participate in the study. Provided that P11 does not have a reading and writing impairment, that leaves us to question the amount and/or quality of the extra instruction or, possibly, the motivation of this particular pupil.

More than 50 per cent incorrect spelling and no extra instruction in Arabic
Five of the less competent spellers (P7, P10, P12, P19 and P25) had no extra instruction in Arabic. P12 had a medium command of the script, whereas the remaining four had a low command of the script. P7 and P19 had participated in HLI for a relatively short period of time, three years. P25, however, had participated in HLI for seven years and P10 and P12 for nine years.

Less than 50 per cent incorrect spelling and extra instruction in Arabic
Thirteen participants (P1, P3, P6, P8, P9, P14, P17, P18, P20, P21, P22, P23 and P24) produced translations with less than 50 per cent incorrectly spelled words and had received some sort of extra instruction. P21, P22 and P23 had a medium level of handwriting and the remaining had a high command of the script. Five of the participants (P3, P17, P18, P20 and P24) arrived in Sweden after the age of 8 and probably attended school in their countries of origin. The remaining eight participants had participated in HLI for 8-10 years. With the exception of P1, who arrived in Sweden at the age of 1, they were born in Sweden.
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Less than 50 per cent incorrect spelling and no extra instruction in Arabic
Three participants (P2, P13 and P26) spelled less than 50 per cent of the translated words incorrectly without having received any extra instruction in Arabic. All of them were born in Sweden.

6.2.2.2 Spelling and contact with different types of written Arabic
In this section, the responses to the questionnaire regarding contact with written MSA are first presented separately to provide an overview of the input of written Arabic. What is of relevance in this section is to see if the participants who indicate that they read different types of written texts are better spellers and/or if a certain type of text can be connected to better results for spelling.

The results are presented in three sections:

6.2.2.2.1 Overview: contact with different types of written Arabic
6.2.2.2.2 Spelling and contact with number of types of written Arabic
6.2.2.2.3 Spelling and contact with different types of written Arabic

6.2.2.2.1 Overview: contact with different types of written Arabic
The question and the options for answers in the questionnaire on contact with written MSA read:

Where do you read written MSA (fusha) in your free time?
- On TV (e.g. subtitles)
- In the Quran
- In the Bible
- On the Internet
- In books
- Other
- I do not read Arabic in my free time

Thus the question did not take into account how much Arabic the participants read and how often; it was intended to map the contact the participants had with written Arabic. The participants could mark several alternatives, not just one. Table 31 shows the frequency and percentage for different types of texts. Note that the number of respon-
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dents to this particular question is 26. The two participants who did not do the translation test as well as the two participants who were recent arrivals all responded to this particular question and their profiles are included in Table 31.

Table 31. Contact with different types of written Arabic. (n=26)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quran</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No text</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Quran is the type of written Arabic that most participants, 65.4 per cent, come into contact with. Arabic on TV comes in second place; 23.1 per cent of the participants indicated that they read Arabic on TV. 19.2 per cent of the participants read books in Arabic and 19.2 per cent read Arabic on the Internet. 11.5 per cent read the Bible in Arabic. Only two participants, 7.7 per cent, chose the option “Other”. Five participants (among them P15 and P16 who said they could not write in Arabic), 19.2 per cent, responded that they had no contact with written Arabic in their free time.

6.2.2.2 Spelling and contact with number of types of written Arabic

In this section, contact with written Arabic is dealt with participant by participant, text type by text type and discussed in relation to results for spelling. Table 32 lists the contact individual participants indicated that they had with different types of written Arabic.

81 The percentages are rounded off, so the sum may not be 100.
Chapter 6 Explaining variation in writing, spelling and production of MSA morphology

Table 32. Contact with different types of written Arabic per participant.
Television (TV), Quran (Q), Bible (B), Internet (IN), books (B’S), other (O), number of types per participant (T/P), yes (x) and no (-). The participants who were recent arrivals (P4 and P5) as well as the participants who did not complete the translation test (P15 and P16) are in parentheses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>TV</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>B’S</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>T/P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P4)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P5)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P13</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P15)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P16)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P24</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The contact the participants have with written Arabic varies a great deal (Table 32). Figure 7 below illustrates the connection between the contact pupils have with different text types and spelling. The six participants who produced more than 50 per cent incorrectly spelled words reported
that they came into contact with no or only one type of text. It should, however, be noted that this is also true for some of the participants who spelled well. If we return to the measure of extra instruction, only one (P11) of the six participants (P7, P10, P11, P12, P19 and P25) with the lower scores on spelling had received extra instruction.

The three remaining participants (P2, P13 and P26) who had not received extra instruction and had better results for spelling reported varied contact with written MSA: 0 (P26), 1 (P2) and 4 (P23).

Figure 7. Spelling and number of types of written Arabic.

6.2.2.2.3 Spelling and contact with different types of written Arabic

In 6.2.2.2.2 it was shown that the participants with a high percentage of spelling errors had limited contact with written Arabic, but that was also true for some of the participants with a low percentage of spelling errors. Could it be that the type of text the participants come into contact with has an effect on their spelling? This section connects the results for spelling to the contact with specific text types: TV, the Quran, the Bible, the Internet, books and the category “other” written source.
Written Arabic: spelling and TV
Figure 8 shows that the four participants who report that they read Arabic on TV were all among the participants with a low percentage of spelling errors. This says little about the quality of the written input and its impact on the written production since several participants with a low percentage of spelling errors marked that they did not read Arabic on TV. In addition, reading Arabic on TV is not an active choice to read. It is in a sense a more coincidental encounter with written language. As a source for written Arabic, it can perhaps be questioned. It may, however, be noted that none of the six participants who produced more than 50 per cent incorrectly spelled words indicated contact with written Arabic on TV.

Written Arabic: spelling and the Quran
Five participants did not say they read the Quran. Four of them (P7, P10, P11 and P25) had a high percentage of incorrectly spelled words. P12 and P19 were the only ones that produced many incorrectly spelled words among the 17 participants who had contact with written Arabic in the Quran.
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**Figure 9.** Spelling and written Arabic in the Quran.

*Written Arabic: spelling and the Bible*

Only two participants indicated that they read the Bible in Arabic. Both had a high percentage of incorrectly spelled words.

**Figure 10.** Spelling and written Arabic in the Bible.
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**Written Arabic: spelling and the Internet**
Five participants (P13, P14, P22, P23 and P24) read Arabic on the Internet. P24 arrived in Sweden at the age of 10, the others were born in Sweden. P13, P14 and P24 were three of the four participants who marked that they read Arabic on TV. The remaining 17 participants did not read Arabic on the Internet.

One problem here is that we do not know to what extent the participants have access to the Internet at home. It could be that some do, but simply do not visit pages in Arabic, whereas others may not have Internet access. In Sweden, public computers are readily available in libraries and schools, but the situation varies between different schools; many schools have computers the pupils can use or even borrow. Furthermore, social media of different kind generally play an important part in the lives of teenagers in Sweden. Even though no open question about Internet use among the participants was included, the reason why only five participants of 22 read Arabic on the Internet is presumably not lack of access to the Internet. Here is a potential source for increasing language input that could be of interest to explore. Further research on the subject would be desirable.

![Figure 11. Spelling and written Arabic on the Internet.](image)
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Written Arabic: spelling and books
Four participants (P13, P14, P23 and P24) indicated that they read books. As mentioned above, P24 arrived in Sweden at the age of 10, but the other three were born in Sweden. They all had good results for spelling. The participants who did not read books had varied results for spelling.

![Figure 12. Spelling and written Arabic in books.](image)

Written Arabic: spelling and “other” source
The category “other” source of written Arabic was left open instead of suggesting, for example, newspapers, since the news in Arabic is nowadays available on the Internet. Only two participants had marked that they met written Arabic in another category than those listed in the questionnaire.
6.2.3 Discussion: spelling, instruction and contact with written Arabic

As was seen in the results for level of handwriting, the participants were highly heterogeneous as regards the measure of spelling, displaying intrapersonal as well as interpersonal variation.

The intrapersonal variation in spelling noted in several participants was thought to indicate that these participants relied on a phonological method of writing and that their spelling was not yet automatised. An unexpected observation was that even common high-frequency, graphically stable words (prepositions, personal pronouns) were irregularly spelled. When the spelling of these kinds of words has not been automatised, it raises the question of how much practice the participants get in writing Arabic. This question can only be answered if addressed in future research which employs a different methodology.

Interpersonal variation in spelling was high. The results for spelling were put in relation to the amount of instruction (HLI and other instruction) the participants had received and the amount of contact they had with different types of written Arabic.

Concerning how long the participants had participated in HLI and how well they spelled, the results were non-conclusive. The participants with a low percentage of incorrectly spelled words included both those...
who had participated in HLI for many years and those who had participated in HLI for only a couple of years. As for the participants with a high percentage of incorrectly spelled words, they too had participated in HLI for a varying number of years. In addition, it was reported that two participants (P15 and P16) claimed they were not able to write in Arabic after six and eight years of HLI.

According to the sample at hand for the present study, many years of participation in HLI does not guarantee that the pupils will develop automaticity in spelling even basic, high-frequency words.

Even though the questionnaire did not go into detail on the quality or amount of extra instruction in Arabic, the results indicate that extra instruction may be an important factor that affects the pupils’ writing acquisition. Among the participants who had received extra instruction only one, P11, spelled more than 50 per cent of the words incorrectly. At the same time, as the example of P13 showed, continuous participation in HLI can lead to good results even for pupils who get no extra instruction. Furthermore, the combination of extra instruction and HLI seems to have a favourable effect. Note, however, that it is not certain that the combination itself is the key, or if input factors or motivation are at work. That two thirds of the pupils had received some sort of extra instruction may reveal something about the motivation of the pupil and/or the parents. It would be desirable that the question of participation in HLI, motivation and extra instruction be addressed in future research involving larger groups of participants.

Concerning the question of contact with written Arabic and spelling, the results are not so easy to sum up. Contact with more types of written Arabic is connected with a better result for spelling but some of the participants with a low percentage of incorrectly spelled words had limited contact with written Arabic. Yet the participants with a high percentage of incorrectly spelled words all had limited contact with written Arabic. It was thus of interest to see if the type of written input could be the decisive factor. Two text types stand out: the Quran and the Bible.

Among the five participants who did not indicate that they read the Quran, only one, P26, had produced less than 50 per cent incorrectly spelled words. The remaining participants had indicated that they read the Quran. Of those, two (P12 and P19) had a high percentage of incorrectly spelled words. It was previously mentioned that P19 had reported at the time for testing that she was a mother tongue speaker of Kurdish, not Arabic. P12 and P19 had not received any extra instruction in Arabic.
To continue to reading the Bible, the opposite picture emerged. The two participants (P7 and P11) who indicated that they read the Bible were both among the less competent spellers. P11 was in fact the only participant who had received extra instruction who produced more than 50 per cent incorrectly spelled words. Note, however, that the sample was not balanced for religious affiliation.

The present study cannot explain the tendency that is visible in this sample, namely that reading the Quran leads to better spelling. A plausible explanation is that reading the Quran leads to an increased input of a variety of written Arabic which has a positive effect on spelling. It should be noted that the questionnaire did not ask for details concerning the time spent per week reading the Quran. It can also be speculated that motivational factors could be at work. Maybe Muslim pupils feel more interested in studying Arabic as a mean of better understanding the Quran and/or get more encouragement from their parents to study Arabic.

Concerning the effect instruction and contact with written Arabic has on spelling, the present research does not enable us to distinguish between the role of extra instruction and the role of Quran reading. Of the 17 participants who had indicated that they read the Quran, 13 had in fact received extra instruction. Two of the 17 produced many spelling errors. As for the five pupils who did not say they read the Quran, only one had received extra instruction. That particular participant had a high percentage of incorrectly spelled words, but one of the other five had less than 50 per cent incorrectly spelled words.

6.3 Variation in the production of MSA morphology
The results for morphology are difficult to quantify. For a start, not all translations were complete. We cannot know whether missing words or phrases are slips or avoidance strategies.

The presentations below regarding MSA morphology have to be considered as accumulative in that they combine spelling and command of MSA morphology. What we are concerned with here is, in other words, what Azzam (1993) referred to as the final stage of mastering Arabic writing, the semantic/grammatical stage.

The MSA-specific structures suitable for comparison due to a relatively high response frequency were as follows:
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- The rendering of adverb
- The rendering of negation + jussive
- The rendering of the future tense
- Feminine adjective with [-HUM PL]

The marking of hamza on 1st person singular verbs is treated in this section as a stylistic feature, and as long as the verbs are otherwise correctly spelled, forms without hamza are accepted.

Table 33. MSA morphology.
Production of adverb (ADV), negation + jussive verb (JUSS), future tense (FUT) and non-human plural agreement ([HUM]), correct form (x), incorrect form (*) and form missing (-).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>ADV</th>
<th>JUSS</th>
<th>FUT</th>
<th>[-HUM]</th>
<th>Total correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*x</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P13</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P17</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P18</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P21</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P22</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>x*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P26</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=22

82 [-HUM] agreement was targeted in two places.
83 P10 had given the head in MASC SG with an agreeing adjective. A [-HUM] PL + FEM SG was not produced.
84 P22 and P26 wrote imperfect verbs instead of future verbs. This was acceptable in the given context, but we cannot know if they actually master future tense morphology.
Table 33 confirms the interpersonal variation. Some participants had a good command of MSA morphology whereas others did not produce a single correct structure.

As with the findings for handwriting and spelling, the results for MSA morphology are put in relation to the responses to the questionnaire regarding instruction and input of written Arabic. The results are presented in the following way:

6.3.1 MSA morphology and instruction
6.3.2 MSA morphology and contact with written Arabic
6.3.3 Discussion: MSA morphology, instruction and contact with written Arabic

6.3.1 MSA morphology and instruction
To repeat, all participants went to HLI and some had in addition received extra instruction in Arabic, either prior to arriving in Sweden or (/ and?) in their free time. This section connects the two types of instruction with the results for MSA morphology.

6.3.1.1 MSA morphology and HLI
According to Figure 14 the effect HLI has on command of MSA morphology is difficult to assess. Among the participants who had participated in HLI for several years, both high scores and low scores on MSA morphology can be seen. Few years of participation in HLI is also connected with both high and low scores. It may be noted that participants who did fairly well on spelling in general (i.e. produced less than 50 per cent incorrectly spelled words) did not have similarly good results for morphology.
6.3.1.2 MSA morphology and extra instruction in Arabic

Zero to one correctly spelled MSA structure was produced by 12 participants; of them, six had received extra instruction and six had not. The remaining two participants (P2 and P13) who had not received extra instruction produced four correct MSA structures of five possible. They had encountered problems with verbs, either the future tense or the negated jussive. P2 and P13 also stood out on the spelling measure as the two participants who had not received extra instruction but performed well on spelling. P2 had participated in HLI for two years and P13 for ten years. Both were born in Sweden. The remaining eight pupils who had produced two to five correct MSA structures had received extra instruction.

It can thus be noted that extra instruction does not guarantee high MSA scores, but that no extra instruction in most cases is connected with low MSA scores.
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![Graph showing data points]

Figure 15. MSA morphology and extra instruction in Arabic.

6.3.2 MSA morphology and contact with written Arabic
The contact the pupils had with different types of texts was described thoroughly above in connection with the discussion on spelling. It was observed that the text type the pupils were most frequently in contact with was the Quran, and that only a few participants read other texts. As a consequence, the results for test types are reviewed less extensively since they would to a high degree be a repetition of the previous discussion.

6.3.2.1 MSA morphology and contact with number of types of written Arabic
Figure 16 below shows that the three participants (P10, P25 and P26) who reported that they did not read Arabic at all in their free time did not get a single structure entirely correct. P10 and P25 had low scores on spelling. P26, on the other hand, did fairly well on spelling. However, it can be added that P26 did not produce the future tense (cf. Table 33). Instead, P26 produced an imperfect form that was acceptable in the context.

As for the remaining participants, the results correspond to those on the spelling measure; there is no obvious connection between contact with more types of written Arabic and the production of MSA morphol-
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Some of the participants who reported contact with one type of written Arabic produced zero to one correct MSA structure, others produced three to five correct MSA structures. Of the two participants who indicated that they had contact with two types of Arabic, one did not produce a single correct MSA structure but the other one produced three correct MSA structures. The four participants who indicated that they came into contact with four to five types of written Arabic, produced one to five correct MSA structures. Here, it can be noted that some of the participants who only had contact with one type of Arabic did better on morphology than two of the participants who were in contact with four to five types of written Arabic.

![Graph](image)

**Figure 16.** MSA morphology and number of types of written Arabic.

### 6.3.2.2 MSA morphology and contact with different types of written Arabic

This section presents the effect that contact with different types of written Arabic has on the production of MSA morphology. The text types to be discussed are: TV, the Quran, the Bible, the Internet, books and “other” texts.
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*Written Arabic: MSA morphology and TV*

Four participants indicated that they read Arabic on TV. These participants had produced two to five entirely correct MSA structures. On the other hand, six participants who produced three to five correct structures reported that they did not read Arabic on TV. The remaining 12 participants did not read Arabic on TV and produced zero to one correct MSA structure.

Those who read Arabic on TV did not get the lowest scores on MSA morphology, but several participants who did not read Arabic on TV had equally good results.

![Figure 17. MSA morphology and written Arabic on TV.](image)

*Written Arabic: MSA morphology and the Quran*

As related above (see Table 31), 65.4 per cent of the participants reported that they read the Quran in their free time. In addition, the Quran was the only type of written Arabic that eleven participants (50 per cent of the participants whose translation tests are included in the study) said they came into contact with.

According to Figure 18, of the five participants who did not say they read the Quran, one produced one correct MSA structure whereas the remaining four produced no correct MSA structures.
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Regarding the 19 participants who read the Quran, both high and low scores are seen. One interesting observation can be made if Figure 18 is compared to Figure 16 above; six of the participants (P1, P2, P18, P20, P8 and P9) who indicated the Quran as their only source of input of written Arabic scored high on morphology with three to five correct MSA structures. Of these six, only P2 did not receive extra instruction in Arabic.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 18.** MSA morphology and written Arabic in the Quran.

*Written Arabic: MSA morphology and the Bible*

Only two of 22 participants indicated that they read the Bible in Arabic. They both had low scores on MSA morphology with zero to one correct structure. P11 has been mentioned in previous discussion as the only participant who reported receiving extra instruction in Arabic, yet had low results on all measures.
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Figure 19. MSA morphology and written Arabic in the Bible.

Written Arabic; MSA morphology and the Internet
As with reading Arabic on TV, it is unclear what effect reading Arabic on the Internet has on the command of morphology. The results are dispersed.

Figure 20. MSA morphology and written Arabic on the Internet.
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Written Arabic: MSA morphology and books
For this text type as well, the results are dispersed and inconclusive.

**Figure 21.** MSA morphology and written Arabic in books.

Written Arabic: MSA morphology and “other” source
Only two participants marked that they read Arabic elsewhere than the alternatives offered by the questionnaire.

**Figure 22.** MSA morphology and written Arabic: “other” source.
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6.3.3 Discussion: MSA morphology, instruction and contact with written Arabic

The number of years the pupils had participated in HLI could not explain the results for MSA morphology.

Furthermore, participation in extra instruction did not guarantee high scores, but most of the participants, six of eight, who did not receive extra instruction had low scores.

To continue to the role for reading, it was noticed that although reading does not guarantee high scores on MSA morphology, not reading is connected to low scores. The participants with greater contact with different types of written Arabic, with one exception (P22), tended to have medium to high results for producing MSA-specific structures. Even though the development of reading and of writing is closely connected, Azzam’s (1993) results suggested that it is in fact writing in Arabic that allows children to pass on to the semantic/grammatical stage.

Regarding the role for input of written Arabic and production of MSA-specific structures, an important question is whether it is input or language vitality that is indicated when it comes to the number of types of written Arabic that the participants have marked that they are in contact with. It could be the other way around; participants do not get better results for morphology with an increased amount of input. Rather, they have more contact with written Arabic because they already have a sufficient command of Arabic to read. At the same time, by the same reasoning, this does not account for the participants who did get good results for morphology, yet gave reading the Quran as their only source of contact with written Arabic.

Among the participants who marked that they read the Quran, high to low scores were seen, whereas not reading the Quran was connected with low scores.

Producing MSA-specific morphology is more challenging than spelling. It is not only a matter of encoding spoken Arabic, where at least some words converge between MSA and DA. To give one example, P26 performed well on the spelling measure but produced no correct MSA-specific structures.

6.4 Conclusion

The analysis of the translation tests in previous chapters revealed a great amount of variation among the pupils regarding command of the Arabic script, spelling and the production of MSA morphology. This chapter investigated whether this variation could be explained by instructional and/or input factors.
Table 34 below presents the participants grouped by results for morphology. In the analysis above, pupils results for MSA morphology were scored according to their production of four MSA-specific structures, one of which was repeated two times. The pupils scored from zero to five on this measure. For the sake of readability and since the results have been discussed in some detail above, these six MSA levels have been merged into three in the table.

**Table 34. MSA morphology, spelling, instruction, and Quran reading.** Results on MSA morphology by group (MSA), participants with 0-1 correct MSA structure (0-1) (n=12), participants with 2-3 correct MSA structures (2-3) (n=4), participants with 4-5 correct MSA structures (4-5) (n=6), mean number of words in the translations (W), mean percentage of irregularly spelled words per entire translation (I%), mean number of years of HLI (HLI), participation in extra instruction (EI), mean number of text types (NT) and Quran reading (Q).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSA</th>
<th>W (SD)</th>
<th>I% (SD)</th>
<th>HLI (SD)</th>
<th>EI yes/no</th>
<th>NT (SD)</th>
<th>Q yes/no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>59.8 (14.6)</td>
<td>53.6 (21.8)</td>
<td>7.3 (5.4)</td>
<td>6/6 (1.1)</td>
<td>7/5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>70.3 (3.6)</td>
<td>15.8 (8.5)</td>
<td>6.3 (2.8)</td>
<td>4/0 (2.25)</td>
<td>4/0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>70.3 (3.6)</td>
<td>21.1 (8.7)</td>
<td>6.2 (3.4)</td>
<td>4/2 (1.9)</td>
<td>6/0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Groups 2-3 and 4-5 are close to one another on all included measures except for the one here used for grouping: MSA morphology. The question then is what distinguishes Groups 2-3 and 4-5 from the participants in Group 0-1? Included in Group 0-1 were participants who had not produced a complete translation, bringing the mean number of translated words down to 59.8, where a complete translation should have around 70 words. In addition, the mean percentage of incorrectly spelled words was 53.6 compared to 15.8 and 21.1 for Groups 2-3 and 4-5. Standard deviations for Group 0-1 were high, pointing to mixed results in the group.

To measure the mean number of years of HLI is somewhat elusive, since a few years of HLI can equal a good result (recent arrivals)
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or low scores (“beginners”). With this in mind, it can nevertheless be observed that Group 0-1 who had low results for many measures actually had a higher mean number of years of HLI than Groups 2-3 and 4-5, one full year.

A measure with more weight is participation in extra instruction in Arabic. Of 22 participants, eight had not received extra instruction; six of these belonged in Group 0-1.

Concerning the effect of written input on spelling and morphology, it was already established that the participants had limited contact with written Arabic in their free time and that the Quran was the most common text for the participants to be in contact with. As for mean number of types of texts, Group 0-1 has a lower mean (1.1), compared to Group 2-3 (2.5) and Group 4-5 (2).

Finally, the Quran reading. All ten participants in Groups 2-3 and 4-5 read the Quran. In Group 0-1, seven read the Quran and five did not.

There are different possible explanations of the result that even medium good spellers have difficulty in producing correctly spelled MSA structures. In some instances, it was the MSA-specific structures that presented a problem. In others, the spelling of the words was context-dependent and included orthographic features that are learned late even in the Arab world (cf. Azzam, 1993).

To sum up, the following tendencies emerged in the analysis:

The effect of HLI
The results for the translation test cannot easily be explained by the number of years of participation in HLI. Good as well not-so-good results for spelling and MSA morphology were found among pupils who had participated for several years in HLI. In fact, many years of HLI does not guarantee that pupils develop automaticity in the spelling of common, high-frequency words. The reverse was also observed, with good and not-so-good results among pupils who had participated in the instruction for a few years. In addition, two participants who had participated in HLI for seven and eight years claimed that they could not write in Arabic.

Extra instruction and good results for spelling
13 of 14 participants who had received extra instruction spelled more than 50 per cent of the produced words correctly.
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Extra instruction and good results for MSA morphology
Eight of ten of the participants who performed well for morphology had received extra instruction in Arabic in their free time and/or in an Arabic-speaking country before arriving in Sweden.

Extra instruction and not good results
Only one participant (P11) who had received extra instruction in Arabic had low scores on all measures in the translation test.

Contact with written Arabic
The participants had limited contact with written Arabic in their free time, the Quran being the most common source of written input.

The effect of written Arabic on spelling
Some of the participants who had a good result for spelling had limited contact with written Arabic, but all of the six participants with more than 50 per cent incorrectly spelled words had limited contact with written Arabic.

The Quran and spelling
Reading the Quran was in most cases connected with better spelling. Only one participant of the five who did not say they read the Quran had spelled more than 50 per cent of the words correctly. Two participants who indicated that they read the Quran had more than 50 per cent incorrectly spelled words in their translations.

The Quran and MSA morphology
Ten of ten of the participants who performed well on MSA morphology read the Quran, but not all pupils who read the Quran performed well on MSA morphology.

Spelling vs. producing MSA-specific structures
Spelling in general was less demanding than producing correctly spelled MSA-specific structures. Several participants who performed well on spelling encountered problems with MSA morphology. Producing MSA morphology requires explicit knowledge of the structures and orthographic rules for writing.

The major finding of this analysis is that the participants are heterogeneous with regard to their command of writing in Arabic, spelling and producing MSA-specific structures. There are in addition other factors at
work that in many cases affect their performance: extra instruction in 
Arabic and reading the Quran. The extra instruction in Arabic that the 
pupils have received in Sweden as well as Quran reading may of course 
be connected with motivation and encouragement from the family. These 
questions remain to be addressed by future research in the field.
Chapter 7
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The concluding chapter starts with a discussion on the research questions that were formulated in Chapter 3. The results of this study are summed up and combined with what was given as the empirical framework for the study, namely factors relating to the Arabic language (Chapter 1) and factors relating to HLI (Chapter 2).

7.1 The research questions

This thesis set out to present an empirical framework relevant to the study of Arabic within HLI in Sweden (Chapter 1 and Chapter 2). The aim of the thesis (Chapter 3) was to answer the following research questions:

1. To what extent do 8th-graders in Arabic HLI master:
   a. The Arabic script?
   b. Spelling in Arabic?
   c. Basic MSA morphosyntax?

2. Can the pupils’ performances be explained by the following factors:
   a. Years of participation in HLI?
   b. Extra instruction in Arabic outside of HLI?
   c. Contact with written Arabic?

A comment on the analysis

Before proceeding to the discussion, a comment on statistics from 3.3.2 will be repeated. Given the small size of the sample, observed tendencies are in focus in the discussion rather than correlations. That said, the observed tendencies are tentative as they need to be confirmed by future research involving larger groups of participants.

In addition, when discussing the variability seen in the responses, we need to take into account that the participants did not necessarily feel that much was at stake when they performed the translation task. They would not be graded and they were guaranteed anonymity. The variability can probably to some extent be explained by not all the pupils proof-reading their translations. On the other hand, the translation test was designed with the explicit intention of trying to avoid monitoring as far as possible and encouraging pupils to write with some speed. With one exception the sentences were not syntactically demanding and the vocabulary was assumed to be basic, considering that the test was based on a text from a schoolbook intended for Lebanese pupils in the 2nd
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Grade. Thus, even a pupil who does not proofread his or her translation, would not be expected to spell familiar words in many different ways if they were skilled writers.

7.1.1 Research question 1
The main answer to the first research question is that the participants were highly heterogenous with regard to all items included in the analysis: writing, spelling, and producing MSA-specific structures.

a. The Arabic script
Some participants could barely write legibly in Arabic and could not produce the basic letter shapes and ligatures, whereas others had well-developed handwriting. In addition, let us not forget that two pupils claimed they did not know how to write in Arabic.

Azzam (1993, see 1.2.5) investigated reading and spelling errors among pupils in Grades 2-6. She applied a hierarchy to the spelling errors, but also included script-related errors such as letter shape and ligatures. Due to the hierarchy strategy, only one error per word was listed and it is difficult to get a full picture of the errors. If we compare Azzam’s findings on handwriting to those in the present study, the following observation can be made: The command the HLPs have of the Arabic script range from lower (that is, the two pupils who said that they could not write in Arabic) than the 2nd-graders in Azzam’s study to at least that of the 6th-graders. Even though it is difficult to say how well an HLP should be able to write in Arabic by the 8th Grade, the heterogeneity is evidently great.

b. Spelling in Arabic
Spelling errors were divided into three categories: orthographic errors, vowel length errors and consonant errors.

Orthographic errors are violations of context-sensitive rules for spelling and incorrect rendering of words that have a fixed spelling that requires specific knowledge of the word. Orthographic spelling errors were the most common type, and this finding agrees with the developmental stages proposed by Azzam (1993). Orthographic features and context-sensitive rules for spelling are acquired at a late stage. In Abu Rabia & Taha’s (2006) study, phonological spelling errors dominated, rather than the irregular rules for spelling category that could be compared with the orthographic errors in this study. However, the results of this study do not necessarily contradict their findings, since their testing material was a dictation, whereas the present study required the partici-
pants to produce full sentences: to employ context-sensitive rules, not to decode a spoken word and write it down.

The second error category was the rendering of vowel length. The most common error was spelling out short vowels by graphemes used for indicating long vowels. On the other hand, even when the incorrect vowel length was indicated, the choice of vowel (u, a or i) was usually correct. This kind of incorrect spelling is interesting since it has not been described in detail in previous research on spelling in Arabic, and it is uncertain how/if spelling out short vowels as long vowels is a frequent error type. It is possible that this kind of incorrect spelling is common among pupils in schools in Arab countries too, but it is either a stage that the pupils pass through rather quickly or researchers have not focused on the particulars of the error type. Regrettably, although previous research mentions this error type, where it is found in a word is not specified. This aspect is highly relevant since an incorrect long vowel in a final syllable could indicate confusion regarding word-final morphemes and graphemes, whereas long vowels inside a word would suggest a decoding error. It is as of now unclear whether this misspelling is a developmental stage, or a spelling strategy that could indicate interference from the Latin script, or/and is related to pedagogy, that is, if/how to what degree HLIs work to make their pupils aware of vowel length. It can furthermore be emphasised that this error type is not an example of DA interference.

The last error type, the least frequent one, concerned the spelling of consonants. Possible sources of errors, according to previous research, were above all visual letter confusion, incorrect choice of consonant due to phonological proximity and DA interference. Although these sources may in some cases overlap, most consonant errors found in the translations were most plausibly explained by DA interference. However, few words targeted in the translation test were of the kind that included phonemes that have different realisations in DA and MSA. Thus the results of the present study do not contradict the results from previous research, where a high degree of phonological misspellings was found in the data (cf. Abu-Rabia & Taha, 2004, 2006; Fragman, 2013).

An important general finding, in line with previous research on both reading and spelling in Arabic (1.2.3 and 1.2.5), was that several participants had a phonological approach to spelling. That many HLs were still at this developmental stage was hardly surprising, given that the participants attend school in Sweden and receive a limited amount of Arabic instruction per week. What was surprising was that this phonological approach was also seen in the spelling of high-frequency, graphically
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stable words such as prepositions and personal pronouns. There were even instances of one participant giving different spellings for the same word. In this study, the question why the spelling of common words had not been automatised cannot be answered. The finding nevertheless suggests that the practice these participants get to write in Arabic and/or the visual input they have of written MSA is insufficient to allow them to move on to the next developmental stage of writing.

There are no previous studies from the Swedish context that test the Arabic spelling of HLPs that could serve as a comparison. In studies from the Netherlands (see 2.2.2), however, Arabic HLPs had low scores for both spelling and syntax. Thus the low scores for spelling seen in some of the participants in the present study are not unique to Arabic HLI in Sweden.

c. Basic MSA morphosyntax

Producing MSA morphosyntax requires explicit knowledge of (MSA) structures and orthographic rules for writing (Azzam, 1993). Several participants who performed fairly well on spelling encountered problems with MSA morphology (Chapters 5 and 6.3).

For the MSA-specific verb forms targeted, some participants produced structures that were clearly DA, while others produced structures that approximated MSA but indicated that they were not entirely sure of the target form. Finally, there were participants who had a good command of MSA morphosyntax.

7.1.2 Research question 2

The second research question was addressed by combining the results for the translation test with the responses to the questionnaire concerning participation in HLI, extra instruction in Arabic outside of HLI and contact with written Arabic. Below, the findings discussed in detail in Chapter 6 are briefly repeated.

a. Years of participation in HLI

It seemed reasonable to think that better results in the translation test would be connected with more years of participation in HLI. However, the data showed at first glance no connection between participation in HLI and the results on the translation test. On closer inspection, the picture that emerged, however, was complex. The number of years of HLI did not necessarily mean the number of years the participants had received Arabic instruction, since the groups were mixed. Beginners as well as recent arrivals would be counted as participants who had partici-
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participated in HLI for a limited amount of time. The questionnaire furthermore showed that, with a couple of exceptions, the participants with high scores had received extra instruction in Arabic, either in their country of origin or in some other context. The data did not indicate that participation in HLI without additional instruction was connected with high scores on the translation test.

The questionnaire did not ask for specific details about types of extra instruction in Arabic. It is plausible to think that some of the participants, the recent arrivals, had studied Arabic prior to arriving in Sweden, whereas other pupils received extra instruction in Arabic in Sweden. As for the extra instruction available in Sweden, we know that there are some after-school initiatives that include Arabic instruction and a religious (Islamic) content (see 2.2.3). We do not know, however, if this is the kind of extra instruction the participants received.

The results agree to some extent with those of the Dutch studies (see 2.2.2). Late arrivals had higher scores on Arabic tests, but the results concerning the effect of additional instruction (mosque schooling) in Arabic on the pupils’ language command were inconclusive.

c. Contact with written Arabic

It may be assumed that contact with more types of written Arabic outside of HLI leads to a better command of written Arabic. However, as was shown in Chapter 6, even some of the participants with high scores on the translation test had limited contact with written Arabic. On the other hand, all the participants who had low scores on the translation test indicated that they had limited contact with written Arabic.

The analysis of the type of written Arabic the participants came into contact with showed that reading the Quran appeared to have an effect on spelling and command of MSA morphology: All participants who performed well on all measures of the translation test reported reading the Quran. In some cases, the Quran was given as the only type of text in Arabic these participants were in contact with, their only source of written input. Yet the results were inconclusive, since not all participants who read the Quran performed well in the translation test. Among the participants who did not indicate that they read the Quran, none had a good command of MSA morphology and only one performed fairly well on spelling.

Explanations of why the Quran in some cases has an effect on the written performance remain tentative. The questionnaire did not ask the participants to indicate how much time they spent reading, only the number of text types they came into contact with. It is possible that the
high scores among the participants who read the Quran are connected with an increased amount of MSA (similar) input. It is also possible that reading the Quran is to some degree connected with what was addressed above: the question of participation in HLI and extra instruction in Arabic. Quite likely, the results we are seeing cannot be explained solely by type of input and amount of instruction available to the pupils. Motivation and support from the family to study Arabic can be assumed to have an impact. While awaiting future research, this reasoning remains tentative.

7.2 Implications of the results
A multitude of internal and external factors are naturally at work for any pupil or student studying any subject at any age. But in elementary school, as a rule, pupils start taking the same subject at the same time and follow the same syllabus over time. Of course, some children are more motivated and/or more academically gifted and/or more supported by their parents and can thus be expected to perform better than their classmates. Prior knowledge of the subject, prior instruction in the subject and extra instruction in the subject outside of school should result in high grades. But the syllabus would be adapted to the progress of the regular pupils, not the pupils with prior knowledge.

Heterogeneity in both age and language command within HLI classes has been reported in other studies on HLI in Sweden. The present study, however, has illustrated and provided details of how great this heterogeneity can be: The pupils have different dialectal backgrounds, they have arrived in Sweden at different ages or have been born in Sweden, some have received instruction in Arabic outside of HLI, they have started participating in HLI in different years, and, above all, they are studying a language variety that functions as an L2.

I argued (see 2.1.5) that the steering documents governing Swedish schools are vague in their wording concerning languages with co-existing language varieties, and/or written in a script other than the Latin, and that one common syllabus for all languages taught within HLI could lead to arbitrary instruction and assessment. In the case of Arabic HLI with recent arrivals joining the classes, the question is even more complicated, since the heterogeneous classes most likely make the pedagogical situation for the HLTs rather challenging. We should also remember that many teachers in HLI lack qualification and have limited opportunities to get qualified due to a shortage of courses at universities and colleges, among other factors.
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One question emerges: Do we even know how well a pupil in the 8th Grade should be able to write in Arabic?

As was briefly commented on in 2.1.5 Steering documents, the National Agency for Education has produced a language-specific (Arabic, Somali, Finish) tool for analysing the written production of pupils in Grades 6 and 9 and relating it to the grading criteria. It is emphasised that written production is only one aspect of HLI. Nevertheless, if the written production of the participants with low scores in this study is compared with the guidelines for analysis provided in the language-specific tool, these pupils would not even get an E in the 6th Grade. Yet they are participating in HLI in the 8th Grade. This does not add up.

7.3 Summary
This study was a first attempt to gain insight into the learning outcomes of Arabic HLI in Sweden. Pupils in the 8th Grade were asked to translate a Swedish text into Arabic and to fill in a questionnaire on various background factors and language contact. Their written Arabic was analysed for handwriting, spelling and production of basic MSA morphosyntax. The translations showed the participants’ command of written MSA to be extremely heterogeneous. The results of the translation test were then connected to the variables of Arabic instruction (HLI and instruction outside of HLI) and the contact the participants had with written Arabic in their free time. Many, but not all, of the participants with good results for the translation test had received additional instruction in Arabic, either in Sweden or prior to coming to Sweden. Reading Arabic in their free time was not in all cases connected to good results, but not reading Arabic in the free time was in most cases connected to a poor command of written Arabic. Regarding these results, it was suggested that additional factors (motivation, support from the family, etc.) could be at work.
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Inledning
I avhandlingen undersöks i vilken utsträckning modersmålslever behärskar skriven modern standardarabiska (hädanefter MSA) och om nivån kan kopplas det till antal år som eleven har deltagit i modersmål- sundervisning, annan undervisning i arabiska eller kontakt med skriven arabiska.

Bakgrund

Diglossi och det arabiska språket

Enligt psykolingvistisk forskning uppvisar arabisktalande skolbarn likheter med tvåspråkiga barn snarare än med enspråkiga barn när man jämför dem utifrån olika lingvistiska mått. Forskarnas slutsats är att MSA fungerar som ett andraspråk för arabisktalande barn.

Skriftforskning och arabiska
När barn lär sig att läsa och skriva med alfabetisk skrift går de igenom tre stador. Först kommer en fas när de närmar sig det skrivna språket: de uppfattar bokstäver, ord eller delar av ord som bilder. Därefter börjar barn koppla samman bokstäver och ljud och stavar sig fram: de bryter ner ord i mindre bitar för att läsa och skriva dem. Det sista stadiet uppnås när läsandet och skrivandet har automatiserats och ord läses och skrivs som enheter. För MSA föreslår en forskare ett fjärde stadium, det grammatisk-sembantiska, eftersom kunskaper i grammatik krävs för att kunna stava korrekt på MSA.

Barn som lär sig att läsa och skriva på arabiska utvecklas långsammare än vad som har setts i forskning om språk som skrivs med det latinska alfabetet. Forskning från arabvärlden om stavning på arabiska
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hos grundskoleelever visar att skrivandet inte automatiserats ens i högre årskurser, utan är kvar i det andra stadiet. Som förklaring till den långsammare utvecklingen anges två samverkande faktorer: (1) den arabiska skriften, som är svår att processa, och (2) diglossin, alltså förhållandet att barn ska läsa och skriva på en språklig variant som de inte talar.

**Arabiska i modersmålsundervisningen**

MSA, inte arabiskt talspråk, är den variant av arabiska som lärs ut i modersmålsundervisningen. MSA är skriftspråksvarianten, så just för skriven arabiska saknas alternativ. Hur modersmålslärare hanterar talad arabiska (talad MSA och talspråk) i undervisningen vet vi inte, men vi kan anta att det varierar beroende på olika lärarens inställning.

**Annan undervisning i arabiska**

I Sverige förekommer det att barn får annan undervisning i arabiska vid sidan om modersmålsundervisningen. Vi vet relativt lite om vilka undervisningsformer som finns och vilket innehåll de har. En studie från Malmö har undersökt föräldrainitierad undervisning där barnen undervisas i arabiska och religion, men även kunde få hjälp med läxor. Den svenska termen för sådan undervisning är ”komplementära skolor”.

**Studien**

**Deltagare**

26 elever i årskurs 8 deltog i studien. 14 av eleverna var födda i Sverige och övriga 12 hade kommit till Sverige mellan 1 och 14 års ålder. Drygt 50 procent av deras föräldrar kom från Irak och övriga föräldrar kom från Syrien, Eritrea, Libanon, Tunisien, Algeriet, Saudiarabien, Iran, Yemen och Jordanien.

**Metod och material**

22 av de 26 eleverna skrev för hand en översättning av en kort text från svenska till arabiska. Testdeltagarna fick även fylla i en enkät om bland annat bakgrund, språkvanor och språkstudier. Frågeställningen var:

1. I vilken utsträckning kan modersmålslever i årskurs 8
   a. skriva på arabiska?
   b. stava på arabiska?

85 Fyra elever deltog endast i enkätstudi: två relativt nyanlända elever och två elever som efter 6 respektive 8 år i modersmålsundervisningen sade att de inte kunde skriva arabiska.
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c. producera MSA-morfosyntax?

2. Kan resultaten kopplas till
a. antal år i modersmålsundervisningen?
b. annan undervisning i arabiska?
c. kontakt med skriven arabiska?

Resultat 1a: skriva

Resultat 1b: stava
Deltagarna hade skrivit olika långa översättningar, från 26-76 ord. Den svenska texten var 80 ord lång och en fullständig översättning borde, beroende på skillnader mellan arabiska och svenska och elevernas ordval, vara omkring 70 ord lång. En analys gjordes efter antal ord i översättningarna som innehöll minst ett stavfel. Även här var skillnaden stor. En elev hade en procent felstavade ord, en annan 87 procent.

Stavfelen delades in i ortografiska fel, vokalfel och konsonantfel. En sammanslagning av stavfelen gav 57 procent ortografiska fel, 29 procent vokalfel och 14 procent konsonantfel. Två deltagare stod dock för 65 procent av samtliga konsonantfel.

Många deltagare använde sig vidare av en fonologisk stavningsstrategi (det andra stadiet i skriftutvecklingen) och stavade fel på korta, vanliga, grafiskt stabila ord, såsom personliga pronomener och prepositioner. Det förekom även att en och samma elev stavade ord som upprepades i texten på olika sätt.

I avhandlingen analyserades olika typer av stavfel i detalj med exempel på arabiska. Ett intressant resultat är att många deltagare stavade korta vokaler med långa vokaler. Arabiska har tre vokaltyper, u, a och i, och vokalerna kan antingen vara långa eller korta. Korta vokaler skrivs inte ut en del av ordet utan med små tecken över och under bokstäverna och markeras vanligtvis inte i text avsedd för vuxna läsare. När deltagarna har skrivit en lång vokal istället för en kort har de använt rätt vokaltrad, men fel vokallängd. I tidigare forskning omtalas den här typen av stavfel, men utan detaljer om var i ett ord en lång vokal har använts för att skriva en kort. Positionen är emellertid relevant eftersom
ett dylikt fel i slutet av ett ord kan peka på osäkerhet om hur ändelser stavas. Om felet förekommer inuti ett ord krävs däremot en annan förklaring. Förmodligen rör det sig om en stavningsstrategi. Om denna stavningsstrategi även förekommer i arabvärlden och är ett steg i skriftutvecklingen har den inte uppmärksammat i tidigare forskning. Om stavningsstrategin däremot inte förekommer i arabvärlden är en möjlig förklaring att deltagarna har påverkats av hur de lärde sig att skriva på svenska, där samtliga vokaler sätts ut.

Resultat c: MSA-morfosyntax
MSA och de olika talspråken skiljer sig åt på en morfosyntaktisk nivå och att producera MSA-morfosyntax är svårare för deltagarna än att stava. Återigen var det stor skillnad mellan eleverna. Ett resultat vart att notera var det för pågående aspekt i förfluten tid. På svenska kan ”jag visste inte” tolkas som att jag vid en viss tidpunkt inte visste något eller att jag under en längre period inte visste något; jämför ”Igår visste jag inte…” (= punktuell aspekt) med ”Under min barndom visste jag inte…” (= pågående aspekt). På arabiska, på talspråk såväl som på MSA, uttrycks aspekt. I den aktuella meningen i översättningsuppgiften hade nästan alla deltagare försökt skriva pågående aspekt i förfluten tid, men behärskade inte MSA-morfologi i tillräcklig utsträckning för att det skulle bli korrekt. Få hade däremot tolkat aspekten som punktuell, något en direktöversättning från svenska hade resulterat i.

Resultat 2a och 2b modersmålsundervisning och annan undervisning i arabiska

12 av de 22 deltagarna hade fått någon typ av annan undervisning i arabiska, antingen i Sverige eller innan de kom till Sverige. Av deltagarna som har fått annan undervisning i arabiska var det endast en elev som fick ett lågt resultat på skrift, staving och behärskning av MSA-morfosyntax. Bland eleverna som inte deltagit i annan undervisning varierade resultaten.

Resultat 2c: kontakt med skriven arabiska
Deltagarna tillfrågades i enkäten om var de mötte skriven arabiska på fritiden: på tv, i Koranen, i Bibeln, på internet, i böcker eller någon annanstans. De flesta av deltagarna hade begränsad kontakt med skriven arabiska på fritiden och den skrivna arabiska som flest hade kontakt med
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vari Koranen. Även vad gäller kontakt med skriven arabiska på fritiden var resultaten varierande. Exempelvis läste samtliga elever som fått bra resultat på måttet MSA-morfosyntax Koranen på fritiden, men alla deltagare som läste Koranen på fritiden fick inte bra resultat.

Slutsats
Att elevgrupper i modersmålsundervisningen är heterogena (bakgrund, ankomststalder/född i Sverige, språkbehärskning) har redan påtalats i tidigare forskning. Den här studien visar emellertid i detalj hur stor heterogeniteten faktiskt är i fråga om behärskning av skriftspråket/standardspråket. Vidare ser faktorer utanför modersmålsundervisningen (annan undervisning, Koran-läsning) ut att påverka behärskningsnivån. Dessa faktorer hänger förmodligen samman med andra som inte togs upp i studien, såsom motivation och stöd hemifrån.

Jag hävdar i avhandlingen att kursplanen i modersmål inte i tillräcklig utsträckning tar hänsyn till språk med diglossi och språk som inte skrivs med den latinska skriften och att detta kan leda till godtycklig bedömning. Frågan kompliceras ytterligare av att undervisning arrangeras på olika sätt i olika kommuner och att många modersmål-slärare saknar pedagogisk examen.
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Questionnaire in Swedish
The questionnaire is first provided in Swedish and thereafter in an English translation. The questionnaire distributed to the participants was in the font Calibri and the size of the text was 16 points.

Enkät

1. Är du tjej eller kille?
   a Tjej
   b Kille
2. Hur gammal är du?
   ……………….år
3. Var är du född?
   a I Sverige
   b I ………………………………………………………………………
4. Hur gammal var du när du kom till Sverige?
   (Om du är född utomlands.)
   ……….år
5. Vem av dina föräldrar är arabisktalande?
   a Mamma
   b Pappa
   c Både mamma och pappa
6. Varifrån kommer dina föräldrar? (Skriv land.)
   Mamma:
   ………………………………………………………………………
   Pappa:
   ………………………………………………………………………
7. På vilken nivå har din mamma studerat?
   a Grundskola
   b Gymnasium
   c Högskola/Universitet
   d Yrkesutbildning
   e Vet inte
Appendix

8. På vilken nivå har din pappa studerat?
   a Grundskola
   b Gymnasium
   c Högskola/Universitet
   d Yrkesutbildning
   e Vet inte

9. Vilka talar du arabiska med? (Kryssa för alla alternativ som passar.)
   a Mamma
   b Pappa
   c Syskon
   d Äldre släktingar
   e Yngre släktingar
   f Jämngamla släktingar
   g Kompisar
   h Modersmålsläran
   i Andra

10. Hur många i din omgivning pratar du arabiska med på ett ungefär?
    a 1-5
    b 6-15
    c Fler än 15

11. Pratar du arabiska varje dag?
    a Ja, mycket
    b Ja, lite grand
    c Nej

12. Hur bra är du på att prata arabisk dialekt (ammiyya)?
    a Mycket bra
    b Ganska bra
    c Mindre bra

13. Har du gått på dagis i Sverige?
    a Ja
    b Nej

14. Har du gått på sexårsvärsverksamhet ("nollan") i Sverige?
    a Ja
    b Nej

15. Vilka år har du haft modersmålsundervisningen i arabiska?
    (Ringa in åren du deltog i undervisningen och även den årskurs du går i nu.)
    dagis
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sexårs/nollan
åk1
åk2
åk3
åk4
åk5
åk6
åk7
åk8

16. **Ser du på arabisk tv hemma?**
   a Ofta
   b Ibland
   c Sällan
   d Aldrig

17. **Vilken sorts program ser ni på i sådant fall?**
   a Nyheter
   b Serier
   c Underhållnings-/tävlingsprogram
   d Filmer
   e Vi ser inte på arabisk tv

18. **Kan du förstå ett nyhetsprogram på t.ex. Al-Jazeera?**
   a Jag förstår mycket bra
   b Jag förstår ganska bra
   c Jag förstår mindre bra

19. **Var läser du skriven arabiska (fusha) på fritiden?**
   a På tv (t.ex. undertexter)
   b I Koranen
   c I Bibeln
   d På nätet
   e I böcker
   f Annat
   g Jag läser inte arabiska på fritiden

20. **I vilka sammanhang hör du talad standardarabiska (fusha) på fritiden?**
   a På tv
   b I moskén
   c I kyrkan
   d På nätet
   e Under samtal med andra arabisktalande
   f Annat sammanhang
   g Jag hör aldrig talad standardarabiska på fritiden
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21. Varför deltar du i modersmålsundervisningen i arabiska? (Markera alla alternativ som stämmer.)
a) Jag vill lära mig att skriva bättre arabiska
b) Jag vill lära mig att läsa bättre på arabiska
c) Jag vill lära mig att tala arabiska bättre
d) Jag vill lära mig om mitt kulturella arv
e) Jag vill kunna kommunicera med arabisktalande släktingar
f) Min mamma vill att jag ska delta i undervisningen
g) Min pappa vill att jag ska delta i undervisningen
h) Annat

22. Är du nöjd med modersmålsundervisningen i arabiska?
a) Ja
b) Delvis
c) Nej

23. Hur många elever går i din modersmålsklasse i nu?
Ange en ungefärlig siffra om det varierar.

24. Finns det elever från olika årskurser i modersmålsklussen?
a) Ja
b) Nej

25. Tycker du att ni elever i modersmålsklassen är ungefär lika bra?
a) Ja
b) Nej

26. Hur mycket använder du standardarabiska (fusha) under lektionerna i modersmål?
a) Ofta
b) Ibland
c) Sällan
d) Aldrig

27. Hur mycket använder du dialekt (ammiiyya) under lektionerna i modersmål?
a) Ofta
b) Ibland
c) Sällan
d) Aldrig

28. Hur mycket använder du svenska under lektionerna i modersmål?
a) Ofta
b) Ibland
c) Sällan
d) Aldrig

29. Hur mycket använder läraren standardarabiska (fusha) under lektionerna i modersmål?
a) Ofta
b) Ibland
c) Sällan
d) Aldrig

30. Hur mycket använder läraren dialekt (ammiiyya) under lektionerna i modersmål?
a) Ofta
b) Ibland
c) Sällan
d) Aldrig
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31. Hur mycket använder läraren svenska under lektionerna i modersmålet?
   a Ofta   b Ibland   c Sällan   d Aldrig

32. Vad tycker du att modersmålsundervisningen i arabiska ska lära ut för sorts arabiska?
   a Standardarabiska
   b Arabisk dialekt
   c Båda

33. Hur bra är du på att tala standardarabiska *(fusha)*?
   a Mycket bra
   b Ganska bra
   c Mindre bra

34. Hur bra är du på att skriva standardarabiska *(fusha)*?
   a Mycket bra
   b Ganska bra
   c Mindre bra

35. Hur bra är du på att läsa standardarabiska *(fusha)*?
   a Mycket bra
   b Ganska bra
   c Mindre bra

36. Har du fått någon annan undervisning i arabiska än modersmålsundervisningen?
   a Ja
   b Nej
   Om du har svarat “Ja”; var då någonstans eller av vem?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

37. Hur ofta åker du till arabisktalande länder?
   a Varje år
   b Vartannat år
   c Sällan
   d Aldrig

38. Är du intresserad av att lära dig språk i allmänhet?
   a Ja
   b Nej

39. Tycker du att du har lätt för att lära dig språk?
   a Ja
   b Delvis
   c Nej
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40. **Vilka andra språk läser du nu i skolan?** (Svara ja eller nej.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Språk</th>
<th>JA</th>
<th>NEJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a Svenska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Svenska som andraspråk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Engelska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Tyska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Franska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f Annat språk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41. **Pratar du något annat språk som du inte läser i skolan?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Svara</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a Ja</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Nej</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
   Om du har svarat “ja”; vilket eller vilka språk då?
   ………………………………………………………………………
   ………………………………………………………………………

42. **Om du skaffar barn i framtiden, tänker du då prata arabiska med dem?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Svara</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a Ja</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Nej</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Vet inte</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TACK FÖR DIN MEDVERKAN!**
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English translation of the questionnaire

1. Are you a girl or a boy?
   a A girl
   b A boy
2. How old are you?
   .................. years old
3. Where were you born?
   a In Sweden
   b In
   ........................................................................................................
4. How old were you when you came to Sweden?
   (In case you were born abroad.)
   ............. years old
5. Which of your parents is Arabic-speaking?
   a Mom
   b Dad
   c Both mom and dad
6. Where do your parents come from? (Write country.)
   Mom:
   ........................................................................................................
   Dad:
   ........................................................................................................
7. At what level has your mom studied?
   a Elementary school
   b Upper secondary school
   c College/University
   d Vocational education
   e Don’t know
8. At what level has your dad studied?
   a Elementary school
   b Upper secondary school
   c College/University
   d Vocational education
   e Don’t know
9. With whom do you speak Arabic?
   a. Mom
   b. Dad
   c. Siblings
   d. Older relatives
   e. Younger relatives
   f. Same age relatives
   g. Friends
   h. The home language teacher
   i. Others

10. Approximately how many people in your surroundings do you speak Arabic with?
    a. 1-5
    b. 6-15
    c. Fler än 15

11. Do you speak Arabic every day?
    a. Yes, a lot
    b. Yes, some
    c. No

12. How good are you at speaking Arabic dialect (ammiyya)?
    a. Very good
    b. Fairly good
    c. Not so good

13. Have you gone to preschool in Sweden?
    a. Yes
    b. No

14. Have you gone to preschool class (“Grade zero”) i Sverige?
    a. Yes
    b. No

15. During which Grades have you received home language instruction?
    (Encircle the Grades in which you participated in the instruction, including the Grade you are now in.)
    preschool
    preschool class/Grade zero
    1st Grade
    2nd Grade
    3rd Grade
    4th Grade
    5th Grade
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6th Grade
7th Grade
8th Grade

16. Do you watch Arabic TV at home?
   a Often
   b Sometimes
   c Rarely
   d Never

17. What kind of TV programmes do you watch in that case?
   a The news
   b TV series
   c Entertainment-/game shows
   d Movies
   e We don’t watch Arabic TV

18. Can you understand news broadcasts in Arabic, for example on Al-Jazeera?
   a I understand very well
   b I understand fairly well
   c I understand not so well

19. Where do you read written Arabic (fusha) in your free time?
   a On TV (for example subtitles)
   b In the Quran
   c In the Bible
   d On the Internet
   e In books
   f Other
   g I don’t read Arabic in my free time

20. In what situations do you hear spoken standard Arabic (fusha) in your free time?
   a On TV
   b In the mosque
   c In church
   d On the Internet
   e During conversations with other speakers of Arabic
   f Other situation
   g I never hear spoken standard Arabic in my free time
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21. Why are you participating in the Arabic home language instruction? (Indicate all correct alternatives.)
   a I want to learn to write better Arabic
   b I want to learn to read better in Arabic
   c I want to learn to speak Arabic better
   d I want to learn about my cultural heritage
   e I want to be able to communicate with Arabic-speaking relatives
   f My mom wants me to participate in the instruction
   g My dad wants me to participate in the instruction
   h Other

22. Are you content with the Arabic home language instruction?
   a Yes
   b Partly
   c No

23. How many pupils go to the same home language class as you?
   Give an estimate if it varies.

24. Are there pupils from different Grades in the home language class?
   a Yes
   b No

25. Do you think that the pupils in the home language class are on a similar level?
   a Yes
   b No

26. How much do you use standard Arabic (fusha) during the home language lessons?
   a Often
   b Sometimes
   c Rarely
   d Never

27. How much do you use dialect (ammiyya) during the home language lessons?
   a Often
   b Sometimes
   c Rarely
   d Never

28. How much do you use Swedish during the home language lessons?
   a Often
   b Sometimes
   c Rarely
   d Never

29. How much does the teacher use standard Arabic (fusha) during the home language lessons?
   a Often
   b Sometimes
   c Rarely
   d Never
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30. How much does the teacher use dialect *(ammijya)* during the home language lessons?

31. How much does the teacher use Swedish during the home language lessons?

32. What kind of Arabic do you think should be taught in the home language?
   a. Standard Arabic
   b. Arabic dialect
   c. Both

33. How good are you at speaking standard Arabic *(fusha)*?
   a. Very good
   b. Fairly good
   c. Not so good

34. How good are you at writing standard Arabic *(fusha)*?
   a. Very good
   b. Fairly good
   c. Not so good

35. How good are you at reading standard Arabic *(fusha)*?
   a. Very good
   b. Fairly good
   c. Not so good

36. Have you received any other kind of instruction in Arabic apart from the home language instruction?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   In case you responded “Yes”; where or by whom?
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

37. How often do you go to Arabic-speaking countries?
   a. Every year
   b. Every second year
   c. Rarely
   d. Never

38. Do you have a general interest in learning languages?
   a. Ja
   b. Nej
Appendix

39. Do you think it is easy for you to learn languages?
   a Yes
   b Partly
   c No

40. What other languages are you currently studying at school? (Respond yes or no.)
   a Swedish YES NO
   b Swedish as a second language YES NO
   c English YES NO
   d German YES NO
   e French YES NO
   f Other language YES NO

41. Do you speak some other language that you don’t study at school?
   a Yes
   b No

   In case you responded “yes”; what other language or languages?
   ………………………………………………………………………
   ………………………………………………………………………

42. If you have children in the future, do you then intend to speak Arabic with them?
   a Yes
   b No
   c Don’t know

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!