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Abstract

Research has shown that explicit instruction with a focus on forms is needed in learning a very different language. This applies to learners with Dutch as L1 and Finnish as L2; Dutch, belonging to the Indo-European languages, and Finnish, belonging to the Finno-Ugric languages, have many differences in vocabulary and structure.

Dutch students are exposed to Finnish grammars that have been based on Latin categories because these grammars were intended for people with an Indo-European language background, which is related to the Latin tradition. For the direct object and the accusative case this appears to cause a problem. Because of the Latin tradition in Finnish grammar, the terms are mistakenly seen as inter exchangeable. In Finnish grammar, the direct object may have 4 cases though, and the accusative is one of them. The use of the Indo-European case system to explain cases in the Finno-Ugric languages has been questioned for decades and even though a large number of grammars and Finnish language learning methods still use this interpretation, times are changing.

This study investigates the effect of teaching the Finnish direct object cases in the traditional way - treating the direct object as the accusative case - and in the non-traditional way - treating the direct object as nominative, genitive, partitive and accusative case - on comprehension and application. The comprehension part of the study involves data from questionnaires of 12 subjects. The application part involves data from writing assignments of 14 subjects. In both parts, the subjects are divided into 2 groups: the experimental group who received explicit instruction in the non-traditional way and the control group who received explicit instruction in the traditional way.

It was found that traditional instruction does not lead to correct comprehension of the use of the Finnish direct object cases and that immersion in the Finnish language has a negative effect, but the non-traditional way seems to improve. In addition, it was found that the non-traditional way leads to significantly better comprehension of the matter. Furthermore, it was found that both ways lead to improved application of the Finnish direct object cases and that the non-traditional way leads to slightly better application, even though the application level did not increase significantly within the time span of the research. The general conclusion is that learning the Finnish direct object case system in a non-traditional way has a positive effect on both comprehension and application.
1 Introduction

Though already in the nineteenth century the difference between the Finno-Ugric case system and the Indo-European case system was noticed by Wiedemann (1884), only more than hundred years later MacWhinney (1997) showed the extreme extent to which the grammars of Indo-European languages and Finno-Ugrian languages differ. Furthermore, more recently DeKeyser (2005) concluded that lack of linguistic transparency plays an important role in the process of learning difficult grammatical rules. Spoelman and Verspoor (2010) showed that it is the case for a Dutch learner of Finnish as well. They found that for such a learner it is very difficult to acquire complex and opaque rules. Norris and Ortega (2000) concluded that in a situation of learning these kinds of grammatical rules, explicit instruction with the focus on forms (Long 1991) is effective.

Moreover, in the treatment of the Finnish accusative case a poignant example of misapprehension was found: in the traditional Finnish grammar the accusative case has always been seen as being of the same order as the direct object (Kiparsky 2005). Furthermore, Kiparsky (2001) saw that large numbers of grammars and Finnish language learning methods are still using the interpretation of the traditional grammar. The misapprehension could arise because of the fact that from the beginning of the Finnish textbooks the grammars were based on Latin categories (Martin 1995). Volodin (1997) saw that this misapprehension remains because linguists still look at the Finnish language and its grammar through ´Indo-European spectacles´.

This thesis describes a study on learning the Finnish direct object case system in a non-traditional (read: not following the Latin tradition) way and the effect on comprehension and application. In order to be able to compare groups who learn the Finnish direct object system in different ways, a quantitative cross-sectional research design was chosen. The motivation for this study is to improve ways for acquiring cases for the
Finnish direct object. The first purpose of the thesis is to investigate whether learning the use of the Finnish direct object cases in the traditional way (read: following the Latin tradition) is the reason for not comprehending and applying the use of the Finnish direct object cases well by the Indo-European (in this case: Dutch) learner. I also hope to find whether the learner who learns in the non-traditional way, comprehends the use of the Finnish direct object cases well and applies it correctly. Finally, I hope to find the effect of immersion in the Finnish language on comprehending and applying the cases correctly.

The structure of the thesis is as follows: chapter 2 gives an overview of the role of explicit instruction in learning a second language. Chapter 3 describes the way of learning Finnish as a very different language. It also describes the traditional way of teaching the Finnish direct object case system. Moreover, the way of choosing the right case for the direct object in the Finnish language is sketched and an overview of the treatment of the accusative case and the direct object in Finnish in the grammar methods throughout the past decades is given. Finally, the reason for this study, the research questions and the expected outcomes are described. Chapter 4 presents the method of the quantitative study that was conducted. The subjects are introduced and the way the data have been collected, is explained. Also the statistical methods and analyses which have been used, are explained. Chapter 5 contains the results of this study. Analyses on comprehension, as well as on application, are outlined. Chapter 6 draws conclusions of this quantitative study. Finally, chapter 7 provides a general conclusion and suggestions for further research. Literature on learning a very different language is linked to the findings of the study.
2 Background literature

This chapter takes off with an explanation of the terms implicit and explicit instruction followed by a short overview of the role of explicit instruction in learning a second language. Then the role of explicit instruction in the process of learning a very different language will be discussed before the way of choosing the right case for the direct object will be sketched. Thereafter an overview of the treatment of the accusative case and the direct object in Finnish in the grammar methods throughout the past decades will be outlined, in order to finally come to the reason for and the hypotheses of this thesis.

2.1 The role of instruction

A considerable amount of research has taken place into the role of instruction within the field of learning a second language (from now on: L2) during the last couple of decades. In this research the main focus was on the role of implicit language learning on the one hand and explicit language learning on the other hand. Furthermore, the focus was on the question how learning an L2 takes place: are unconscious processes the reason that we learn something or does the process of learning an L2 take place because of conscious manipulation of information (Bialystok 1990, Ellis 1989, Ellis 1994, Krashen 1981). Implicit learning can be described as ‘acquisition of knowledge about the underlying structure of a complex stimulus environment by a process which takes place automatically and without conscious operations, simply as a result of experience of examples’ (Ellis 1999: 12), whereas explicit learning can be seen as a ‘conscious, problem-solving operation where the individual attends to particular aspects of the stimulus array and generates and tests hypotheses in search of structure’ (Ellis 1999: 11).
From psychological research, it can be learned that implicit instruction is more effective in the case of more randomly structured learning material with a lot of variables in which the critical features do not have to be salient. Explicit instruction, on the other hand, will help when the learning material is simple or when the learning material is relatively complex with only a small number of variables. In the latter case also the critical features will have to be salient (Ellis 1999).

In the case of grammar, evidence for the positive effects of explicit instruction has been found by Long (1991) and Ellis (2001), amongst others. They found that instructed language learning affects the process and ultimate level of L2 acquisition positively. Robinsons’ (1996) study showed that instruction with an explicit focus on structures in the L2 which are rule-governed are effective and Norris and Ortega (2000) concluded that they are durable as well.

After Schmidt and Frota (1986) already had pointed out that producing something correctly is the result of understanding something correctly, Schmidt (1990) showed that the role of explicit instruction is to let the students really focus on a new rule and that rules actually need to be instructed in order to be able to deduct them. Furthermore, input can only be noticed and learned from attention that is paid consciously (Schmidt 1990). Although implicit knowledge or changes, which take place immediately in the learners’ interlanguage, may not directly follow from explicit grammar instruction (Lightbown 2000), there is evidence that the acquisition process is helped by conscious understanding (Schmidt 1990).

Finally, even though a mixture of implicit exposure to forms and explicit instruction is supposed to be the most useful for a learner (Ellis 2001, Lightbown 2000, MacWhinney 1997b), Norris and Ortega (2000) concluded that implicit types of instruction are less effective than those which are explicit.

It can be concluded that explicit instruction may be effective in a lot of situations. Moreover, it will never do any harm in teaching an L2.
2.2 Learning a very different language

This chapter took off with an overview of the role of instruction in learning an L2. In this paragraph the role of explicit instruction in the process of learning a very different language will be discussed. Furthermore, an outline of the grammar of the Finnish language, as a very different language, will be given before giving insight in the way of choosing the right approach for the direct object.

Ringbom (1987) already noticed that the L1 is of importance in the acquisition of the L2 by finding that learning a different language is much more difficult than learning a similar language. MacWhinney (2008) also noticed the extra difficulty for the learner who is learning an L2 which is different from his L1. The basis of learning a language is input and the learning takes place by comparing this input with a learner's knowledge of L1, searching for similarities and differences. In this context MacWhinney uses the term ‘cue’ and explains it as follows: '[It] is a notion of the linguistic sign as a mapping of form and function' (MacWhinney 2008: 5).

MacWhinney (1997) distinguished three dimensions of cue distribution. These are, next to frequency, in the first place cue availability, which can be understood as the quantity of presence of the cue in the input. Only in the case of contrast the available cue is useful and if a language is learned, the learner will use an available cue before one which is less available. Then there is simple reliability; this is the consistent use of a cue, and according to MacWhinney the most important dimension of cue validity. Finally there is the conflict reliability, which MacWhinney describes as a reliability ‘in addition to simple reliability, cues can be characterized in terms of their conflict reliability vis-à-vis some other particular cue’ (MacWhinney 1997; 123). These dimensions play an important role in determining the opacity of patterns related to the course of acquisition. Later on MacWhinney showed that some systems in the different L2 are extremely difficult to achieve for learners who have to deal
with an L1 that does not have a similar system (MacWhinney 2008). Bybee (2008) also noticed that frequency is important in the development of the L2.

After presenting learners with five morphological rules in a traditional way, DeKeyser (1995) found that explicit-deductive learning helps in the process of learning straightforward rules, i.e. rules by which language can be categorized (DeKeyser 1995). This was also an outcome of the study of Robinson (1996). The results of this study showed that, in the case of learning simple rules, explicit learning conditions worked best for short-term learning.

Williams (2003) made clear that discerning conceptual distinctions that do not exist in L1 may be a difficult issue for an adult L2 learner. From his research it can be concluded that the effect of explicit instruction depends on the extent to which the L1 and the L2 are related, but that it might be of help in the situation of learning a very different language. De Bot, Lowie and Verspoor (2005) suggested subsequently that the complexity of rules also may have an effect on the internalization of the rules by the learner and that, besides the complexity, the salience of the construction in the L2 and the frequency of practicing the rules may play an important role in the process of internalization.

VanPatten and Cadierno (1993) showed that the effect of processing instruction for the learning of grammar is positive. They found that within explicit teaching, implicit knowledge follows from the created intake, derived from comprehension based instruction. Larsen-Freeman (1997) sees the value of explicit instruction in the fact that it facilitates intake, even though she realizes that grammatical items may not be mastered directly. The effectiveness of processing instruction was the subject of research of DeKeyser and Sokalski (2001). They found that the morphosyntactic complexity is of influence on the effectiveness and that especially for promoting comprehension skills, input processing is effective.

Schmidt’s (1990) ‘noticing hypothesis’ shows that noticing is ‘the necessary and sufficient condition for the conversion of input to intake for
learning’ (Schmidt 1994: 17), i.e., noticing grammatical structures guarantees incorporation into the developing language of the learners (Schmidt 1990). Though the effect of giving explicit instruction is that the salience of target language forms in the input can be increased in a useful way, the process of acquiring target forms will only take place if they are really noticed. Also Leow (2001) made sure that learners really paid attention to the forms they were confronted with in the input. He found that learners who were aware of the morphological forms they had to deal with, were significantly more able to recognize them and to produce them in their writing after exposure. By doing this, he put aside the 1980s hypothesis that language learning could take place without some degree of consciousness (Nassaji and Fotos 2004).

According to Schmidt and Frota (1986), just the process of noticing is not sufficient for input to become intake. The learner should consciously have to ‘notice the gap’ between the L1 and the L2 because in that case, that which is noticed could be reflected on. Schmidt and Frota concluded that learners often continue making the same errors as they did before the noticing, and that the learners do not take advantage of the process. Still, Fotos (1994) concluded that for the integration of formal instruction within a communicative framework, grammar consciousness-raising tasks are a possibility. This conclusion was based on an exploration of grammar consciousness-raising tasks dealing with word order. She considered these tasks a combination of requirement for meaning-focused use and development of knowledge about problematic grammatical subjects in the L2. However, for the acquisition of target structures, awareness may not be sufficient (Leow 2001) and even when learners of an L2 get explicit instructions of grammar rules, applying these rules correctly often fails in communicative tasks; in other words, the awareness and the performance do not merely associate (Green and Hecht 1992).
3 Finnish as a very different language

The former chapter gave an overview of the role of instruction in learning an L2. In this chapter an exploration of the role of explicit instruction in the process of learning a very different language and an outline of the Finnish language as a member of the Finno-Ugrian language family will be given. Furthermore this chapter provides insight in the way of choosing the right case for the Finnish direct object, in order to show one of the difficulties for a Indo-European learner in learning Finnish as L2.

As explained in chapter 2, the feeling for the role of cues in L2 is developed by learners while they are learning a new language, and every learner has to learn to distinguish the weights of the cues. In his research MacWhinney (1997) found that children already recognize cues in language production. This takes places even in the first months of language learning in the child’s L1. MacWhinney is aware of the difficulty of getting a feel for those cues which exist in L2 but do not in L1. Such cues were for instance totally ignored or were not the case at all in L1 but may be very useful in L2. In L2 these cues may be ‘obligatory grammatical contrasts’ (MacWhinney 1997: 128). He showed that in the Indo-European languages a considerable variation can take place in the use of cues to mark case roles, but that there are rather extreme variations in languages not from the Indo-European language group, i.e. Hungarian (MacWhinney 1997). His conclusion was that learners of the Hungarian language, a member of the Finno-Ugrian language family, need a lot of work to do before they are able to understand the rules of the Hungarian grammar and that they make a lot of errors in the choice of conjugations because of the extreme extent to which the grammar of the Hungarian language differs from the Indo-European languages. In such a case explicit instruction is always better than learning without cues (Ellis and Laporte 1997, Ellis 1999, Hulstijn and DeKeyser 1997, Spada 1997).
Worldwide the languages can typologically be divided into three large families: the Indo-European languages, the Uralic languages and the Altaic languages. In Europe about a hundred languages are spoken, most of which belong to the Indo-European languages: more than 95 % of the European people speak an Indo-European language (Ahonen 2006).

The Finnish language family belongs to the Finno-Ugric languages, which is a member of the Uralic language family. This is the reason why the Finnish language seems ‘strange’ for people who speak a language of the Indo-European family. In its vocabulary and in its structure the difference is evident. Finnish has no articles or gender and it is an agglutinative language: endings are added to the stems of the words, in order to express the relations between words in a sentence. On the contrary Indo-European languages are analytic languages, which implies that relations between words are regularly expressed by means of prepositions and word order (Ahonen 2007). Another issue is the enormous divergent form of the vocabulary of Finnish compared to the vocabulary of an Indo-European language (Ahonen 2006). Moreover, the Finnish language has 16 cases, which is more than most Indo-European languages have, and therefore Finnish differs considerably from most of these languages.

The Finnish cases can be classified in five groups: grammatical cases, locatives, cases which only appear in expressions or grammatical constructions and a couple of cases which cannot be classified in one of these categories (Ahonen 2006). The grammatical cases are an important group for this study and consist of the nominative -, the genitive -, the partitive - and the accusative case.

When L2 learners of Finnish have to use a direct object in a sentence, they must decide whether it should be the accusative case without an ending (-0), the accusative case, with the endings -n and -t, or the partitive case, with the endings -a/-ä, -ta/-tä and -tta/-ttä (Ahonen 2006). Making this choice is not a simple matter. There are five questions which have to be
asked every time it is needed to decide on the case of the direct object: (1) Is the sentence affirmative or negative? (2) Is the action, expressed in the sentence, resultative, i.e. is it taking place at this moment, has it already been completed and, moreover, will it be completed at all, i.e. is the action irresultative? (3) Is the verb in the sentence a transitive verb, expressing a process, or not? (4) Is the direct object a divisible entity, is it a indivisible entity or is it an abstract entity? (5) Does the sentence have a subject in the nominative case or not? If the sentence has a subject in the nominative case, the rules as just explained can be followed. If the sentence does not have a subject in the nominative case, it has to be decided if the sentence is a passive - , an imperative - or a necessive sentence. It may also be a generic sentence, in which case there is an implicit subject in the nominative case. In all of the aforementioned cases the basic question always is whether the verb, related to the direct object, is in singular or in plural (Ahonen 2006).

In short, to choose out of a number of cases for a direct object is extremely foreign to most non-Finnish learners, and they have a lot of trouble to get insight in the matter. According to MacWhinney (1997) the efficiency of acquisition can increase for adult learners when they will focus on such ‘particularly difficult parts of a grammatical system’ (MacWhinney 1997: 129).

3.1 The Finnish direct object case system

In this paragraph the treatment of the accusative case and the direct object in Finnish in the grammar methods throughout the last couple of decades will be outlined.
The traditional Finnish grammar

From the beginning of Finnish textbooks, the grammars were based on Latin categories (Martin 1995). This was because they were intended for people with an Indo-European language background, like Swedish and German (Vihonen 1978). This Indo-European language background is related to the Latin tradition. The fact that in grammars, which were written before 1824, the nominative was used to derive all the other forms from (Wiik 1988), indicates also an important role for the Latin tradition.

Discussions about traditional Finno-Ugristic are often about the issue of the form of the primal Uralic accusative, a subject of the historic morphology (Hasselblatt 1998). Mingled with this accusative, the existence of which has not been questioned for decades by linguists that followed the Latin tradition, was the direct object. It is quite logical that the term accusative was mixed up with the term direct object and the other way around. For decades this mixing up occurred in the Indo-European literature, which was very influential in the linguistic tradition. Grünthal (1941) can serve as an example of the consequences of the confusion: he used the Finnish word ´Objekt´ as the equivalent of the German word ´Akkusativ´, in the text he was translating (Hasselblatt 1998). In other words, traditional Finnish grammar treats the accusative case as being of the same order as the direct object (Kiparsky 2005).

The accusative seems to be a case that includes three different forms: the accusative itself (–t), the accusative-like uses of the nominative case (–0, -t) and the genitive case (–n) (Kiparsky 2001, 2005). The other case for the direct object is the partitive case, which is seen as the counterpart of the accusative case (Karlsson 1999, White 2006, Fromm 1982, Hahmo and Liebe 1998, Ahonen 2006). In traditional grammars, the case system of Finnish nouns and pronouns is presented as follows:
Table 1: The traditional classification of the direct object cases in Finnish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Type</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nouns:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominative singular:</td>
<td>karhu*</td>
<td>karhu-t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accusative singular:</td>
<td>karhu</td>
<td>karhu-t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>karhu-n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genitive singular:</td>
<td>karhu-n</td>
<td>karhu-j-en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partitive singular:</td>
<td>karhu-a</td>
<td>karhu-j-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronouns:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accusative singular:</td>
<td>sinu-t</td>
<td>teidä-t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* [bear] 

source: Kiparsky 2001

Already in 1884 Wiedemann noticed, that the Finno-Ugric case system differed from the Indo-European system (Wiedemann 1884). Sakuma (1994) saw, however, that in most of the articles about the distributions of the genitive object and the partitive object, the genitive object was still regarded as an accusative object. Finally, Volodin (1997) said that the Uralic languages do not distinguish a separate subject and object case, like the Indo-European languages do. He concluded that the reason why the misunderstanding still remains, is that linguists still look at Finnish through ‘Indo-European spectacles’.

Examples of 4 traditional Finnish grammars and 1 Finnish method
Every source yet to discuss, understands the accusative and the partitive as cases of the direct object in Finnish. The rules to know when the partitive case has to be applied are definitely relevant for understanding the grammar of the direct object cases. This application of the partitive for the direct object, however, will not be outlined here because of the
irrelevance of the matter in the explanation of the traditional way of

treatment of the accusative case in comparison to the direct

direct

(1) The grammar of Karlsson (1999) treats the accusative case as a

collective name, given to a certain group of cases which mark the direct

object in a sentence. These are the nominative singular, which has no

ending (-0), the genitive singular, which has the n-ending (-n) and the t-

ending (-t), named ‘t-accusative’, used for personal pronouns and the

nominate plural. This means that, even though Karlsson refers to the
different cases, ending on -0, -n and -t, they are all regarded as
accusative forms in the matter of the case of the direct object.


explained as ‘genitive singular kirjan [book]’, and ‘accusative t-form’. The

latter form is used for the interrogative pronoun ‘kenet’ [who], derived from
the nominative form ‘kuka’ [who], and for personal pronouns. This means
that also in the grammar of White the direct object cases, ending on -0, -n
and -t are regarded as accusative forms.

(3) The grammar of Fromm (1982) uses the terms ‘accusative 1’

with the addition ‘= genitive’ and ‘accusative 2’ with the addition ‘= stem-

form, nominative’. It explains that either the accusative case is without an

ending, and then equal to the nominative singular or it has the ending –n,
to which he adds that this is the same case as the genitive singular.

Furthermore, the plural form of the accusative case has the t-ending.
Again, the direct object cases on -0, -n and -t are all regarded as
accusative forms, even though the grammar explains the relationship of
every accusative form with the analogous case.

(4) The grammar of Hahmo and Liebe (1998) uses the terms

‘accusative 1’ with the addition ‘-n’ and ‘accusative 2’ with the addition
‘without ending’. The first term is explained as equal to the genitive case
singular and the second term as equal to the nominative case singular. In
plural there is no ending for the accusative case, it exists of the vocal stem
and -t. The personal pronouns and the interrogative pronoun ‘kuka’ [who]
have the -t ending in the accusative case. Also Hahmo and Liebe state that every direct object case on -0, -n and -t is actually to be seen as accusative forms.

(5) An example of a traditional Finnish teaching method is Kuulostaa hyvältä! [Sounds good!] (Ahonen 2006). This method is used at the bachelor's degree program ‘Finno-Ugric languages and cultures’ at the Faculty of Arts at the University of Groningen. To explain the term ‘endingless accusative’ the method adds ‘form = nominative’ and ‘nominative-like accusative’. To explain the term ‘accusative singular’ the method adds ‘= equal to the genitive singular ending’ and ‘genitive-like accusative’. The plural accusative case and the plural nominative case are formed equally and look identical, which means that both end on -t. According to the method, the singular non-count direct object is equal to the accusative case and it regards the direct object cases on -0, -n and -t all as accusative forms, though the method refers to every particular case.

To sum up, every source discussed explains the direct object cases, ending on -0, -n, or -t, as being accusative forms, while every source at the same time explains the relationship of the accusative forms with the analogous cases nominative in singular and plural, genitive in singular and plural and accusative in singular and plural for the personal pronouns and the interrogative pronoun. Moreover, a huge amount of different terms is used to describe the cases on -0, -n, or -t of the direct object in the Finnish language. In other words, there is no unity in the use of terms.

**Changes in the point of view**
Kiparsky (2001) saw that, even though a large number of grammars and Finnish language learning methods still use the interpretation of the traditional grammar, times are changing. Von Farkas (1956) already questioned the use of the Indo-European case system on the Uralic languages and also Itkonen (1972) was aware of the problems around understanding the accusative form and the direct object. He regarded the
accusative in singular and in plural as nominatives. This agreed with the study of Kiparsky (2001), who found that linguists like Timberlake (1974) and Nelson (1998) do the same.

According to Sakuma (1994) a form of the object with an -n- ending should be regarded as a genitive form and he considered the nominative case as one of the cases of the direct object. Moreover, he found that in the Finnish language the same set of cases is used to indicate the subject and the object (Sakuma 1994). The matter of the accusative and the direct object without ‘Indo-European spectacles’ can be presented as follows:

Table 2: The non-traditional classification of the direct object cases in Finnish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nouns:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nominative singular:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominative plural:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accusative singular:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accusative plural:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genitive singular:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genitive plural:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partitive singular:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partitive plural:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronouns:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>accusative singular:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accusative plural:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*[bear]

source: Kiparsky 2001

This table shows that all case forms without endings can be denoted as nominatives, that all case forms with an -n ending can be denoted as genitives, in other words, ‘the accusative singular case is identical in form with the genitive case’ (Sakuma 1999: 10). Further the table shows that -t has the functions of nominative plural and accusative singular and - plural.

A recent example of a leading Finnish grammar which was written from this point of view is the Iso suomen kielioppi (Hakulinen 2004), a
reference book of Finnish grammar. The book differs from earlier grammars by taking a descriptive approach to standard literary Finnish instead of solely describing the standard literary Finnish. In the *Iso suomen kielioppi* the accusative case is described as a case for the personal pronouns ‘minut’ [me], ‘sinut’ [you, singular], ‘hän’ [him/her], ‘meidät’ [us], ‘teidät’ [you, plural], ‘heidät’ [they]. Moreover it is the case for the interrogative pronoun ‘kuka’ [who], which is ‘kenet’ [who, singular and plural] in the accusative case. In the book the direct object is explained as a part of the sentence which can have different cases: the nominative case, which has no ending in the singular form and the -t ending in the plural form, the genitive case, which has the -n ending in the singular form as well as in de plural form, the accusative case, - as described - a case for the personal pronouns and for the interrogative pronoun ‘kuka [who]’, and finally the partitive case, with the endings -a/ä, -ta/-tä, -tta/-ttä in the singular forms, and the endings -a/-ä and -ta/-tä in the plural forms (Ahonen 2006).

### 3.2 The lack of comprehension

Now that the role of explicit instruction in learning a very different L2 has been explored and an overview of the treatment of the accusative case and the direct object in Finnish in the grammar methods has been given, in this paragraph the reason for this study will be outlined.

With the conclusion of Norris and Ortega (2000) about the positive effects of explicit learning in mind, an exploration of what type of explicit learning is most effective will follow. This exploration looks into the situation of a person with an Indo-European language background (a Dutch learner in this case), learning the Finnish language. Such a learner has to deal with constructions in L2 which are opaque to him. In a situation like this, a
learner cannot distil the correct rule by himself so he needs explicit instruction (de Bot, Lowie and Verspoor 2005).

The use of the partitive and accusative case in the Finnish language is a highly complex and difficult issue (Spoelman and Verspoor 2010) and the partitive case is a problematic issue for L2 learners of the Finnish language (Schot-Saikku 1990). Spoelman and Verspoor (2010) found that the errors, made by a Dutch learner of Finnish, in the partitive singular and accusative singular were mainly semantic use errors, and that these error rates were relatively high. With these forms, complex semantic rules are involved. Spoelman and Verspoor found that the problems in the use of the partitive and accusative singular were not solved during the longitudinal study (Spoelman and Verspoor 2010). Besides, it is important to realize that in this study the accusative case has to be understood in the traditional way, in other words, the case includes the accusative itself (-t), the accusative-like uses of the nominative case (-0, -t) and the genitive case (-n) (Kiparsky 2001, 2005). Spoelman and Verspoor concluded ‘that the difficulty [of the use of the partitive and accusative case in Finnish] lies in a lack of consistency and/or frequency of relevant instances to entrench the instances’ (Spoelman and Verspoor 2010: 10). They suggested that a lack of rule transparency is a logical result of the complex rules of the linguistic structures of the partitive - and the accusative singular. In their longitudinal study, the learner kept on having difficulties with these particular cases, and this supports the view ‘that complex and opaque rules are the most difficult to acquire’ (Spoelman and Verspoor 2010: 13). Also DeKeyser (2005) concluded that lack of linguistic transparency plays an important role in the process of learning difficult grammatical rules in L2. Norris and Ortega (2000) concluded that explicit instruction for this kind of language learning, called Focus-on-Forms (Long 1991), is effective. In this way of learning, in which the attention is especially focused on form instead of communication (Long 1991, Ellis 2001), the learner is focused intensively on a ‘discrete grammatical form, selected en
presented in an isolated matter’ (Nassaji and Fotos 2004), in order to learn the specific grammatical rule (Ellis 2001).

So far, it can be concluded that an Indo-European learner who is learning Finnish, suffers from a lack of linguistic rule transparency. Also it was shown that almost every grammar and method follows the traditional way (see table 1) of explaining the direct object case system and the role of the accusative case in relation to the direct object. Furthermore, it was found that, even when learners of an L2 get explicit instructions of grammar rules, the correct application of these rules often fails in communicative tasks. These issues taken together brings us to the reason for this study. It may be concluded that what is needed is a study to investigate what the reason is for the difficulty of acquiring the complex rules of the Finnish direct object case system for the Indo-European learner (in this case: the Dutch learner). Is it because of learning the matter in the traditional way? Furthermore, it needs to be investigated what happens when the matter is learned in the non-traditional way (see table 2). Moreover, do both methods lead to correct application and which method leads to better comprehension and application? Finally, what effect does immersion in the Finnish language have on comprehending the use of the matter? This results in the following research questions:

1  
   a: Does explicit instruction in the traditional way lead to correct comprehension of the use of the Finnish direct object cases?
   
   b: Does explicit instruction in the traditional way lead to correct application of the use of the Finnish direct object cases?

2  
   a: Does explicit instruction in the non-traditional way lead to correct comprehension of the use of the Finnish direct object cases?
   
   b: Does explicit instruction in the non-traditional way lead to correct application of the use of the Finnish direct object cases?
3. Does explicit instruction in the non-traditional way lead to better comprehension of the use of the Finnish direct object cases than having explicit instruction in the traditional way?

4. Does explicit instruction in the non-traditional way lead to better application of the use of the Finnish direct object cases than having explicit instruction in the traditional way?

5. What effect does immersion in the Finnish language have on comprehending the use of the Finnish direct object cases?

It is expected that the experimental group, getting explicit instruction in the non-traditional way, will have correct comprehension of the use of the Finnish direct object cases. It is also expected that the subjects in this group will have better comprehension of the matter than the ‘traditional’ subjects. The non-traditional method may not lead to correct application of the use of the Finnish direct object cases.

It is expected that the control group, learning Finnish from the method with the traditional way of dealing with the Finnish direct object case system, will not have correct comprehension of the matter. They may have less comprehension of the use of the Finnish direct object cases than the subjects who have had explicit instruction in the non-traditional way. The traditional method may not lead to correct application of the matter.

Finally, it is expected that immersion in the Finnish language, through a stay in Finland, will have a positive effect on the use of the Finnish direct object cases.
4 Method

The study took off with a short overview of the role of instruction in learning an L2, the role of explicit instruction in the process of learning a very different language, and an outline of the Finnish direct object case system throughout the past decades to come to the hypotheses. This chapter focuses on the method of the study. First, the subjects will be introduced. Then, the materials and the method of collecting the data will be presented. Finally, the design and analyses will be described.

4.1 Subjects

Because there are few students enrolled in Finnish an an L2, this study makes use of 2 different cohorts (see table 3). The experimental group consists of first-year students who are enrolled in Finnish grammar in the Fall of 2009. They were chosen to be the experimental group because of the fact that they had only had 1 semester of grammar at the moment this study started. They were therefore still flexible in dealing with grammar. Besides, this group is the largest cohort of Finnish in Groningen. The control group consists of students who were enrolled in previous years in this same course. All students of the experimental group and the control group have/had the same Finnish language lecturer, who is a native speaker of Finnish, and they all learn/learned Finnish from the teaching method Kuulostaa hyvältä! (Ahonen 2006). This method is used in the first year of the study at the bachelor's degree program ‘Finno-Ugric languages and cultures’ at the Faculty of Arts at the University of Groningen. The first-year students have studied Finnish less long than the other students so far, but explicit instruction of the Finnish grammar only takes place in the first year of the study. They already learned the basic constructs of the Finnish grammar in the first semester.
The difference between the 2 groups is that the experimental group got explicit instruction on the use of the cases for the Finnish direct object and the role of the accusative case in the Finnish grammar in the non-traditional way in the first week of the second semester of the first year of their study, whereas the control group only got explicit instruction in the traditional way. This implies that the experimental group had to make a mind shift from the second semester on.

Table 3: The compilation of both groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>experimental group</th>
<th>control group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>enrolled in Fall 2009</td>
<td>enrolled in previous years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>comprehension</strong></td>
<td>6 first-year students</td>
<td>6 second- and third-year students, 1 graduated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 males, 4 females</td>
<td>1 male, 5 females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 part-time</td>
<td>3 part-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 stayed in Finland</td>
<td>3 stay(ed) in Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>application</strong></td>
<td>7 first-year students</td>
<td>7 second- and third-year students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 males, 5 females</td>
<td>1 male, 6 females</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Materials and procedures

This study consists of 2 parts. The first part, focusing on comprehension, involves data of 2 questionnaires, filled in by 12 Dutch subjects. The second part, focusing on application, involves data of writing assignments of 14 Dutch subjects.
Questionnaire 1

Both the experimental group and the control group received a questionnaire (‘Questionnaire 1’, see Appendix 1) 2 weeks before the second semester started. The questionnaire was made in order to get an overview of a) the linguistic background of the subjects, b) their ability to recognize the direct object in Dutch and in Finnish sentences and c) their knowledge about the accusative and the direct object in the Finnish grammar.

Questionnaire 1 consisted of 10 questions. Question 1 and 2 focused on the linguistic background of the subject. In question 3 and 4 the subjects were asked to estimate and to show their knowledge of the Dutch direct object. In question 5, the subjects were asked to explain which languages help them to learn Finnish. From question 6 to 10, the subjects were asked to estimate and to show their knowledge of the Finnish direct object and the role of the Finnish accusative case.

For every question the answers of questions 1 to 3 and 5 to 9 were registered per subject. This was done first by hand and afterwards in Excel. On the answers on questions 4 and 10, points were given for correct answers, wrong answers were not counted. This was done by hand. Afterwards the data were put in Excel. The questions were formulated in Dutch and the subjects could answer in Dutch as well. They could fill in the questionnaire in their own time and place. In the questionnaire, they were asked explicitly not to use any tools, like a grammar method or a dictionary, while filling in the answers. The subjects were asked to return it by e-mail before the new semester would take off.

It was assumed that by sending the questionnaire via the lecturer, who is known by all the students, the largest number of possible subjects would react. Still, after contacting the students by e-mail and later personally by the lecturer, some students did not return the questionnaire. In total 12 students did: 6 first-year-, 3 second-year- and 2 third-year students and 1 master of Finnish. Though the subjects were asked to fill in the answers
without consulting external sources, answers may have been looked up because of the fact that the questionnaire was filled in at home. In that case the outcomes may be influenced.

**Non-traditional model of the direct object case system**

In the first week of the second semester the explicit instruction, focusing on forms, was given to the 7 first year students of the experimental group; in a lesson of about an hour the difference between the role of the accusative case in the Finnish direct object case system in the traditional way and in the non-traditional way was discussed. In this lesson also a conceptual model of the use of the Finnish direct object cases in the non-traditional way (see Appendix 2) was presented. The original model was designed by the Finnish language lecturer and researcher. The subjects were asked for suggestions to improve the model in order to become the best tool for applying the rules. One week later the subjects were presented with the definite model of the use of the Finnish direct object cases in the non-traditional way, by putting it on Nestor, the university website. The model contains every possible case for the Finnish direct object, including example sentences. In the model the terms nominative, genitive, accusative and partitive are used to point out the direct object case. The experimental group was able to use the model whenever they wanted, i.e. while doing their homework.

**Questionnaire 2**

All subjects of the experimental group and the control group who had reacted to the first questionnaire, were presented with Questionnaire 2 (see Appendix 3) in the eighth week of the second semester. This questionnaire was made in order to get insight in the comprehension of the use of the Finnish direct object cases.

Questionnaire 2 consisted of 9 questions which were divided into 3 parts. The first part consisted of sentences in which the correct direct object case had to be filled in. In part 2 the subjects were asked to
describe the use of the partitive case as case for the direct object and in part 3 the subjects were asked to describe the steps they would take in order to find the right direct object case in a given sentence.

In the first part the answers could be correct or wrong. For every question in the first part, the subjects were given points for every correct answer; incorrect answers were not counted. This was done by hand after which the data were put in Excel. Because of the fact that more points could be scored to some questions than to other questions, the points were presented in percentages. The subjects were invited to elucidate their answers in order to show their knowledge. A good explanation about the use of the direct object case provided the subjects with a bonus point. They were not informed about this. The total number of the bonus points were added up. This bonus score is a good indication of the comprehension of the matter. The answers to the second and third part were studied in order to discuss later on. Questionnaire 2 was formulated in Dutch and the subjects could answer in Dutch as well. The subjects of the experimental group and the control group were given 2 weeks to answer the questions and to send it back. Again they were asked explicitly not to consult any external resources.

Every subject, who had filled in and returned the first questionnaire, did so with the second one. To some of the subjects several e-mails had to be sent to remind them. The subjects could fill in the questionnaire in their own time and place, which implies that answers may have been looked up. In the questionnaire, they were asked explicitly not to do so several times. In the case of looking up some answers, the outcomes may be influenced.

**Writing assignments**

The method *Kuulostaa hyvältä!* is used in the first study year. It consists of 39 lessons. The method describes the direct object cases and the role of the accusative case in the traditional way. The assignments, which have to be done every week for every lesson, consist of writing assignments on a
specific subject, practising grammar in exercises, practising speech on the
computer, reading texts and watching a videotape. The learner is always
allowed to use a dictionary, the grammar method or other tools.

The writing assignments of lessons 13 to 16 of the experimental
group and the control group were available for this study, in order to trace
the levels of the groups before the non-traditional way of dealing with the
matter was given. This was needed, in order to exclude possible
differences in levels between the groups. These writing assignments had
been corrected by the lecturer. The correct and wrong use of the cases for
the direct object were counted. Appendix 4 provides an overview of the
materials of the lessons.

Moreover, writing assignments of lessons 20, 21, 28 and 29 of the
experimental group and the control group and lessons 24 and 25 of the
experimental group were used for this study. Lesson 20 is the first lesson
of the second semester. This lesson was the first given to the experimental
group after the explicit instruction. Lesson 29 was the lesson before
Questionnaire 2 was given to all the subjects. All homework had been
corrected by the lecturer and again, the correct and incorrect use of the
cases for the direct object were counted. Therefore, the data consist of
writing assignments of the same lessons for every subject. The data also
consist of about the same number of words. Per lesson the correct and
incorrect use of the cases for the direct object were counted for every
subject, first by hand and afterwards in Excel. Appendix 5 provides an
overview of the materials of the lessons.

The subjects of the experimental group knew of this study at the time they
had to do the writing assignments. This may have influenced their writing,
even though they were not aware of the fact that their writing assignments
would be used for this study. What also may have been of influence is the
fact that the experimental group could use the model (Non-traditional
model of the direct object case system) while doing their homework.
Moreover, since the explicit instruction in the non-traditional way had been
given, the lecturer corrected the use of the direct object cases in the writing assignments of the experimental group in the non-traditional way. This may have influenced the results. Finally, in both groups some subjects may have avoided using particular cases or sentence constructions because they did not want to make a mistake or to disappoint the lecturer. This may have influenced the score; some cases may not have been used in the same proportion as in everyday life.

4.3 Design and Analyses

What follows is a presentation of the design and analyses of the study. Questionnaires were analysed on comprehension and writing assignments were analysed on application. The design and the analyses of the comprehension part is described first, then the design and the analyses of the application part is described.

Comprehension
The subjects of the experimental group and the control group had to fill in 2 questionnaires, 2 weeks before the second semester started and in the eighth week of that semester, in order to measure their comprehension of the direct object cases. In questionnaire 2 bonus points were given when a subject gave a good explanation about the use of the direct object case.

Questionnaire 1
Question 1 and 2 of this pretest were not described in the results; it was concluded that the answers did not have value for the research. The subjects’ recognizing the Dutch and Finnish direct object in a sentence was traced by counting the correct and incorrect answers, in order to find their competence in dealing with the matter. Furthermore languages that, according to the subjects, help to understand the Finnish grammar were traced by counting the answers, in order to see which grammar systems
are used by the subjects in learning Finnish. Moreover, the Finnish direct object cases, given per subject, were traced by analysing the answers, in order to visualize the diversity of answers. Of the outcomes of questions 1, 2, 7 and 9 an analysis was given in written text.

*Questionnaire 2*

For part 1 of Questionnaire 2, the scores were imported into the data processing program SPSS 16.0 and an Independent-Samples T test was run. The α decision level was determined at 0.05 and the testing was 2-tailed. Per subject, the absolute number of points and bonus points per question was used. The hypotheses were as follows:

H0: There is no difference in the comprehension of the Finnish direct object cases between the experimental group and the control group.

H1: There is less comprehension in the experimental group.

H2: There is more comprehension in the experimental group.

Also the total number of points of part 1 in percentages per question was traced by counting the correct and incorrect answers, in order to compare the comprehension of particular grammar constructions in relation to the direct object. Furthermore, the total number of bonus points was traced by counting the bonus points, in order to compare the comprehension; both the experimental group and the control group could obtain bonus points by filling in the remarks part on the form correctly. Besides, the mean score of the points and the bonus points of subjects with and without immersion in the Finnish language was traced by counting the answers of part 1, in order to compare the comprehension of the use of the direct object cases of these 2 specific groups.

Of the outcomes of part 2 and 3 an analysis was given in written text. This implies that a conclusion on the basis of numbers could not be given.
Application
Writing assignments, done in a couple of weeks of the first semester and in a couple of weeks of the second semester were analysed of the subjects of both the experimental group and the control group, in order to measure their application of the direct object cases.

Writing assignments - The cases of the Finnish direct object
The total number of uses of the Finnish direct object cases in lessons 20, 21, 28 and 29 of the experimental group and the control group taken together were traced by counting the correct and incorrect used direct object cases, in order to get insight in the dispersion of the use of the cases. Besides, in 4 lessons in the second semester the use of the direct object was traced per case, in order to show application of the direct object cases of the 2 groups taken together. Furthermore, the total number of correct and incorrect used direct object cases was traced in percentages, in order to compare the use of direct object cases of the experimental group and of the control group.

Writing assignments - The experimental group versus the control group
To show the total number of correct and incorrect used direct object cases in the first semester per group, lessons 13 to 16 were compared. Beforehand it was determined that a score of 70% or more correct used direct object cases was called ‘correct’.

For application of the direct object cases in lessons 20, 21, 28 and 29, done in week 1 and in week 8 of the second semester by both the experimental group and the control group, the hypotheses were as follows:
H0: There is no difference in application of the Finnish direct object cases between the experimental group and the control group.
H1: The application of the experimental group is better.
H2: The application of the experimental group is less.

The total number of correct and incorrect used direct object cases in the second semester per group was shown in percentages. Finally, 6
writing assignments of the second semester done by the experimental group were traced, in order to show the total number of correct and incorrect used Finnish direct object cases in percentages.
5 Results

This chapter presents the outcomes on comprehension (5.1) and on application (5.2). For both items it can be said that the distribution in the experimental group and in the control group is approximately normal and that the group size is the same.

5.1 Comprehension

Questionnaire 1

Two weeks before the second semester started a pretest was done by the experimental group and the control group. The questionnaire provides insight in recognizing the Dutch and the Finnish direct object in a sentence by the subjects (figure 1).

![Graph of Comprehension Results](image)

**Figure 1**: Recognizing the Dutch and the Finnish direct object in a sentence by both the experimental and the control group, in percentages
Figure 2 provides insight in languages which help the subjects to understand the Finnish grammar.

![Languages](image)

**Figure 2**: Languages that help to understand the Finnish grammar of both the experimental and the control group, in percentages

Figure 3 provides insight in the Finnish direct object cases, given per subject. The combination accusative, nominative and partitive is the most frequently mentioned combination. One subject (no.10) mentioned the only completely correct answer in the list. In the 12 given answers 9 different combinations of cases for the Finnish direct object were given.

![Cases](image)

**Figure 3**: The knowledge of the cases of the Finnish direct object per subject of both the experimental and the control group
After interpreting the outcomes of the questions it was concluded that for questions 7 and 9 it was better not to give a score, but to describe the outcome in words: on the question whether the term ‘accusative’ and the term direct object’ in the Finnish grammar are convertible, two subjects considered that they are. Striking is that one of these subjects answered in the question mentioned above (figure 3: 8) that there are 3 cases for the direct object. The other subject was consistent in both answers (figure 3: 1). Two subjects did not know whether the term ‘accusative’ and the term ‘direct object’ in the Finnish grammar are convertible and 8 subjects did not think they are. One of them did not consider the accusative as a case for the direct object, the rest considered the accusative case as one of the cases for the direct object.

**Questionnaire 2**

For part 1 of Questionnaire 2, given in the eighth week of the second semester, an Independent-Samples T test was run (figure 4). On average, the experimental group showed a higher level of comprehension (M=22.7, SE=1.56) than the control group (M=16.5, SE=1.73). This difference was significant (t(10)=2.6; p<0.05) and the hypothesis could be rejected.

![Figure 4: Representing the comprehension score of the experimental group and the control group, showing the median and the interquartile range of both groups](image-url)
This total score on comprehension, bonus points included, was also presented in absolute numbers (figure 5). The experimental group scored a mean of 3.8 bonus point per person and the control group scored a mean of 1.3 bonus point per person.

![Figure 5: The total score on comprehension (part 1 of Questionnaire 2), bonus points included, of the experimental group and the control group, in absolute numbers](image)

Furthermore, the difference in comprehending a particular grammar construction in which the direct object had to be used, was investigated (table 3, figure 6). Both the experimental group and the control group scored the lowest on question 7. On question 3 both groups had the second worst score. Question 7 revealed the biggest difference between both groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>Direct object related to</th>
<th>Exper. group</th>
<th>Contr. group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>negation</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>countability</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>quantity determination</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>irresultative verb ‘auttaa’</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Part 1 of questionnaire 2 in percentages
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>Direct object related to</th>
<th>Exper. group</th>
<th>Contr. group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ordinal numbers</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>irresultative verb ‘kiinnostaa’</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>generic sentence</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 6:* The total score, bonus points excluded, per question on comprehension (part 1 of Questionnaire 2) for the experimental group and the control group, in percentages

Moreover, the number of bonus points was investigated (figure 7). It is striking that the experimental group scored the highest number of bonus points on question 5, on which the control group did not score a bonus point.
Figure 7: The total score of bonus points, per question on comprehension (question 1 to 7 of Questionnaire 2) of the experimental group and the control group, in absolute numbers.

Four subjects of the experimental group and the control group stay(ed) in Finland and had therefore had immersion in the Finnish language. Their mean score of the points and the bonus points was 14.3 and 1.3. Ten subjects did not stay in Finland and had not been immersed in the Finnish language. Their mean score of the points and the bonus points was 15.8 and 2.7.

Figure 8: The mean score of points and bonus points on comprehension (part 1 of Q. 2) of subjects who stay(ed) and did not stay in Finland for a year, in absolute numbers.
In part 2 of questionnaire 2 the subjects of both groups answered to the question in which situation the partitive case has to be used as a case for the direct object. Five subjects of the experimental group and 4 subjects of the control group mentioned the negative sentence. Every subject of the experimental group mentioned the use together with an irresultative verb and the use in a process, whereas no subject of the control group thought of this combination.

In part 3 the subjects had to describe the steps to be taken if they had to translate a Dutch generic sentence into Finnish. Three subjects of the experimental group and 1 subject of the control group took the correct steps and chose the correct case for the direct object.

5.2 Application

The cases of the Finnish direct object
To become aware of the use of the different direct object cases, the total number of used direct object cases in 4 lessons of the second semester by the experimental group and the control group taken together was traced (figure 9).

![Figure 9](image)

**Figure 9:** The total amount of use of the Finnish direct object cases in the lessons 20, 21, 28 and 29 in the second semester of the first year of the experimental group and the control group taken together, in percentages
Moreover, the correct and incorrect use of every Finnish direct object case in 4 lessons of the second semester by both groups was traced (figure 10).

![Figure 10: The correct and incorrect use of every Finnish direct object case in the lessons 20, 21, 28 and 29 in the second semester of the first year of the experimental group and the control group taken together, in absolute numbers](image)

Furthermore, the correct and incorrect use of every Finnish direct object case in the same 4 lessons of both groups were traced. In total the experimental group used 82.5% of the cases correctly, the control group 74.1%. (figure 11). Striking is the relatively equal amount of use of the cases by the 2 groups. Also striking is the high score of the correct use of the genitive case and the low score on the nominative case by the control group. The high score of the correct use of the partitive case by the experimental group strikes too. The accusative case was not used incorrectly.
The experimental group versus the control group

In the first semester, a pretest was done in order to trace possible differences between the groups. Of 4 writing assignments the direct object cases were traced. The experimental group used for the direct object 35.2% cases correctly, the control group 35.1% (figure 13).
Figure 13: The scores of the use of the Finnish direct object case in the lessons 13 to 16 of the first semester of the first year of the experimental group and the control group, in percentages.

In the second semester the experimental group had got non-traditional instruction on the Finnish direct object cases. In 4 lessons of writing assignments of that semester the experimental group used 83.3% direct object cases correctly, where as the control group used 73.7% correctly (figure 14).

Figure 14: The scores of the use of the Finnish direct object cases in the lessons 20, 21, 28 and 29 of the second semester of the first year of the experimental group and the control group, in percentages.

Before the scores of the experimental group and the control group of the use of the Finnish direct object cases in the lessons of the second semester (20, 21, 28 and 29) were imported into the data processing program SPSS 16.0, a Levene’s test was done for equality of variance. The test showed that the dispersion within the groups was not the same
and therefore equal variances could not be assumed; the significance level was smaller than 0.05 (0.045). On average, the experimental group showed a higher level of application ($M=12, SE=3.0$) than the control group ($M=8, SE=1.9$). This difference was not significant ($t(8.8)=1.2; p<0.05$) and the hypothesis could not be rejected.

Because of the striking fact that the experimental group showed a higher level of application, 6 writing assignments of the second semester were used to distil possible increasement of applying the direct object cases correctly (table 4, figure 15). The correct use stayed between 80% and 90% and did not increase.

**Table 4: Part 1 of questionnaire 2, the use of the direct object cases in percentages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lesson</th>
<th>correct use</th>
<th>incorrect use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 15:** The scores of the use of the Finnish direct object cases in the lessons 20, 21, 24, 25, 28 and 29 of the second semester of the first year by the experimental group, in percentages
6 Discussion

This chapter discusses the outcomes which were presented in the previous chapter. The outcomes on comprehension will be discussed in 6.1 and those on application in 6.2.

6.1 Comprehension

The starting point of the research was Questionnaire 1, filled in by the experimental group and the control group a week before the non-traditional explicit instruction was given. All subjects of both groups had at that time had explicit instruction in the traditional way. In the questionnaire they had to recognize the direct object in a Dutch and in a Finnish sentence. The scores were very high, which implies that the level of recognizing the direct object in a sentence was sufficient. If the results had been negative, this would have been of influence on the ability to comprehend the use of the Finnish direct object cases. The fact that the enormous amount of Indo-European languages helps almost every subject to understand the Finnish grammar, sketches the ignorance of the difference in the approximation of the direct object case system in the two language families.

Only 1 subject of both the experimental group and the control group could reproduce the correct cases for the Finnish direct object. This is an indication for confusion amongst the subjects. The genitive case was only mentioned a few times, while this case was the second most often used case for the direct object by the 12 subjects. The accusative case and the partitive were mentioned more often. This would not have been remarkable (the subjects learned that the cases of the direct object are the accusative in different kind of forms, and the partitive), had it not been that the majority at the same time also mentioned the nominative and the genitive case. The
combination accusative, nominative and partitive was mentioned most often. The fact that the genitive was not mentioned by these subjects, implies confusion too: the nominative and the genitive both have the suffix ‘like-accusative’ in the method and are thus treated in the same way. Moreover, the nominative-like accusative was mentioned once together with the nominative case, while the nominative case is identical to the nominative-like accusative. The fact that 9 different combinations of cases for the Finnish direct object were given shows ignorance.

On the question about the exchangeability of the terms ‘direct object’ and ‘accusative’ in Questionnaire 1, 2 subjects of the experimental group and the control group thought that they are in Finnish grammar. This is not the case. Moreover, 1 of them mentioned that there are 3 cases for the direct object, which does not match with the previous answers. Furthermore, 2 subjects did not know the answer and 1 of the subjects who thought that the terms are not exchangeable did not consider the accusative as a case for the direct object. These are signs of confusion.

It can be concluded that explicit instruction in the traditional way does not lead to adequate comprehension of the use of the Finnish direct object cases; in contrast: it leads to confusion.

In Questionnaire 2, given in week 8 of the second semester, when the experimental group had already had explicit instruction in the non-traditional way 8 weeks before, both the experimental group and the control group were asked to explain the use of the partitive case for the direct object. The use of this case in a negative sentence had been explained explicitly in the traditional method, and it was therefore not surprising that both groups knew this. The experimental group explained very well how the countability of the direct object influences the case; this item is explicitly described in the ‘Non-traditional model of the direct object case system’, which may have been of help. This also applies to the quantity determination, for ordinal numbers related to the direct object and for a generic sentence in relation to the direct object, items on which the
experimental group scored far better than the control group. The irresultative verb ‘auttaa’ [to help] serves as an example-verb in the method for the specific group of verbs that ‘go with the partitive case’. This may be the reason for the high score for both groups. On the sentence with the verb ‘kiinnostaa’ [to interest], a verb with exactly the same classification, the experimental group scored considerably higher than the control group. The classification of irresultative verbs is explicitly described in the model. This might have been the reason for the higher score of the experimental group. Besides, a significant difference in advantage of the experimental group was shown in the Independent-Samples T test. Also the difference in the comprehension of the use of the correct direct object case in specific grammar constructions was shown: even though generic sentences and quantitative clauses are difficult items for all subjects, on every question of the first part of Questionnaire 2 the experimental group scored better than the control group.

Moreover, the experimental group scored more bonus points than the control group on every question. They explained the matter about ordinal numbers (explicitly described in the model) related to the direct object very well, whereas the control group did not do this at all. With the bonus points both groups scored the lowest on the generic sentence. The Finnish generic sentence may be an inconceivable subject for Indo-European learners.

The 2 specific uses of the partitive case (1: together with an irresultative verb; 2: in a process) in relation to the direct object had not been explicitly explained in the traditional method, but were described in the model to the experimental group. This may have been the reason for the fact that every subject of the experimental group mentioned both ways, whereas in the control group only 1 subject did so.

Furthermore, 3 subjects of the experimental group took the right steps in choosing the right case for the direct object in a generic sentence when they had to explain these in an open question, whereas 1 of the control group did. This implies that in both groups the score was not
sufficient. The fact that a generic sentence seems to be a difficult item may have been the reason for this.

It can be concluded that explicit instruction in the non-traditional way leads to better comprehension of the use of the Finnish direct object cases than explicit instruction in the traditional way. In relation to this, it can be concluded that explicit instruction in the non-traditional way seems to lead to correct comprehension of the controlled use of the Finnish direct object cases.

Of the experimental group 1 subject had been in Finland for a year, before the study had started. Of the control group 1 subject had been there during the study and 2 subjects were still in Finland during this research. Their results were all taken together in order to compare the effect of immersion in the Finnish language on the matter. The group of subjects who stay(ed) in Finland for a year scored worse than the group of subjects without immersion. The very complex and opaque rules of the use of the direct object are not understood better through immersion in the Finnish language because the rules of the direct object cases are hardly to be distilled. It seems the case that explicit instruction in combination with explanation after corrections by a lecturer, over and over again, are needed to comprehend the use of the cases, even if the lesson is only once a week. Moreover, the Finnish (street)language may not have contained the standard use of the direct object cases, and therefore may have had a negative influence on the Finnish L2 learner.

It can be concluded that immersion in the Finnish language has a negative effect on comprehending the use of the Finnish direct object cases.
6.2 Application

Though research shows that the partitive case is often problematic for learners of Finnish (Schot-Saikku 1990, Martin 1995), both the experimental and the control group used it more for the direct object than the other cases taken together in the writing assignments of the second semester. Moreover, the experimental group used it almost 1 out of 1 time correctly, and the control group almost 3 out of 4 times. The partitive had also been most often used incorrectly, but this was not in relation to the correct and incorrect use of the other cases; it was proportionally used far less incorrectly. On the other hand, the accusative case was barely used; the reason for this may have been the subjects’ uncertainty about the correct use, and they therefore may have looked for alternative forms. The relatively equal amount of use of the cases by the 2 groups can be explained by the answers which had to be given because of the topics of the lessons: sometimes the subjects gave about the same answers. Why the control group scored high in the right use of the genitive case and the experimental group scored high in the right use of the partitive case cannot be explained.

In the first semester the experimental group used a little more correct cases and fewer incorrect cases for the direct object than the control group in their written homework. The difference was negligible (about 1% in both cases). This can be explained by the fact that the experimental group had not had explicit instruction in the non-traditional way by then. The application in the first semester could not be called correct though; all subjects taken together scored less than 70% correct answers (it was decided that 70% correct answers or more was called ‘correct application’). In the second semester the difference was larger; about 10% in both cases to the advantage of the experimental group. The experimental group had got explicit instruction in the non-traditional way
and could make use of the Model whenever they wanted. Besides, both groups scored more than 70% correct answers.

It can therefore be concluded that both ways of explicit instruction lead to correct application and that explicit instruction in the non-traditional way leads to slightly, but not significantly, better application of the use of the Finnish direct object cases than explicit instruction in the traditional way.

The fact that the experimental group showed a higher level of application than the control group did, resulted in comparing 6 lessons of the experimental group, in the beginning, the middle and the end of the 8 week testing term in the second semester. This was done in order to find if there would be an increase of applying the direct object cases correctly. It was shown that, even though the level of application was higher, the correct application itself did not increase during the semester. The higher level may have been caused by the use of the Model and by the weekly corrections in the non-traditional way by the lecturer and, therefore, the constant awareness of the subjects. This, combined with the not increasing level of application during the 8 weeks, may have been caused by the difficulty of some complex grammar constructions, like the applying of the direct object case in a generic sentence. These complex constructions may remain an extreme difficulty for Indo-European learners.

It can be concluded that the non-traditional way does not lead to an increased level of correct application of the Finnish direct object cases.
Conclusion

In the previous chapter the results have been discussed in order to come to a general conclusion in this chapter. Literature on learning a very different language and literature on the Finnish direct object case system are linked to the findings of the study.

This study revealed that the traditional way does not lead to correct comprehension. This is in accordance with Itkonen (1972), Timberlake (1974), Nelson (1998) and Kiparsky (2001), who were already aware of the problems with the accusative case and the direct object. Also it was shown that the non-traditional way does seem to lead to correct comprehension. This is in accordance with Volodin (1997) who said that linguists who make grammars and methods, still look at Finnish through ‘Indo-European spectacles’. Besides, the function of the ‘Non-traditional model for the direct object case system’ was already demonstrated by Schmidt (1990), who concluded that the role of explicit instruction is to let the students really focus on a new rule. MacWhinney (2008) also noticed that the learning takes place by comparing this input with a learner’s knowledge of L1, searching for similarities and differences. Furthermore, it could be concluded that the non-traditional way leads to significantly better comprehension. This does conform with Schmidt and Frota (1986) who showed that the learner should consciously have to ‘notice the gap’ between the L1 and the L2 because in that case that which is noticed can be reflected on. The negative outcome of the question what effect immersion has on comprehending the use of the direct object cases was not expected and does not conform with De Bot, Lowie and Verspoor (2005) who suggested that, amongst others, the frequency of practicing the rules may play an important role in the process of internalization.

The study showed that both the non-traditional and the traditional way lead to correct application (more than a 70% correct score). This does not conform with Green and Hecht (1992) who showed that, even when
learners of an L2 get explicit instructions of grammar rules, applying these rules correctly often fails in communicative tasks. Moreover is was found that the non-traditional way leads to slightly better application, but that the non-traditional way did not lead to incréase of applying the rules correctly within the time span of the research. For this outcome the Model and the corrections of the lecturer may be responsible (Schmidt 1990), or the fact that declarative knowledge does nos lead to internalization.

The general conclusion of this study is that learning the Finnish direct object case system in a non-traditional way has a positive effect on both comprehension and application.

My suggestions for further research are in the first place a study with more subjects over a longer period. Data of subjects who use a method which is written in the traditional way of subjects who use a method which is written in the non-traditional way, could be used. Furthermore, the use of the Finnish direct object cases by native speakers would be an interesting item to investigate. Finally, it would be interesting to find the complex rules in the Finnish grammar which remain extremely difficult to acquire.

Sneek, July 2010
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Questionnaire 1: Direct object / Accusative case

Algemeen:

1] Mijn vooropleiding is (vul hier in welke vormen van onderwijs je hebt gevolgd na de basisschool):

2] Ik beheers de volgende talen ‘heel goed/goed/redelijk/niet zo goed/niet’ (vul één van deze mogelijkheden in elk vakje van de tabel in):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>taal</th>
<th>spreken</th>
<th>verstaan</th>
<th>schrijven</th>
<th>lezen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nederlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latijn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grieks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nederlands:

3] Ik herken het lijdend voorwerp in een Nederlandse zin eenvoudig: ja / nee (haal steeds weg wat niet van toepassing is)

4] Is in de volgende Nederlandse zinnen een lijdend voorwerp aanwezig?

A] Jan is een grote jongen: ja / nee
Zo ja, het lijdend voorwerp in deze zin is:

B] Morgen geeft hij zijn moeder een kado: ja / nee
Zo ja, het lijdend voorwerp in deze zin is:

C] Wees toch eens lief voor je broertje! : ja / nee
Zo ja, het lijdend voorwerp in deze zin is:

Zo ja, het lijdend voorwerp in deze zin is:

Fins:

5] Mijn kennis van de grammatica van de volgende ta(a)l(en) helpt mij in het begrijpen van de Finse grammatica:

6] Ik herken het lijdend voorwerp in een Finse zin eenvoudig: ja / nee
7] De begrippen 'lijdend voorwerp' en 'accusatief' zijn in de Finse grammatica inwisselbaar: ja / nee / weet niet

8] Het lijdend voorwerp wordt in het Fins met de volgende naamval(len) gemarkeerd:

9] Kun je kort aangeven waarvoor de naamval 'accusatief' volgens jou in het Fins wordt gebruikt?

10] Is in de volgende Finse zinnen een lijdend voorwerp aanwezig?
   A] Minulla on kirja: ja / nee
   Zo ja, het lijdend voorwerp in deze zin is:
   De naamval ervan is:

   B] Minä panin kirjan ylähyllylle: ja / nee
   Zo ja, het lijdend voorwerp in deze zin is:
   De naamval ervan is:

   C] He ovat opiskelijat: ja / nee
   Zo ja, het lijdend voorwerp in deze zin is:
   De naamval ervan is:

   D] Lue tämä runo!: ja / nee
   Zo ja, het lijdend voorwerp in deze zin is:
   De naamval ervan is:

   E] Toivon, että Mika ottaa hänet mukaan: ja / nee
   Zo ja, het lijdend voorwerp in deze zin is:
   De naamval ervan is:

   F] Meidän täytyy ostaa uusi auto: ja / nee
   Zo ja, het lijdend voorwerp in deze zin is:
   De naamval ervan is:

   G] Onko hän sinusta kiva?: ja / nee
   Zo ja, het lijdend voorwerp in deze zin is:
   De naamval ervan is:
Appendix 2: Non-traditional model of the direct object case system

Naamvallen lijding voorwerp/aan het lijding voorwerp verwante kwantiteitsbepalingen

1) Bevestigende zin met het zowel impliciete (=niet in de Finse zin vermelde) onderwerp als expliciete onderwerp in de nominatief.
   • Enkelvoud:
     nominatief Minä ostan kolme pulloa olutta. Ik koop drie flessen bier. (: telwoorden vanaf 2)
     genitief He ostavat takin. Zij kopen de/een jas.
     accusatief Minä tunnen sinut. Ik ken jou.
     partitief Minä juon ensin tämän kahvin. Ik drink eerst deze koffie.
     • Meervoud:
       nominatief Minä ostan kukat. Ik koop de bloemen.
       accusatief Minä tunnen heidät. Ik ken hen.
       partitief Me syömme mansikoita. Wij eten aardbeien.

2) Bevestigende zin zonder onderwerp in de nominatief (=een necessieve zin, een imperatieve zin, een passieve zin of een zin met het onderwerp in de genitief).
   • Enkelvoud:
     nominatief Annan on helppo löytää asunto. Anna kan gemakkelijk de/een woning vinden.
     accusatief Annan on helppo löytää sinut. Anna kan jou gemakkelijk vinden.
     partitief Ota kahvia! Neem koffie!
   • Meervoud:
     nominatief Osta autot! Koop de auto’s!
     accusatief Osta autot! Koop de auto’s!
     partitief Ota kahvia! Neem koffie!

3) Irresultatieve zin met een l-werkwoord (= een werkwoord dat de partitief regeert), een ontkennin dan wel afzwakking uitdrukend of een proces aangevend.
   Altijd in de partitief. Het maakt niet uit in welke tijd de zin staat, of de zin in enkelvoud of meervoud staat, actief of passief is of wat voor soort zin het is.
   • L-werkwoord
     nominatief Minä rakastan sinua/heitä/kahvia/mansikoita. Ik hou van jou/hun/koffie/aardbeien.
     accusatief Minä en voi auttaa sinua/heitä. Ik kan jou/hun niet helpen.
     • Ontkenning
     nominatief Minä en syö omenaa. Ik eet geen appel.
     accusatief Täänä ei voi syödä mansikoita. Hier kun je geen aardbeien eten.
     • Proces
     nominatief Minä kuin kirja. Ik was een boek aan het lezen.
     accusatief Minä juon kahvia. Ik ben koffie aan het drinken.
Appendix 3: Questionnaire 2: Comprehension of the Finnish direct object

Deel 1.a. Beantwoord onderstaande vragen zo uitgebreid mogelijk, met de kennis die je zelf hebt, zonder anderen te vragen of andere bronnen te raadplegen. In elke zin staat een lijdend voorwerp. Let op: de mogelijkheid bestaat dat de naamval van het lijdend voorwerp niet juist is weergegeven. Ook kan het zijn dat er meerdere mogelijkheden juist zijn, vermeld dat dan onder ‘opmerkingen’. Wil je daarin ook andere, voor jouw gevoel relevante, opmerkingen plaatsen met betrekking tot het lijdend voorwerp in de desbetreffende zin?

VOORBEELD:

Tiedätkö sinä kenet he tuntevat?

a] Vertaling van de gehele zin in het Nederlands: Weet jij wie zij kennen?
b] Lijdend voorwerp: kenet
c] Naamval van het lijdend voorwerp/enkelvoud of meervoud: accusatief / ev
d] De naamval van het lijdend voorwerp is correct: ja

Ja, want: ‘kenet’ is de accusatiefvorm van ‘kuka’. Als het vragend voornaamwoord het lijdend voorwerp in de zin is dient de accusatief als naamval.

f] Zo nee, dit zou er in het Fins moeten staan:

g] De naamval hiervan is:
h] Waarom is dit de juiste naamval:
i] Opmerkingen:

1] Älä ota juusto jääkapista!

a] Vertaling van de gehele zin in het Nederlands:
b] Lijdend voorwerp:
c] Naamval van het lijdend voorwerp/enkelvoud of meervoud:
d] De naamval van het lijdend voorwerp is correct: ja/nee

Ja, want:

f] Nee, dit zou er in het Fins moeten staan:

g] De naamval hiervan is:
h] Dit is wel de juiste naamval omdat:

i] Opmerkingen:

2] Hän saa palkan keskiviikkona.

a] Vertaling van de gehele zin in het Nederlands:
b] Lijdend voorwerp:
c] Naamval van het lijdend voorwerp/enkelvoud of meervoud:
d] De naamval van het lijdend voorwerp is correct: ja/nee

Ja, want:

f] Nee, dit zou er in het Fins moeten staan:

g] De naamval hiervan is:
h] Dit is wel de juiste naamval omdat:

i] Opmerkingen:

3] Hän on ollut Venäjällä kahden vuoden.

a] Vertaling van de gehele zin in het Nederlands:
b] Lijdend voorwerp:
c] Naamval van het lijdend voorwerp/enkelvoud of meervoud:
d] De naamval van het lijdend voorwerp is correct: ja/nee

Ja, want:

f] Nee, dit zou er in het Fins moeten staan:

g] De naamval hiervan is:
h] Dit is wel de juiste naamval omdat:

i] Opmerkingen:
4] He luulevat, että me autamme teitä.
a] Vertaling van de gehele zin in het Nederlands:
b] Lijdend voorwerp:
c] Naamval van het lijdend voorwerp/enkelvoud of meervoud:
d] De naamval van het lijdend voorwerp is correct: ja/nee
e] Ja, want:
f] Nee, dit zou er in het Fins moeten staan:
g] De naamval hiervan is:
h] Dit is wel de juiste naamval omdat:
i] Opmerkingen:

Deel 1.b. Vul in onderstaande 3 zinnen zelf de juiste vorm van de tussen haakjes gegeven woorden in en beantwoord de vragen. Zoek niets op maar volg je eigen inzicht!

5] He tapaisivat (toinen kerta).
a] Vertaling van de gehele zin in het Nederlands:
b] De juiste naamval van het lijdend voorwerp:
c] Dit is de juiste naamval omdat:
d] Eventuele opmerkingen:

a] Vertaling van de gehele zin in het Nederlands:
b] De juiste naamval l van het lijdend voorwerp:
c] Dit is de juiste naamval omdat:
d] Eventuele opmerkingen:

7] (Lippu, enkelvoud) voi ostaa sieltä.
a] Vertaling van de gehele zin in het Nederlands:
b] De juiste naamval van het lijdend voorwerp:
c] Dit is de juiste naamval omdat:
d] Eventuele opmerkingen:

Deel 2. Kun je aangeven in wat voor soorten zinnen jij de naamval partitief voor het lijdend voorwerp gebruikt in het Fins? Geef er zo mogelijk (zonder op te zoeken) een voorbeeldzin bij met de Nederlandse vertaling.
1.
2.
3.
....

Deel 3. Omschrijf de stappen die je neemt om tot de keuze van de naamval voor het lijdend voorwerp in het Fins te komen wanneer je de volgende zin zou moeten vertalen: ‘Hij moet hen vinden.’
1.
2.
3.
....
Appendix 4: The materials of writing assignments 13, 14, 15, 16

Les: Osio 13 (kolmetoista)

Naam:

Opdracht C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woord</th>
<th>Woordenboekvorm</th>
<th>Woordsoort</th>
<th>Stam</th>
<th>Rectie en overig</th>
<th>Betekenis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Opdracht D

1. Miksi Jutan täytyy lähettää paketti ehdottomasti juuri tänään?
   Antwoord:
2. Miksi hänen oli helppo valita lahja veljensä vaimolle?
   Antwoord:
3. Miksi Jutta osti niin monta kaunista postikorttia?
   Antwoord:

Opdracht E

Mitä pidät tästä pienestä suomalaisesta runosta (etsi uudet sanat sanakirjasta)? Onko se sinusta vaikea vai helppo ymmärtää?
Antwoord:

"Elämä on toisaalla,
mutta sinne pääsee taksilla." (Jari Tervo)
Antwoord:

Aantal woorden:
Les: Osio 14 (neljätoista)

Naam:

Opdracht C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woord</th>
<th>Woordenboekvorm</th>
<th>Woordsoort</th>
<th>Stam</th>
<th>Rectie en overig</th>
<th>Betekenis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Opdracht D

1. Miksi Jutta oli pienenä ylpeä isoveljistään?
   Antwoord:
2. Millä tavalla Anssi oli lapsena aivan erilainen kuin Jutta?
   Antwoord:
3. Mitä Anssi harrasti silloin kun hän oli vielä pieni?
   Antwoord:

Opdracht E

Kerro omasta perheestäsi. Missä sinä asuit lapsena? Millainen olit pienenä?

Antwoord:

Aantal woorden:
Les: Osio 15 (viisitoista)

Naam:

Opdracht C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woord</th>
<th>Woordenboekvorm</th>
<th>Woordsoort</th>
<th>Stam</th>
<th>Rectie en overig</th>
<th>Betekenis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Opdracht D

1. Miksi Jutta oli niin hämmästynyt, kun hän näki Annan?
   Antwoord:
2. Millä tavalla Jutta yritti piristää ystäväänsä?
   Antwoord:
3. Miksi Anna lähti niin nopeasti kotiin?
   Antwoord:

Opdracht E

Mitä luulet, miksi Anna on nyt niin erilainen kuin tavallisesti? Oliko hänellä siihen jokin hyvä syy?
   Antwoord:

Aantal woorden:
Les: Osio 16 (kuusitoista)

Naam:

Opdracht C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woord</th>
<th>Woordenboekvorm</th>
<th>Woordsoort</th>
<th>Stam</th>
<th>Rectie en overig</th>
<th>Betekenis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Opdracht D

1. Miksi Jutta oli nukkunut liian vähän?
   Antwoord:
2. Mitä kaikkea Jutta Anssin mielestä voisi tehdä tässä tilanteessa?
   Antwoord:
3. Miten Jutta joka tapauksessa voisi viettää rauhallisen viikonloppun?
   Antwoord:

Opdracht E

Käytä sanakirjaa apuna. Kirjoita noin 100 sanaa. Laske sanat ja merkitse lukumäärä tehtävän loppuun.
Antwoord:

Mitä sinä teksit tällaisessa tapauksessa? Luuletko, että sinä voisit ottaa rauhallisesti, vaikka olisitkin väsynyt?
Antwoord:

Aantal woorden:
Appendix 5: The materials of writing assignments 20, 21, 24, 25, 28, 29

Les: Osio 20 (kaksikymmentä)

Naam:

Opdracht C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woord</th>
<th>Woordenboekvorm</th>
<th>Woordsoort</th>
<th>Stam</th>
<th>Rectie en overig</th>
<th>Betekenis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Opdracht D

1. Miksi Anssi soitti Jutalle?
   Antwoord:
2. Mistä Jutalle tuli ongelma?
   Antwoord:
3. Millä tavalla Jutta hämmästytti Annaa?
   Antwoord:

Opdracht E

1. Kerro, mitä tiedät siitä, miten Suomessa vietetään itsenäisyyspäivää?
   Antwoord:
2. Milloin Suomi tuli itsenäiseksi? Millainen Suomen tilanne oli sitä ennen?
   Antwoord:

Aantal woorden:
Les: Osio 21 (kaksikymmentäyksi)

Naam:

Opdracht C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woord</th>
<th>Woordenboekvorm</th>
<th>Woordsoort</th>
<th>Stam</th>
<th>Rectie en overig</th>
<th>Betekenis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Opdracht D

1. Miten Anssi sai vapaaliput konserttiin?
   Antwoord:
2. Miksi Jutta oli kiinnostunut lähtemään konserttiin, vaikka kulttuuri ei häntä yleensä paljon kiinnostanut?
   Antwoord:
3. Millä tavalla Temppeliaukion kirkko on erilainen kuin monet muut kirkot
   Antwoord:

Opdracht E

1. Mitä tiedät suomalaisesta joulusta? Vietetäänkö sitä eri tavalla vai samalla tavalla kuin joulua vietetään sinun kotimaassasi?
   Antwoord:

2. Kirjoita kirje joulupukille. Mitä toivoisit joulupukilta? Miksi?
   Antwoord:

Aantal woorden:
Les: Osio 24 (kaksikymmentäneljä)

Naam:

Opdracht C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woord</th>
<th>Woordenboekvorm</th>
<th>Woordsoort</th>
<th>Stam</th>
<th>Rectie en overig</th>
<th>Betekenis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Opdracht D

1. Miksi Jutta ja Anna alkavat katsoa valokuvia?
   Antwoord:
2. Miksi Kari sai käyttää sukulaistensa kesäpaikkaa Ahvenanmaalla?
   Antwoord:
3. Mitä kaikkea saarella tehtiin?
   Antwoord:

Opdracht E

1. Vietetäänkö sinun kotimaassasi juhannusta? Jos vietetään, niin miten?
   Antwoord:

   Antwoord:

Aantal woorden:
Les: Osio 25 (kaksikymmentäviisi)

Naam:

Opdracht C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woord</th>
<th>Woordenboekvorm</th>
<th>Woordsoort</th>
<th>Stam</th>
<th>Rectie en overig</th>
<th>Betekenis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Opdracht D

1. Millaisia lauluja nimitetään kansanlauluiksi?
   Antwoord:
2. Millaista musiikkia nimitetään uudeksi kansanmusiikiksi?
   Antwoord:
3. Millainen asema kansanmusiikilla on Suomessa?
   Antwoord:

Opdracht E

1. Oletko kuullut suomalaista kansanmusiikkia? Mitä, missä, milloin? Tunnetko kotimaasi kansanmusiikkia?
   Antwoord:
2. Tiedätkö, mitä 'uudella kansanmusiikkilla' tarkoitetaan? Tunnetko uutta kansanmusiikkia soittavia yhtyeitä? Mitä pidät niiden musiikista?
   Antwoord:

Aantal woorden:
Les: Osio 28 (kaksikymmentäkahdeksan)

Naam:

Opdracht C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woord</th>
<th>Woordenboekvorm</th>
<th>Woordsoort</th>
<th>Stam</th>
<th>Rectie en overig</th>
<th>Betekenis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Opdracht D

1. Miksi Jutta ei ollut ottanut yhteyttä lääkäriin heti kun hänen kurkkunsa oli tullut kipeäksi?
   Antwoord:
2. Millä tavalla Anna auttoi Juttaa?
   Antwoord:
3. Miksi Jutan ei tarvinnut odottaa kauan ennen kuin hän oli vuorossa?
   Antwoord:

Opdracht E

1. Milloin sinä olit viimeksi sairas tai hoidit sairasta? Vai etkö sinä ole koskaan sairas?
   Mistä mielestäsi johtuu, että sinä et tule helposti sairaksi.
   Antwoord:

2. Millä tavalla sinun kotimaassasi hoidetaan vilustumista (nuhaa, yskää ja kuumetta)?
   Antwoord:

Aantal woorden:
Les: Osio 29 (kaksikymmentäyhdeksän)

Naam:

Opdracht C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woord</th>
<th>Woordenboekvorm</th>
<th>Woordsoort</th>
<th>Stam</th>
<th>Rectie en overig</th>
<th>Betekenis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Opdracht D

1. Miksi Anssi ajatteli, että Jutalle oli tapahtunut jotakin hauskaa?
   Antwoord:

2. Mikä Juttaa harmitti?
   Antwoord:

3. Miksi Lapinmatkaa kannattaa aina alkaa suunnitella ajoissa?
   Antwoord:

Opdracht E

1. Mitä tiedät saamelaisista ja saamenkielestä?
   Antwoord:

2. Mitä tiedät saamenkielen asemasta Suomessa?
   Antwoord:

Aantal woorden: