



Citation: S. Harchaoui (2026) Receptive Multilingualism from the Outside: Challenges and Strategies for Teaching Mainland Scandinavian Mutual Intelligibility to French-speaking Learners. “Quaderni di *Lea* – Scrittori e scritture d'Oriente e d'Occidente” 9: pp. 35-52. doi: <https://doi.org/10.36253/lea-1824-484x-16576>.

Copyright: © 2026 S. Harchaoui. This is an open access, peer-reviewed article published by Firenze University Press (<https://oajournals.fupress.net/index.php/bsfm-lea>) and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Data Availability Statement: All relevant data are within the paper and its Supporting Information files.

Competing Interests: The Author(s) declare(s) no conflict of interest.

Receptive Multilingualism from the Outside: Challenges and Strategies for Teaching Mainland Scandinavian Mutual Intelligibility to French-speaking Learners

Sarah Harchaoui

Sorbonne Université (<sarah.harchaoui@sorbonne-universite.fr>)

Abstract

This article examines receptive multilingualism from an external perspective, focusing on the mutual intelligibility of Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish when teaching French-speaking learners. Challenging the assumption that Scandinavian mutual intelligibility is inherently accessible, the study highlights difficulties arising in a foreign academic context shaped by a monolingual tradition. Drawing on qualitative data from a year-long university course, it analyses students' receptive development and metalinguistic awareness. Results show an initial focus on linguistic distance and variation that is gradually replaced by adaptive decoding strategies through systematic exposure, comparative tasks, and reflexive practice. The study argues for a pedagogy of receptive multilingualism tailored to secondary speech communities.

Keywords: Inter-Scandinavian Communication, Mainland Scandinavian Mutual Intelligibility, Mediated Intelligibility, Norwegian as a Foreign Language, Receptive Multilingualism

1. Receptive Multilingualism from the Inside

1.1 Challenges in Teaching Scandinavian Mutual Intelligibility in a Nordic Country

Over the past two decades, the Nordic Council and the Nordic Council of Ministers have intensified efforts to promote receptive multilingualism¹ among children and young people

¹ I refer to receptive multilingualism according to the definition of Gooskens and van Heuven who defined “intelligibility as the degree to which a listener is able to recognise the linguistic units in the stream of sounds and to establish the order in which they are spoken. Mutual intelligibility is the

through formal education. One notable initiative is the free digital learning platform *Norden i skolen* (The North in the School), that provides a wide range of teaching resources aimed at fostering mutual intelligibility across the Nordic languages,² including the indigenous languages Sámi and Greenlandic.

This aim is further reinforced by the updated *Declaration on Nordic Language Policy* (2024), which reaffirms that cooperation among Nordic societies is founded upon the mainland Scandinavian languages – Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish –, that are deemed vital for the region’s cohesion and future. The declaration stresses that all Nordic citizens should be able to speak, understand, read, and write the language(s) of the society in which they live, and furthermore, that they should be able to communicate in at least one Scandinavian language and possess knowledge of the others in order to fully engage with the Nordic language space.

While such policies establish an ambitious framework, a closer look at their implementation reveals a more complex reality. Questions arise concerning how these goals are reflected in public education systems and curricula. An early indication of challenges in implementation comes from a 2000 survey by Aas investigating the state of neighbouring language³ instruction (*nabospråkundervisning*) in Scandinavian primary and lower secondary schools. Using a mixed-methods approach – including teacher surveys, interviews, classroom observations, analyses of curricula and teaching materials – she found that instruction in neighbouring languages occurs only once or twice per year on average, with Norway showing the highest level of activity. The study also highlighted key challenges: insufficient time in Norway and Sweden, low student interest in Denmark, and, more generally, a lack of suitable teaching materials. Aas also pointed out that younger teachers devoted generally less time to this instruction than their older counterparts, raising concerns that the emphasis on neighbouring languages may continue to decline over time.

A follow-up survey a decade later conducted by the Language Council of Norway (Språkrådet) found that many Norwegian teachers deprioritised the comprehension of neighbouring languages in their teaching. The study concluded that “many have a feeling that neighboring language teaching is not taken very seriously, even though the curricula have clear competence goals in this area” (2011, 4). In addition, many of the teachers surveyed felt they had limited qualifications to teach neighbouring languages effectively. Hårstad (2015, 31), who authored a handbook on receptive multilingualism for Norwegian teachers, claims that neighbouring language learning differs fundamentally from traditional foreign language learning, as it emphasises receptive rather than productive skills. That is, comprehension across Scandinavian languages is presumed to be an intuitive faculty among native speakers, rather than something explicitly learned inside the primary community.

mean of the two directions, i.e., the degree to which listener A understands speaker B and vice versa. It should be noted that the two directions can be asymmetric, i.e., can yield different scores” (2021, 87).

² The Nordic languages – Danish, Swedish, Norwegian (Bokmål and Nynorsk), Icelandic, and Faroese – may be arranged along a continuum of mutual oral intelligibility. According to Torp (2014, 45), they fall into two main groups: *Insular Nordic* (Icelandic and Faroese) and *Scandinavian*, the latter subdivided into North Scandinavian (Norwegian and Swedish) and South Scandinavian (Danish). In this article, I use the term *mainland Scandinavian languages* to refer specifically to Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian.

³ i.e. “Nabospråk er altså språkformer som har så mange lingvistiske likhetspunkter at de er innbyrdes forståelige, men som av sosiohistoriske og politiske årsaker likevel regnes som forskjellige språk” (Hårstad 2015, 18). Trans.: Neighbouring languages are language forms which have so many linguistic similarities that they are mutually intelligible, but which, for socio-historical and political reasons, are nevertheless regarded as different languages. Unless otherwise stated, all translations are mine.

However, the widespread assumption that cross-linguistic understanding among the mainland Scandinavian languages relies on inherent intelligibility – i.e., “the level of intelligibility that is linked to linguistic factors only, without any influence from previous exposure to the language of the speaker (acquired intelligibility) or another related language (mediated intelligibility)” (Gooskens and van Heuven 2021, 70) – has been considered outdated for several decades. Research has shown that comprehension is shaped not only by linguistic proximity but also by exposure, metalinguistic awareness, and active learning strategies, highlighting the need to view mutual intelligibility as a dynamic and context-dependent process rather than a natural given.

These findings underscore the structural and pedagogical constraints that affect the promotion of mutual intelligibility among the mainland Scandinavian languages. Despite longstanding policy initiatives to support cross-linguistic understanding, the infrequent exposure and lack of resources suggest that institutional support remains insufficient to fully develop receptive multilingual skills. Moreover, the variation in challenges across countries indicates that local educational contexts significantly shape the effectiveness of neighbouring language instruction. This highlights the need for coordinated curricular and material development, as well as teacher training, to enhance systematic opportunities for fostering mutual intelligibility in Nordic schools.

In the following section, I will briefly review the linguistic and extralinguistic factors underlying the asymmetries among the mainland Scandinavian languages and discuss how these factors should be considered in the teaching of the discipline within the Nordic community, and, by extension, in contexts outside the Nordic region. Particular attention will be given to Norwegian.

1.2 Linguistic and Extralinguistic Factors Causing Asymmetric Intelligibility of Mainland Scandinavian Languages

In the Scandinavian countries, receptive multilingualism practice is not self-evident, despite the close linguistic relatedness of the Scandinavian languages. Several challenges in teaching receptive multilingualism within the primary⁴ Nordic speech community stem from linguistic asymmetries between the mainland Scandinavian languages, especially between Swedish and Danish (see Schüppert in this volume). According to Gooskens and van Heuven, “many pairs of languages have been identified in which the cross-language intelligibility was far from symmetrical and could not be attributed to differences in exposure or some other social variable” (2021, 55).

In the first major study of inter-Nordic language comprehension among adolescents, Delsing and Lundin-Åkesson (2005, 29) documented significant imbalances in the comprehension of both spoken and written language across the Scandinavian languages. For instance, Norwegian participants were found to understand written Danish more readily than spoken Danish, while Danes tended to understand Bokmål more effectively, and Swedes showed better comprehension of Nynorsk (137).

Building on Haugen’s pioneering work (1966), Torp (2014, 70) similarly reported that Norwegians consistently demonstrate better oral comprehension of both Danish and Swedish compared with their neighbouring speakers. Danes better understand Norwegian than Swedish, while Swedes struggle with Danish and have a slightly better grasp of Norwegian.

These differences may be explained in part by Norway’s sociolinguistic landscape, which is characterized by a broad spectrum of dialectal variation and the coexistence of two written standards, conditions that arguably foster greater linguistic adaptability among Norwegian speakers.

⁴ “La communauté primaire est constituée par les personnes dont l’une des trois langues (danois, norvégien ou suédois) est la première langue (ou langue maternelle selon une terminologie différente)” (Ridell 2012, 104).

Haugen (1981, 131) developed the idea of “språklig elastisitet” (linguistic elasticity) related to the language climate in a society. He argued that the stronger and more uniform a society’s language standard is, the less its speakers will be adept at handling linguistic variation. Hårstad extends this argument by noting that there is a stronger perception in Denmark and Sweden that “det finnes et felles riksspråk eller normalspråk, både muntlig og skriftlig”, and that “denne store graden av språkstandardisering har på sin side gjort dem mindre reseptivt elastiske; de er rett og slett ikke vant til å takle språklig avvik utover det ganske minimale” (2015, 35).⁵ By contrast, Norway is often described as a ‘dialect paradise’ and its tolerance for dialectal diversity contributes to a higher degree of linguistic elasticity; this in turn explains Norwegian speakers’ greater capacity for receptive multilingualism.

Additional challenges in intelligibility of mainland Scandinavian languages may be ascribed to extralinguistic factors. As an example, Delsing and Lundin-Åkesson noted that “almost all respondents understood English better than the neighbouring languages” (2005, 145) – a finding that points not only to linguistic exposure but also to ideological preferences. Aurstad (2012, 50) highlights the ideological part of language use arguing that some Scandinavians even avoid using other Scandinavian languages, fearing this may signal insufficient proficiency in English.

These tendencies reflect broader global language ideologies that have reshaped the Nordic linguistic landscape. Although language policy documents express concern about the erosion of domains traditionally reserved for national languages, English continues to enjoy elevated prestige and expanding functional roles, particularly among younger generations and professionals.

Attitudinal and subjective perceptions also play a critical role. Two French studies focused on mutual intelligibility of distant languages highlight the importance of openness and sociolinguistic awareness in fostering comprehension. Méziane, in examining intelligibility between Norwegian and French, found that perceived linguistic proximity or distance is shaped by geographical, cultural, and psychological factors not just structural similarities: “Nous avons tous une représentation de la proximité ou de la distance plus ou moins grande qui subsiste entre les langues, à la fois géographique, culturelle et linguistique” (2017, 46). In other words, receptive multilingualism also regards language attitude and subjectivity that results from perception rather than linguistic skills.

Similarly, Aurstad demonstrated in her study among Norwegian and Swedish speakers that

[l]a capacité de compréhension s’explique en partie par le désir de comprendre et par l’attitude sociolinguistique envers les deux autres langues voisines. Un locuteur motivé et ouvert à la communication est plus apte à comprendre qu’un locuteur portant sur ses voisins scandinaves (et donc sur leur langue) un jugement négatif. Ce paramètre du prestige et du statut social de la langue est souvent aussi important pour la compréhension que celui de la simple ressemblance linguistique. (2004, 480)

Learners who are open to cross-cultural communication and view neighbouring languages positively are more likely to succeed than those with exclusionary or negative attitudes.

Thus, receptive multilingualism depends not only on typological closeness, but also on individual willingness and practice, sociolinguistic awareness, and frequency of exposure. These findings underscore the importance of integrating reflective, attitudinal, and experiential components into receptive multilingualism pedagogy. Without attending to these dimensions, instructional efforts risk overlooking the very factors that determine success in cross-linguistic comprehension.

⁵ Trans.: there exists a common national language or standard language, both spoken and written [...] this high degree of language standardisation has, in turn, made them less receptively elastic; they are simply not used to dealing with linguistic deviation beyond what is quite minimal.

2. *Receptive Multilingualism from the Outside*

While receptive multilingualism is often viewed as a natural feature of intra-Scandinavian communication, its implementation in foreign language contexts raises specific pedagogical and sociolinguistic challenges. From an external perspective, the perception of a unified Nordic linguistic space remains widespread though recent studies have shown that mutual intelligibility among Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish is far from straightforward, particularly among younger generations.

This divergence is particularly evident in foreign language learning environments, such as French universities, where the Nordic languages are studied not as neighbouring tongues within a shared sociolinguistic context, but as distinct foreign languages, and where opportunities for exposure differ significantly from those in the Nordic region itself.

Branets, Bahtina, and Verschik (2020) introduced and defined the concept of “mediated receptive multilingualism” through a case study where Estonian speakers with no prior exposure to Ukrainian successfully comprehended Ukrainian texts via their knowledge of Russian. This theoretical concept is particularly relevant to the present case study, as my informants – whose first language is French – accessed Danish and Swedish through Norwegian. In this respect, their experience parallels what has been described in the literature, where comprehension of a less familiar language is facilitated by the mediation of a linguistically related and more familiar one.

2.1 *Methodology*

2.1.1 *The Context of the French University Setting*

In recent years, growing interest in Nordic studies in France has led to the development of a university-level course focused specifically on mutual intelligibility of the mainland Scandinavian languages called “intercompréhension nordique”. This course is designed for bachelor students with a background in Nordic studies, particularly those who have studied Danish, Norwegian, or Swedish as a foreign language for at least two years.

Crucially, the course emphasises receptive over productive skills. Its primary objectives are to help students identify the three languages in both spoken and written form, recognise linguistic features that distinguish them, and understand the general meaning of texts and speech in Danish, Norwegian and Swedish. In this sense, the course encourages students to develop strategies for comprehension without requiring active production in all three languages.

As part of the pedagogical framework, an introductory module entitled “Reflecting on intercomprehension” was designed to foster reflexive engagement with the mainland Scandinavian languages and introduce a two-pronged research approach. The module pursued three main objectives. First, it aimed to raise students’ awareness of their personal relationship to the Nordic languages and to mutual intelligibility, including the identification of prior knowledge, areas for improvement in Norwegian, Danish, and Swedish, and the development of metalinguistic awareness. Second, it encouraged comparative analysis of similarities and divergences among the mainland Scandinavian languages, particularly regarding written proximity, distance, and cross-linguistic correspondences. Third, it sought to provide broader knowledge of the Nordic linguistic landscape, including national language policies and the distinction between primary and secondary Nordic communities.

Yet, despite this pedagogical focus, a key challenge lies in the availability – and applicability – of instructional materials. Most existing resources are produced in Nordic languages and intended for use by speakers within the primary Nordic speech community (Rekdal 2002; Eide and Breivik 2015; Hårstad 2015). While projects such as EuroComGerm and Well-BeIntercomprehension have facilitated the development of intercomprehension tools across multiple Germanic and Romance languages, the course examined in this study is conducted entirely in French and focuses specifically on the three mainland Scandinavian languages, without reference to other Germanic languages such as German or Dutch.

2.1.2 A Targeted Pedagogical Approach

As I have discussed in another article (Harchaoui, forthcoming), this discrepancy reveals fundamental differences between the primary Nordic speech community and learners of these languages. The following table summarises the main contrasts between the two groups:

Nordic Languages Speakers	Nordic Languages Learners
- Nordic language as dominant (or mother tongue)	- French as dominant language
- <i>ettspråkprinsipp</i> ⁶ – Assumption of a shared linguistic continuum	- Nordic languages studied as foreign languages
- “Neighbouring” languages	- “Distant” languages
- Inherent mutual intelligibility	- Acquired intelligibility, learning-based approach
- Presumed shared intercultural skills	- Intercultural skills must be acquired
- Belonging to the primary Nordic speech community	- External to the Nordic speech community

Tab. 1 – Presupposed main differences between the Nordic primary speech community and the learners outside the Nordic countries

These distinctions highlight a central pedagogical concern: learners of a mainland Scandinavian language cannot rely on inherent mutual intelligibility. Instead, they require explicit instructions and structured exposure to variation in form and meaning. The “neighbouring language” model presumes a sociolinguistic context that is simply not accessible to learners in a foreign language setting, where linguistic proximity must be learned rather than presupposed.

This distinction is also visible in the structure of language acquisition. While traditional second language instruction often follows a linear model – moving from reading and listening to speaking and writing – receptive multilingualism challenges this progression. As Escudé and Janin (2010, 51) suggest, cross-comprehension may develop through a recursive, back-and-forth process in which receptive skills (especially reading) support the development of productive competence, but not necessarily in a sequential way. Learners may develop strong receptive capacities without progressing equally in oral or written production, and vice versa.

⁶ “Ettspråkprinsippet innebærer at enhver skandinav normalt bruker sitt eget morsmål i samtale med personer fra et av de øvrige landa i Skandinavia. I stedet for å veksle mellom tre språk holder altså den enkelte seg til ett språk uavhengig av hvilket (skandinavisk) språk samtalepartneren bruker” (Hårstad 2015, 12). Trans.: The one-language principle implies that Scandinavian speakers normally use their own mother tongue when conversing with individuals from other Scandinavian countries. Rather than switching between the three languages, people continue to use their own language, regardless of which (Scandinavian) language their interlocutor uses.

Within the field of interactional linguistics, no standardised or widely recognised pedagogical method has yet been established – either in the Nordic countries or abroad – for the teaching of Nordic mutual intelligibility. Current approaches remain largely experiential, grounded more in practice and exposure than in formal instruction. Importantly, the Nordic mutual intelligibility course described here operates at the intersection of linguistic analysis and lived language practice. It is not a course in learning a new language per se, but rather a course in accessing new linguistic material through previously acquired knowledge. This means that pedagogical success depends not only on linguistic content, but also on learners' individual language backgrounds, prior exposure to multilingual environments, and openness to variation. Factors such as mother tongue, monolingual or multilingual upbringing, and experience with linguistic diversity all play a role in shaping outcomes. This process is inherently uneven, as learners differ in their adaptability depending on plenty of factors.

Moreover, extra-linguistic factors – such as language ideologies, emotional responses, and contextual familiarity – also influence students' ability to engage with variation. Global language policies that favour English, for instance, can undermine tolerance for non-standard forms, while learners' affective states (confidence, anxiety, or motivation) may impact their ability to process unfamiliar input. Thus, understanding receptive multilingualism from the outside requires a holistic perspective that accounts for both linguistic and non-linguistic variables in the learning process.

In the following section, I turn to a concrete case study based on a year-long course conducted at a French university. The analysis aims to explore French-speaking learners' attitudes toward receptive multilingualism and to identify the specific challenges they encounter to understand Danish and Swedish through Norwegian. Through qualitative data, I explore how students develop receptive skills in Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish, and how their overt attitudes toward linguistic variation shift over time. In particular, the study seeks to determine whether recurring patterns in the learning process can be observed across this secondary speech community.

3. The Survey Protocol

3.1 Participants

The study was conducted in 2022 with a group of seven students who were in their final year of a bachelor's degree programme in Nordic Studies at a university in France.⁷ All participants had Norwegian as their primary language of specialisation, and all but one reported French as their mother tongue (in addition to one student who was Dutch native speaker).

At the beginning of their bachelor's programme, all participants were complete beginners in Norwegian Bokmål. By the final year of the degree, participants' proficiency in Norwegian ranged from intermediate (B1) to advanced (B2). To complete their language training, each student also received one hour of instruction in Norwegian Nynorsk per week during the final year, although six of the seven continued to use Bokmål as their preferred written norm.

The participants represented a heterogeneous group in terms of age (ranging from 19 to 65) and linguistic background. Despite French being the dominant language for most respondents, all had prior experience with multiple foreign languages, reporting between five and twenty languages studied to varying degrees. This multilingual background provided an important

⁷All data presented in this article are originally in French and have been translated by the author.

basis for examining how learners mobilise their existing linguistic repertoires when engaging in receptive multilingualism.

Respondent	Gender	Age	Number of studied languages	First mainland Scandinavian language learned	Second mainland Scandinavian language learned	Self-reported skills in Norwegian Bokmål
R1	F	24	5	Norwegian	Swedish	B1
R2	F	24	20	Norwegian	Swedish	A2/B1
R3	F	25	8	Norwegian	Swedish	A1 (oral) / B2 (written)
R4	F	19	6	Norwegian	Swedish	A2 (oral) / B1 (written)
R5	M	65	5	Norwegian	Swedish	B2
R6	M	21	7	Norwegian	Swedish	B1
R7	M	23	15	Norwegian	Danish	B1/B2
Total						N= 7 respondents

Tab. 2 – Participants’ Linguistic Background and Perceived Competence in mainland Scandinavian languages

Written comprehension in Norwegian Bokmål emerged as the respondents’ strongest skill, a finding that aligns with expectations given their specialisation in Norwegian from the outset of their undergraduate programme. Students self-reported relative ease in understanding everyday topics, literary texts, and political or social commentary in Norwegian. However, oral comprehension presented greater challenges, particularly due to dialectal variation and the speed of spoken input. One participant remarked: “It depends on the accents and how fast they speak. A normal pace with an accent similar to those we have seen in class is understandable” (R4). Another cited difficulty recalling vocabulary or differentiating between similar-sounding forms across languages: “I still regularly find myself unable to find the right words, confusing languages, and struggling to understand certain terms” (R7).

In terms of production, the respondents typically found that writing was less challenging than speaking. Several respondents explained that they appreciated having time to think and self-correct when writing: “If I am given time to think about the structures and look up the necessary vocabulary, it is manageable” (R4). Spoken expression, by contrast, was described as more demanding – primarily due to the spontaneity required and limited vocabulary recall. Still, multiple participants identified their conversational skills as functional, especially in immersion contexts: “I consider myself to have a certain level of Norwegian that allows me to communicate without too many problems when speaking” (R7). “I think I have an advanced conversational level. I have been able to hold conversations on various topics with native speakers” (R6).

The participants’ strength in written comprehension of Norwegian Bokmål can be a salient factor in their subsequent engagement with Danish and Swedish. Given the high degree of orthographic and lexical overlap among the mainland Scandinavian languages, especially between Norwegian Bokmål and Danish, it can be expected that competence in reading Norwegian facilitates the identification of cross-linguistic correspondences and thus lowers the threshold for accessing written Danish and by extension Swedish. This supports earlier findings

that receptive multilingualism in closely related languages is particularly robust in the written modality (e.g., Frinsel *et al.* 2015).

By contrast, the persistent challenges students reported in oral comprehension of Norwegian – particularly those linked to dialectal variation, speech rate, and lexical retrieval – help account for the difficulties they later encountered in processing spoken Danish and Swedish. The well-documented phonetic reduction and syllable structure of Danish (Gooskens and van Heuven 2021, 55, 79) further amplify these issues, rendering oral comprehension significantly more demanding than in the written mode. The observed asymmetry between written and oral proficiency also extends to productive skills. Students consistently characterised writing as more manageable than speaking, attributing this to the opportunity to reflect, monitor, and draw on external resources. This could parallel their experiences in Danish and Swedish, where written input was processed with relative confidence while spontaneous oral interaction imposed greater cognitive and lexical strain.

From a receptive multilingualism perspective, Norwegian thus functions both as a facilitating language and as a source of constraint. On the one hand, it provides a solid written base learners can use as a foundation to extrapolate to the other Scandinavian languages. On the other hand, its oral challenges anticipate and mirror the difficulties posed by Danish and, to a lesser extent, Swedish. This dual role underscores the importance of considering not only structural similarities, but also modality-specific processing demands when analysing mutual intelligibility across closely related languages.

3.2 Instruments

To investigate the development of receptive multilingual skills among French-speaking learners of Scandinavian languages, data were collected through a structured questionnaire administered at the end of a one-year course on mutual intelligibility of the mainland Scandinavian languages. Responses were collected individually and anonymously to encourage honesty and depth of reflection. The questionnaire, consisting of 30 items (see *Appendix*), was designed to elicit both quantitative and qualitative information, combining closed questions (e.g., Likert-scale evaluations) with open-ended items that encouraged participants to provide detailed reflections on their linguistic experiences.

The questions were organised into thematic sections. The first section focused on participants' self-assessed proficiency in Norwegian and in other Scandinavian languages, providing a baseline for evaluating their linguistic competence. A second section explored expectations and preconceptions prior to the course, including attitudes towards Danish and Swedish and initial definitions of the concept of mutual intelligibility. The third section investigated changes observed after the course was completed, with questions targeting both perceived progress in comprehension and the role of Norwegian as a mediating language for understanding Danish and Swedish. Additional items addressed participants' evaluation of specific exercises, their preferred learning strategies, and their views on the pedagogical status of the course (whether as a continuation of Norwegian studies or as a distinct discipline). Finally, two Likert-scale questions (1-10) measured the perceived usefulness of the course for participants' academic training and professional development.

By combining open and closed questions, the questionnaire provided insights into both the subjective dimension of language learning (overt attitudes, beliefs, and self-confidence) and the more structural aspects of receptive skills (oral vs. written comprehension, graphemic correspondences, and cross-linguistic transfer). This dual design made it possible to trace how students' perceptions evolved during the course while also highlighting individual variation in

strategies and outcomes. Open-ended items invited participants to provide detailed comments, while closed questions offered structured points of comparison across respondents.

In addition to the questionnaire, the data collection comprised two further phases of evaluation: 1. A series of written comprehension exercises, focusing on Danish and Swedish, intended to measure how students leveraged their knowledge of Norwegian and French to interpret unfamiliar texts; 2. Oral comprehension tasks, followed by individual interviews, where students reflected on their experiences and feelings during the various stages of the course. This mixed-methods approach allowed for triangulation between self-perception, actual comprehension skills, and attitudes towards receptive multilingualism, offering an understanding of the pedagogical process from both cognitive and affective standpoints. For the purposes of this article, only results from the written survey are presented. The results concerning written comprehension exercises will be published in another article (Harchaoui forthcoming), while those on oral comprehension are currently under analysis.

3.3 Participants' Expectations for a Mutual Intelligibility Course

One particularly revealing finding of the study is that none of the participants regarded the mutual intelligibility course as a traditional language course, even before starting the course. Rather, they articulated expectations grounded in the assumption of an inherent intelligibility among the mainland Scandinavian languages. As one respondent observed, this stemmed from “the similarity of these three languages in terms of grammar and vocabulary” (R1), coupled with the widespread belief that “in general, Scandinavians understand each other” (R5). Another participant emphasised the geographical and historical proximity of the languages, remarking that “they had a common language of origin, and the countries were close and relatively similar. But I did not really have any more ideas” (R3).

A particularly illustrative account came from respondent 6, who drew a parallel with the French linguistic situation: “Before starting my degree, I was completely unaware of this mutual understanding and knew very little about Nordic languages and societies in general. So, I first learned my language of specialisation, i.e. Norwegian (Bokmål), and then became aware of Scandinavian mutual intelligibility. I was immediately informed that it included Norway, Sweden and Denmark. Still unfamiliar with other Nordic languages, I defined this intercomprehension as almost three different ‘accents’ of a single language. I could sometimes explain it to people around me by using an extremely simplified parallel: the understanding between what could be a kind of Parisian dialect and its Marseille counterpart (including a strong accent, apocopes and other syntactic modifications). It was therefore possible for me to imagine that all those included in this misunderstanding could converse without changing their usual speech, but only by making a minimum effort to understand each other, due to the extreme similarity of the mainland Scandinavian languages in terms of syntax”.

Respondent 7 similarly stressed the potential for communication in one’s own language as an attractive alternative to relying on English: “The possibility of communicating between speakers of different Nordic languages in their own languages has always seemed preferable to me to using English, and something appealing. I have already had interactions with Swedes and Danes (both spoken and written), and it was clear that mutual intelligibility was possible, even with my poor skills, but that there were some significant barriers to overcome (e.g. Danish pronunciation). Mutual intelligibility among native speakers, on the other hand, seemed achievable, if not easy”.

Yet not all students shared this perspective. For example, one participant underscored the challenges posed by limited proficiency in Norwegian and the difficulty of recognising structural parallels: “For me, Scandinavian mutual intelligibility was not obvious, both because my level

of Norwegian was too low to detect similarities with other languages, and because I was closed-minded to comparison. For me, these languages only shared a few words in common but were not mutually intelligible and did not have much in common in terms of grammar or syntax, for example” (R4).

Together, these testimonies highlight the diversity of preconceptions students brought to the course: while several assumed a high degree of inherent similarity, others regarded intelligibility as less obvious, conditioned by linguistic competence and openness to a comparative approach to the Scandinavian languages.

Concerning expectations, most of them emphasised a desire to acquire strategies or “keys” for comprehension rather than to achieve productive competence in Danish or Swedish. As one of the respondents explained: “I expected to learn the main keys to understanding that would allow me to converse with Danish and Swedish speakers, but not to learn to speak those languages” (R1).

Several highlighted interest in identifying similarities and differences across vocabulary, syntax, and pronunciation, and in understanding how receptive multilingualism functions in practice between speakers of related languages: “My expectations concerned differences and similarities in vocabulary, conjugation, and pronunciation – understanding how mutual intelligibility is possible and how it presents itself among different speakers” (R3).

A few respondents reported having no clear expectations, though they were aware of structural proximities between Norwegian and the other Scandinavian languages, particularly between Danish and Norwegian in written form: “I had no expectations. I knew that Danish and Norwegian are very similar in writing, and that Swedish is less close in writing but more so orally. I had already read Danish and Swedish, and I had also spoken Norwegian with Swedes and found that they understood me. My general difficulties with listening comprehension had bothered me a lot” (R5).

Others anticipated learning practical tools or “conversion” strategies to make unknown forms intelligible, describing the course as a way to develop “means by which the comprehension of Swedish and Danish would become possible” (R6). Finally, one respondent characterised the training as a kind of communicative bricolage rather than a traditional language-learning endeavour: “I was not expecting to learn other mainland Scandinavian languages properly, but rather to receive training in a kind of DIY approach [une sorte de bricolage] facilitating communication, rather than genuine language learning” (R7).

These answers reveal that students approached the course not as an opportunity to acquire new languages in the traditional sense, but as a means to develop receptive strategies and meta-linguistic awareness to facilitate cross-Scandinavian communication.

3.4 Overt Attitudes Towards Danish and Swedish

In the questionnaire, respondents were also asked to reflect on their attitudes toward Danish and Swedish before and after having completed the course. The responses largely mirrored trends observed among native Nordic speakers, particularly regarding asymmetries in comprehension. Before the course, written Danish was generally described as easier to understand than spoken Danish, due to similarities with Norwegian Bokmål: “Written Danish is much easier because it is almost identical to Norwegian” (R4) or: “I read Danish easily due to the similarity with Norwegian” (R5).

However, spoken Danish posed persistent challenges. As one of the respondents put it: “Danish is still very difficult to understand when it is spoken. I can more or less follow along when reading a text read by a Danish person, but without written support, it remains difficult to understand anything” (R4). When asked which aspects of Danish had become easier to

understand after the course, most respondents highlighted written comprehension as their strongest area. Several described written Danish as “rather simple to understand” (R1) or even “nothing very complicated to spot and adjust in one’s head” given its proximity to Norwegian (R4). Others emphasised that consistent exposure in class had helped them consolidate reading skills: “The written form of Danish now seems even easier to grasp... I have been able to read far more Danish than before and get used to its differences and similarities with Bokmål and Nynorsk” (R6). The number system was also repeatedly mentioned as an aspect that had become more transparent, with one respondent noting: “The Danish system for counting is logical – once you understand how it works” (R4).

Some participants reported incremental progress in oral comprehension, describing how practice and awareness of phonological features aided perception. One student explained: “Now I understand why I do not understand Danish. I know about the *stod* and that p, t, and k are pronounced differently depending on their position” (R3). Another mentioned being able to segment words in speech and recognise sound correspondences, even if comprehension remained partial: “I first managed to separate words in sentences and now I know which sounds have equivalents” (R6).

Nevertheless, oral comprehension remained the most challenging area overall. Respondents consistently pointed to the speed and indistinct articulation of spoken Danish as major obstacles: “It is still a bit difficult to understand when a Dane is speaking – the pace is sometimes too fast, and I need it slower than Norwegian” (R1). Others singled out the vowel system and the *stod* as particularly problematic. As one put it: “Even though I know more about pronunciation, the language is still very difficult to understand, if not impossible in most cases. The *stod* is what really trips me up” (R3).

Several participants stressed that the limited time devoted to phonology in the course contributed to these difficulties: “Danish pronunciation is still difficult... It would have required more course time” (R4). Others reflected that while theoretical knowledge was useful, it did not automatically translate into fluent comprehension: “It must be a question of practice; knowing the theoretical principles is not enough for it to become automatic” (R5). For some, oral comprehension remained the weak point: “Oral comprehension is still the most different aspect and therefore the most difficult – by far” (R7).

Regarding Swedish, comprehension was generally better – both orally and in writing – before the course: “Having learned Norwegian before Swedish helped a lot and makes comprehension and expression easier” (R3). “As for Swedish, I am now beginning to understand it quite easily, both orally and in writing, if the vocabulary is not too different from Norwegian” (R4).

After the course, respondents generally highlighted greater ease with oral comprehension than they had initially anticipated. Several explained that Swedish pronunciation was perceived as closer to Norwegian, making it easier to process. As one noted: “Oral comprehension [of Swedish] is easier because I find it close to Norwegian pronunciation, which we had mainly studied, and we learned what the sound differences were” (R3). Another remarked that “Swedish is easier to understand orally than I thought at the beginning. The accent is fluid, so it is much easier to understand them when they speak” (R4).

Phonological awareness and prosody were frequently cited as facilitating factors. Respondent 6 reflected: “I have much more ease with Swedish prosody. I was able to set real rules for what I could previously only understand instinctively... My ear naturally picked up the prosody, and I think I can reproduce it without too many errors”.

Exposure to both written and oral Swedish, particularly through comparative exercises, also helped students identify systematic correspondences: “I can now recognise the [sj] sound

and know which letter combinations it corresponds to, and how it relates to Norwegian terms” (R6). At the same time, respondents acknowledged persistent difficulties. Limited classroom exposure was mentioned by some as a barrier to progress: “In terms of oral comprehension it has not changed – it stayed at the same level because we hardly listened to any Swedish” (R1). Others pointed to problematic sounds and shifting vowel values: “The pronunciation of *ä*, which changes depending on the word and dialect, the grammar, and the verbs that are not recognisable from Norwegian” (R2). Lexical distance was also cited as an obstacle: “It remains difficult when the vocabulary has no common root with Norwegian... when the vocabulary is too different, I cannot rely on my Norwegian knowledge” (R4).

Prosody, while often described as a helpful cue, was also considered a source of confusion. Respondent 6 admitted: “Prosody still sometimes hinders my comprehension of Swedish... we actually worked very little on it in the intercomprehension course, which I regret”. Still, several participants noted interference between the languages during production: “When it comes to expression, it is more difficult because you have to think of the vocabulary in Swedish, and often it only comes to me in Norwegian” (R4).

In sum, students tended to perceive Swedish oral comprehension as more accessible than Danish, largely due to perceived phonological proximity to Norwegian and a “smoother” prosodic pattern. However, dialectal variation, prosodic complexity, and lexical divergence continued to pose significant challenges, particularly in the absence of systematic practice and exposure.

3.5 Shifts in Language Attitudes and Confidence

The most significant shift observed over the course was in students’ metalinguistic awareness and confidence changes over the year. Responses varied considerably during the first lesson, when students tended to doubt their ability to understand the other two Scandinavian languages, despite their knowledge of Norwegian. At the outset, several students expressed scepticism about the feasibility of cross-comprehension: “The two languages seemed generally difficult to understand. Danish in particular was difficult to pronounce. Swedish felt like a completely different language. But Danish in particular was difficult to pronounce. With Swedish, it was more that it was a different language, and I could not see how to make it fit in with Norwegian. For Danish, it was because it has a reputation for being pronounced with a hot potato in the mouth and is therefore incomprehensible. Swedish was less obvious, but I clearly did not trust the concept of neighbouring language understanding” (R4, before the course).

By the end of the year, the same participant revised their position: “In my opinion, Nordic mutual intelligibility was not a given, and I did not think that Danish and Swedish would be easy to understand. I was too closed off to the idea that learning Norwegian would help me with Danish or Swedish” (R4, after the course).

After completing the course, respondents described it as a metalinguistic experience that helped them build awareness of language variation and proximity. Several commented on the challenge of recognising similarities between the mainland Scandinavian languages, especially when these were not perceived as “natural”: “With Swedish, *ä* and *ö* felt like an extra mental step... Transferring *ä* to *e* and *ö* to *o*. We learned that certain letters in Norwegian produce certain sounds, and in Swedish, you get the same sounds with different letters” (R3). This perception highlights the gap between structural proximity and learner intuition. Rather than feeling the interconnectedness of the languages instinctively, students needed to consciously learn the correspondences.

Students also reported that the course encouraged a different, more reflective way of engaging with languages: “For me, it is a different way of learning languages. Less theoretical than

linguistics, less academic than traditional language learning. It is more like real-life learning – through practice and building on what you already know. The important thing is to give extra tools to those who can, without putting others in difficulty” (R5). This answer suggests that respondents were not only acquiring new linguistic competencies but also developing greater metacognitive awareness of their own learning processes. The multimodal pedagogical approach was perceived as both practical and exploratory, encouraging students to engage reflectively with their progress.

Preconceptions and mental biases strongly influenced how participants evaluated their potential for success in receptive multilingualism. For example, when asked whether their skills in Danish or Swedish had improved over the course (questions 25-27), one student explained: “It is definitely better because before this course I thought I was incapable of understanding even a single word of Danish. I am no longer afraid of writing. My oral skills are definitely better than nothing” (R4). The same respondent added about Swedish: “Swedish is easier to understand when spoken than I initially thought”. Metalinguistic remarks such as “I initially thought” indicate that students were able to challenge earlier assumptions, ultimately adopting a more flexible and exploratory approach to comprehension.

Participants also highlighted the crucial role of sustained exposure to the three languages in fostering receptive skills. Regular contact was seen as essential for developing the automatism required to detect similarities, while also building the foundational knowledge necessary to interpret differences. Increased exposure in turn bolstered confidence, as students learned to decode unfamiliar forms and patterns more effectively. Guided interpretation and systematic cross-linguistic comparison further enhanced their capacity for linguistic elasticity and their tolerance of variation. As one participant noted, “I have become accustomed to the pronunciation of Danish” (R1).

With respect to Swedish, one respondent explained: “I heard and read a lot of Swedish... Over time, my ear naturally picked up the prosody, and I now think I can reproduce it fairly accurately. On the other hand, having learned the rules of Swedish in my introductory language classes, I was able to relate this to my language of specialisation [Norwegian]. As a result, I rely much less on ‘instinct’” (R6). Finally, another student reflected on structural similarities: “Since the vocabulary is almost identical, with the difference being in a few points (e.g. voiceless or voiced plosives) that we have also seen in the linguistics course, Norwegian and Danish have similar written forms” (R4).

Overall, these comments reveal that students gradually moved from initial scepticism and uncertainty toward an active engagement with linguistic variation, supported by exposure, comparison, and the gradual internalisation of cross-linguistic correspondences. One respondent summarised this transformation as follows: “The course is, in my opinion, a new field that helped me discover new aspects of Norwegian, especially vocabulary, and let us hear a variety of accents. Understanding what makes Norwegian understandable to Swedes and Danes gave me a new way of thinking about Norwegian itself” (R3).

The results of this study confirm that the Scandinavian mutual intelligibility course functions through a recursive, back-and-forth learning process, and serves as an effective tool for enhancing students’ metalinguistic awareness – particularly in relation to the Norwegian language. Learners’ sensitivity to linguistic variation and their capacity for cross-comprehension were shown to be strongly shaped by ideological frameworks, most notably the dominant French monolingual ideology.

Before the course, students displayed limited flexibility in their approach to language, often taking linguistic norms for granted and seldom questioning variation or change. This rigidity inclined them to focus on differences rather than similarities among the Scandinavian

languages, with several reporting that they “did not understand” without attempting interpretive strategies. Such attitudes weakened both their intuitive comprehension and their confidence.

Over the course of the programme, however, students were progressively encouraged to confront and reconsider these mental biases. Systematic exposure to internal variation within the Scandinavian languages required them to adjust their expectations and adopt a more exploratory and adaptive stance. What initially appeared as a lack of linguistic flexibility gradually evolved into active engagement with strategies of bricolage and reflexivity.

By the end of the academic year, many participants expressed greater ease in navigating various linguistic forms. The course’s pedagogical structure – situated between foreign language instruction and theoretical linguistic analysis – was instrumental in this development. Focused work on graphemic correspondences across the Scandinavian languages further enabled students to detect structural regularities, thereby facilitating inter-Scandinavian pattern recognition and reinforcing their confidence in receptive skills.

4. Improvements and Conclusion

A key area for improvement lies in making receptive multilingualism meaningful for the students by placing learners at the centre of a reflexive process. In contexts such as Scandinavian mutual intelligibility taught in a French university, the inherently hybrid nature of the situation calls for an equally hybrid teaching model. This necessitates moving beyond traditional methods of foreign language teaching or purely theoretical linguistics and instead adopting a pedagogy that integrates linguistic analysis with reflective language awareness.

Effective instruction in receptive multilingualism must address both the linguistic and ideological dimensions of cross-linguistic comprehension. Students should be encouraged to reflect on their own linguistic backgrounds, as well as on broader ideological influences – such as monolingual norms and standard language ideologies – that shape their perceptions of linguistic variation. Such reflection fosters greater tolerance toward variation and helps develop linguistic flexibility for successful cross-comprehension.

Receptive skills should not be regarded as intuitive but as competencies that can be deliberately cultivated. Structured exposure, training in graphemic correspondences, and explicit focus on structural parallels across Scandinavian languages, can scaffold this process. The more learners encounter inter-Scandinavian variation, in both oral and written forms, the more confident and effective they become in managing comprehension. At the heart of receptive multilingualism pedagogy lies this dynamic cycle of interpretation, self-correction, and reflection.

This study has aimed to reframe receptive multilingualism as a situated and reflexive practice beyond the Nordic primary speech community. Teaching receptive multilingualism in non-Nordic contexts therefore requires rethinking traditional pedagogical paradigms. Rather than relying on prescriptive norms or linear models of acquisition, educators should cultivate metalinguistic insight, promote openness to variation, and embrace the dynamic nature of understanding across closely related languages.

Finally, although exploratory, the survey protocol used in this study is intended to be administered annually to track recurring trends among student cohorts. This longitudinal perspective will provide a basis for refining classroom practices and continuously improving course design.

Appendix

1. To what extent do you consider yourself proficient in Norwegian? Please provide as many details as possible.

2. To what extent do you consider yourself proficient in one or more other Nordic languages? Please provide as many details as possible.
3. Before starting the course on mutual intelligibility among Scandinavian languages, what were your expectations regarding the learning of other mainland Scandinavian languages?
4. Before starting the course on mutual intelligibility among Scandinavian languages, how did you define the concept of Nordic mutual intelligibility? Please provide as many details as possible.
5. Before the course began, did you consider it to be primarily a continuation of your Norwegian studies, or a distinct field of study in its own right?
6. Before the course began, which aspects of Danish and Swedish did you perceive as easy to understand?
7. For what reasons?
8. Before the course began, which aspects of Danish and Swedish seemed difficult to understand?
9. For what reasons?
10. Now that the course is completed, which aspects of Danish do you find easy to understand?
11. For what reasons?
12. Now that the course is completed, which aspects of Danish do you find difficult to understand?
13. For what reasons?
14. In what ways did your knowledge of Norwegian facilitate your understanding of Danish? Please provide as many details as possible.
15. Now that the course is completed, which types of exercises do you consider most effective for improving your Danish? Please provide concrete examples if possible.
16. Now that the course is completed, which aspects of Swedish do you find easy to understand?
17. For what reasons?
18. Now that the course is completed, which aspects of Swedish do you find difficult to understand?
19. For what reasons?
20. In what ways did your knowledge of Norwegian facilitate your understanding of Swedish? Please provide as many details as possible.
21. Which types of exercises do you consider most effective for improving your Swedish? Please provide concrete examples if possible.
22. On a scale from 1 to 10 (1 = not at all, 10 = very much), how useful do you consider the course to have been for your academic training?
23. On a scale from 1 to 10 (1 = not at all, 10 = very much), how useful do you consider the course to have been for your professional development? (Please provide details if possible.)
24. After completing the course, do you now regard it primarily as a continuation of your Norwegian studies, or as a distinct discipline in its own right?
25. Do you consider that your skills in Danish have improved as a result of the course? Please specify in which areas (regardless of whether your answer is affirmative or negative).
26. For what reasons?
27. Do you consider that your skills in Swedish have improved as a result of the course? Please specify in which areas (regardless of whether your answer is affirmative or negative).
28. For what reasons?
29. In situations requiring mutual intelligibility, would you choose to use Norwegian or English to communicate?
30. For what reasons?

References

- Aas, Inger. 2000. *Grannespråksundervisning – har vi det da?: Grannespråksundervisning i dansk, norsk og svensk grunnskole: aktuell praksis og lærerholdninger* (Neighbouring Language Teaching – Do We Have It? Neighbouring Language Teaching in Danish, Norwegian and Swedish Primary Schools: Current Practice and Teacher Attitudes). Oslo: Universitetet i Oslo.
- Aurstad, Bodil. 2004. “Des langues semblables, simplement différentes. Enseigner le norvégien en Suède”. *Éla. Études de linguistique appliquée* vol. 4, no. 136: 477-85.
- . 2012. “Det nordiske perspektivet i norskfaget” (The Nordic Perspective in Norwegian Language Studies). *Nynorskopplering. Spesialnummer: Tospråk og danning* (Nynorsk Education. Special Issue: Bilingualism and Education) no. 17: 49-58.
- Bacquin, Mari, and Robert Zola Christensen. 2013. “Dansk og svensk – fra nabosprog til fremmedsprog?” (Danish and Swedish – From Neighbouring Languages to Foreign Languages?). *Språk i Norden / Sprog i Norden* (Languages in the Nordic Region) vol. 44, no. 1: 1-16. <<https://tidsskrift.dk/sin/article/view/17141>> (01/2026).
- Branets, Anna, Daria Bahtina, and Anna Verschik. 2020. “Mediated Receptive Multilingualism: Estonian-Russian-Ukrainian Case Study”. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism* vol. 10, no. 3: 380-411.
- Braunmüller, Kurt. 2013. “Communication Based on Receptive Multilingualism: Advantages and Disadvantages”. *International Journal of Multilingualism* vol. 10, no. 2: 214-23. doi: 10.1080/14790718.2013.789524.
- Delsing, Lars-Olof, and Katarina Lundin Åkesson. 2005. *Håller språket ihop Norden?: En forskningsrapport om ungdomars förståelse av danska, svenska och norska* (Does the Language Keep Together the Nordic Countries? A Research Report on Young People’s Understanding of Danish, Norwegian and Swedish). Copenhagen: Nordic Council of Ministers. doi: 10.6027/TN2005-573.
- Eide, Ove, and Torbjørn Breivik (eds). 2015. “Handbok i nabospråkundervisning” (Handbook in Teaching Neighbouring Languages). *Språkrådets skrifter* (Writings of the Language Council) no. 4. Oslo: Språkrådet.
- Escudé, Pierre, et Pierre Janin. 2010. *Le point sur l’intercompréhension, clé du plurilinguisme?*. Paris: CLE International.
- EuroComGerm*. <<http://www.eurocomgerm.de>> (01/2026).
- Europa IC. Understanding Each Other in 12 Romance and Germanic Languages*. “Well-BeIntercomprehension”. <<https://www.europaic.eu/local/staticpage/view.php?page=presentation>> (01/2026).
- Frinsel, Felicity, Charlotte Gooskens, Anne Kingma, et al. 2015. “Predicting the Asymmetric Intelligibility between Spoken Danish and Swedish Using Conditional Entropy”. *Tijdschrift voor Skandinavistiek* (Journal of Scandinavian Studies) vol. 34, no. 2: 120-38.
- Gooskens, Charlotte. 2024. *Mutual Intelligibility between Closely Related Languages*. Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. doi:10.1515/9783111134697.
- Gooskens, Charlotte, and Femke Swarte. 2017. “Linguistic and Extra-Linguistic Predictors of Mutual Intelligibility between Germanic Languages”. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* vol. 40, no. 2: 123-47. doi: 10.1017/S0332586517000099.
- Gooskens, Charlotte, and Vincent J. van Heuven. 2021. “Mutual Intelligibility”. In *Similar Languages, Varieties, and Dialects: A Computational Perspective*, edited by Marcos Zampieri and Preslav Nakov, 51–95. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi: 10.1017/9781108565080.006.
- Harchaoui, Sarah. Forthcoming. “Didactique de l’intercompréhension nordique hors pays nordiques: Un exemple parmi l’enseignement supérieur en France.” In PUSMB (Presses Universitaires de l’Université Savoie Mont Blanc), Collections du laboratoire LLSETI.
- Haugen, Einar. 1966. “Semicommunication: The Language Gap in Scandinavia”. *Sociological Inquiry* vol. 36, no. 2: 280-97.
- . 1981. “Skandinavisk mellomspråk: Forskning og fremtid” (Scandinavian Inter Language: Research and Future). In *Internordisk språkforståelse. Föredrag och diskussioner vid ett symposium på Rungstedgaard utanför Köpenhamn den 24-26 mars 1980* (Internordic Language Comprehension.

- Lectures and Discussions at a Symposium at Rungstedgaard outside Copenhagen, 24-26 March 1980), edited by Claes-Christian Elert, 280-97. Umeå: Umeå Universitet.
- Hårstad, Stian. 2015. *Nabospråk og nabospråkundervisning* (Neighbouring Languages and Neighboring Language Teaching). Oslo: Cappelen Damm.
- Méziane, Karine. 2017. "L'intercompréhension entre langues éloignées: le cas du français et du norvégien". *Synergies France*, n. 11: 43–60.
- Norden i skolen* (The North in the School). <<https://nordeniskolen.org>> (01/2026).
- Nordisk Ministerråd (2024). *Declaration on Nordic Language Policy*. <<https://pub.norden.org/politikknord2024-710/declaration-on-nordic-language-policy.html>> (01/2026).
- Rekdal, Olaug. 2002. *Norsk som nabospråk: Håndbok for deg som er svensk og vil lære mer om norsk språk og kultur* (Norwegian as a Neighbouring Language: A Handbook for Those of You Who Are Swedish and Want to Learn More About Norwegian Language and Culture). Uppsala: Hallgren & Fallgren.
- Ridell, Karin. 2012. "L'intercompréhension des langues scandinaves et la réalité d'une communauté linguistique scandinave à l'ère de la mondialisation". *Nordiques* n. 24: 103-16. doi: 10.4000/15qrf.
- Schüppert, Anja. 2011. *Origin of Asymmetry. Mutual Intelligibility of Spoken Danish and Swedish*. PhD Dissertation. Groningen: University of Groningen.
- Skjold Frøshaug, Andrea, and Truls Stende. 2021. *Does the Nordic Language Community Exist?*. Copenhagen: Nordisk Ministerråd. doi: 10.6027/nord2021-004.
- Sletten, Iben S., Carl C. Olsen, Kaisa Häkkinen, *et al.* (eds). 2014. *Nordens sprog med rødder og fødder* (The Nordic Languages with Roots and Feet). Copenhagen: Nordisk Ministerråd.
- Språkrådet. 2011. *Norsklæreres holdninger til eget fag* (Norwegian Teachers' Attitudes Towards Their Subject Matter). Oslo: Språkrådet. <https://sprakradet.no/wp-content/uploads/Norsklæreres-holdning_Synovate2011.pdf> (01/2026).
- Torp, Arne. 2014. "Nordiske språk i fortid og nåtid" (The Nordic Languages in the Past and in the Present). In *Nordens språk med røtter og føtter* (The Nordic Languages with Roots and Feet), edited by Iben S. Sletten, Carl C. Olsen, Kaisa Häkkinen, *et al.*, 19-74. Copenhagen: Nordisk Ministerråd. <<https://www.norden.org/no/publication/nordens-sprak-med-rotter-og-fotter>> (01/2026).