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Abstract

This paper presents an explorative study of informal written narratives and oral picture descriptions in the native language as well as in the second language (L2) of six intermediate/advanced Dutch L1 learners of Swedish. Data from six Swedish L1 native controls, performing the same tasks as the learners, were also collected. Quantifications for the following aspects of information structure were made for the transcribed oral descriptions. 1) reference introduction, including occurrences of spatial/existential constructions, 2) reference maintenance per type and finally 3) elements in the prefield. For the written material, elements in the prefield were analysed. Pronouns in all clausal positions and adverbials in the prefield were analysed in detail for both oral and written material. The following research questions were asked: Do Dutch L1 and Swedish L1 differ in their patterns of information structure within the area of referent introductions and maintenance and prefield constituents in picture descriptions? Do the L2 learners adhere to the target language (Swedish) patterns, the patterns of their mother tongue (Dutch), or does the interlanguage exhibit different patterns? In the written data, differences in percentages for prefield constituents emerged where Dutch L1 showed a more adverbial-initial pattern. No major differences were found in the oral data, where both languages exhibited a pattern of two thirds subject-initial clauses and one third adverbial-initial clauses. Some further differences were found concerning the distribution of subtypes of prefield constituents (such as place adverbials, subject pronouns, subject NP’s). Concerning the perspectives taken for referent introduction, Dutch L1 was slightly more spatial than Swedish L1. However, both languages exhibited a predominantly existential perspective. Substantial individual variation was found in all three language varieties and for all features investigated. The learners in their Swedish L2 mainly followed the norms of the L2, but also showed patterns similar to those of their L1 as well as patterns neither connected to the L1 or the L2. The strict dichotomy of spatial/existential perspective of referent introduction proposed by e.g. Carroll et al. (2000) was found to exclude many cases of referent introduction. Drawbacks of the present study are the small quantity of data and the lack of comparable studies; thus, this subject and language combination needs to be researched further.
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1. Introduction

Research within the field of second language (L2) acquisition has often focused on the acquisition of morphology and syntax, i.e. on the learner’s grammatical competence, viewed as an inner knowledge of the grammatical system of a language, and not on the learner’s actual ability to use grammatical structures in adequate and idiomatic ways in different communicative contexts. Carroll & von Stutterheim (2003:366) note that “the acquisition of the individual grammatical means of a language does not automatically entail target-language-like principles of information organization”. Having acquired the grammar of a language does not mean that one is able to use that knowledge adequately in conversation. Mehan (1980:132) writes that “[t]he functional aspects of language concern effective language use in different social situations”. Appel & Muysken (1987:148) write about ‘functional competence’ as opposed to ‘formal competence’. Functional competence can be viewed as the ability to use language for communicative purposes. The theoretical starting point for this paper is that this type of competence is a crucial factor for successful second language learning. These aspects have not been researched enough and are often over-looked in language teaching.

Knowledge about, and the ability to use, what is often called information structure, i.e. the structuring of information into sentences and text, is one aspect of functional competence. Ekerot (1979:85) is among many who argue that we have to study language from a communicative perspective; others include well-known Hymes and his concept of communicative competence.¹ A communicative perspective on language means viewing language as a means of transferring information from speaker to hearer.² Communication means adding new information to what the hearer already knows, to the common ground (see e.g. Krifka 2007), and also includes structuring of the new information. The process of introducing new information to a discourse is not only a communicative but also a cognitive process; the speaker visualizes a concept/idea inside her and tries to pass this on to the hearer.

¹ See Hymes (2001 [1972], 2003 [1967]) for an introduction to Communicative Competence. For a development of Hymes’ concept see e.g. Young (2000). See also Lindgren (2009a) for the further developed and more sociologically directed concept of Interaction Competence.
² This view can be questioned; in e.g. Conversation Analysis (CA) the view is that meaning is created within interaction; communication means creating meaning and not transferring a message ‘from one end to the other’; see Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson (1974) for a classic paper on CA. See also Schegloff (2007). See Norrbjo (2004) for a concise introduction to CA. For the purpose of this paper, what is important is the focus on communication, i.e. language as performance and not only as competence. See Chomsky (1965) for more on the competence/performance divide.
It is my position that the appropriate employment of information structure is important for determining a successful second language acquisition.

One way of adding new information to a discourse is through referent introduction, i.e. how objects are introduced in discourse. In the same way, how to do referent maintenance, i.e. how the referents introduced are kept and continually referred to in discourse, is also a matter of adequate employment of information structure. These features are of relevance for second language acquisition and adequate language use. A concept or a referent introduced in the discourse creates a mental representation inside both the speaker and the hearer. Carroll et al (2000) found that referent introductions can be made from two perspectives. The two perspectives are due to different questions underlying the organization of the information of the referent introduction. Either the question is ‘What is where?’ (object based/existential perspective) or ‘Where is what?’ (spatially based perspective) (Carroll et al 2000:446). Concerning referent introduction, which is the focus of this paper, these two perspectives are reflected in the use of existential or locational constructions when introducing the referent (Carroll et al 2000:447). In verb second (V2) languages, the prefield, i.e. the first position of a clause, is extra important for the structuring of new and old information and therefore distribution patterns of prefield constituents are of interest when concerned with information structural features of V2 languages.

The field of closely related languages is an interesting one, especially when focusing on second language acquisition; due to the many similarities between the languages a high amount of transfer can be expected, following the ideas of e.g. Schwartz & Sprouse (1996), Odlin (1989, 2003) and Jarvis (1998). Bohnacker & Rosén (2007, 2008, 2009) found subtle differences in information structure between German and Swedish, two closely related Germanic languages. Another combination of Germanic languages, one which has not been researched extensively, is Dutch and Swedish. From the small pilot study carried out within the frame of my bachelor’s thesis in linguistics (Lindgren 2009b), there seemed to be some differences regarding referent introduction and maintenance and prefield constituents between Swedish L1 and Dutch L1 and the one learner studied kept the patterns from his L1 in his L2 Swedish. However, the sample studied in Lindgren (2009b) was very small and it is therefore necessary to validate the results by collecting more data and from more informants, which will be done in the current study.

The observant reader notices traces from different linguistic perspectives in this paper. However, my intention is not to make any broader statement concerning the “correct” view on language or as to whether information structure is primarily a cognitive concept inside the
speaker/hearer or a purely communicative aspect of language. I believe that the field of L2 acquisition needs different perspectives in order to extend our understanding of language acquisition and use. However, I maintain that the focus must be on how the mental representation of a referent introduced and maintained is manifested into words and thus how this representation is communicated; on the use of language. This is a study, in Chomskyan terms, concerned with *performance* and not with *competence*.

Ekerot (1979:80f) states that language teaching for immigrants (e.g. in Sweden, SFI (Svenska För Invandrare) often teaches students which structures are grammatical and has them practise syntactic transformations (e.g. whereby simple S-V-X sentences become X-V-S etc.), but does not much discuss the strongly limited possibilities of choice we have in a given context. Ekerot (1979) maintains that we need not only teach what is grammatically possible in principle, but also why and when certain structures are used; i.e. what does a certain structure signal in that specific context? (See also Rosén 2006). Information structure is something quite vague and diffuse, as it consists more of tendencies than of definitely right and wrong. However, in mastering a language to the extent of nativeness or near-nativeness, I believe it to be a crucial factor. Yet, it is very rarely taught to students of a language. Information structure is an aspect which is highly functional; it has little to do with what structures are grammatical, but concerns structures *actually* used by native speakers. This is why I believe that studies such as the present one are important as it shows which structures are used by natives and compares this to the performance of learners. Introduction and maintenance of referents is an ‘every-day’ aspect of information structure and they are therefore especially important to learners at all levels.

This paper explores the way referents are introduced and maintained in oral picture descriptions, as well as what constituents are placed in the prefield in oral picture descriptions and written narratives, in Swedish L1, Dutch L1 and Swedish L2. In addition to this, pronouns in different clausal positions and adverbials in the prefield will be studied in detail. This paper aims, through a small quantitative study, to look at aspects of information structure of the Swedish learner language of 6 Dutch L1 learners of Swedish L2. The oral and written material collected from the learners will then be compared to samples from 6 native Swedish speakers as well as to samples of Dutch L1. To my knowledge, the only study of this topic and language combination that has been carried out is my own pilot study (Lindgren 2009b). Both studies are based on the work on information structure by Bohnacker (2007, 2010) and

---

3 The terms learner language and interlanguage are used interchangeably in this paper. For more upon interlanguage as a term, see Selinker (1972) who originally coined the term. For a brief but clear discussion about interlanguage, see also Appel & Muysken (1987:83-92).
Bohnacker & Rosén (e.g. 2009) for the combination of Swedish and German and on referent introduction and maintenance and existential/spatial perspective by Carroll et al. (2000) and Carroll & von Stutterheim (1993, 2003).

1.1 Problem definition & research questions
The overall aim of the current study is to investigate if and how information structure differs between closely related languages, specifically within oral descriptions of pictures and written narratives. Earlier studies have shown that even closely related languages such as German and Swedish differ with respect to features of information structure, such as the tendency that Swedish has more expletive-initial clauses and follows the principle of ‘rheme later’ to a higher degree than German (See Bohnacker 2007, 2010, Bohnacker & Rosén 2007, 2008, 2009). The differences in information structure then pose a problem for learners of the languages, as even advanced learners retain their native patterns of information structure in their L2. Because of this, Dutch L1 learners of Swedish L2 are interesting to study, especially since there have been few, if any, studies made of learners of this language combination.

My pilot study of one Dutch L1 learner of Swedish L2 (Lindgren 2009) showed some differences regarding referent introduction and maintenance and the distributional patterns of prefield constituents for oral picture description, but as the sample of that study was very small, more data is needed in order to verify the results from that study. In addition to looking at the same phenomena in the oral picture descriptions from 6 Dutch L1 learners of Swedish L2, recording them in both Dutch L1 and Swedish L2, as well as 6 Swedish L1 native controls, the current study also explores the distributional patterns of prefield constituents of written narratives of the same 6 speakers for Dutch L1, Swedish L1 and Swedish L2. Also, a comparison between the oral and written material will be made, regarding distribution patterns of prefield constituents, since comparing different genres will give further insights into the possible differences between the languages. The current study is to be regarded as explorative as the amount of data collected is small-scale. The research questions are the following:

1. Do Dutch L1 and Swedish L1 differ in their patterns of information structure within the area of referent introductions and maintenance in oral picture descriptions?


5 For more about the methodology of the current study, see Chapter 3.
2. Do Dutch L1 and Swedish L1 differ in the distributional patterns of prefield constituents in oral picture descriptions and written narratives?

3. Do the learners follow the target language (Swedish), the mother tongue (Dutch) or does the interlanguage exhibit different patterns? Can a case be made for L1 transfer?

4. Do the patterns observed here inform and uphold existing proposals of typological differences in information structure?

1.2 The structure of this paper
This paper proceeds as follows. Chapter 2 gives the theoretical background of the current study as well as describes some relevant earlier studies. In Chapter 3 a description of the method used is given together with detailed descriptions of the data collection and the informants. Chapter 4 contains the results, where statistical data as well as examples from the data are given; in this section, a brief analysis of the data is also provided. Because of the explorative nature of this study, the results are presented in detail and thus this chapter constitutes a substantial part of the paper. In Chapter 5 the results and analysis are discussed, with references to the theoretical background as well as to ideas that were gained during the work with the data. Chapter 6 contains some general conclusions, a brief discussion of problems with this study and finally some suggestions for future research.
2. Theoretical background and earlier studies

This chapter gives an overview of the theoretical background of this study, starting with a brief overview of the syntactic structure of Dutch and Swedish (Section 2.1), followed by introductions to the concepts of information structure (Section 2.2), linearization (Section 2.3), and referent introduction and maintenance (Section 2.4). Finally, there will be a short section on studies of Dutch learners of Swedish (Section 2.5). This chapter, with the exception of Section 2.3, is based on Lindgren (2009b, chapter 2).

2.1 The syntactic structure of Dutch and Swedish: a brief overview and comparison

This section gives a brief overview and comparison of the syntax of Swedish and Dutch, limited to those aspects judged to be relevant to this paper.

Dutch and Swedish are closely related. Both are Germanic languages, where Swedish belongs to the North Germanic and Dutch to the West Germanic branch (Moberg et al. 2007:58). I have not been able to find any percentage of cognates in the two languages; this is a sign that this combination has not been researched to any greater extent.

Swedish is often described to have S-V-O (subject-verb-object) as its basic word order (Bolander 2005:199), even though a more accurate description would be V-O, as the subject does not always precede the verb, but the verb typically precedes the object. Dutch is described as an O-V language. However, the differences between Dutch and Swedish lie in the ordering of object and non-finite verb, where the non-finite verb in Dutch usually follows the object and in the word order of subordinate clauses where the Dutch main verb comes at the end. Both languages are restrained by the V2 constraint and finite verb placement in main declarative clauses is identical; both languages exhibit a structure of X-Vfin-Y (See section 2.1.1). This makes the actual differences, especially those connected to the features of interest for the current study smaller than the typological description as V-O and O-V languages might imply, from which it looks as if the structures of Dutch and Swedish are opposites.

---

6 Gooskens, van Bezooijen & Kürschner (not published:1) write “These two Germanic languages share many stems due to their common origin in Proto-Germanic. So, originally their lexicons were very similar. However, the two languages have diverged considerably, as a consequence of both language internal and language external factors, in particular language contact”; Bohnacker & Rosén (2007:30) give a figure of 80% cognates for Swedish and German; it is likely that the number for Dutch and Swedish is similar.

7 See e.g. Erteschik-Shir (2007:60): "languages with basic OV (e.g. Dutch)."
2.1.1 Verb Second and the “prefield”

Dutch, as well as Swedish (see Bolander 2005:189, 201), is a so-called Verb Second (V2) language. This means that in Dutch “like many Germanic languages, the tensed verb of the highest clause must appear in second position” (Frazier 1987:526), i.e. in main declarative clauses the verb is always placed in second position.

The basic structure of Swedish declaratives is the following (Ekerot 1979:83):

1) Finite verb in second position
2) Other constituents (subject, non-finite verb, object, adverbials) have fixed positions to the right of the finite verb
3) One of these constituents, the subject or some other constituent, needs to be placed clause-initially, as the fundament (prefield).

This corresponds to the structure of Dutch declarative main clauses. The verb second constraint gives Dutch and Swedish similar structures of main declarative clauses and creates an important clause-initial position before the verb, namely the prefield. Example (1) and (2) below show the identical structure of non-subject-initial declarative clauses in Swedish and Dutch. The preverbal slot or prefield is indicated in italics.

(1) Swe: Igår åkte han till Stockholm  (2) Du: Gisteren ging hij naar Stockholm
  yesterday went he to Stockholm yesterday went he to Stockholm

'Yesterday he went to Stockholm'

Word order is more fixed in Swedish than in many other languages (Ekerot 1979:82). However, Dutch is not less restricted, as word order is used in Dutch as well as in Swedish to express subject/object relations, where the tendency is for the first nominal phrase of a clause to be the subject of the clause, whereas a post-verbal nominal phrase is mostly the object.

The preverbial slot (Carroll & von Stutterheim 2003) or the prefield (Ger. Vorfeld, Swe. fundament), is the position before the verb in declaratives of V2 languages, i.e. it is the syntactic Position 1 (Bolander 2005:200). In both Swedish and Dutch, subjects and adverbials as well as objects and other constituents such as predicatives, fronted verbs, VP’s or particles etc. can be positioned in the prefield. The prefield is, hence, not a slot which is restricted to a

---

8 Except for the fact that if a second verb occurs, in non-finite form (e.g. an infinitive or a participle), this always comes at the end of Dutch clauses, just as in German, whereas in Swedish the second verb follows the finite verb. See de Rooy & Wikén Bonde (2005:148).

9 In present-day Swedish and Dutch case marking on subject and object is only found in personal pronouns.
specific constituent in these languages. The prefield often contains constituents which are known information (Bolander 2005:204). Generally, this means subjects, but theoretically all kinds of constituents can grammatically be placed in the prefield. De Vries (2009:2) writes about Dutch that “[i]n unmarked sentences, the subject is positioned leftmost. However, depending on the intended information structure, every constituent can be moved to the first position instead, triggering inversion. This is called “topicalization”. The same is true for Swedish; whereas a subject most often has position 1, this position can also be given to another constituent, depending on how the speaker/writer wants to structure the information of his/her message. (See Section 2.2 for an introduction to information structure). Dutch, like German, has a higher number of different pronominal adverbs than Swedish which can appear in the prefield and which are widely used both in informal speech and in writing. (See de Rooy & Wikén Bonde 2005:89ff, van den Toorn 1984:232f for more about pronominal adverbs in Dutch). The Swedish language almost completely lacks this kind of elements and the few pronominal adverbs that are used belong to the formal, written language (e.g. därefter ‘after that/then’, därtill ‘in addition to that’) and are not used to any larger extent in spoken or informal language.

De Vries (2009:3) writes that “the initial field is divided into two qualitatively different components, namely the prefield, which is an essential part of the clause, and the ‘true’ left periphery, which may contain a dislocated constituent”. It is important to differentiate between the prefield and what he calls the ‘left periphery’. The periphery contains elements which do not affect the syntactic structure of main clauses, i.e. these elements are not a part of the clause as such. Such elements are common in spoken language. Following e.g. Bohnacker & Rosén (2007:31, 2009:3) conjunctions as well as parts of the utterance which are divided from the main clause by a pause, are here seen as non-affecting elements and are not counted as occurring in the prefield in the analysis of my data.11

Bohnacker & Rosén (2007:32) note that "the prefield is especially important for communication as it anchors the clause in discourse”. The prefield is also of importance for the introduction of referents as, even though not all referents are introduced in main declarative clauses, the prefield helps structuring the text and is one factor which determines

---

10 For example in the old Swedish saying Därom tvista de lärde ‘this the learned argue about’, a pronominal adverb is used in the prefield. However, the nature of this sentence shows the type of contexts where pronominal adverbs are used in Swedish, i.e. in sayings and formal text.

11 “We disregard coordinating conjunctions here, as they are not treated as clausal constituents, but as linking words with no influence on word-order. Utterance-initial elements separated by a pause or intonation break, e.g. left-dislocated constituents, vocatives and interjections, are not considered to be part of the prefield” (Bohnacker & Rosén, 2007:31).
the perspective of referent introduction. (See Section 2.4.3 for more on perspectives of referent introduction.)

Jörgensen (1976:103) gives figures of subjects in the prefield: for spoken Swedish corpus data, 62% for interviews and 60% for academic conversations/debates. (See also Håkansson 2006). Bohnacker & Rosén (2008:517) give a figure of 73% of subjects in the prefield for informal written Swedish. Bohnacker & Rosén (2007:33f) write that “according to G. Håkansson (1997:50), 60% of all declaratives in Swedish, German, Dutch and Icelandic begin with a subject, whilst 40% are non-subject-initial. However, no empirical evidence is provided for this claim.” Thus, according to G. Håkansson (1997), Swedish and Dutch should show similarities with respect to the frequency of subjects in the prefield, something which is of relevance to this study. This is also supported by the figures of Bouma (2008:95f), who, in his study of topicalization/fronting in Dutch, found around 70% subjects in the prefield, using a large corpus of spoken material, Corpus Gesproken Nederlands. (For more information about this corpus, see Bouma 2008:63ff). The conclusions drawn from earlier studies of the prefield are that Dutch and Swedish show tendencies of having a similar proportion of subject-initial clauses, and that this amount is around 60%-75%, depending on the study and the material/genre used.

2.1.2 Expletive constructions

Swedish has what is called platshållartvång (lit. ‘place-holding constraint’) (Ekerot 1979:83, Bolander 204:165) which means that the first position of the clause cannot be left empty, but must be occupied by some constituent. When the logical subject is moved to the position after the verb (inversion), which is fairly frequent in Swedish, an expletive subject or another constituent has to occupy the first position. This has been shown to be a problem for learners of Swedish as L2 (Hammarberg & Viberg 1979).

The structure of Dutch is very similar to Swedish here; Dutch has what is called topisch er12 ‘topical it/that’, which is also called noodzakelijk plaatsonderwerp (lit. ‘necessary place-topic’) (van den Toorn 1984:230), i.e. a construction and structural constraint very similar to the Swedish platshållartvång. (See also Holmes & Hinchliffe 2003:437f, 480ff for more about det and place holders). Given these similarities between the two languages, expletive constructions should not be a problem for Dutch L1 learners of Swedish. The following are

12 For more about the diverse functions of er ‘it/there’, see van den Toorn (1984:230f) or de Rooy & Wikén Bonde (2005:91ff).
examples of the structure expletive-verb-logical subject (Expl-V-logical S) in Swedish and Dutch:

(3) Swe: det finns kaffe
it is coffe
‘There is coffee’

(4) Du: er is koffie
it/there is coffee

As can be seen above, this expletive construction is realised in an identical way in the two languages. The Dutch expletive construction *er is* ‘there is’ is the equivalence of the Swedish *det är/det finns* (de Rooy & Wikén Bonde 2005:92). These constructions are common\(^{13}\) in both languages, and constitute one way of introducing referents, in the form of *er is een X* and *det finns en/ett X* ‘there is a(n) X’. (See section 2.4.3 for this existential perspective of referent introduction).

Expletive *det* in Swedish can be found in different positions in the clause, although it is frequently placed in first position. Expletive *er* as a formal subject always has position 1, according to de Rooy & Wikén Bonde (2005:146). However, *er* can also have other positions where it could be classified as a weak locational adverb (‘there’). This classification is not straight forward, which can be seen in the following constructed example where the Swedish *det* is classified as an expletive, but what about the Dutch *er* placed in the same position and filling a more or less identical function? (Note also the ambiguity of *it/there* in English.)

(5) Swe: nu finns det kaffe
      now is it coffee

(6) Du: nu is er koffie
      now is it/there coffee

      'Now there is coffee'

As can be seen in the examples above, Swedish *det* and Dutch *er* have a very similar, almost identical, function also when not placed in the prefied field. I also suggest that the use of the Swedish verb *finnas* ‘exist/be’ instead of *är* ‘be’ may also, to some degree, indicate that there is existence at a location, something which is not expressed by the Dutch verb *zijn* ‘be’.\(^{14}\) Thus, *det finns* and *er is* behave more or less identically, also when *er* is not placed clause-initially. As will be shown later in this paper, these constructions form an important part of the cases of referent introductions with an existential/object-based perspective (see Section 2.4.3 and 4.1).

\(^{13}\) However, I do not have any percentages for how common these constructions are in the languages.

\(^{14}\) *is* in third person singular.
2.2 Information structure

In this section, a brief overview of the concept of information structure will be given. It has to be kept in mind is that the terminology used by different authors often lacks clear definitions as well as general agreement. Therefore, I have chosen to present mainly one version of the concept of information structure, namely the concept as brought forward by Mörnsjö (2002).

“The term ‘information structure’ refers both to the organization of information in the sentence and to information structuring above the sentence level, namely the organization of information in the text” (Mörnsjö 2002:17). Information structure can be found both at clause and text level. In this paper, focus is on the structure of sentences, i.e. what can be called the micro-level. I think that this is a topic well-suited for analysis on the sentence-level even though I acknowledge the need for research on the text or macro-level as well; coherence on the macro-level is of outermost importance for the performance of second language learners. I also suggest that the clause level forms the basis for information structure at the text level and that structure of constituents within clauses is a realization of the structuring of concepts. (See also section 2.3 about linearization). Which view is taken depends on the purpose of the investigation. It is clear that the two levels influence each other.

Information structure is tied to the use of clauses for linguistic communication (Ekerot 1979:86) and “the study of information structure is not concerned with lexical and propositional content in the abstract but with the way such content is transmitted” (Lambrecht 1994:3); i.e. it concerns “organising information for expression” (Carroll & von Stutterheim 2003:365). The perspective taken in this paper is that information structure is both functional and cognitive, i.e. it is both a matter of communicative functions and the cognitive representations inside speakers and hearers. What is studied here, however, is primarily the linguistic realisation of structures in the material and not the deeper, underlying representations. In this sense, the current study can be directed more towards the functional aspects of the features studied.

When studying information structure one tries to answer the following questions: How do speakers, once content has been selected, encode this content? How do they structure the presentation of information to the hearer? In other words: “In addition to deciding what to say, speakers must decide how to say it” (Ward & Birner 2003:119). Information structure is

---

15 Information structure has also been called discourse structure, text grammar, text structure, discourse pragmatics.

also sometimes called *discourse pragmatics* and “is concerned with the question of why one and the same meaning may be expressed by two or more sentence forms” (Lambrecht 1994:5). Different information structures have the purpose of answering different questions (Ekerot 1979:85f), there is a selection of text type or what Klein & von Stutterheim (1987) call the *quaestio*, the overarching question a text tries to answer. This is also true for the clause level, where the structure of the clause determines the way the message is presented to and understood by the hearer.

The description used by Mö尔nsjö (2002)\(^{17}\) is the three layer model of information structure of Molnár (1991) which is based on Bühler’s (1934) ideas of:

> “three fundamental components of the communicative situation, namely that things or states of affairs will be described (‘Darstellung’) and be conveyed to a hearer (‘Appell’) in a manner that obeys the intentions of the speaker (‘Ausdruck’)”

(Mö르nsjö 2002:17).

The three levels, which each correspond to one of the components of the communicative situation, are: topic-comment, theme-rheme and background-focus. These categories are thought to be relatively independent of each other, even though they have a tendency to overlap. It is important to point out that this is only one of the many models proposed and this one, with its three layers, is one of the more complex ones. Other models with only two layers or even one layer, with only topic and focus\(^{18}\) have also been proposed (e.g. Ward & Birner 2003; Erteschik-Shir 2007).

Mö尔斯jö (2002:18) writes that “*topic* stands for what the sentence is about and *comment* for the prediction made with respect to the topic”; i.e. the comment is what is said about the topic. Further, “*theme* is what the speaker assumes the hearer to know and *rheme* is what the speaker assumes to be new information for the hearer” (Mö尔斯jö 2002:18), i.e. theme is given and rheme is new information. Ward & Birner (2003:121) make the distinction between discourse new/old and hearer old/new; where other things can be assumed to be old to the hearer irrelevant of the discourse and where certain things are not generally known to the hearer, but have become old in the current discourse. There is also the distinction between what the speaker “would like to highlight in the utterance, i.e. *focus*, whereas the remainder of the utterance constitutes the *background*” (Mö尔斯jö 2002:18). Ward & Birner maintain that focus “refers to that portion of an utterance that represents new information” (Ward & Birner

---

\(^{17}\) This is also similar to the system presented in Krifka (2007).

\(^{18}\) Mostly in the Anglo-Saxon tradition.
Concerning information structure and second language acquisition, Carroll & von Stutterheim (2003:372) write that “although the learner varieties of very advanced learners are characterised by a high degree of formal accuracy, their use of linguistic structures in context, i.e. form function relations, do not correspond to those found in the target language”. They propose that different languages have different “preferred patterns of information organisation” (Carroll & von Stutterheim 2003:396) and that this poses a problem for second language learners; a problem which is harder to overcome than acquiring formal aspects of syntax. In order to be a fluent speaker, one must master the native patterns of information structure, which is more complex than to master grammatical forms, as informational patterns are not made up of categorical or explicit rules as found in a grammar, but only constitute tendencies.

The following two sections summarize relevant aspects of some studies on information structure in Swedish and Dutch respectively. As information structure is a large field, after an introduction to the related concept of linearization (Section 2.3), Section 2.4 homes in on the more specified area of referent introduction and maintenance relevant for the purposes of the present study.

### 2.2.1 Information structure in Swedish: Earlier studies

Information structure in Swedish has not been widely researched. However, there are some studies of the subject, even concerning second language acquisition, most notable the work by Bohnacker (2007, 2010) and Bohnacker & Rosén (2007, 2008, 2009) on Swedish-speaking learners of German and German-speaking learners of Swedish. Since these studies concern both second language acquisition as well as closely related Germanic language, they provide useful knowledge for understanding the context in which the ideas of the current study were formed.

Bohnacker & Rosén (2007, 2008, 2009) found that Swedish L1 compared to German L1 has a higher tendency to place constituents of low informational value, such as the expletive det ‘it’ or thematic elements in the prefield; more declaratives in Swedish begin with a formal subject than in German. Swedish, to a higher degree than German, follows “a principle of

---

19 Ward & Birner (2003) follow an information-structural model of only the layer of topic (known information) and focus (new information).
information structure that we called ‘rheme later’, where informationally new (i.e. rhematic, focal) material is kept out of the clause-initial position, and instead is placed further to the right, i.e. postverbally” (Bohnacker & Rosén, 2007:53). Bohnacker (2010) also showed that advanced German L1 learners of Swedish L2 do not master the patterns of information structure found in native Swedish. Further on Bohnacker & Rosén (2008:38) write that:

“We therefore suggest that there are subtle differences between Swedish and German concerning the linguistic means used in referent introduction. These cross-linguistic differences are not categorical (grammatical vs. ungrammatical), but tendencies, yet their mastery is an integral part of language competence.”

The quotation above clearly shows that this is indeed an important field of study as it is highly relevant for second language acquisition.

2.2.2 Information structure in Dutch: Theories and earlier studies

The information structure of Dutch has, to my knowledge, not been widely researched and I have not been able to find many studies. Those I have found were mostly carried out in phonology, looking at how information structure is linked to prosody.

Steedman (1990) found that the interpretation of intonational patterns, which can be called ‘intonational structure’, is related to patterns of information structure. This was researched for Dutch by Swerts et al (2002), who found that information status (new/old) affects whether or not an NP is accented in Dutch. Similar results were obtained by van Son & Pols (2003). However, as my study does not concern intonation and stress, these studies are only relevant for the current study in so far as they point towards the importance of acquiring information structure as it can be reflected not only in word order patterns but also in the domain of phonology.

Nuyts & Vonk (1999) found a connection between information structure and the use of epistemic modal expressions in Dutch native oral descriptions of a short cartoon. However, since they are mainly concerned with determining the adjectives and adverbs used in such descriptions, their results are tangential to my study. Still, Nuyts & Vonk (1999) give an additional ‘proof’ that information structure is indeed important for the structure of native speech and something to take into account when learning a language.

Ehrich & Koster (1983) carried out a study of room descriptions in Dutch (their study concerned descriptions of three dimensional miniature rooms), looking at both macro and
micro aspects of discourse organization. The results are presented as generalisable to other languages and the authors seem unaware of possible differences between languages with regard to the organisation of room descriptions; in fact they do not even once in the description of their study mention the fact that the subjects researched had Dutch as their mother tongue! This insensitivity to at least potential differences lowers the value of their study. In two pilot studies and four experiments, Ehrich & Koster (1983) researched various issues concerning word order, linearization, and the role of pre-existing knowledge for discourse organization. Due to the many aspects researched, the results are complex but some main points can be mentioned: linearization of speech and segmentation of speech into sequences seems to be made on the basis of information structure with different types of linearization modes. Depending on the structure of the contents of the room, different strategies were used by the subjects studied. One interesting finding that is relevant for my study is the fact that Ehrich & Koster (1983) noticed that definite articles in the beginning of a description segment (i.e. where referents had not previously been mentioned in the discourse) were mostly used for items included in the ‘frame’ of the room, i.e. for walls, floor and ceiling. Ehrich & Koster (1983) maintained that this is due to the fact that the existence of such objects in a room is common knowledge between speaker and hearer (Ehrich & Koster 1983:189f). Thus, segmentation and linearization of speech has both a cognitive and a communicative side (Ehrich & Koster 1983:192), an idea which is highly compatible with my own ideas.

2.3 Linearization

Another important piece of theoretical background that is needed in order to place the current study in its context, concerns the question of linearization.

Whilst linearization can refer to a number of things, such as the linear organization of linguistic units, e.g. phrases, into larger units, such as clauses, and their ordering in relation to each other, I will here be concerned with the linear organization of concepts (Levelt 1981:92), i.e. the sequential ordering of information. For Levelt, the founder of the concept of linearization, it is a non-linguistic process, i.e. a conceptual process taking place before the speaker formulates his/her message in words. Still, he means that linearization is also related

---

20 In fact the only place where the study is said to concern Dutch is mentioned in the title, otherwise Ehrich & Koster (1983) write about discourse organization in general and do not discuss whether or not their findings can be related to the structure of Dutch - they take a very universal view of language and information structure/linearization.
to functional issues of language use (Levelt 1982:202). Levelt writes that “the requirement to linearize is due to the oral modality of language: our vocal apparatus is not equipped for the simultaneous expression of complex information” (Levelt 1981:99); linearization is by necessity a part of oral communication, even though some information is conveyed through facial expressions, gestures etc., and can be given at the same time as words. Even though the concept of linearization was first developed for speech, the written modality, when using an alphabet like the Latin one, has the same constraints, i.e. the message given from sender to receiver has to have a linear form, a beginning and an end, and information has to be organized in such a way that certain parts of the message come first and other parts later. How to organize messages according to this linear structure is what Levelt (1981, 1982) calls “the linearization problem: the speaker will have to decide on what to say first, what to say next, and so on” (Levelt 1981:91).

Linearization is, in Levelt’s influential writings, perceived as a property of oral and written communication and even though it is not formally connected to syntax, “[t]he grammar of a language may put certain boundary conditions on the order in which thoughts can be expressed, and the order of expression decided on will in turn limit the choice of appropriate grammatical forms” (Levelt 1981:92). Hence, there is a kind of interdependency relationship between linearization and syntax.

There is also, for different languages/speech communities, an “unmarked form of linearization” (Levelt 1981:93), a sort of default setting which is neutral and “allows for easy retrieval on the part of the speaker and for easy inference on the part of the listener, given shared general or more specific knowledge in the speech community” (Levelt 1981:94). This unmarked linearization is dependent on a shared context in the speech community. This also indicates that there is a relation between linearization and culture/society and that there are norms for linearization, just as there are norms for language use in the form of suitable registers for different social situations. By using the type of linearization that is normal for the language at hand, “the speaker facilitates the listener’s comprehension” (Levelt 1981:93). Levelt also maintains that the listener, and the speech community surrounding the speaker, and maybe through this the culture, can influence linearization: “The listener’s reactions may become highly important for the speaker’s linearization” (Levelt 1982:200). Linearization strategies are systematic (Levelt 1982:200) and their function is to “impose an ordering scheme upon domain” (Ferreira & Henderson 1998:88). This is also connected to how speakers order clauses within larger discourses (Ferreira & Henderson 1998:88). There can be
different styles of linearization for different domains, or more clearly expressed, for different genres.\(^{21}\)

It has been argued that linearization is strongly connected with the properties of concepts: “The general principle seems to be that the more available or salient a concept is, the earlier in a sentence the corresponding linguistic constituent tends to be” (Ferreira & Henderson 1998:88). Salience is in itself a vague concept and it is necessary to define what is meant by availability or salience of a concept, which is not done by all researchers. Sometimes reasoning concerning salience and the position of certain concepts becomes circular: what is realised first is most salient or most easily available and what is most salient is realised first. Ferreira & Henderson (1998) studied oral descriptions, made by adult native English speakers, of networks of coloured dots and found “a general preference for the most available and accessible word concept to occur early in a sentence” (Ferreira & Henderson 1998:95).

Even though Levelt’s position is that linearization is non-linguistic, it can be argued that syntactic structure and linearization are closely linked. Lyons (1981:220) writes that “the factors that determine the linearization of spoken language utterances have operated, historically, to fix the word order on sentences in some, but not all, languages”. This is, for example, to some extent, true for Germanic V2 languages such as Swedish, German, and Dutch. Still, their structure, with the prefield’s important role as anchoring the clause in the discourse, and the fact that the prefield, according to formal grammar, can hold almost any constituent, makes the word order in terms of concepts relatively free. One can chose which information is presented first, for instance first present an entity or alternatively present information about the location of that entity, since clauses in V2 languages can be e.g. subject-initial or adverbial-initial. This can also be linked to how new objects in discourse are presented to the hearer/reader, i.e. what is called referent introduction (see Section 2.4). Still, the connection between word order and linearization may be more clearly seen when looking at information-structural tendencies, such as the tendency in Swedish for clauses to start with phonologically ‘light’ elements such as the formal subject \textit{det} ‘it’. Here we are not dealing with categorical word order rules\(^{22}\) but rather with tendencies in production. Lyons (1981:220) writes that “languages vary considerably in the grammatical and stylistic use they make of word order”. This has been seen in the studies by Bohnacker & Rosen (2007, 2008, 2009), where German L1 showed more variation in the prefield than Swedish L1 did. This is also

\(^{21}\) For a discussion about genres and styles/types of linearization, see Klein & von Stutterheim (1987).

\(^{22}\) Some authors, e.g. Koutsoudas (1981), have been interested in finding rules for linearization. However, the results are not completely conclusive and more research is needed.
connected to the current study, both regarding the analysis of prefield constituents and perhaps even more so in connection with referent introductions and maintenance, where different ways of introducing referents may reflect different linearization strategies.\textsuperscript{23}

Linearization has been studied extensively, but mostly with a universal perspective, in order to try to find commonalities between languages, and is often related to cognitive issues such as language processing, and not only to use of certain linguistic features for linearization. For a study of descriptions of maps with focus on spatial linearization, see Daniel et al (1996). For examples of ‘gaze tours’, i.e. descriptions of apartments and rooms, see Linde & Labov (1975), Shanon (1984) and the above-mentioned Ehrich & Koster (1983). These studies typically investigate the behaviour of native speakers. I have not been able to find any studies of L2 learners of Swedish, as few studies that deal with linearization and learner language exist.

\subsection*{2.4 Referent introduction and maintenance}

In this section I will give an overview of some theories concerning referent introduction and maintenance, i.e. how new objects are introduced into a discourse and then, later, referred to again in the same discourse. However, before this, I will introduce two important concepts, for understanding referent introduction and maintenance, namely common ground and givenness.

\subsubsection*{2.4.1 Common ground (management) and givenness}

Krifka (2007:14f) sees “communication as continuous change of the common ground (CG)”. The common ground consists of the information that can be assumed to be mutually known to all participants in a conversation.\textsuperscript{24} Krifka (2007) argues that it is important to distinguish between the content of the common ground, i.e. what it consists of before any given conversation, and the management of the common ground, i.e. how participants make changes in the common ground during a conversation. The common ground contains different types of information. Among this is “a set of entities that have been introduced into the CG before” (Krifka 2007:16). Here the link with referent introduction and maintenance is clear. A part of

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{23} This possibility will, due to space constraints, not be discussed further but should be kept in mind by the reader throughout this paper.

\textsuperscript{24} See also e.g. Stalnaker (1974), Karttunen (1969, 1974) and Lewis (1979). Karttunen’s (1969) ideas about discourse refererents and anaphoric expressions will be discussed below.
Common Ground Management is how to introduce new referents into the discourse. Also, referents that are already part of the common ground can be maintained or reintroduced.

According to Krifka (2007), givenness obtains when an expression is taken for granted in the immediate common ground context, i.e. in the present conversation (see also Chafe 1976, Féry 2007). Krifka (2007:37ff) identifies two types of phenomena that indicate givenness of an expression or entity, namely anaphoric expressions (including definite expressions) and givenness through deaccentuation, deletion or word order. For the current study, anaphoric expressions are of particular interest, since we are here dealing with referent introductions. Krifka (2007:38) argues that, in the typical case, definite articles indicate that the expression/entity is given in the general common ground, i.e. part of a specific topic or setting, whereas clitics and pronouns indicate that the expression/entity is given in the immediate common ground, i.e. in the specific situation where it was mentioned in the immediate discourse.

2.4.2 Referent introduction and maintenance: An overview

Nakamura (1993:86) writes that “[c]hildren must acquire ways of distinguishing referent introduction from reference maintenance and marking referents based on the degree to which the identity of the entities can be more or less presupposed from context”. This is true for second language learners as well. Managing referent introductions and maintenance is an important part of functional knowledge of a language, as this concerns language use in context and not the creation of grammatically correct sentences. Thus, I believe referent introduction and maintenance to be closely linked to patterns of information structure and also to linearization of the message presented.

Geluykens (1993:182) writes that “the introduction of referents in conversation, and the subsequent tracking of these referents, is an interactional process which depends heavily on speaker-hearer co-operation”. In addition to this, I have suggested that referent introduction/maintenance is not only a communicative and functional aspect of language use but also a cognitive process where the mental representation of an object is triggered through making reference to that object.

The term discourse referent was introduced by Karttunen (1969) who suggests that indefinite nouns phrases are used to introduce new discourse referents whereas anaphoric expressions (e.g. pronouns) and definite forms are used to ‘pick up’ discourse referents, i.e. for referent maintenance. This is related to Krifka’s (2007) account of givenness, where
referent maintenance obtains when a referent is already given in the discourse and referent introduction adds new referents to the discourse. Karttunen writes that “[b]y ‘establishes a discourse referent’ we meant that there may be a co-referential pronoun or definite noun phrase later on in the discourse” (Karttunen 1969:34), i.e. a referent is introduced when it is possible to refer to that object again later using a definite form/pronoun (i.e. to maintain it). Referent maintenance is the continued mentioning of the referent, i.e. “all linguistic expressions referring to a protagonist after that first act of referring to that particular protagonist” (Hendriks 2003:299). A referent, following Karttunen (1969), is not only an animate entity, but any object or substance; ‘protagonist’ in the quotation above should be seen as meaning simply ‘referent’. An example of a standard referent introduction and maintenance would be the following: ‘There is a cake on the table. I take the cake from the table.’ Here a referent, cake, is first introduced into the discourse using an indefinite article and then, in the second sentence, the same referent is maintained using the definite article.

Note the following: with referent I do not mean a physical object, but an object of the discourse. Thus, any object mentioned is a referent, not only those which de facto exist on the pictures used as stimuli for the current study (see Chapter 3 for research design). The reason for this is that my concern is not so much how ‘real objects’ are described, but rather how referents are introduced and maintained in discourse. However, most of the referents introduced by the speakers in the present study are in fact ‘normal’, non-problematic, referents, in that they are objects in the pictures and can be said to be ‘real’ referents, i.e. they do exist as real, physical objects (as objects in a picture) outside of the discourse. They are introduced mainly by indefinite expressions and are and can be maintained in a ‘regular’ way (i.e. by definite forms of anaphoric expressions) in the discourse.

Even though Karttunen (1969:4f) claims that when a negation is used, no referent is introduced, I believe that for the purpose of this paper, it is the idea of an object that is important, not whether or not it exists. Even the negation of an object brings the idea of that object. You cannot ‘not think of X’ - it always entails first thinking of X, e.g. consider the following sentence: There is no cake on the table. In order to be able to state that there is no cake on the table, one need not only know what a cake is and see that it is not there, but the very act of stating this makes it impossible not to think of a cake. However, it is surely true that negated referents cannot be maintained in the ordinary way by using a definite form or a pronoun, as what is stated is that some referent does not exist in a particular discourse. They can, however, be ‘re-introduced’, but it would then have to be in the indefinite form.

Something which is very similar to maintenance; similar enough for the purpose of this paper.

25 Something which is very similar to maintenance; similar enough for the purpose of this paper.
Karttunen (1969) also claims that referents cannot be said to be introduced in the ‘normal’ sense in clauses containing a modal verb, as these do not state how things are (Karttunen 1969:8f). However, just as with the case of negated referents, I believe that stating ‘I would like a cake’ still introduces the mental representation of a cake in the mind of the hearer; that this cake has no physical existence (yet) does not make it any less a referent. However, as far as the maintenance of such a cake is concerned, it also differs from the ‘regular’ way as it can indeed be maintained using a normal definite expression or pronoun, but the rest of the sentence cannot be in indicative mode, e.g. ‘The cake would have to be tasty, otherwise I do not want it’, i.e. “provided that the discourse continues in the same mode” (Karttunen 1969:19). Karttunen suggests that such referents may be termed short term referents\textsuperscript{26} (1969:18f); i.e. they cannot exist outside the scope of the modal; they cannot be maintained later in the discourse. Karttunen (1969) further discusses different types of verbs and structures that may or may not lead to the introduction of a referent, or to a short term referent. Basically, his criterion is that a referent is only introduced if it can be maintained using a definite form or an anaphoric expression. I believe that this is true for referents that are said to exist (in ‘reality’) but that this does not cover every type of referent, as for me a referent is in fact the same as ‘the idea of an object’, irrelevant of what is stated about it. I argue that when viewing language not in terms of truth conditions, but as communication or a cognitive state in the mind of the speaker/hearer, this is the only logical position one can take regarding discourse referents and their introductions/maintenance. It can also be claimed that discourse does not, in fact, need to be connected to reality at all, since discourse is a linguistic representation and not a statement about ‘reality’.

Karttunen (1969) tries to answer the question: When is there supposed to be an individual associated with an indefinite noun phrase? He claims that “[a] non-specific indefinite NP in an affirmative sentence (single sentence or a complement) establishes a discourse referent just in case the proposition represented by the sentence is asserted, implied or presupposed by the speaker to be true” (1969:13); he is looking for the existence of a referent. Instead, I argue that the important question should be: When is there an idea of an individual/entity/object/substance evoked by the use of an (indefinite) noun phrase? This, I believe, is the reason why my idea of what constitutes a referent differs from that of Karttunen (1969); in order to have an idea (i.e. a mental representation) of an object, such an object does not need to be mentioned as existing in the discourse, the simple mentioning of the object (i.e. the (indefinite) noun phrase) is enough to trigger the mental representation. Note that, in the

\textsuperscript{26} In opposition to ‘normal’ asserted referents that, according to Karttunen (1969:34), are permanent referents.
present study, I will use my own concept of referent when counting occurrences in the data; if one uses Karttunen’s framework, the number of referents is lower. I am sure, however, that this would not greatly affect the patterns of referent introduction and maintenance as to be reported here.

A special category of referents are those introduced with definite forms; a category which Karttunen (1969) does not mention, but which is frequent in Dutch and Swedish natural production, as we will see in the empirical part of this paper.²⁷ I suggest that referents introduced with a definite or anaphoric form are those whose existence is taken for granted, i.e. it is presupposed that the discourse contains them and that the hearer has knowledge of the existence of these referents. The existence of such referents is a type of presupposed information i.e. “information that the speaker assumes is already a part of the common ground” (Ward & Birner 2003:120). This is consistent with the Krifka’s (2007) account of givenness (see section 2.4.1) Because of the fact that their existence is presupposed, definite forms can be used even though the referents have not been mentioned earlier in the discourse. An example of this is the following fictive example: ‘This is a bedroom. The walls are yellow.’ The referent walls have not been previously mentioned in the discourse; yet in the context of describing a bedroom it would be presupposed that the room has walls, and the sentence above would constitute an acceptable and normal way of introducing the walls to the hearer.

Hendriks (2003:291) states that in “West-European languages”²⁸ indefinite articles are a marker of new information, and that speakers of most languages mark ‘newness’. Following Hendriks (2003) as well as Karttunen (1969), indefinite forms would be expected to be used for referent introduction in both Swedish and Dutch, whereas definite forms and anaphoric expressions such as pronouns would be used for maintenance in both languages.

Jarvis (2002) makes a distinction between new, continuous, and reintroduced NP referents. His system (which builds on e.g. Chaudron & Parker 1990, Givón 1984), divides referent management into three categories, as opposed to the previously mentioned binary division into referent introduction and maintenance. What Jarvis names continuous NP referents is called referent maintenance in the current study. In some cases, referents that are maintained in the indefinite form may be cases of reintroduction. Still, since the texts,

²⁷ This is because he presupposes that the function of introducing a discourse referent is always realised linguistically through the use of an indefinite form.
²⁸ I believe that by this she means the West-European Indo-European languages, i.e. in fact Romance and Germanic languages only. See also Hendriks (1998:69), where this view is supported. However, I also think that this is a clumsy, not to say wrong, way of expressing this as not all West-European languages are Indo-European (what about e.g. Basque and Finnish?).
particularly the picture descriptions, in the current study are very short, not many cases of the reintroduction type are expected and, hence, a system which only distinguishes between referent introductions and maintenance is deemed sufficient for my purposes here.

In Jarvis’ (2002) study of Finnish L1 and Swedish L1 learners of English L2, he found that the L2 learners’ use of articles to mark the categories of referent introduction and referent maintenance were influenced by whether or not articles existed in the L1 (Swedish has indefinite/definite markers whereas Finnish lacks this distinction). From this, the conclusion can be drawn that marking referent introduction and maintenance in the L2 may depend on the availability of similar types of markers in the L1. Since Dutch and Swedish have very similar systems of indefinite and definite systems, one may expect no substantial differences in this respect, at least not concerning the use of indefinite and definite articles. The proportions of the different types of anaphoric expressions used for maintenance (definites, pronouns etc) may, however, reveal some interesting differences. Therefore, these different expressions will be investigated more closely in the current study.

2.4.3 Spatial vs. existential perspective of referent introduction and maintenance

One interesting theory concerning referent introductions/maintenance has been proposed by Carroll & von Stutterheim (1993, 2003), von Stutterheim (1997), von Stutterheim et al (1993) and Carroll et al (2000), namely the idea that referent introductions (and maintenances) can be done through different perspectives.

Carroll & von Stutterheim (2003) and Carroll et al (2000) collected different kinds of oral descriptions made by native speakers of English, German, French, Italian and Spanish and of learner varieties with the combinations L1 English-L2 German, L1 German-L2 English and L1 Spanish-L2 German. They found two different perspectives of referent introduction in their material; the spatially based perspective with a “high rate of locationals in reference introduction” (Carroll & von Stutterheim 2003:370) and proadverbials (pronominal adverbials) used for maintenance, which was prevalent in native German, and the object based perspective with subject-initial referent introduction using expletives, i.e. what they termed existential constructions, and nominal forms used for referent maintenance. This latter perspective was the one favoured by native speakers of English and the Romance languages.

Carroll & von Stutterheim (2003) and Carroll et al. (2000) use the term reference introduction and maintenance, whereas I find the term referent introduction and maintenance more suitable, as it concerns the introduction/maintenance of a referent, i.e. an object.
In the spatially based perspective “the main organization principle is based on concepts in the spatial domain” whereas with an object based perspective “the organization principle is object based /…/ that is, the domain of entities provides the basis for the underlying perspective in organizing information” (Carroll et al. 2000:445). According to these authors, the two perspectives are due to different questions underlying the organization of the information. Either the question is ‘What is where?’ (object based/existential perspective) or ‘Where is what?’ (spatially based perspective) (Carroll et al. 2000:446). Concerning referent introduction, which is the focus of this paper, these two perspectives are reflected in the use of existential or locational constructions when introducing the referent (Carroll et al. 2000:447).

An example of the existential perspective is the following: ‘there is a girl’, where girl is the referent introduced. An example of the spatial perspective is: ‘in the room stands a girl’, where girl is the referent introduced.

An important finding here is not only that languages may differ in the way they introduce referents, but also that second language learners have problems with mastering the perspective of the target language. When Carroll & von Stutterheim (2003) and Carroll et al. (2000) compared the native speaker data to the data from L2 German and L2 English they found that “learners retain the underlying principles of their source language” (Carroll & von Stutterheim 2003:366), thus they did not acquire a target-like perspective of referent introduction and maintenance. Since differences and difficulties were found for the combination English-German, two relatively closely related Germanic languages, it is highly relevant to look closer at how Dutch L1 learners of Swedish L2 perform in this regard.

For Swedish, Bolander (2005:210) discusses constructions of presentation (presenteringskonstruktion), which have two forms: one which begins with expletive det followed by finns ‘is’ or an intransitive positional verb such as sitter ‘sits’, ligger ‘lies’, hänger ‘hangs’, and another which begins with a locative adverbial, e.g. på väggen ‘on the wall’ or under sängen ‘under the bed’. An example of the former would be Det hänger tavlor på väggen ‘there are paintings (hanging) on the wall’ and of the latter På bordet står en kopp ‘on the table there is a cup’. The former represents an existential perspective on the

---

30 Even though topic/comment will not be discussed or studied in the current study, it is important to keep in mind that with the object based perspective, the subject (here coinciding with the referent) has topic status in the clause, whilst with the spatially based perspective the adverbial constitutes the topic. Reinhart (1981) writes about adverbial topics that “in many cases, it seems that a temporal (or locative) adverb […] fulfills the requirements needed for topic status” (Reinhart 1981:72 quoted in Mörnsjö 2002:19). Following Reinhart (1981), Mörnsjö (2002:19) calls these aboutness topics, a term which is similar to Chafe’s (1976) notion of Rahmentopik ‘frame topic’. Mörnsjö (2002:19) writes that “Although subjects universally show a very strong correlation with topics, other referential arguments may occur as ‘aboutness’ topics as well”.

introduced referent whereas the latter expresses a spatial perspective. Both of these constructions are also possible as well as used in Dutch. An example of the ‘existential’ construction of presentation would be the following: 

Er hangen schilderijen aan de muur

‘there are paintings (hanging) on the wall’. The following is a Dutch example of the construction beginning with an adverbial: 

Op de tafel staat een kopje

‘on the table there is a cup’.

Before moving on to describe the methodology and results of the current study, it is highly relevant to look into what has previously been done on Dutch learner of Swedish. This will be done in Section 2.5, the final section of this chapter.

2.5 Studies of Dutch learners of Swedish

I have not been able to find any relevant studies of Dutch learners of Swedish, except for my own pilot study (Lindgren 2009b). Of the few studies with this language combination, none are relevant for the purposes of my study. No studies have been made of prefield constituents or referent introductions and maintenances in the learner language of Dutch L1 learners of Swedish L2. Also, to my knowledge no studies have been made of picture descriptions with this language combination.31

The combination Dutch-Swedish is in general very unusual and this is especially true for studies related to L2A. This may be due to the relatively low numbers of Dutch learners of Swedish as well as of Swedish and Dutch native speakers. The present work is, hence, to be viewed as explorative.

After this theoretical overview, I will now move on to describe the methodology of the current study (Chapter 3).

---

31 Personal e-mail communication with Annika Johansson (Stockholm Universitet, Sweden), Gudrun Rawoens (Universiteit Gent, Belgium), Charlotte Gooskens (Universiteit van Groningen, the Netherlands) and Harry Perridon (Universiteit van Amsterdam, the Netherlands).
3. Method & data collection

The method used in this paper is an analysis at clause level of oral and (informal) written material. The focus is here on the learner language as expression (Ellis & Barkhuizen 2005:7f), i.e. as form and not as content. The material comes from 6 Dutch L1 adult learners of Swedish, with material collected from the same learners both in Dutch L1 and in Swedish L2, and from 6 Swedish L1 adult native controls. Referent introduction, constituents of the prefied and linearization preferences at clause level are analysed and compared between Dutch L1, Swedish L1 and Swedish L2, with focus on how the learners adjust to the linearization patterns and patterns of referent introduction and maintenance of the L2. Both the oral and written material are samples of “clinically” elicited data, as tasks were given where “learners are primarily concerned with message conveyance” (Ellis & Barkhuizen 2005:23). The elicitation tasks were pictures description (oral material) and a narrative (written material). Some control was exercised over the material, more so with the oral material as the task given was designed to make the learners produce referent introductions and maintenances. The oral material can be described as a focused sample, whereas the written material is a more general sample (Ellis & Barkhuizen 2005:30).

Using two pictures depicting rooms as stimuli, semi-structured oral data was collected and analysed. In addition to this, a simple written task was administered, where the subjects were asked to write a short narrative on a given topic. Transcription of the material and manual encoding according to the categories is also specified below.

Because of this study’s purpose, which is to look at the effects of Dutch on Swedish, the terms Dutch L1 and Swedish L2 will be used throughout this paper, even though Swedish is not the learners’ second language/first foreign language. This is standard within Second Language Learning/Acquisition research, with the exception of cases where the effect of an L2 on the process of L3 acquisition is studied, which is not the case here.

This chapter consists of the following sections. Section 3.1 describes the learners, section 3.2 describes the native controls, in section 3.3 a detailed description of the data collection is given, including descriptions of the oral and written tasks, in section 3.4 the method of analysis is described and finally, in section 3.5 (dis)advantages/limitations of the data are discussed.

32 See also Chaudron (2003).
3.1 The learners

The 6 Dutch L1 learners of Swedish L2 were between 19 and 23 year old at the time of the data collection and the length of their exposure to the Swedish language varied from around 1 year to 6 years. All of the learners were living in Sweden, and enrolled at Uppsala University, at the time of the data collection. The length of their stay in Sweden ranges from three weeks to 3,5 years. All of the learners, except learner 1, are women. All had learned English and French at school and all except learner 4 had learned German as well. Three of the learners (learner 1, 3 and 6) have Swedish as their major at the University of Groningen, the Netherlands, and had achieved 50 ECTS university credits in Swedish. All the learners, except learner 4, who is from the Flemish-speaking part of Belgium, are from the Netherlands. All the learners except learner 6, who is a Dutch/German bilingual, were monolingual until age 10-11 when they started to learn their first foreign language at school.

The learners were asked to estimate their own L2 Swedish proficiency levels according to the scale of the council of Europe. The author, a native speaker of Swedish, finds the learners’ self estimates accurate. The learners were recruited through personal contacts and through each other. Table 1 below gives information about the learners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner 1</th>
<th>Learner 2</th>
<th>Learner 3</th>
<th>Learner 4</th>
<th>Learner 5</th>
<th>Learner 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex (m/f)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother tongue</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>Dutch/ German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in/grew up in</td>
<td>Limburg</td>
<td>Overijssel</td>
<td>Zuid-Holland</td>
<td>Flanders</td>
<td>Friesland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at Date Coll.</td>
<td>21 years</td>
<td>22 years</td>
<td>21 years</td>
<td>23 years</td>
<td>18 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of 1st exposure</td>
<td>18 years</td>
<td>20 years</td>
<td>19 years</td>
<td>17 years</td>
<td>17 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of FT**</td>
<td>240 hours</td>
<td>120 hours</td>
<td>250 hours</td>
<td>200 hours</td>
<td>240 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in Sweden***</td>
<td>2.5 months</td>
<td>11 weeks</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>3,5 years</td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated level</td>
<td>C1/C2</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>C1/C2</td>
<td>A2 -&gt; B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other languages</td>
<td>Eng 7y, 11, F</td>
<td>Eng, 7y, 11, F</td>
<td>Eng, 7y, 11, F</td>
<td>Fre, 8y, 10, G</td>
<td>Eng, 12y, 10, G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ger, 6y, 13, F</td>
<td>Ger, 4y, 13, B</td>
<td>Ger, 5y, 13, R</td>
<td>Rus, 1y (uni), U</td>
<td>Fre, 5y, 12, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fre, 6y, 12, R</td>
<td>Fre, 4y, 12, B</td>
<td>Fre, 6y, 12, B</td>
<td>Italian, vacation, U</td>
<td>Latin, 3y, 12, RW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eng, 5y, 13, F</td>
<td>Class.Gre, 5y, 13, R/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra</td>
<td>Swe/Ger major</td>
<td>25 ECTS in Swe</td>
<td>Sve major</td>
<td>50 ECTS in Swe</td>
<td>Sve major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 ECTS in Swe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50 ECTS in Swe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Formal teaching
*** At time of data collection
F = fluent
G = good
U = understanding (only)
R = reading (only)
I = intermediate
W = writing (only)
B = beginner

Table 1: The learners. This table is based on the learners’ answers to a set of questions about language skills. See Appendix 1 for the set of questions.

34 See http://www.britishcouncil.org/slovenia-exams-cambridge-europe-language-levels.htm for a description of the scale.
As can be seen in Table 1, all the learners except learner 5, have had between 120 and 250 hours of Swedish instruction and rate themselves to be between level B2 and level C2. Learner 5 has a lower level of Swedish L2 than the others - however, considering the small amount of formal instruction she has had, her Swedish is very good, which may be related to the fact that she first started to learn Swedish at the age of 16. She makes some mistakes that the other learners do not make, such as some violations of the V2-rule. The V2-violations occur only in adverb-initial clauses. Example (7) shows a V2-violation (Note also the wrong gender on skåp ‘cupboard’). The V3 is indicated in italics.

(7) * till höger om bädden det finns en skåp
    to right of bed-the it is (V3) a cupboard
Targetlike: Till höger om sängen finns ett skåp
‘To the right of the bed, there is a cupboard.’ (Learner 5, Pic 2)

However, it is not the case that learner 5 is incapable of producing correct adverbial-initial V2-clauses. I believe that her V2-violations can be connected to the fact that the most frequently used language of learner 5, at the time of the data collection, was English. Example (8) shows a correct use of the V2 rule in an adverbial-initial clause by the same learner.

(8) till höger av det finns det en, en flicka
    to right of it is it a, a girl
‘To the right (of that) is a girl.’ (Learner 5, Pic 1)

3.2 The native controls

The Swedish L1 native controls belong to the same age and educational group as the learners. All the 6 native controls were enrolled as students at Uppsala University at the time of the data collection. All of them have dialects which are fairly close to rikssvenska (the standard variety of Swedish) and I consider them to be representative of the language of educated Swedes (living in the eastern part of the country) within that age group. The native controls consist of 5 women and 1 man and were recruited through personal contacts. Native controls 1 and 2 are the same as the ones used in Lindgren (2009b).\(^\text{35}\)

Native controls 1 and 2 were both 24 years old at the time of data collection. They are both originally from the region of Gävleborg (the coastal area slightly south of the middle of

\(^{35}\) In that study, they are Native controls 1 and 3.
Sweden), but had been living and studying in Uppsala for the past 3-4 years. Native control 3 was 20 years old at time of data collection and has always lived in Uppsala. Native control 4 is 24 years old and from Stockholm. Native control 5 is 21 years old, has lived 2 years in Uppsala, and is originally from the isle of Gotland; however, he does not have the characteristic dialect from that area of Sweden, but speaks a fairly standard Swedish. Native control 6 is 25 years old and originally from Gothenburg, on the west coast. However, she has lived in Uppsala for the past 5 years and does not have the characteristic dialect of Gothenburg, but speaks very similar to the other native controls.

Except for the wish to have speakers who speak a variety that is as close as possible to standard Swedish, and matching the learners when it comes to socio-educational aspects and age there were no special reasons for choosing these six persons. They were chosen mainly because of their accessibility. Although this method of recruitment of informants can be questioned, the native controls’ affiliation with the author has not affected the way the material has been collected or analysed, except that it contributed to an informal atmosphere during data collection.

### 3.3 Data collection

The data comprises two parts, one containing oral material and the other consisting of written material. The oral material consists of recordings of informal picture descriptions, each description being between 2 and 5 minutes in length.\(^36\) The oral material consists of ca 1hr 45min of speech (and ca 10 000 words). The method of collection and type of analysis of the oral material is the same as the one employed in my earlier pilot study (Lindgren 2009b), except that some more detailed analyses are made. The written material consists of simple narratives of 250 to 700 words per narrative. In total, the written material comprised ca 8 000 words.

The learners carried out both the written and the oral task in both languages on the same occasion. The following order of the tasks was used for data collection of the learners: the learners first did the written task and the oral task in Dutch L1, after which they did both tasks in Swedish L2. The order of the tasks was written L1, oral L1, written L2, and oral L2. At the time of the L2 written task the learners did not have access to their L1 texts. It was thought to be best to start with the tasks in the mother tongue so as to prevent the learners from writing/saying exactly the same things in their mother tongue as they had already done in their

---

\(^36\) See appendix 2 for the exact length of all descriptions.
L2. However, this method may influence the outcome of the data collection. The informant may, when performing the task in the L1, be aware that she/he will later have to do it in the L2 as well. This means that a) there is a risk that the learners will simply translate what they have already said/written into the L2 and b) the two languages are closely related and the formal differences between them concerning e.g. allowed constituents in the prefield are very small - i.e. if there are differences, these are tendencies in different directions rather than cases of right and wrong and these patterns may influence each other in such a situation as this one. Both a) and b) may mean that the language which is not used for performance is activated, in a cognitive sense, and may influence the performance of the other language. These topics will be discussed in Chapter 5.

The native controls first carried out the written task and then the oral tasks, with the exception of native controls 1 and 2 who did the written task on another, later occasion. For each native control, both recordings were made on the same occasion. The oral material consists of 12 recordings of Dutch L1, 12 recordings of Swedish L1, and 12 recordings of Swedish L2. The written material consists of 6 narratives in Dutch L1, 6 narratives in Swedish L1 and 6 narratives in Swedish L2. With the exception of the oral data from native control 1 and 2, the material was collected November 8th, 2009 - February 28th, 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral Material</th>
<th>min</th>
<th>words</th>
<th>clauses</th>
<th>w/c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dutch L1</td>
<td>29:55</td>
<td>3383</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>11,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish L1</td>
<td>31:20</td>
<td>3361</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>11,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish L2</td>
<td>46:10</td>
<td>3625</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>11,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: The oral material

As can be inferred from Table 2, the amount of data, counted in words and clauses, can be judged to be comparable. The recordings vary in length between 01:16 minutes (Native 6, Dutch L1) and 05:31 minutes (learner 3, Swedish L2). The picture descriptions range from 113 words (native control 5, Swedish L1) to 532 words (native control 6, Swedish L1) and consist of between 12 clauses (Native 6, Dutch L1) and 46 clauses (native control 6, Swedish L1). The average number of words per clause is very similar for the three language varieties with Swedish L1 having slightly longer clauses (11,7 words/clause) than Dutch L1 (11,5 words/clause) and Swedish L2 (11,0 words/clause). Note that hesitation markers such as hm/mm/eh/ah are here counted as words, as are repetitions of agreements (ja ‘yes’) and

---

37 This data was collected in March 2009. The oral data from Native controls 1 and 2 is the same as the data used in Lindgren (2009b).
negations (*nej/nee ‘no’) and other lexical items. Therefore the actual number of words per clause, as in lexical items, is lower than what is shown in Table 2. The Swedish L2 material contains more hesitations and repetitions and, therefore, the difference between the L2 words per clause and the words per clause in native Swedish and Dutch is slightly bigger than what can be read from Table 2. Still, the difference is not substantial.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Material</th>
<th>words</th>
<th>clauses</th>
<th>w/c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dutch L1</td>
<td>2729</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>13,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish L1</td>
<td>2794</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>13,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish L2</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>9,8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: The written material

Table 3 gives an overview of the written material. The amount of material is similar for all three languages, both in number of clauses and number of words with around 400 words fewer and about 35 clauses more in the Swedish L2 material. The material can therefore be judged to be comparable in size. The written narratives range from 265 words (learner 5, Swedish L2) to 713 words (learner 6, Dutch L1) and consist of between 18 clauses (native control 6, Swedish L1) and 59 clauses (learner 6, Dutch L1). In comparison with the oral material, where the average number of words per clause was very similar for all the languages, there is substantial difference in clause length between the Swedish L2 data and the two L1 languages. Also, on average, the L2 narratives are shorter. For a more detailed overview over the composition of the data, see Appendix 2.

Below, a detailed description of the stimuli for the oral material, the oral task, and the written task will be given.

### 3.3.1 The stimuli for the oral task: the two pictures

The pictures used as stimuli for the description task are simple colour drawings. They depict two different rooms (See Appendix 3). The first picture is of a bathroom where a woman/girl was present. The second one shows a bedroom, possibly that of a child or of a student. The pictures do not contain the same objects, as this could to possibly influence the learners’ choice of words. The pictures were chosen with the intent that they should contain fairly simple, every-day objects, so as not to pose lexical problems for the learners. More complex pictures could have made the learners focus too much on vocabulary, which might have put

---

38 The text in this section is based on the description of the stimuli given in Lindgren (2009b).
additional stress on the learners. Too much searching for the correct word might break up the learners’ flow of speech, introducing undue pauses and hesitations in the learners’ syntactic structures and make analysis of the word order of the learner language misleading. In order to make sure that enough data would be gained, i.e. that a sufficient amount of reference introductions would be made, two simple pictures were used, instead of one more complex one.

3.3.2 The oral task

The oral task was exactly the same as the one in Lindgren (2009b). The learners and the native controls were recorded while describing two pictures to another person in an interactive setting. (For more about picture descriptions tasks and other types of research methods for second language acquisition, see Mackey & Gass 2005). The author herself was the interlocutor in all cases. The task itself was structured, as the purpose of describing the pictures was clear, but the setting itself was informal. Before the recording device was switched on, the informants were instructed to describe the pictures as detailed as possible, as if the person they were speaking with could not see the pictures. For Swedish L2, the learners were told that they were allowed to ask about a word that they did not know.39 The two persons were placed opposite each other. The pictures were presented to all informants in the form of a printed version in colours. The data recorded is not spontaneous because of the clear task, but the language used has an informal character.40

The descriptions were recorded using a digital voice recorder, which was positioned between the two persons. The device was very small, only about 10 cm long and around 3 cm wide and should, thus, not have been a disturbing element for the descriptions. The number of minutes and seconds recorded for each description is specified in the general description of the data (see section 3.3 and Appendix 2).

The recordings where transcribed by the author, using a basic orthographic transcription system, where no phonetic information or intonation patterns was marked, but which included hesitations and laughs. Words were mostly transcribed according to the spelling norms of the standard written language, so as to make the structural analysis easier.

39 The extent to which they did this varied between the different learners.
40 There is no space here to compare formal and informal language use; it is possible that this would reveal additional similarities/differences, both between Dutch and Swedish and between the formal and informal styles. However, a comparison between the oral and written data will be made, so some conclusions about the differences between genres can hopefully be made.
3.3.3 The written task

The written task was a very simple one, yet one leaving sufficient space for different levels of language and for the subjects’ own creativity. Both learners and native controls were asked to write a short narrative on a computer keyboard about the topic “What I did during the last week”. They were given a time slot of 20 minutes. No lower or upper word limit for the length of the narrative was given. Short instructions were given, mainly instructing the informant not to focus too much on spelling. In addition to this, the subjects were told that they could choose to focus on certain parts of their week. This task could be seen as a semi-structured one, where the frames, in the form of the topic, are given but the content is free as long as it is within the given frames. The subjects were not told to write in any certain style. These narratives can be seen as a fairly informal type of text. All, learners and native controls alike, used a simple text editor, such as WordPad, to write their narratives. No access to any additional material was allowed and no one was allowed to use spell check or grammar check.

3.4 The method of analysis

This section describes the method of analysis. Occurrences of the aspects mentioned below were counted manually and are presented together with comments in Chapter 4.

3.4.1 Analysis of the oral material

After the transcriptions of the recordings (the oral material) had been carried out, the number of main clauses was counted. Once the main clauses had been identified, the instances of 1) referent introduction per type (indefinite/definite) including occurrences of spatial/existential constructions of referent introduction, 2) referent maintenance per type, 3) prefield constituents per type, 4) subtypes of pronouns in the prefield and in other clause positions and finally 5) subtypes of adverbials in the prefield were counted. Step 1 through 3 was done in the same way as in Lindgren (2009b), except that cases that are neither existential nor spatial, the so called non-fitting cases, are analysed more in-depth in the current study. The above mentioned coding was done for the Swedish L1 data, the Dutch L1 data and the Swedish L2 data. These quantitative measures of the three languages are compared throughout the paper.

41 See Appendix 4 for the exact instructions.
42 The parts of this section that deal with the analysis of the oral material are based on the description given in Lindgren (2009) as the method of analysis was the same for that pilot study and for the current study. However, in the current study adverbials in the prefield and pronouns are analysed in more detail.
so as to find potential patterns. A comparison of the oral material with the written material was carried out for steps 3 to 5. The results are presented in Chapter 4.

Before moving on to describing the analysis of the written data, some comments on the analysis of referent introductions will be given as well as on the use of analysing the prefield.

In this paper, I do not focus on the correlation between the descriptions and the reality. In other words, I do not make any comparison between the objects on the pictures and the content of the pictures. The pictures are only used as stimuli in order to get enough material containing the searched for features of information structure, i.e. prefield constituents and referent introduction and maintenance. When I use the term referent, I refer to a referent that is introduced into the discourse. I am concerned with the concepts of objects and not with ‘real objects’.

Referents are not only introduced and maintained in main declarative clauses. However, the greater part of the clauses produced by the learners and native controls are declarative clauses, partly due to the informal and relatively simple nature of the task. Because the prefield is very important for the information structure of V2-langauges, as it anchors the clause in the discourse, I have chosen to investigate prefield constituents in addition to occurrences of referent introduction and maintenance. The distribution of different syntactic elements in the prefield can also offer an explanation for the way referents are introduced in terms of the spatial and existential perspective; a low number of adverbials in the prefield limits the possibilities of spatial referent introductions.

The division into spatial and existential constructions builds on the work of Carroll & von Stutterheim (1993, 2003) and Carroll et al (2000). (See Section 2.4.3 for more about their division). However, as these authors do not discuss Dutch and Swedish, I have ordered the constructs according to what I find to be the underlying idea of a spatial versus existential perspective on reference introduction. The principles for this are the same as in Lindgren (2009b). Note that occurrences of negated referents were counted as referent introduction/maintenance.

3.4.2 Analysis of the written data

The written data consisting of short narratives were analysed as follows. Once the main clauses had been identified (see Section 4.1 and Appendix 1), instances of 1) prefield constituents per type, 2) subtypes of pronouns in the prefield and in other clause positions and 3) subtypes of adverbials in the prefield were counted. This was done for the narratives of
Dutch L1, Swedish L1 and Swedish L2. The figures obtained were compared; first between the three languages and then with the figures from the oral material.

3.5 (Dis)advantages/limitations of the data

Even though the amount of data collected here is larger than in Lindgren (2009b), it can still be considered a primarily explorative study and the figures presented in this study can only be seen as pointing towards possible patterns. Due to the small sample analysed, occurrences have been counted and percentages are compared, but no statistical significance tests are made, which can be seen as a disadvantage. More data is needed in order to validate the patterns presented in Chapter 4.

Both the oral and the written material are types of informal data and, therefore, this study does not allow comparison between radically different registers. However, as the study includes both oral and written data, some comparison is possible and some conclusions about the similarities and differences between oral and written data can possibly be drawn. Another limitation is of course the number of features analysed. Because of the limited size of this study as well as because of the limited space in this paper, it has not been possible to make a comparison of all features of linearization or information structure. For instance theme-rheme (i.e. given vs. new information) distribution and thematic progression will not be investigated, neither will I look at issues related to focus. However, this study focuses on reference introduction and maintenance and prefield constituents, and within this frame it is possible to carry out comparisons within the data as well as with other studies. As the combination Dutch L1/Swedish L2 has not been widely researched, I believe that all types of data collected and all types of comparisons made can contribute to the understanding of second language learning involving closely related languages. The subject of limitations of the data and methodology used in the current study will be more thoroughly discussed in Section 5.1.
4. Results

In this chapter the results are presented. This chapter consists of five main sections. In the first, section 4.1, the results of the oral data in terms of referent introduction and maintenance will be presented, followed by the results of prefield constituents for the oral and the written data (section 4.2). In the following two parts I will look closer at the pronouns (section 4.3) and the adverbials (section 4.4) for both the oral and the written data. Finally, in section 4.5, the main points from the results will be summarized, to serve as a starting point for the discussion in Chapter 5. The results will not only be presented in but some more specific aspects will be discussed as well and conclusions are drawn. Chapter 5, then, focuses on some more general themes and makes references to other studies and theoretical frameworks.

4.1 Referent introduction and maintenance

In Table 4 an overview of referent introduction and maintenance in the oral material is given.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Swedish L1</th>
<th>Swedish L2</th>
<th>Dutch L1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ref Intro</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref Maint.</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref Intro/Clause</td>
<td>1,21</td>
<td>0,99</td>
<td>1,24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref Maint/Clause</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td>0,87</td>
<td>1,15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Overview Referent Introduction and Maintenance.

The total numbers of referent introductions and maintenances in the material are comparable for Swedish L1, Swedish L2 and Dutch L1 are comparable, with slightly higher figures for Dutch L1. As also can be seen in Table 4 above, the figures for Swedish L1 and Dutch L1 are roughly equivalent, especially for referent introduction per clause (1,21 and 1,24 respectively). By contrast, the Swedish L2 learners introduce fewer referents per clause (0,99) than the native speakers do. This may be because the learners have access to a lower number of lexical items, and thus referents available, in their L2.

4.1.1 Referent introduction

Table 5 below shows the figures for referent introduction in terms of indefinite and definite constructions. The percentages are equivalent in the three languages, with the lowest percentage of definite referent introductions found in Swedish L2 and the highest percentage...
in Dutch L1, with Swedish L1 in the middle. Roughly 20% of the referents are introduced in definite form compared with 80% in indefinite form. This is not particularly surprising as languages which mark the difference between definite and indefinite, typically introduce new references in the indefinite form (Hendriks 2003:291). The indefinite form, naturally, marks that the object in question is not known to the hearer - if it were, some type of anaphoric or definite expression would most likely be used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referent Intro</th>
<th>Swedish L1</th>
<th>Swedish L2</th>
<th>Dutch L1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Indefinite</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Definite</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Referent Introduction: Indefinite/Definite

Most of the referents introduced with the definite form are the same type of objects in all three languages, namely objects/referents whose existence is taken for granted in the discourse, such as walls and floor in the discourse of room descriptions, as well as referents that form a natural part of other referents already introduced in the discourse. In the words of Krifka (2007), these referents are a part of the common ground, their existence is given or presupposed. Examples of this type of referent are parts of objects already introduced such as parts of the room (floors, walls) or the wheel and other parts of the bike that can be seen in Picture 2 (see Appendix 3 for the pictures used as stimuli). These referents form a natural part of the context of introducing a room (or a bike); i.e. introducing the idea of a room, where the room can be seen as a type of frame setter (Krifka 2007:45f) also introduces certain expectations into the discourse. Frame setters “set the frame in which the following expression should be interpreted” (Krifka 2007:46), i.e. mentioning a room makes us presuppose that the walls introduced later are the walls of that particular room and the walls can, hence, be introduced with a definite expression.

Table 6 shows referent introductions in terms of existential and spatial perspective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referent Intro</th>
<th>Swedish L1</th>
<th>Swedish L2</th>
<th>Dutch L1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existentials</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatials</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-fitting Cases</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen in Table 6, the figures are similar for all three languages, with a predominance of existential introductions. There is, however, a slightly higher percentage of spatial introductions for Dutch L1. Swedish L2 is closer to Swedish L1 than the Dutch L1.

In order to classify the referents for Dutch and Swedish, a system for these languages was introduced in Lindgren (2009b). In the current study, the same system has been used. Below an overview of the structures classified as Existential and Spatial is given. An overview of the different types of Non-fitting cases will be given later on. By non-fitting cases I mean that the referent introduction is neither straightforwardly existential nor straightforwardly spatial. It is important to note that non-fitting cases are not necessarily the same as those referents introduced in definite form, even though most of the definite referent introductions are also non-fitting cases. The classifications of referents into spatial, existentials and non-fitting cases builds on the system constructed for Swedish and Dutch in Lindgren (2009b).

1) **Existential constructions:**
   1a) There is an X (Swe + NL)
   1b) I/One (can) see an X (Swe + NL)
   1c) It looks like an X (Swe only)
   1d) We have an X (Swe only)
   1e) Y has an X (Swe + NL)

2) **Spatial constructions**
   2a) Loc. Adverbial is X (Swe + NL)

As can be seen above, a total of 5 types of existential referent introductions were found in the data. Out of these 5, only three were found in the Dutch L1 data. Only one type of spatial construction was found. Below the different types are exemplified. I have chosen not to give examples from all three languages for every type, since then the number of examples would have been very high.

1) **Existential constructions:**

1a) Swe: det finns/är/står en/ett X, NL: het/er is/staat/toont een X:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(9) det är en stor pöl</th>
<th>(10) er is een venster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>it is a big puddle</td>
<td>there is a window</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'It is a big puddle.' (Swed. native 6, Pic 1) 'There is a window.' (Dutch native 4, Pic 1)
There is a bed. (Learner 6, Pic 2)

There is a girl. (Dutch native 3, Pic 1)

There is a bucket. (Learner 3, Pic 1)

I see a bathroom. (Learner 1, Pic 1)

I see a bathroom. (Dutch native 1, Pic 1)

One sees a shelf. (Swedish native 6, Pic 1)

It almost looks like a figure. (Swed. native 1, Pic 1)

It looks like a bathroom. (Learner 4, Pic 1)

Then we have a tea cup. (Swed. native 3, Pic 2)

Then one has a towel holder. (Learner 4, Pic 1)

She has black hair. (Learner 4, Pic 1)

She has a broom. (Native 3, Pic 1)

She has black hair. (Learner 4, Pic 1)

Spatial constructions:

2a) Advl (place) is/are X: These are simply constructions with different locational adverbial expressions and copula:
As can be seen in Table 6 above, the figures are similar for all three languages, with a slightly higher percentage of spatial introductions for Dutch L1. Swedish L2 follows the trend of Swedish L1. In order to see if this pattern is similar for all speakers, it is necessary to study the variation between speakers. Table 7 shows the range of the proportions for all three language varieties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Swe L1</th>
<th>Swe L2</th>
<th>Dutch L1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exitentials</td>
<td>38,3% - 62,5%</td>
<td>34% - 71,8%</td>
<td>29,1% - 59,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatials</td>
<td>5,4% - 33,8%</td>
<td>0% - 44,7%</td>
<td>8,3% - 45,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Fitting</td>
<td>14,1% - 36,2%</td>
<td>15,2% - 30,6%</td>
<td>14,3% - 31,9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Range of figures for referent introduction: existential, spatial, non-fitting.

As can be seen in Table 7, there are big differences within the languages between the highest and the lowest figures. Within every category, there are all possible different patterns: unusually low numbers of spatials, of existentials or of non-fitting cases as well as similar numbers for two or even three of the categories. However, both the high and the low figures for non-fitting cases are very similar across the languages and they vary less than the figures for existentials and spatials. The individual variation, thus, is substantial and as none of referent introductions in the descriptions appear abnormal, there seems to be a high acceptance for diverse as well as extreme patterns in both Dutch and Swedish. Thus, due to the large individual variation and the acceptability of the variation it is not possible to see a general trend of referent introduction in terms of existential/spatial constructions for any of the three languages. However, existential constructions predominate in all three languages.

From the material of this study, Dutch seems, on average, slightly more spatial whereas Swedish has a tendency to go in the direction of favouring existential constructions. However, in order to establish this as a pattern, a larger amount of data would need to be collected and analysed.
Interestingly, learner 4, who has spent a much longer time in Sweden than any of the other learners has a substantially higher percentage of existential referent introductions. As the trend is that Swedish L1, on average, has a higher percentage of existential constructions, it may be an easy conclusion to say that learner 4 has accommodated herself towards the Swedish L1 pattern. However, this would be a faulty conclusion, for two reasons. Firstly, her figure for existential referent introductions in Swedish L2 is almost 10% higher than the highest figure of any native control (71,8% vs. 62,5%). Secondly, when looking at the figures for Dutch L1, where the highest percentage found (59,8%) is just slightly lower than that of Swedish L1, it turns out that this is also the figure for her. Thus, it seems to be the case that her unusual high percentage of existential constructions is a personal trait and is not connected to her long stay in Sweden. This is, of course, assuming that her stay in Sweden has not affected her native tongue, which is of course a further possibility. She is also the only Swedish L2 learner who is from the Dutch (Flemish) speaking part of Belgium; the others are all from the Netherlands, so another possibility is that there are differences between Dutch spoken in the Netherlands and the Flemish spoken in the north of Belgium. There are some indications that there are differences in use of expletive constructions with *er/het* between standard Dutch and the dialect West Flemish. However, this would need to be studied further. Notable is that learner 4 does not have any spatial constructions at all in her Swedish L2 and that she has the lowest percentage of spatial constructions in Dutch L1 (8,3%).

As can be seen in Table 7, almost one third of the referent introductions are classified as non-fitting. There is a correlation between the cases of definite referent introduction and the Non-fitting cases, but the factor of definite referent introductions cannot account for all the non-fitting cases. It is also not the case that all definite referent introductions can be classified as non-fitting. Below a more detailed classification of the non-fitting cases is given.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-fitting Cases*</th>
<th>Swe L1</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Swe L2</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Dutch L1</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>prep + X</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57,8%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>57,4%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>66,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>direct obj</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14,5%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subj</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13,3%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possessive + X/med X</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7,8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indirect/prep obj</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Σ90</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td><strong>Σ80</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td><strong>Σ95</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* X is the referent introduced.

Table 8: Non-fitting cases broken down into subcategories

---

43 Personal communication between Ute Bohnacker and Liliane Haegeman and Marjo von Koppen (both of Universiteit Gent) in Tromsø, 11 June 2010.
As can be seen in Table 8 as well as in the classification system below, 6 different categories of Non-fitting cases have been found in the material. The first three categories predominate, accounting for a total of 85.6% (Swedish L1), 97.4% (Swedish L2), and 92.6% (Dutch L1). Note that the Swedish L1 data is more diverse in terms of the different categories of non-fitting cases. Also of interest is the low number of Dutch L1 direct objects (3.2%), especially in comparison with the high percentage found for this category in the Swedish L2 data (20%). Below the different categories of non-fitting cases are exemplified.

3a) preposition + X:

(26) på väggen
(27) på bilden
(28) op de vloer

on the-wall on the-picture on the floor

‘On the wall.’ (Swedish) ‘In the picture.’ (Swedish) ‘On the floor.’ (Dutch)

In the construction above, referents are introduced as part of a spatial expression. Example (26), (27) and (28) are all expressions that occur several times in the material. However, one cannot say that this makes these referent introductions spatial, as no information about their spatial position is given. Neither can they be said to be existential.

3b) X as direct object:

(29) hon torkar upp vatten
(30) hon sopar golvet

she wipes up water she sweeps the-floor

‘She wipes up water.’ (Swed. native 3, Pic 1) ‘She sweeps the floor.’ (Learner 3, Pic 1)

When the referent is introduced as a direct object, it is often as part of expressions such as ‘sweeps the floor’. One cannot say that this type of expressions is spatial or existential as no reference to the referent position is made but neither is there any reference to its existence. It is simply there.

3c) X as subject:

(31) väggarna och golven är gula

the-walls and the-floor are yellow

‘The walls and the floor are yellow.’ (Learner 2, Pic 1)

(32) de muur van de badkamer is geel

the wall of the bathroom is yellow

‘The wall of the bathroom is yellow.’ (Dutch native 2, Pic 1)
A similar case as the ones with direct object, are referent introductions as subjects. This type often occurs with subjects that are introduced in definite form and whose existence is thus taken for granted - however, this does not make these cases existential introductions.

3d) possessive X / Y med ‘with’ X:

(33)  hennes  arm  (34)  haar  knieën
     her   arm       her   knees
‘her arm.’ (Swedish native 3, Pic 1)   ‘her knees.’ (Dutch native 5, Pic 1)

(35)  en  byrå  med  tre  lådor
      a  bureau  with  three  drawers
‘A bureau with three drawers.’ (Swedish native 5, Pic 2)

The construction above is the most unclear out of the non-fitting constructions and could possibly be classified as existential. However, this only works if one sees these expressions as conveying the same information as ‘it/she/he has X’, which would be possible. Here there is some uncertainty in the classification system, but since it concerns only 10 cases in total (see Table 8 above), it would make only a nominal difference if these cases were counted as existential. This type also serves to show that the difference between existential and non-fitting is not clear-cut.

3e) X as indirect/prepositional object:

(36)  engagerad  i  miljöfrågor
       involved  in  environment-issues
‘Involved in environment issues.’ (Swedish native 6, Pic 2)

The cases where X is introduced as an indirect or prepositional object are few but similar to cases where X is introduced as a direct object.

3f) Y X (Y is a referent that has already been introduced):

(37)  en  mugg  te
      a  cup  tea
‘A cup of tea.’ (Swedish native 4, Pic 2)

(38)  een  kop,  ja,  koffie
      a  cup,  yes,  coffee
‘A cup of coffee.’ (Dutch native 1, Pic 2)

44 In fact, in Lindgren (2009) it was on some occasions, even though in that study the non-fitting cases were not studied more closely.
The last non-fitting construction found and exemplified in (37) and (38), is the one where X follows directly after Y, a referent that has already been introduced. These are few cases and only occur when introducing the liquid found in a cup (in Picture 1).

4.1.2 Referent maintenance

In Table 9 referent maintenance is presented per category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referent Maint.</th>
<th>Swedish L1</th>
<th>Swedish L2</th>
<th>Dutch L1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Indefinite</td>
<td>7,7%</td>
<td>18,5%</td>
<td>9,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Definite</td>
<td>60,3%</td>
<td>53,9%</td>
<td>51,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demon + NP</td>
<td>5,2%</td>
<td>2,1%</td>
<td>1,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>55,1%</td>
<td>51,8%</td>
<td>50,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Pronouns</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27,6%</td>
<td>38,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronominal adv.</td>
<td>0,3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>32,7%</td>
<td>27,6%</td>
<td>27,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Referent maintenance

For all three languages, the majority of referent maintenances consist of definite noun phrases and pronouns. This is not surprising, but the general trend for languages which make the distinction between definite and indefinite and which employ overt pronouns. However, there are also some differences between Swedish and Dutch concerning referent maintenance, and this mainly concerns pronominal adverbs. It is not surprising to find 11,2% pronominal adverbials in the Dutch L1 data; almost one third of the pronouns are in fact pronominal adverbs. This is a very short and efficient way of doing referent maintenance.

(39) Naast het bed staat verder een nachtkastje, met daarop een nachtlampje

`Further, next to the bed there is a bedside table. There is a nightlight on top of it.` (Dutch native 1, Pic 1)

An example of a Dutch maintenance with a pronominal adverb is shown in (39). Note the difference between the syntactic structure of the literal translation and of the more common and expected well-formed English sentence. Although the second clause could be adverbial-initial in English, the expletive-initial structure would be preferred. (See Carroll et al 2000, Carroll & von Stutterheim 1993, 2003 for more on preferred structures for referent introduction and maintenance in English).
In the Swedish L1 data, only one case of referent maintenance with a pronominal adverb was found. This is shown in (40) below.\textsuperscript{45} It is interesting that this occurs when describing the same part of the picture as is done in (39).

\begin{verbatim}
(40) därpå står det en lampa
\textit{there-on stands it a lamp}

‘On top of it, there is a lamp.’ (Swedish native 4, Pic 2)
\end{verbatim}

Swedish L2 has a comparably high percentage of indefinite referent maintenance, 18.5\%, which is more than double what is found for Swedish L1 (7.7\%) and Dutch L1 (9.4\%). This is partly due to repetitions of words that the learners struggled to remember.

Another noteworthy difference concerns referent maintenance with a pronominal demonstrative pronoun. A comparatively high amount of the maintenance construction with a pronominal demonstrative and an NP is found in the Swedish L1 data. This construction is exemplified below.

\begin{verbatim}
(41) det är tre hyllor i den här hyllan
\textit{it are three shelves in this-here shelf}

‘This set of shelves consists of three shelves.’ (Swedish native 1, Pic 1)
\end{verbatim}

Because the descriptions are short it is in fact optional to use a demonstrative pronoun together with the NP. No cases where the demonstrative pronoun would have been obligatory in order to understand which object the maintenance is referring to are found. Because of this, it is relevant to analyze this category further in order to determine whether or not this is a personal trait or a general pattern for Swedish L1. Table 10 shows the occurrences of this construction in the Swedish L1 data in more detail.

\begin{verbatim}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>demon + NP</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native Control 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Control 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Sigma 15 )</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\end{verbatim}

Table 10: Demonstrative + NP construction in Swedish L1 oral data

It turns out that native control 1 is responsible for 40\% of the referent maintenance in the form of a construction with demonstrative pronouns followed by a NP. Thus, this seems to

\textsuperscript{45} Example (40) also contains a case of referent introduction (\textit{en lampa ‘a lamp’}), but here we are concerned with referent maintenance (\textit{därpå ‘on top of’}).
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be an individual trait and not a general pattern for Swedish L1. Native control 3 does not use this construction at all and the other four native controls together produce 60% (9 cases). This construction has also been found in Swedish L2. Below, an example of this construction found in the Swedish L2 data is shown.

(42) till höger och över den där handduken, ähm, finns det ett fönster
    to right and above this-there towel, eh, there is a window
  ‘To the right and above that towel, eh, there is a window.’ (Learner 3, Pic 1)

From the fact that the use of this construction turned out to be an individual trait in Swedish L1, the possibility is that this might also be true for Swedish L2. An overview of the use of this construction per speaker for Swedish L2 is given in Table 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>learner &amp; NP</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learner 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Σ6</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Demonstrative + NP construction in Swedish L2 oral data

Apparently the use of this construction is also an individual trait in Swedish L2, where only three of the learners have this construction and learner 3 is responsible for 66% of the cases. Another possibility is that some of the learners believe that the use of a construction with a demonstrative pronoun is not only general acceptable in Swedish L1, but in fact necessary, or that some of the learners have not yet acquired the use of this construction.

4.2 The prefield

4.2.1 The oral material

In Table 12 an overview of prefield constituents found in the oral data is given. For the total number of clauses in the different languages, see Section 3.3. For more detailed raw figures of prefield constituents, see Appendix 5.
Oral Prefield  | Swedish L1 | Swedish L2 | Dutch L1  
---|---|---|---
1. Subjects | 66.4% | 63.8% | 63.6%  
   a. expletives | 22.9% | 24.8% | 19.9%  
   b. pronouns | 27% | 26.7% | 19.9%  
   c. full NP’s | 16.5% | 12.3% | 23.8%  
2. Adverbials | 32.6% | 35% | 34.9%  
   a. time | 9.3% | 15.2% | 3%  
   b. place | 22.3% | 19.2% | 26.8%  
   c. pron advl | 0.4% | 0% | 3.4%  
   d. other | 0.7% | 0.6% | 1.7%  
3. Objects | 1% | 0.9% | 1.5%  

Table 12: Overview of the oral prefield.

Note the small differences. In fact the figures are almost identical with a slightly higher percentage of adverbials in Dutch L1 and Swedish L2, but as the difference is less than 2.5%, it is within the error margin and can thus not be said to constitute a significant difference. All three languages have a very low percentage of clause-initial objects. The question then arises if there could be hidden differences within the broader categories of subject, adverbial and object. In Table 13, these are broken down into subcategories.

Oral Prefield  | Swedish L1 | Swedish L2 | Dutch L1  
---|---|---|---
1. Subjects | 66.4% | 63.8% | 63.6%  
   a. expletives | 22.9% | 24.8% | 19.9%  
   b. pronouns | 27% | 26.7% | 19.9%  
   c. full NP’s | 16.5% | 12.3% | 23.8%  
2. Adverbials | 32.6% | 35% | 34.9%  
   a. time | 9.3% | 15.2% | 3%  
   b. place | 22.3% | 19.2% | 26.8%  
   c. pron advl | 0.4% | 0% | 3.4%  
   d. other | 0.7% | 0.6% | 1.7%  
3. Objects | 1% | 0.9% | 1.5%  

Table 13: The prefield of the oral material expanded. Adverbials of time are sen så, då, så ‘then’ for Swedish L1 and L2 and dan, zo ‘then’ and verder ‘further (on)’ for Dutch L1.  

In Table 13 we can see some notable differences. Let us start with subjects. Even though the total figures of subjects are very similar across the three languages (66.4%, 63.8% and 63.6%), there are differences within the category. In the Dutch L1 material there is a much higher percentage of (subject) full NP’s and lower percentages of both subject expletives and subject pronouns as compared to the Swedish L1 and L2 material. The figures for Swedish L2 closely mirror the figures for Swedish L1. Whereas the Dutch L1 figure for subject expletives

---

46 It is not surprising to find this type of temporal adverbials in the room descriptions, as it is common in this genre “spatial links become expressed by temporal connectives (*and then*)” (Levelt 1981:94).
is just slightly lower than the figures for Swedish L1 and L2 (19.9% compared to 22.9%/24.8%) the difference for subject lexical NP’s and subject pronouns is much higher. The difference in the figures for subject NP’s is substantial: 23.8% for Dutch L1 compared to 16.5% and 12.3% for Swedish L1 and L2 respectively. However, I have no explanation for this difference. Whereas Swedish L1 and L2 have subject pronoun percentages of 27% and 26.7% respectively, there are only 19.9% subject pronouns in the prefield of the Dutch L1 material. This is a substantial and interesting difference and therefore pronouns will be analysed further (Section 4.3). Notable is also the high amount of pronouns for the learners.

Another big difference between the three languages can be seen when considering the figures for adverbials. Even though the total adverbial percentages are very similar (32.6%, 35%, 34.9%), there is a clear difference in the distribution within the category. Except for the fact that Dutch L1 has 3.4% pronominal adverbials, a category that the other languages lack (except for 1 case in the Swedish L1 material, see section 4.1.2 for this case), there is also considerable variation for time and place adverbials. Dutch L1 has a very low percentage of time adverbials (3%) in the prefield in the oral data under investigation here, whereas Swedish L1 has a figure that is three times higher (9.3%) and the figure for Swedish L2 is five times higher (15.2%) than that for Dutch L1. This may be due to the use of the connective-like time adverbial construction så/sen så ‘so/then’ in Swedish,\(^{47}\) which will be looked at more in-depth in Section 4.4.1. There is another relevant question, namely whether this is a general phenomenon or whether most of the time adverbials are produced only by a few speakers, i.e. whether it is an individual trait rather than a language specific one. Tables 14 and 15 show the distribution of time adverbials by speaker for Swedish L1 and L2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time advl</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native Control 3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Control 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Σ27**         |    | 100%

Table 14: Time adverbials in Swedish L1 oral material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time advl</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learner 4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner 3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Σ50**         |    | 100%

Table 15: Time adverbials in Swedish L2 oral material

\(^{47}\) Ekberg (1997) calls Swedish sen, så, då connective adverbs (1997:99) and also temporal connectors (1997:107), which indicates that they do not behave in the same way as other time adverbials.
As can be seen in Tables 14 and 15, there is indeed a difference in the use of time adverbials between speakers. Whereas native control 5 does not use any time adverbials in the picture description task, native control 3 uses 13, (48%) of all the time adverbials in the Swedish L1 data; the other four native controls together produce only 14 (52%). Two learners (4 and 3) produce 72% of all time adverbials whereas learner 2 uses none. Here it is important to point out that learner 4 has spent a substantially longer time in Sweden than any of the other learners. It is, thus, possible that she has acquired an extensive use of especially så because of this. Also of interest is the fact that the learners use a total of 50 time adverbials which is close to twice as many as the native controls use. However, no explanation for this can be found in the data. Learners 3’s and 4’s use of time adverbials, especially the connective-like så ‘so’ seems a bit exaggerated, but not completely abnormal.

The pronouns and adverbials in the oral material will be analysed more closely in sections 4.3.1 and 4.4.1.

4.2.2 The written material

In Table 16 an overview of prefield constituents found in the written data is given. For the total number of clauses in the different languages, see Section 3.3. For more detailed raw figures of prefield constituents, see Appendix 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefield</th>
<th>Swedish L1</th>
<th>Swedish L2</th>
<th>Dutch L1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Subjects</td>
<td>64,3%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>48,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(131/203)</td>
<td>(148/241)</td>
<td>(100/207)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Adverbials</td>
<td>29,2%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>42,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(59/203)</td>
<td>(90/241)</td>
<td>(88/207)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Objects</td>
<td>4,5%</td>
<td>0,5%</td>
<td>3,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9/203)</td>
<td>(1/241)</td>
<td>(7/207)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Clause</td>
<td>1,5%</td>
<td>0,5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3/203)</td>
<td>(1/241)</td>
<td>(12/207)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Predicative</td>
<td>0,5%</td>
<td>0,5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1/203)</td>
<td>(1/241)</td>
<td>(0/207)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16: Overview of the written prefield.

As can be seen in Table 16, there is a substantial difference between the three languages. Dutch L1 has substantially higher figures for adverbials and clauses as well as a lower figure for subjects. Other constituents, such as objects, clauses and predicatives, are, with the exception of 1 object (0,5%), 1 clause (0,5%) and 1 predicative (0,5%), absent from the
Swedish L2 material. It is interesting to note that whereas Swedish L2 (61.5%) follows the pattern of Swedish L1 (64.8%) concerning subjects in the prefield, its figures for adverbials (37.5%) are in between those of Dutch L1 (42.5%) and Swedish L1 (29.2%); this can be viewed as a partial accommodation to the pattern of Swedish L1. Table 17 gives a more detailed description of the prefield constituents of the different languages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefield</th>
<th>Swedish L1</th>
<th>Swedish L2</th>
<th>Dutch L1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Subjects</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. expletive</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. pronouns</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. full NP's</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. left out</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Adverbials</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. time*</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. place</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. pron advl</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. other</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Objects</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Clause</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Predicative</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* a wide variety of constructions.

Table 17: The prefield of the written material expanded

Notable in Table 17 is that both Dutch L1 and Swedish L2 have higher percentages of subject expletives than Swedish L1. Regarding subject pronouns, Swedish L1 has a higher percentage (33.6%) compared to Swedish L2 (28.3%) and Dutch L1 (23.5%). Recall that this distribution is similar to what was found for the picture description task. In both the oral and the written data, Swedish L1 has more subject pronouns in the prefield than does Swedish L2 and especially Dutch L1. The learners do, however, show some accommodation towards the pattern of Swedish L1; the figure for Swedish L2 is between that of Dutch L1 and Swedish L1. Because of the difference in subject pronouns in both the oral and the written material it is of interest to study them further. There also seems to be a higher tendency in Swedish L1 to leave out the subject in the written material, for which I do not have an explanation.

Not surprisingly considering the nature of the task given, time adverbials predominate, with a very low number of place adverbials and a low number of other adverbials. The number of prefield adverbials is much higher for Dutch L1 (42.5%) than for Swedish L1.
(29.2%) and the learners only show partial accommodation to the target language (37.5%). Because of the differences in adverbials for both the oral and written material it is of interest to study the adverbials in further detail. Pronouns and adverbials will be analysed more closely in section 4.3 and 4.4 respectively.

**4.3 Pronouns**

In this section the pronouns in the material will be studied more in detail. Details will be given concerning overall numbers of all pronouns, prefield as well as non-prefield ones, and attention will be paid to the types of pronouns that are present in the material. The reason for studying pronouns more in-depth is the fact that the three languages differ in terms of percentages of prefield subject pronouns. Also, as Swedish L1 and L2 have higher percentages of prefield subject pronouns than Dutch L1, it is interesting to look at pronouns in other positions of the clause, to see if this pattern is due to a higher amount of pronouns overall or if it is a phenomenon localized to the prefield.

**4.3.1 The oral material**

Table 18 gives an overview of the number of all pronouns found in the oral material of the three languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronouns</th>
<th>Swe L1</th>
<th>Swe L2</th>
<th>Dutch L1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefield</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-prefield</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pron/Total words</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pron/Clause</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18: Pronouns in the oral material: an overview

From Table 18, it is evident that pronouns are more common in the L2-material, both in the prefield and in other positions in the clause, where 9% of all words are pronouns, and there is almost one pronoun per clause. In contrast to this, Dutch L1 has on average only 0.56 pronouns per clause and only 5% of the words are pronouns. Swedish L1 is placed in the middle with 0.77 pronouns per clause and 7% total pronouns. It is interesting to note that the learner language seems to be more pronoun rich than the language of the native Swedish speakers. Even though this difference cannot be explained through studying this material, the
high percentage of subject pronouns in the learner language is of interest and will be discussed further in this paper (Section 5.4). It seems to indicate, at least for the oral material, that the fact that Dutch L1 has fewer pronouns in the prefield is related to an overall lower pronoun percentage - the Dutch L1 speakers in this study seem to be less prone to use pronouns. As was seen above (Section 4.2.1) there seems to be a tendency for them to use subject lexical NP’s instead. Another means available in Dutch are pronominal adverbs, which are used for referent maintenance in 11.2% of the cases (Section 4.1.2), and which may lower the number of pronouns necessary for referring to objects in the pictures described.48

Table 19 gives a detailed description of the pronouns found in the prefield for the three languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefield</th>
<th>Swe L1</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Swe L2</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Dutch L1</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jag</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24,4%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47,7%</td>
<td>ik</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hon</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33,3%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17,1%</td>
<td>hij/zij*</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>den/det</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29,4%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21,6%</td>
<td>het / subj</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7,7%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10,2%</td>
<td>je</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>det här</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,2%</td>
<td>wie</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σ78</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Σ88</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Σ59</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 4 in pic 2 are references to inanimate objects

Table 19: Prefield pronouns: Oral material.

As can be seen in Table 19 the four most common pronouns are the same for all three languages: first person singular (jag/ik ‘I’), third person singular animate (hon/hij/zij ‘she/he’) and third person singular for inanimate (den/det/het ‘it’) and the generic pronoun (man/je49 ‘one/you’). When comparing the figures for the three languages, one finds very similar patterns except that the third person animate is more frequent in Swedish L1 whereas the first person is more common in Swedish L2 and Dutch L1. Swedish L1 and L2 combined have a total of 7 different pronouns whereas Dutch L1 has 5. However, this is a very small difference especially since the four shared pronouns account for 98,3% in Dutch L1, 97,6% in Swedish L2 and 94,8% in Swedish L1. Thus, the general pattern of prefield pronouns is the same for all the three languages.

48 Pronominal adverbs, which can be thought of as a category between pronouns and adverbs, have here been counted as adverbials and not as subject pronouns as their function in the context of the picture description task is clearly spatial, thus an adverbial function.
49 Not to be confused with second person singular jij/je ‘you’. All cases of je found in the data are generic.
Moving on to the non-prefield subject pronouns, it can be concluded that they form a more diverse, as well as a more frequent, category in all three languages compared to prefield subject pronouns. Because of this it is not necessary to look at the specific pronouns. Instead they have been classified into 5 categories, which, in addition to separating the three most frequent pronouns, make two distinctions, namely between personal pronouns and others, and the syntactic function of subject versus object. This classification is shown in Table 20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-prefield Pronouns</th>
<th>Swe L1</th>
<th>Swe L2</th>
<th>Dutch L1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 most common</td>
<td>59,3%</td>
<td>65,3%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal subj</td>
<td>13,1%</td>
<td>9,3%</td>
<td>8,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal obj</td>
<td>10,3%</td>
<td>13,3%</td>
<td>6,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others subj</td>
<td>9,7%</td>
<td>8,9%</td>
<td>9,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others obj</td>
<td>7,6%</td>
<td>3,2%</td>
<td>4,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Σ145</strong></td>
<td><strong>Σ225</strong></td>
<td><strong>Σ107</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20: Non-prefield pronouns in the oral material

In Table 20 different patterns can be detected. In Dutch L1, the three most common pronouns account for 71% of all pronouns compared to only 59,3% for Swedish L1. There seems to be a partial accommodation to the target-language; the figure for Swedish L2 (65,3%) is between the one for Dutch L1 and Swedish L1.

When comparing the number of personal and other pronouns one sees that Dutch L1 uses fewer personal pronouns (14,9%) whereas the figures for Swedish L1 (23,4%) and Swedish L2 (22,6%) are very similar. Swedish L1 has the highest figure for other pronouns (17,3%) whereas Swedish L2 has the lowest (12,1%) and Dutch L1 is in between (14,1%). This may indicate that the learners have yet to master the use of other pronouns than personal ones. However, the differences are fairly small, so definite conclusions cannot be drawn.

When looking at the pronouns in terms of their syntactic function, the three most common pronouns excluded, further differences emerge. Swedish L1 has 22,8% subject pronouns and 17,9% object pronouns; the figures for Swedish L2 are 18,2% versus 16,5% and for Dutch L1 17,8% and 11,2%. Swedish L2 does, thus, have a lower number of subject pronouns in postverbal position as compared to Swedish L1, whereas the figures for object pronouns are very similar. However, when combining pronoun type and function, the most interesting difference is found for other object pronouns where Dutch L1 and Swedish L2 have very low figures (4,7% and 3,2% respectively) compared to Swedish L1 (7,6%). The learners do, thus,

---

50 Note that two of the three most frequent pronouns are subject pronouns.
use pronouns in their L2 in a way which can be said to be in between how they use it in their L1 and how Swedish L1 speakers use them.

Table 21 shows the three most frequent pronouns, which are the same for all three languages. These are the relative pronoun (som/die/dat\(^{51}\)), the generic pronoun (man/je) and the first person singular pronoun (jag/ik).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 most common</th>
<th>Swe L1</th>
<th>Swe L2</th>
<th>Dutch L1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>som/die/dat - relative</td>
<td>55,8%</td>
<td>44,9%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man/je - subj</td>
<td>29,1%</td>
<td>32,7%</td>
<td>28,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jag/ik - subj</td>
<td>15,1%</td>
<td>22,4%</td>
<td>21,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22: Non-prefield pronouns in the oral material: the 3 most common.

Even though the most frequent pronouns are the same for all three languages, there are differences with respect to their distribution. However, it is hard to see any clear patterns that would group the L2 use together with any of the two L1’s. Swedish L1 uses the first person pronoun less (15,1%) than Swedish L2 (22,4%) and Dutch L1 (21,1%). Swedish L2 uses the generic pronoun to a greater extent (32,7%) than Swedish L1 (29,1%) and Dutch L1 (28,9%). Swedish L1 uses the relative pronoun to a greater extent (55,8%) than Swedish L1 (44,9%) or Dutch L1 (50%) - however, there are differences between Swedish L1 and Dutch L1 where the Dutch L1 figure is actually closer to the figure of Swedish L1 than the figure of Swedish L2 is. Thus, when looking closer at the three most common pronouns the results are inconclusive and may be due to individual variation.

### 4.3.2 The written material

Table 23 gives an overview of pronouns in the written material.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Swe L1</th>
<th>Swe L2</th>
<th>Dutch L1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefield</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-prefield</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pron/Total words</td>
<td>0,09</td>
<td>0,10</td>
<td>0,08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pron/Clause</td>
<td>1,27</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td>1,10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23: Pronouns in the written material: an overview

\(^{51}\) Dutch has two relative pronouns, one for each gender, whereas Swedish only has one. Dutch relative pronouns can be hard to distinguish from demonstrative pronouns as these have the same form. See Gärtner (2000) for more about relatedness and overlap of Dutch (and other Indo-European) relative/demonstrative pronouns. In the material of the current study, all occurrences of die/dat have been judged as relative pronouns because of their function. The author had help from a native speaker of Dutch in order to make these judgments.
When comparing the figures in Table 23 with those of the oral material, one finds a similar trend in the prefield pronouns, where Dutch L1 has a substantially lower figure than Swedish L1 and L2. However, the raw figures of non-prefield pronouns are almost the same for all three languages (187 for Swedish L1, 172 for Swedish L2, and 180 for Dutch L1). This also influences the number of pronouns per total words, where the differences are much smaller in the written material than in the oral material - Swedish L2 has a slightly higher percentage of pronouns (10%) than Swedish L1 (9%) and Dutch L1 (8%). For all three languages there is a higher percentage of pronouns in the written material compared to the oral material. The difference is highest for Dutch L1 (3%) and lowest for Swedish L2 (1%) with Swedish L1 (2%) in between. When comparing the number of pronouns per clause the figure is highest for Swedish L1 (1.27) and lowest for Swedish L2 (1.00) with Dutch L1 placed almost exactly in between (1.10). Still, these figures are very similar. It is possible that the relatively low pronoun count per clause in the Swedish L2 is due to the fact that this material has a relatively high number of declarative clauses which are also fairly short clauses. (See Bohnacker 1997 and Section 5.4 for more about the relation between amount of pronouns and clause length). The Dutch L1 and Swedish L1 material contain longer clauses and many non-declarative clauses.\textsuperscript{52}

When comparing these figures with those of the oral material one notes that for all three languages, the overall number of pronouns is higher for the written material, both as percentage of words and counted in pronouns per clause. However, whereas the difference in pronouns per clause for Swedish L2 is marginal, the increases for both Swedish L1 and Dutch L1 are substantial. The difference in pronoun count in Swedish L2 is only 0.05 (from 0.95 to 1.00) but the differences for Swedish L1 and Dutch L1 are 0.50 and 0.54 respectively (from 0.77 to 1.27 for Swedish L1 and from 0.56 to 1.10 for Dutch L1). In fact the rate of pronouns per clause is almost double in the Dutch L1 written material compared to the oral material. However, the reason for this cannot be explained from this data alone and a discussion of this subject falls outside of the scope of this paper, as the main thing of interest here is the learner language in relation to the learners’ mother tongue (Dutch) and the target language (Swedish) and not the properties of the native languages as such. Below, in Table 24, the prefield pronouns are described.

\textsuperscript{52} The clauses counted are only declarative clauses.
As can be seen in Table 24, the Swedish L1 written material contains a total number of 9 different prefield pronouns, out of which 3 are only used once. In the Swedish L2 data 7 different pronouns are found, out of which 3 are only used once. In the Dutch L1 data 5 different pronouns are found, out of which 2 are only used once. The first person singular pronoun *jag/ik* ‘I’ predominates, followed by the first person plural pronoun *vi/wij/we* ‘we’ and the third person singular animate pronouns *han/hon/hij/zij* ‘he/she’. The two most frequent pronouns account for 73,3%, 80,9% and 89,5% of the Swedish L1, Swedish L2 and Dutch L1 prefield pronouns respectively. Due to the relatively small size of the material, it is hard to draw conclusions - these figures may be due to individual variation or to the content of the narratives written by the different speakers. As regards content, the narratives in Swedish L2 and Dutch L1 are virtually identical; however, the lexical and syntactic resources available to the learners in their L1 and L2 are different. Even though it is possible that the learners try to accommodate to another norm in their L2, it is a too large conclusion to draw from this limited material, especially since there are differences in raw figures for the three languages. The possible patterns found for prefield pronouns in the written data, as stated above, resemble those of the oral data with substantially fewer prefield pronouns for Dutch L1. Table 25 gives an overview of the non-prefield pronouns, classified into 5 subcategories.

---

Table 25: Non-prefield pronouns in the written material

---

53 The Dutch first person plural pronoun has two forms, *wij* and *we*. 
As has been stated above, the raw total for the different languages are very similar (187, 172, 180). This makes the patterns easier to compare and interpreted. Compared with the oral data, the percentage of the three most common pronouns in all three languages in the written data is substantially higher - a difference of 9,8% for Swedish L1, 8,5% for Swedish L2, and 9,6% for Dutch L1. One can conclude from this that there is not a greater diversity of pronouns in the written material than in the oral.

When comparing the percentages of pronouns in terms of syntactic function, excluding the three most frequent pronouns, some differences can be seen. Swedish L1 has fairly high and almost identical percentages for both subject and object pronouns (15,5% versus 15%), whereas both Swedish L2 and Dutch L1 have a higher percentage of object pronouns than of subject pronouns (14,4% compared to 11,7% and 11,1% compared to 8,3%). This is different from the oral material, where all three languages had a higher percentage of subjects than of object pronouns. However, all these differences are small and it is therefore hard to draw any definite conclusions.

When comparing the number of personal and other pronouns, it can be seen that Dutch L1 uses fewer personal pronouns (14,4%) compared to Swedish L1 (25,7%) - Swedish L2 (19,2%) is placed in between, although slightly closer to the Dutch L1 percentage. The percentages are similar to the ones found in the oral material, except that Swedish L2 has a lower percentage of personal pronouns in the written material (19,2% compared to 22,6%). The figures for other pronouns are very low for all three languages. Surprisingly, Swedish L2 has the highest percentage of other pronouns (7%) compared with both Swedish L1 (4,8%) and Dutch L1 (5%). However, the figures are so low that it is hard to draw any conclusion from this. These percentages are also very low compared to the other pronoun percentages found in the oral material, in which Swedish L2 had the lowest percentage of other pronouns. This may simply be due to the fact that the oral task was a picture description whereas the written task was a narrative, focusing on the experiences of the writer and thus prone to be more focused on the first person - both in singular and plural and less on other referents. This becomes clear when looking at the three most common pronouns found in the written data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 most common</th>
<th>Swe L1</th>
<th>Swe L2</th>
<th>Dutch L1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jag/ik - subject</td>
<td>63,1%</td>
<td>65,4%</td>
<td>60,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi/wij/we - subject</td>
<td>23,8%</td>
<td>23,6%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>som/die/dat - relative</td>
<td>13,1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26: Non-prefield pronouns in the written material: the 3 most common.

54 Out of which 2 are subject pronouns, see below.
The three most frequent pronouns are the first person singular (jag/ik), the first person plural (vi/wij/we), and the relative pronoun (som/die/dat). This is different from the three most common in the oral material, where relative pronouns predominate. This may be linked to the different genres, description versus person focused narrative. The percentages for the 3 most common pronouns are very similar. Dutch L1 has slightly lower percentages for the first person singular and the relative pronouns and a higher percentage for the first person plural pronoun; however, this may be just a coincidence and does not need to be analysed further.

### 4.4 Adverbials in the prefield

In this section adverbials in the prefield will be studied more closely.

#### 4.4.1 The oral material

Table 27 shows the raw figures and percentages of prefield adverbials in the oral material. The raw figures are very similar for all three languages. In all three languages the majority of the prefield adverbials are adverbials of place. The rest is time adverbials, with only a small minority of other adverbials. Dutch L1 here forms an exception with the same amount of time and other adverbials - but this is more a sign of the very low number of time adverbials than of a high percentage of other adverbials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefield adverbials</th>
<th>Swe L1</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Swe L2</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Dutch L1</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. så 'so/then'</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. sen så/verder 'then'</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. då/dan 'then'</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. prep. + NP</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. prep + Pron</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. prep + demon + NP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. incl. left/right</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. here/there</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. pron. advl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σ94</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Σ115</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Σ103</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27: Adverbials in the oral material
The distribution of prefield adverbials is not surprising considering the nature of the picture description task - place adverbials necessarily predominate. The difference in other pronouns is substantial if percentage is considered (4.9% for Dutch L1, 2.1% for Swedish L1, and 1.7% for Swedish L1). However, the difference is in fact only 3 cases of other adverbials. It is also not surprising that Dutch L1 has 9.6% pronominal adverbials, whereas these are almost completely absent from the Swedish material.55

More of interest is the low proportion of time adverbials in the Dutch L1 material, which was already noted above (Section 4.2.1). It was proposed that this may be due to an extensive use of the connective-like time adverbials så/sen så ‘so/then’ in Swedish, which does not have a true counterpart in Dutch. When looking at the time adverbials in Table 27, it is clear that this is the case. The large difference in time adverbials between Dutch L1 and Swedish L1 and L2 is due to the use of så/sen så. Example (43) shows the construction with så.

(43) och så finns det ett fönster
and then is it a window
‘And then there is a window.’ (Learner 4, Pic 1)

These forms make up 26.6% of all adverbials in Swedish L1 and 35.7% of all adverbials in Swedish L2. In Section 4.2.1, it was found that the high figures of time adverbials in Swedish L1 and Swedish L2, especially regarding the use of så, are mostly due to individual variance, especially in Swedish L2. There is even a slight overuse of så for some of the L2 learners. Still, it may be that some of the learners have yet to acquire the use of så as a way of ‘buying time’ or leading the narrative onwards.

Dutch L1 has a much higher proportion of place adverbials - 82.6% - compared to Swedish L1 (69.2%) and Swedish L2 (57.4%). Looking closer at the different types of place adverbials found in the data, some differences emerge. The largest category found is that of the structure consisting of a preposition and a NP. The figures for this construction are almost identical for Swedish L1 and Dutch L1 (52.1% and 51.2% respectively); the figure is lower for Swedish L2 (34.7%) which is mainly due to the high percentage of time adverbials. The figures for here/there are different (5.3% for Swedish L1, 2.6% for Swedish L1, and 8.6% for Dutch L1), but as the percentages are so low it is hard to draw any conclusions from this, and the L2 does not resemble any of the L1’s for this aspect. A more interesting construction is 55The 1 case found in Swedish L1 has already been shown above, as it is also a case of referent maintenance. See Section 4.1.2.
the one which includes left/right, where the figures for Dutch L1 and Swedish L2 are very similar (12,4% and 12,2% respectively) whereas Swedish L1 has a substantially lower figure (4,3%). It is, however, hard to know what this means. When looking at place adverbials the learners seem to either follow the distribution patterns of their L1 or create a pattern that is different from both Dutch L1 and Swedish L1. However, concerning time adverbials, the learners’ patterns resemble those of the target language to a large extent. This is worth noting, but it is hard to draw any conclusions from this - more data is needed in order to see whether it is the case that correct distribution patterns for time adverbials in Swedish L2 is indeed acquired earlier or more easily than place adverbials by Dutch L1 learners.

As a final comment about the prefield adverbials in the oral material, I would like to mention the high degree of correctness by the learners. There are no mistakes concerning preposition use - the prepositions used are the correct ones. This may not be surprising, considering that we are dealing with the concrete, most transparent use of prepositions when referring to positions. These are to a great extent similar for Dutch and Swedish. Still, this is a sign that the learners have a fairly good command of their L2, at least within the genre of spoken descriptions. They have no problems concerning the production of correct place adverbials; I believe that this is an important point to mention. Also, they do not use prefield adverbials to a lesser extent than the native speakers of Swedish, which is also worth pointing out. Even though there may be a somewhat excessive use of time adverbials, especially of så by some learner, the learners’ use of adverbials cannot be seen as diverging from the Swedish L1 norm to any notable extent. The learners’ use of prefield adverbials in the oral material will not be discussed further, as no substantial and important differences have been found.

### 4.4.2 The written material

Table 28 gives an overview of prefield adverbials in the written material.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefield advl</th>
<th>Swe L1</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Swe L2</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Dutch L1</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Time*</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Place</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Left out</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σ59</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Σ90</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Σ92</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes some cases that were counted as clause in the prefield count.
As can be seen in Table 28, there is a very high percentage of time adverbials, followed by other adverbials and adverbials of place. This is not surprising considering the nature of the task; a narrative describing last week’s activities should by necessity contain many time adverbials. Due to the fact that the tasks are so different, there is no need to compare the oral and written material here. The figures for time adverbials are very similar with 74.6% for Swedish L1, 75.6% for Swedish L2 and 81.5% for Dutch L1. There are very few cases of adverbials that were left out. There is a large difference in the proportion of other adverbials; Swedish L1 has as many as 22%, whereas Dutch L1 only has 9.8%, with Swedish L2 placed in between with 17.8%. However, it is fully possible that this is in fact due to the content of the narratives. The material is too small for any broad conclusion regarding this. Also the difference in percentage regarding place adverbials is likely to be related to content. From Table 28, it is clear that the interesting category here is the one of time adverbials. Table 29 gives a more detailed description of the prefield adverbials of the written material.
Looking closer at the category of ‘other adverbials’, it is interesting that, even though this is a very broad and diverse category, there are two adverbials that are found in the written material of all three languages: tyvärr/helaas ‘unfortunately’ and lyckligtvis/gelukkig ‘luckily’. Three further adverbials are shared between Swedish L1 and L2 and two others are shared between Swedish L2 and Dutch L1. However, the category of other adverbials is too large and diverse and it would be unexpected if only the same ones were used in the three different languages of the material. Notable is only that, in comparison with the oral material,
other adverbials are more frequent in the written material. However, the number of cases is still not very high, which is probably connected to the informal genre of personal narratives.

A total of 10 different categories of time adverbials, including one category called ‘other’, were found in the material. Looking closer at the time adverbials, which is the main adverbial category of the written material, there are some things that need to be commented on. The category *sedan/sen* (så) ‘so/then’ accounts for a very similar percentage of the Swedish L1 and L2 adverbials (8.5% and 8.9% respectively), but this category is completely absent from the Dutch L1 material. Here the learners have a very target-like production. This category is, however, a fairly small category in the written material, compared to the oral material. Concerning så, another construction is found both in Swedish L1 and Swedish L2: namely the construction where så is placed in position 0 in the clause, i.e. creating a kind of V3-construction. Så here acts as a connector between two declarative clauses. The learners produce this type of construction in a target-like fashion and to approximately the same extent as do the native controls. The construction is exemplified in (44) and (45) below.

(44) *Det det var länge sedan jag såg honom så det var kul*

it was long since I saw him so it was funny/nice

‘It was a long time since I saw him, so it [seeing him] was nice.’ (Swedish native 1)

(45) *Tyvärr föreläste man lite monotont, så det blev jättespännande tyvärr.*

unfortunately lectured one a bit monotonous so it became really exciting unfortunately

‘Unfortunately the lecturing was a bit monotonous, so unfortunately it did not become really exciting.’ (Learner 1)

Concerning the category of clock-time (i.e. *kl. 19* ‘at 19.00’), Swedish L1 does not have any cases of this construction whereas it is relatively frequent in the Swedish L2 and Dutch L1 data (6.7% and 7.6% respectively). However, it is unlikely that this is due to any differences between Dutch and Swedish; rather it is content-related. Because the Dutch L1 and Swedish L2 narratives are produced by the same speakers and mainly narrate identical events, it is not strange that they also use clock-time adverbials to the same extent.

However, these two things mentioned above are not the most striking things regarding time adverbials. Instead, one major difference is detected. This concerns the construction of preposition plus NP or time/day expression versus only a bare NP form. In Swedish, except for rare cases, correct time expressions need a preposition; a correct time expression would be

---

56 No detailed analysis of this has been made in the current study; due to this there are no figures on how frequent this construction is in the Swedish L1 and L2 data respectively.

57 The use of *föreläsa* ‘lecture’ in the context of Learner 1’s narrative is not correct as he is writing about a person reading a story from a book in front of an audience. Instead the verb *läsa* ‘read’ or possibly *högläsa* ‘read aloud’ would have to be used.
på måndag ‘on Monday’. (Further examples of constructions in Swedish will be given below). This can also be seen when looking at the Swedish L1 data: there are only 2 cases of a bare NP form (3,4%) compared to 26 cases of a preposition combined with either a lexical item for part of the day/time or another NP (43,1%). In Dutch, however, in most expressions, especially those concerning the days of the week, a preposition is not used. (Examples of constructions in Dutch will be given below). This can also be seen from the Dutch L1 data: there are only 5 cases (5,5%) of constructions with a preposition whereas the bare NP forms account for 37% of all adverbials (34 cases). Once this difference in constructions between the two languages, a very subtle difference, is established, not only as a fact of formal grammar, but also as expressed in empirical data showing the actual use of the forms, it becomes of great interest to look at what the learners do. At first glance, this clearly looks like a difference in distribution patterns of sub-types of prefield adverbials: forms without a preposition are much more common in the Dutch L1 data, but not entirely absent in the Swedish L1 data. This is one of the larger differences in form (sub-categories of syntactic category) found in the material and is therefore interesting to look deeper into.

As can be seen in Table 29 above, the learners’ largest category of time adverbials is indeed expressions including a preposition (26,6%, 24 cases) just as for Swedish L1. However, when turning to the construction with only a bare NP, it is evident that the learners have not yet managed to remove this construction from their L2. This seems to indicate a problem with finding the right distribution patterns for time adverbials in their L2. However, when looking closer at the bare NP’s found in the Swedish L2 material, one finds that this may in fact not be a question about distribution patterns of constituents or word order. The patterns in themselves are not the core of what is problematic for the learners - there are also distinct problems with form.

There are a total of 14 cases (15,6%) of bare form NP’s used as time adverbials in the prefield, and even though some of them are correct, there are also many incorrect forms. (Examples of the learners’ use of time expressions will be given below). Also, in cases where there is a correct use of preposition or no preposition there may be other problems. One very common mistake among the learners is to use a definite article when there should be none or the other way around. As these types of time expressions seem to be a problem for the learners, I believe it is interesting to look deeper into this even though this is in fact not related to distribution patterns. This topic is partly outside of the scope of this thesis and will therefore not be discussed further in Chapter 5. I will here give examples of correct time expressions found in the Dutch L1 and Swedish L1 written materials and then discuss
examples from Swedish L2 in relation to these examples. I will mainly focus on the expressions regarding days of the week and parts of the day. Of course, only clause-initial time expressions will be studied, as I have limited my study of adverbials to those occurring in the prefield. There is, however, no reason to believe that time expressions in other clause positions would be different - this is obvious, even from only studying the texts without a detailed analysis.

As the task was to write a narrative about last week’s experiences, all time expressions concerning days and part of the day found in the material occur in clauses which are in the past tense (either perfect tense or imperfect). This also means that these time adverbials refer to a point in time prior to the point at which the narrative is written. Dutch and Swedish differ in respect to whether or not this aspect modifies the time expressions, i.e. whether or not certain expressions can only be used with past tense or future tense. Examples (46)-(49) show the time expressions found in the Dutch L1 material.

(46) Maandag heb ik aan een opdracht gewerkt.
    Monday have I on an assignment worked
    ‘On Monday I worked on an assignment’. (Dutch native 2)

The bare NP construction, as seen in (46), is very common when referring to the days of the week (as can be seen in Table 29). However, one of my informants regards this form not as formally correct, but rather as a short form, and states that it would be more correct to use days together with the preposition op ‘on’. Still, the bare NP is the most frequent way of referring to days of the week and parts of the day in the Dutch L1 written material. It also occurred as a combination of day and part of the day, as in (47).

(47) Zaterdagmorgen kwamen we aan in Riga.
    Saturday-morning came we to in Riga
    ‘On Saturday morning we arrived in Riga’. (Dutch native 5)

There are, however, also a few cases of the construction with the preposition op ‘on’. One such example can be seen in (48) below. However, this construction is much less frequent than the ‘bare’ NP form.58

58 Furthermore, op can only be used with the days of the week. For parts of the day, the preposition in ‘in’ is used instead; then the definite article is required. There are, however, no cases of this construction in the prefield in the Dutch L1 data.
Op woensdag ben ik gaan wandelen in het bos.
‘On Wednesday I went for a walk in the forest.’ (Dutch native 4)

A third, special construction is the one in (49). The ‘s is what remains of the old possessive article des59 and is only used with expressions of parts of the day.

’s Middags begonnen mijn andere lessen.
‘At noon my other lessons begun.’ (Dutch native 3)

Examples (50)-(52) below show the time expressions found in the Swedish L1 material. Example (50) below shows one of the rare examples found in the Swedish L1 material of a time expression including days, times of day, week, without a preposition.

Denna vecka har jag besökt min syster.
‘This week I have been visiting my sister.’ (Swedish native 1)

Another expression which is very similar to this one and also occurs in the material is den här veckan ‘this week’. The main difference between these two expressions is that the former does not require the definite form whereas the latter does.

På torsdagen försökte jag studera hemma.
‘On Thursday I tried to study at home.’ (Swedish native 2)

As can be seen in (51), the day (Thursday) is used with a definite article. The construction is the same if the NP is a part of the day. The use of these constructions indicates that it is already known which Thursday is the referent. The frame of referent, i.e. last week, has already been established before. Without the frame of reference it is not possible to know which specific day/part of day that is meant by the narrator.

One common way to refer to days already past, found in the Swedish L1 material is through the use of a construction with the preposition i ‘in’ + day+s. One example of this can be seen in (52) below.

---

59 In German, the possessive construction with des NP+s is used for the masculine and neuter gender.
The difference between this construction and the construction with på + day + definite is that whereas that construction requires a frame of reference in order to be understood, the construction in (52) always refers to last Sunday, as seen from the perspective of the point in time where the narrator is.

Before moving on to analyzing the expressions found in the Swedish L2 material, I will make a brief comparison between the Dutch and Swedish expressions. Just like in English, the time expressions found in Dutch L1 (in (48) and (46) above) would be the same if they were instead to be produced in a clause in the future tense. The constructed examples (53) and (54) show this.

(53) *Op woensdag* ga ik wandelen in het bos.
    *On Wednesday* go I walking in the forest
    ‘On Wednesday I’ll go for a walk in the forest.’ (Constructed)

(54) *Maandag* ga ik aan een opdracht werken.
    *Monday* go I on an assignment work
    ‘On Monday I will work on an assignment.’ (Constructed)

However, this is not the case in Swedish. In Swedish, the construction with på and the definite form as well as the one with *i* + *s* can only be used with the past tense. Instead på + day (without the definite) must be used with the future tense. Similarly, the expression in indefinite form can *only* be used with the future tense. This expression is illustrated in (55) below.61

(55) *På måndag* ska jag försöka studera hemma.
    *On Monday* will I try study at home
    ‘On Monday I will try to study at home.’ (Constructed)

Thus, there is a clear difference between how time expressions are linked with tenses in Swedish and Dutch, where Dutch is in some cases (the case with *op* + day) very similar to

---

60 See van den Toorn (1984) and de Rooy & Wikén Bonde (2005) for more about this.
61 Swedish lacks a distinct future tense and a construction with *ska* ‘will’ (in this sense) or *kommer att* ‘is going to’ is used. Another possibility would be to use the present tense. See Bolander (2005), Holmes & Hinchliffe (2003) for more about the future tense in Swedish.
English. Below in Examples (56)-(63), the different constructions found in the Swedish L2 material are exemplified.

(56) På fredag kväll gick vi till Kalmar nation.
    on Friday evening went we to Kalmar nation.
    ‘On Friday evening we went to Kalmar Nation.’ (Learner 1)

(57) På lördagafton åkte vi tillbaka.
    on Saturday-evening went we back
    ‘On Saturday evening we went back.’ (Learner 5)

Both (56) and (57) above are examples of a non-target-like use of time expressions with på. As both examples are in the past tense, the definite article is needed in order for the expression to be correct. Also (58) below is an example of the same mistake made with på + day.

(58) På tisdag såg dagen lite annorlunda ut
    on Thuesday saw the-day a bit different out
    ‘On Thuesday the day looked a little bit different.’ (Learner 4)

Looking closer at the other frequent construction in the L1 data, the construction with the preposition i +day+s, one can find both correct examples as in (59) and incorrect due to lack of preposition as in (60).

(59) I tisdags var jag ledig hela dagen.
    in Thuesday's was I free whole the-day
    ‘On Tuesday I was free the whole day.’ (Learner 3)

(60) Onsdags hade jag lektion kl. 12.00.
    Wednesday's hade I lesson at 12.00
    ‘Last Wednesday I had a lesson at 12.00.’ (Learner 2)

Also some other non-target-like time expressions can be found in the L2 written material. Example (61) is another case where the preposition has been dropped - something that is allowed in Dutch, but not in Swedish. However, learner 5, i.e. the learner who has had the least formal instruction in Swedish, is the only one to make this particular mistake, thus this mistake is most likely due to lack of knowledge about how to form proper time expressions in Swedish.
In (61) one can see another problem connected to the use of definite article in Swedish time expressions.

(61) *Fredag åkte jag till Stockholm.*

Friday went I to Stockholm

‘On Friday I went to Stockholm.’ (Learner 5)

Together with nästa ‘next’, there should not be any definite form. This does not give the expressions another meaning, as på + definite does, but would simply be regarded as a grammatical mistake, by native Swedish speakers. One special and interesting case can be seen in (63).

(62) *Nästa dagen promenerade vi igen.*

next the-day walked we again

‘The next day the walked again.’ (Learner 6)

The time expression above (in italics) is not a form a Swedish native speaker would use. Instead, the correct expression would be förra söndagen ‘last Sunday’.

Translating fredag förra veckan literally into Dutch would be *Vrijdag laatste week*, which is not the correct expression. The correct Dutch expression is instead laatste week vrijdag ‘last week Friday’. What is striking though is that fredag förra veckan is indeed a literal translation of the correct English expression: Friday last week. Thus, this expression in the Swedish interlanguage or learner language of learner 1, is a case of transfer from another of his languages, namely English. There is no other explanation for the occurrences of this expression, since it is unlikely that any type of possible developmental stages should create a use of this expression.

As has been shown above, time expressions, beyond the use of så, då, sen, pose a problem for the learners. However, this is not primarily a problem with the distributional patterns of constituents or word order issues such as placement of constituents, but a problem with forming morphologically correct expressions. In sum, concerning prefield adverbials in

---

62 Note that Swedish past tense requires the definite article.

63 See Selinker (1972) for the original of the term interlanguage and an early discussion about its properties.
the written material, there are no ‘true’ problems with distributional patterns, even though this at the first glance seems to be the case. This shows the value of not only classifying expressions into categories, but of looking closer at individual cases and making a more qualitative analysis. Learners do, in fact, have other problems that can be ‘hidden’ under what seems to be a question of distribution patterns.

4.5 Summary

Compared to the native speakers, the learners generally do fewer referent introductions and maintenances. There is no real difference between how referents are introduced in terms of definite/indefinite in the three languages. When looking at how referents are introduced according to the idea of spatial versus existential introduction constructions, one finds that Dutch L1 has a slightly higher proportion of spatial introductions. However, the difference is not large (6,1% more spatial introductions in Dutch than in Swedish) and also in Dutch L1 existential referent introductions are much more common than spatial ones. Swedish L2 mainly follows the pattern of Swedish L1. There are fairly substantial individual differences concerning the proportion of existential vs spatial introductions, which makes it impossible to see clear general trends - except for the fact that existential introductions predominate. The most striking feature concerning referent introduction is not the patterns of the three languages in relation to each other, but the high proportion of non-fitting cases found in all three languages. Roughly 25% of the introductions are made are classified as non-fitting, and 6 different types of non-fitting constructions are found.

Concerning referent maintenance, Dutch has pronominal adverbs, one construction not available in Swedish, which are used for 11,2% of the maintenances. Swedish L1 uses NP’s to a greater extent than do Swedish L2 and Dutch L1. A construction with a demonstrative pronoun and an NP is more frequent in Swedish L1, but found to be an individual trait.

Concerning the prefeld of the oral material, the patterns are very similar for all three languages when looking at the categories of subject, adverbial and object. Few objects are found, and two thirds of the declarative clauses are subject-initial and one third is adverbial-initial. However, in Dutch L1 higher proportions of subject NP’s as well as of place adverbials and fewer subject pronouns are found in the prefeld. The learners mostly follow the patterns of Swedish L1 in their L2.

In the prefeld of the written material larger differences are found. Whereas Swedish L1 keeps the proportion two thirds subject-initial and one third adverbial-initial clauses, Dutch
L1 has 48.3% subject-initial and 42.5% adverbial-initial clauses. Subject-initial clauses are thus substantially less frequent in the written Dutch material than in the Dutch oral data. The learners mainly follow the patterns of Swedish L1, with a high rate of subjects in the prefield, and a low rate of adverbials. The types of adverbials found in the prefield vary between the oral material (mainly place adverbials) and the written material (mainly time adverbials) - this is clearly connected to the different tasks given.

When looking closer at pronouns, both in the prefield and in other clause positions, in the material, it is clear that pronouns do not pose a problem for the learners as they use different types of pronouns (personal and other types) as well as use them for different syntactic functions (subject and object). In all three languages, the proportion of pronouns is higher in the written than in the oral material. The learners have a higher proportion of pronouns in the oral material and a lower proportion in the written material than Dutch L1 and Swedish L1. The most common pronouns are the same for all three languages in both the oral and the written material.

When looking closer at adverbials of the prefield in the oral material, one finds a high proportion of time adverbials in the Swedish L2 material and a low one in the Dutch L1 data. The very high figure found in the Swedish L2 material is mainly due to an overuse of så ‘so’, by a few of the learners. The low proportion of time adverbials in Dutch L1 as compared to Swedish L1 is thought to be related to the fact that no such device as så exists in Dutch. Concerning subcategories of place adverbials, there are some differences between Dutch L1 and Swedish L1, where the learners either follow the pattern of their native tongue or a pattern that is not characteristic of Dutch L1 or Swedish L1. However, the learners use place adverbials correctly, which is not the case with time adverbials in the written material. The mistakes made with time expressions in the written material are not related to differences in distributional patterns but rather are problems with producing correct expressions (i.e. use of prepositions and/or definite/indefinite forms). What at the first glance looks as a difference in distributional patterns between Dutch L1, Swedish L1 and Swedish L2, is in fact a morphologically non-target-like use of time expressions by the learners.
5. Discussion

In this chapter some important themes connected to the results will be discussed. I do not intend to discuss possible explanations why Dutch and Swedish differ with respect to the researched features of linearization; this would be premature and too complex for a small study such as the current one. Instead I discuss some issues I find important related to the current study.

First, the question of the impact of the methodology chosen is discussed (Section 5.1). Three subtopics concerning methodology are touched on: the impact of the tasks given (Section 5.1.1), the question of language activation (Section 5.1.2), and problems relating to studying tendencies and patterns in closely related languages (Section 5.1.3). Secondly, a brief critique on the existential/spatial divide for referent introduction as presented by Carroll et al (2000), Carroll & von Stutterheim (1993, 2003) is made (Section 5.2). This critique builds on and develops the argument presented in Lindgren (2009b). Thirdly, in Section 5.3 the present study is briefly compared with my earlier pilot study (Lindgren 2009b) and with figures from some studies of the prefield of Swedish L1 and Dutch L1. Finally, two aspects of the learner language, namely pronouns (Section 5.4) and variability (Section 5.5), are discussed, comparing the results of this study with some other studies.

5.1 Discussion of methodology

In this section, three questions directly related to the methodology of this study will be discussed: the impact of the tasks given (Section 5.1.1), the question of language activation (Section 5.1.2) and finally some problems related to studying closely related languages will be brought up (Section 5.1.3).

5.1.1 The impact of the tasks

One very important question to consider is the impact of the tasks on the data. In the case of the picture description task performed by the informants in this study the task is thought to influence the types of adverbials used, something which is also true for the written narrative task. This can be clearly seen when comparing the adverbials found - the adverbials found in the material from the picture description task are mainly place adverbials whereas the ones found in the written material are almost exclusively temporal adverbials. It is in fact
natural that the learners are influenced by the type of discourse they are expected to produce. After all, these are different genres and they have different characteristics. What is important is not to prematurely generalize the results to other types of discourse or other types of learners.

Task effects are attested e.g. within research connected to language teaching, where the tasks given in the classroom affect both the output of the students and the teacher’s instruction (Ellis 2000). Also in psycholinguistic studies task effects have been found. For instance, de Groot et al (2002) studied word processing in lexical decisions in Dutch-English bilinguals. They used three different tasks, a lexical-decision task, a standard-naming task, and a delayed naming task (for more information about the research design, see de Groot et al 2002:97ff), measuring response time for the different tasks and for different languages (English/Dutch), and found task effects concerning response times for naming if a collection of letters was a word or a pseudoword.64

Ellis & Barkhuizen (2005:143) write that “task demands push learners to perform tasks in certain ways, prioritizing one or another aspect of language”. This is certainly true; something which can be seen when looking at the data and results of the current study. In the oral descriptions many objects are introduced, using the available means for referent introduction. In the written narratives, there is an extensive use of different time adverbials, something which is necessary when describing the activities of last week as in the task given here. It is, however, hard to distinguish direct task effects from other variables, e.g. individual variation, place and manner of language acquisition. In order to measure the impact of the tasks on the results, more data is needed. Also, effects of different types of discourse may be stronger for certain languages. This can be seen in the current study where, in the oral material, the proportions of adverbials in the prefield are similar for Swedish L1, Swedish L2 and Dutch L1. However, in the written material the proportion of adverbials are substantially higher for Dutch L1. However, in order to know if this is generally true, a larger comparative study would be needed.

5.1.2 Language activation and distribution patterns

As has been pointed out above (Section 3.3), the method chosen for this study, where the informants first perform the tasks in their L1 and then in their L2 at the same occasion may

64 Also in studies testing the extent of L1 transfer (Schwartz & Sprouse 1996) tasks effects have been discussed, although not in detail. In her study of transfer on L2 and L3 acquisition, Leung (2006) writes that the nature of the task could be responsible for some of the results (Leung 2006:179, 184 note 4).
influence the results. When performing the task in the L1, the learner is aware of the fact that she/he will later do it in the L2 as well. This may lead to neural activation of the other language as the structures and words of the other language may be close at hand, in a psycholinguistic sense, during the tasks. Adding to this is the factor that Dutch and Swedish are structurally very similar, especially concerning the features studied here - we are thus dealing with tendencies towards different distribution patterns and not a question of right and wrong. The question is thus how potential activation of the other language during the tasks may influence the results in this type of study. Here I will first give a short overview of some theories of language activation and then discuss these in relation to the current study.

Most research on the subject of activation has focused on the lexicon, particularly concerning language storage and the retrieval and production of lexical items (See e.g. Kroll & Sunderman 2003, Gollan & Kroll 2001, Kroll & de Groot 2007, de Bot 2007). None of these focused on what effects activation of the other language could have on e.g. prefield elements distribution patterns or referent introduction and maintenance. Nonetheless, I believe that it is possible to extend the idea of activation and influence on the language beyond the domain of lexical semantics. Also the focus has been on speech production but I believe that the same idea can, to a lesser degree, be applied to written production as well.

Theories of activation belong within the field of cognitive linguistics and activation should thus be viewed as not primarily related to language production, but rather to neural activation of the brain. Still, the point is that the level of activation of the different languages may exert influence over production. Green (2007:375) divides languages into three categories: selected, “hence controlling speech output”, active, “playing a role in ongoing processing”, and dormant which means that it is “residing in long-term memory but exerting no effects on ongoing processing” (See also Green 1998). Thus, not only one language is involved in the process of speech production.

Green writes that “Choosing an appropriate word requires ensuring that its activation exceeds that of any of its competitors” (Green 2007:371). How, then, is this ensured? Green has developed a model to account for why the interference between the languages is not larger than it is. The model is called the inhibitory control model and assumes that “an inhibitory loop restricts the retrieval of word sounds from L2” (Green 2007:376) in the cognitive system of bilinguals, i.e. there is a type of control mechanism that controls speech production and makes sure that the words of the correct language are produced. This means that “L2 learners

65 Here I have chosen to centre my discussion around the work of Green (1998, 2007). For more about neural activation, processing and bilingualism, see also e.g. Paradis (2004), Kroll & Stewart (1994).
66 And one can assume a somewhat similar process should be true for the written modality as well.
may need to acquire a new set of processing skills that fall outside the language itself to be able to effectively use both languages” (Kroll & Sunderman 2003:121). This not only concerns the processing of individual lexical items, but also syntax, as lexical items have to be put together according to the rules of the selected language. However, distributional patterns of prefield constituents or referent maintenances are not only a question of syntax. Dutch and Swedish differ of course, such as in the use of pronominal adverbials for referent maintenance in Dutch, a resource not generally available in Swedish. However, there are few formal differences for referent introduction and maintenance and in the prefield, concerning the type of constructions allowed in the two languages.

Green (2007:375) writes that “selection and suppression requires that the relevant output be identified”. This may be a relatively simple process, when concerning selection of lexical items, but much more complex when the relevant output is not only lexical items and formal syntax but also expected patterns for introducing new referents as spatial and existential constructions. To identify relevant output in terms of linearization patterns requires knowledge, not only of what is allowed according to the formal rules of the target language, but also of tendencies concerning native usage patterns. Whereas the native speaker gets this information unconsciously, as a small child, through input from the surrounding speech community, the adult learner may need to be taught this. However, this is rarely done in second language teaching. It is also not certain that formal teaching will help, even though it may raise the learner’s awareness of differences regarding these types of constructions. It may also be the case that adult learners need large amounts of natural input in order to be able to produce correct patterns. This has not been studied for referent introductions. However, Bohnacker (2010), in her study of German L1 adult learners of Swedish L2, found substantial differences between the learners and Swedish L1 speakers in their use of different constituents in the prefield – but that these differences declined with the learners’ more extended stay in Sweden and thus more input from native Swedes. It thus seems that large amounts of input are necessary in order for patterns of information structure to change, much more than the typical adult L2 learner receives.

Kroll & Sunderman (2003:116) write that words in both languages tend to be active before production in bilingual speakers. The learners in this study are bilingual by some definitions and thus one can assume that both their languages can be active simultaneously.

---

67 She compared the same learners at 3 years, 6 years and 9 years residency in Sweden. See Bohnacker (2010) for more about her study.

68 Unfortunately, the space in this thesis does not allow for any exploration into what is a bilingual and at which stage in the L2 acquisition process a learner can be said to be bilingual. The term ‘bilingual’ is simply too complex to define in an easy manner and there is considerable disagreement among researchers about what
especially since there is the awareness that they later have to perform the task in the other language or that they have already performed it once in their mother tongue. Further on Kroll & Sunderman (2003) write that “The evidence on bilingual speakers suggests that the other-language alternative is available well into the process of planning to speak a word in one language alone” (Kroll & Sunderman 2003:118). Thus it may be possible that different patterns of prefield constituents are ‘accidentally’ produced since they are present through much of the production process.

Another theory related to language activation concerns *language modes*, which “corresponds to the various levels of activation of the two languages” (Grosjean 2007:429). The language mode is a “situational continuum ranging from a monolingual to a bilingual speech mode” (Grosjean 2007:429) where one language is always most dominant and fully active - it is the base language and “the language that governs language processing” (Grosjean 2007:430). This is slightly different from Green’s (2007) account of activation, since Grosjean (2007) assumes that only one language can govern language processing. According to Grosjean, the other language is not involved in language processing in terms of syntax. Among the factors influencing the language mode are the situation, participants, the content of the message the speakers wants to convey to the audience, but Grosjean (2007) also includes what he calls ‘specific research factors’, including the task given. He points out that the fact that the participant (i.e. the learner) knows that the interlocutor (i.e. the researcher) is bilingual may activate the other language, even during a monolingual conversation. Knowledge of the fact that the study concerns bilingualism (such as a comparison of the learner’s two languages may influence the learner’s language mode as well (Grosjean 2007:432). This is a very important point as it stresses the fact that the elicited material collected for research is in no way neutral and that the performance of the learners in the current study may be influenced by the fact that they all knew about the interlocutor’s knowledge of both Dutch and Swedish (as well as of English and German, other languages spoken by the learners).

The non-active language, when in monolingual mode, can still influence the content of the utterances, through interference (Grosjean 2007:433). Grosjean writes further that “bilinguals who are highly dominant in one language may simply not be able to control language mode in the same way as less dominant or balanced bilinguals” (Grosjean 2007:447). Combining this idea from Grosjean (2007) with the theory of Green (1998, 2007) it means that less proficient bilinguals, or bilinguals who use one language more often than constitutes a bilingual.
the other, have a less developed inhibitory mechanism and can, thus, produce a mix of the languages by mistake. This should then, of course, be true for L2 learners as well especially for non-advanced learners and beginners. In the current study, this can be seen when looking at the oral material from learner 5, who has had the least formal teaching and is the only learner in the current study that may be classified as a beginner or having a proficiency that is lower intermediate. Whereas the other learners when lacking a lexical item tried to describe the item they saw on the picture, learner 5 uses Dutch words on some occasions mixed in with her Swedish descriptions. Judging from her reaction, she seems to be unaware of doing so, it is thus not a conscious switch, and then a split-second later she realises that she has used the wrong language and says, in Swedish, ‘but I have to speak Swedish now’. Her inhibitory mechanism or ability to control language mode seems not as developed as those of the other learners, something which supports the idea that there is in fact a mechanism that a learner needs to develop in order to be able to stay with one language. Of course, the fact that the author, the interlocutor of the picture description task, is a L2 speaker of Dutch, something that the learners were aware of, may have some influence on the situation.

Green (2007) differs slightly in his view on language activation and the relation between activation and processing from Grosjean (2007), since Green argues that more than one language can be involved in language processing, in the sense of deciding the message that is to be produced. This is something truly relevant for distribution patterns such as the ones studied in the current study since even when all items produced are in the target language there may be influences from the other language.

Grosjean (2007:438) writes that “language mode has rarely been controlled for in bilingual acquisition research”, and neither in the current study. The reason why this variable is mostly not included may be the fact that, even though Grosjean (2007) makes it sound like an easily measurable variable, it is not a matter of ‘just controlling for it’. In his paper, he does not make any suggestions about how to control for it other than looking at the produced results. This may work when it concerns lexical items, since one ‘proof’ for a bilingual mode may be the production of lexical items from the other language or code-switching. However, as can be seen in the theory of Green (1998, 2007), language activation is not a matter of production only, since the inhibitory mechanism only prevents production of certain features that it associates with the ‘wrong’ language - these features may still be present cognitively even if they are not realized in speech. As distribution patterns of e.g. prefield constituents are

---

69 There are no lexical items present from the mother tongue or any third language and the syntactic constructions used are in accordance with the formal rules of the target language.
not absolutes, but rather tendencies where all alternatives are allowed, but some alternatives more common and ‘idiomatic’, it may be that they easily ‘slip through’ the inhibitory mechanism. Maybe this mechanism can develop more easily and become more extensive when a person is younger - which would explain why child learners typically attain higher proficiencies in their L2. However, this is speculative, since individual differences also influence learners’ results. Thus, this would need to be studied further, not only within linguistics, but also within connected fields such as neurology and psychology.

Grosjean writes that “[i]n sum, if one is interested in such issues as the independence or the interdependence or the bilingual’s language systems, selective versus non-selective processing, one versus two lexicons, etc., one should be careful not to activate the other language with the stimuli or the procedure used” (2007:442) and that “[l]anguage mode is a variable that is constantly present, whatever the bilingual research question being studied, and it therefore needs to be taken into account at all times” (2007:445). I completely agree and believe that this is an important factor in researching different types of linearization and information structural patterns, but how to avoid this in practice is a complicated issue. When one language is active and thereby exerts influence over the other language - something that may not only hold for the dominant (native) tongue onto the L2, but also the other way around - this may pose some research-related problems. The two obvious problems a) analysing the competence of the learners, i.e. validating their performance through comparing it to the language of native (monolingual) speakers, and b) being able to assess the general validity of this type of research method. However, measuring language activation is very complicated. What could be done is to try to design studies and tasks that will lower the possibility of interference from the other language(s). For the current study, a possibility would have been to add extra Dutch L1 speakers who do not speak Swedish (or another Scandinavian language), in order to see if they differ from the Dutch informants presented here, who may have been influenced by their L2 Swedish. Still, it is useful to collect data from the Swedish L2 learners in their L1 as well, since comparing an individual with himself/herself is better than to compare to others. It would also be relevant to compare the learners’ results with data from native Dutch monolinguals - however, it will most likely be impossible to find such speakers of the right age and educational group since foreign languages are compulsory in the Dutch school system.

The inhibitory mechanism would need to be even more refined in order for the speaker to produce target-like patterns of information structure, and this mechanism is can be assumed to be needed in order to have a target like pronunciation as well.
Another possibility would be to study two groups of learners, where the first would be living in Sweden at the time of the data collection whereas the second would be living in the Netherlands. This may show some difference since Swedish is more likely to activate more easily in a Swedish-speaking environment than in an environment where it is rarely spoken. However, the group living in Sweden would most likely also have a higher competence, since they would have had more practice, which would make the groups not completely equal. The question of activation and the speaker’s language mode at the time of the data collection seems, thus, to pose a complicated problem. Collecting more data from both different learners and from the same learners again as well as from further Dutch and Swedish native controls would increase the validity of the results found here but cannot, unfortunately, completely solve the problems connected to activation.

The discussion here cannot be seen as going into depth into all aspects of language activation and mode, but has tried to relate these theories to problems with studies of linearization patterns and the current study.

5.1.3 Studying L2 acquisition of closely related languages

It is clear that the question of cross-linguistic influence in second language acquisition is complex (Odlin 2003:478). This is especially true when researching distribution patterns since influence from the L1 (or another language known to the learner) can be spotted more easily if it concerns use of lexical items or grammatical structures that do not exist in the target language. Odlin (2003:443) writes, concerning the question of transfer, that “language distance matters”. It is clear that relatedness is one factor of importance when studying L2 acquisition, since many aspects of language learning will be different if the L1 and L2 are structurally similar and historically related. Even though universal development sequences have been proposed for L2 acquisition, I think that the possible influence of language distance must be discussed, as it seems unlikely that this would not influence the learning process as well as determine some of the difficulties with learning the L2. Even though some authors have viewed L2 acquisition as a purely universal procedure, there is not enough data to prove this proposition. Instead, “there is plenty of evidence for the influence of the native language in naturalistic as well as scholastic settings” (Odlin 2003:464).

71 The question of relatedness is a very complex one and here I can not go into details into the question of definition. I think, however, that all linguists would agree that Dutch and Swedish can indeed be classified as two closely related languages, irrelevant of the definition used to measure language distance.
According to Processability Theory (Pienemann 1998), which states that there is a universal developmental sequence for L2 acquisition based on the cognitive processability of the grammatical features, Pienemann et al (2005) write that L2 learners do not transfer grammatical features even if the languages are closely related. Instead they argue that the possibilities of L1 transfer are “constrained by the capacity of the language processor of the L2 learner” (Pienemann et al 2005:85). Also Håkansson et al (2002) claim that learners of closely languages (German and Swedish) do not transfer structures that are common for both languages, but instead follow the universal sequence of language acquisition, the processability hierarchy. However, the studies made by Bohnacker (2007, 2010) and Bohnacker & Rosén (2007, 2008, 2009) have shown that Swedish L1 learners of German L2 and German L1 learners of Swedish L2 transfer their knowledge of the V2-structure to their L2 even though the V2-rule is supposed to be a structure coming higher up in the processability hierarchy and thus to be acquired later. Similarly, Conradie (2005), showed that German L1 beginner learners produce correct V2 clauses in their L2 Afrikaans. As there are many different positions concerning the role of transfer in the acquisition process, especially concerning closely related languages, it is clear that more research is needed.

Odlin (2003:447) writes that there is “a difference in success depending on the presence or absence of a structure in the native language”. This seems logical, since if a structure does not exist in the native tongue, one can assume that the learner is unfamiliar with that structure and thus have to understand it and learn its form and function before being able to use it. However, the distribution patterns researched in the present study are tendencies where most possibilities are acceptable in both languages. Take the case of prefield constituents - Dutch and Swedish allow the same syntactic elements in the prefield, so for the learner there are no new rules to learn. Both languages are V2 languages and thus the prefield serves the same function of anchoring the clause in the discourse. Still, there may be subtly different patterns in the different languages. Bohnacker (2007, 2010) and Bohnacker & Rosén (2007, 2008, 2009) found different patterns in Swedish and German72 - another Germanic language closely related to both Swedish and Dutch. Thus, there are reasons to believe that there may be a difference in the distribution patterns of prefield constituents between Dutch and Swedish as well; this has in fact been shown in the current study, where, in the written material, Dutch has a clear tendency to place more adverbials in the prefield than Swedish. However, the current study is a relatively small-scale study looking only at 6 learners and 6 native controls and researching only 2 genres.

72 As well as in learner language from that combination, i.e. German L1 learners of Swedish L2 and vice versa.
In order to create a more extensive picture of e.g. the distribution patterns of prefield constituents in Dutch, Swedish and the learner language (Swedish L2), more data is needed. Since the patterns are tendencies, it is hard to collect enough material in order to ‘prove’ the patterns found here. It is, obviously, much easier to research aspects of grammar where the two languages show a categorical difference, also when studying learner language, as one can then judge the presence or absence of a structure in the learner languages. The fact that subtle differences, such as differences in distribution patterns of prefield constituents, can pose persisting problems for L2 learners is clearly shown in the study of Bohnacker (2010), where her advanced German L1 learners of Swedish L2 have problems with this aspect. In the learner languages of the current study, one finds some morphologically unacceptable forms and some slightly non-target-like expressions. However, with the exception of the material from learner 5, where some violation of the V2 rule can be found, the learners show a high level of formal syntactic correctness. They can thus be said to have mastered many aspects of formal syntax. However, the results of Bohnacker (2010) and also Bohnacker & Rosén (2007, 2008) and those of the current study, largely resemble each other in showing the problems that learners have with aspects of language that are at the intersection between formal syntax and discourse pragmatics.

Due to the formal similarities between closely related languages in general and between Dutch and Swedish in particular it is hard to draw any conclusions concerning the cause of similarities or small differences in distribution patterns. This fact does not diminish the importance of the results of the current study, as the purpose is descriptive and not explanatory. In this study, it has, to some degree, been established that the distribution patterns of prefield constituents and of referent introductions and maintenances, differ between Swedish L1 and Dutch L1 and that the learners, in their Swedish L2, partly adhere to the patterns of the target language, partly to those of their L1 and partly show patterns that are different from those of both L1s. There, thus, seems to be some amount of transfer from the L1 concerning these features of linearization and information structure even if we take individual differences into account. However, the differences between Swedish L1 and Swedish L2 are not large and mainly concern subcategories of syntactic categories. When studying closely related languages with few formal differences, it is even more important to collect large amounts of data in order to see if patterns are stable for many speakers. This is,

---

73 Something which is most likely due to the fact that the other foreign language she was using regularly at the time of the recording was English, a language that has no V2 rule but instead strict SV-order irrespectively of what is placed at the beginning of the clause.
as I see it, the major drawback with the current study related to the question of studying L2 acquisition of closely related languages.

5.2 Discussion of the existential/spatial divide

In this section I continue and elaborate the discussion of the existential/spatial divide for referent introductions brought forward in Lindgren (2009b). I will not argue that there are no spatial and existential referent introductions - in fact the current study has shown that it is possible to classify constructions in Dutch and Swedish into those categories. However, my main point of critique of this binary system is that not all referent introductions can be classified as a member of one of these two categories.

In the studies by Carroll et al (2000) and Carroll & von Stutterheim (1993, 2003) no figures are given for the proportions of the two types of referent introductions found in their researched languages (English, German, French, Spanish). This weakens their claim that German has a primarily spatial perspective of referent introduction whereas English and the Romance languages are more directed towards existential referent introductions. They also, however, do not mention the occurrence of ambiguous or non-fitting cases or even the possibility that such cases could be found. Lindgren (2009b:67) writes that “it is possible that within their data, all cases could be classified in terms of either spatial or existential, but it is equally possible that they have simply excluded non-fitting cases in order to create the perfect model”. The results from the current study (Section 4.1.1) indicate that non-fitting cases do account for a substantial part of all cases of referent introduction in Swedish and Dutch and it seems unlikely that no such cases exist in Carroll & von Stutterheim’s (1993, 2003) and Carroll et al’s (2000) data. The categories of existentials and spatials proposed by e.g. Carroll et al (2000) and Carroll & von Stutterheim (1993, 2003) are sound, although unspecified and generalized in the original framework developed by these authors, but there is a need for at least one additional category, since all cases of referent introductions cannot be conveniently classified in a binary system.

I am not fully satisfied with using the name ‘non-fitting cases’, since this name indicates that there are two ‘normal’ categories and then there are those cases that diverge from the norm. Since the so-called non-fitting cases in the current study amount to 25% of the total number of referent introductions, it does not seem fitting that such a large category should
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75 This is even higher than the percentages found in Lindgren (2009): 18% for Swedish L1, 11% for Swedish L2 and 16% for Dutch L1.
be named non-fitting. From the results of the current study, where the non-fitting cases were analysed in depth and further classified into subcategories, it is also not clear if the non-fitting cases form a coherent category at all. At first glance, when looking at the different forms of non-fitting cases, (see Section 4.1.1 for the different structures of non-fitting cases found), it seems that the only thing they have in common is the fact that they cannot be put into any of the other two categories.

In Lindgren (2009b) only 2 categories of non-fitting cases were found: referents introduced in the form of subject/objects in definite form (e.g. ‘the walls are...’, ‘sweep the floor’) and referents introduced as part of a locative adverbial expression (prep + X; ‘on the floor’). In addition to these, in the current study, referent introductions in the form of subjects and objects in indefinite form were found (‘She wipes water from the floor’). When taking a closer look at the non-fitting cases, once finds that they do in fact have one property in common, except for the fact that they do not fit into the two categories: “The existence of the referent as well as its position is taken for granted in the discourse” (Lindgren 2009b:67). In a way, this would mean that the non-fitting cases of referent introductions are not introductions in the traditional sense. They are mentioned for the first time in the current discourse, i.e. in the actual descriptions, but in fact their existence is already a logical and ‘taken for granted’ part of a larger discourse, i.e. a room description discourse. Many of the non-fitting cases are parts of the room described, such as walls and floor. Other ones constitute parts of objects that have already been introduced as wholes (e.g. ‘her arm’ - the arm can be seen as a taken for granted part of the girl already introduced). They can thus be said to form natural parts of the scenario set by the start of the descriptions, i.e. ‘there is a room’, and the referent already introduced. This does not change the fact that these cases are not accounted for in the model of Carroll et al (2000) or even commented on, but it leads me to believe that this type of referent introduction may actually not have been counted as ‘true’ introductions in their work. Even if one can argue that they fall outside of the category of referent introductions, it is still necessary to comment on the occurrences of these types of referents. I suggest that a specific category is needed for these referents, especially for comparison of these cases between different languages - presupposed knowledge differs in many cases between languages (as it does between cultures). From the current study it is clear that the presupposed knowledge, as judged from the non-fitting cases found, for room descriptions in Dutch and Swedish is very similar. Maybe a more fitting name for this group of referents would be presupposed referents, as this clearly points to the function of these structures.
In Lindgren (2009b), in addition to discussing the role of the non-fitting cases, a point was also made concerning the high numbers of existential constructions with a clause-final locational adverbial (Expl-V-logical S-locational Advl) in the material of that study. Example (64) below shows this structure. (‘A woman’ is the referent introduced).

(64) det finns en kvinna i rummet
it is a woman in the-room
‘There is a woman in the room.’ (Learner 3, Pic 1)

This structure has also been found in the material from the current study and casts further doubt on the idea of a strict divide between spatial and existential introductions. It may be easy to determine referent introductions only from what precedes the referent introduced at clause level. However, even though the prefield of V2 languages anchors the clause in the discourse and is thus very important for a description or a narrative, the rest of the clause is not irrelevant. In fact, the last part of a clause can be used to focus, with the preceding elements forming the background. So the structure with the locational adverbial at the end of the clause puts focus on the position of the object, and anchoring it in space, though not on Carroll et al.’s definition of ‘spatial’ referent introduction which only considers whether there is a locational adverbial in clause-initial position or not.

It thus seems that, even though the categories existential and spatial are generally sound and to some degree form a logical binary system, the reality of examples found in discourse, at least in the data from this type of room descriptions used in the current study, is more complex than is shown in that model. The presupposed (non-fitting) cases need to be taken into account when researching existential/spatial ways of introducing referents. However, more research is certainly needed, especially from other languages than Indo-European ones.

5.3 Comparison to the pilot study & other relevant studies

I have not been able to find any relevant studies of picture descriptions in Dutch\textsuperscript{76} and Swedish. Referent introduction and maintenance has not been studied for Dutch and Swedish. Also, to my knowledge, no studies of Dutch (L1) learners of Swedish (L2) exist. Therefore, the most relevant study for comparison is my own pilot study of oral picture descriptions

\textsuperscript{76} The study made by Ehrich & Koster (1983) is not relevant, since they did not focus on prefield constituents and/or referent introductions and maintenance and their results are thus not comparable to the current study.
Concerning prefield constituents, the native informants in my pilot study (Lindgren 2009b), produced a substantially higher proportion of subjects in the prefield in Dutch L1 (79%) than Swedish L1 (52%). The learner followed the pattern of his mother tongue in his L2 (78%) at both data collection points. In the current study, virtually no differences were found regarding distribution patterns of prefield constituents in the aggregated oral material between Swedish L1, Swedish L2 and Dutch L1. (66.4%, 63.8 % and 63.6% subjects in the prefield respectively). In both studies, the majority of the clauses were subject-initial for all three languages. However, some of the learners as well as some of the native controls were more prone to have a higher proportion of subject-initial clauses, whereas others had higher proportions of adverbial-initial clauses. This may explain why the pilot study found Dutch L1 and Swedish L2 to be more subject-initial than Swedish L1 - within both languages there appears to be quite a large amount of individual variation and the informant in the pilot study happened to belong to the more subject-initial type of Dutch L1 speakers. In the current study, learner 4, was found to be extremely prone to produce subject-initial clauses – even more so than the learner in the pilot study. However, as other learners produced a higher proportion of adverbial-initial clauses, the aggregated data in the current study shows a more balanced picture (see Section 4.2.1). In order to check if the patterns in the current study are stable as an average for the languages it would be necessary to collect data from a larger group of learners and native controls. Also, data from Dutch L1 speakers who do not speak Swedish would be useful in order to see if Dutch L1 Swedish L2 learners have different patterns than other Dutch L1 speakers.

When comparing the distribution patterns of prefield constituents of the current study with figures from corpus of data from native speakers of Swedish and Dutch, one finds some differences.

Concerning speech data, I have found two large scale studies, one of Swedish L1 oral material and one of Dutch L1 oral material. Jörgensen (1976:101-105), in his study of Swedish L1 oral material, found 60% subjects in the prefield for conversations and academic discussions (from 979 declarative clauses) and 62% subjects (from 4610 declarative clauses) in the prefield for informal interviews. (See Jörgensen 1976 for details). His figures are close to the figure for Swedish L1 in the current study (66.4%). Bouma (2008), in his study of

77 Note that all Dutch L1 material in the pilot study comes from the L2 Swedish learner himself.
topicalization/fronting in Dutch, finds around 70% subjects in the prefield,\(^{78}\) for a large corpus of spoken material, *Corpus Gesproken Nederlands*. (For more information about this corpus, see Bouma (2008:63ff). This is slightly higher than the figure found in the current study (63.6%). However, the reader should keep in mind that these figures do not come from picture descriptions, even though they are figures from informal oral material. This may account for the differences between the data from Jörgensen (1976) and Bouma (2008) and the results of the current study. What the figures from Jörgensen (1976) and Bouma (2008) do show is that both Dutch and Swedish can be said to be languages which has a strong tendency to place subjects in the prefield in oral material.\(^{79}\)

For written data, Bohnacker & Rosén (2009) give a figure of 73% subject-initial declarative clauses for informal letters written by adult speakers of Swedish L1.\(^{80}\) This is substantially lower than the proportion of prefield subjects for the written Swedish material in the current study (64.8%). However, this can be due to differences in genres, since informal letters and narratives may differ. I have not been able to find any figures for written Dutch L1, but the Dutch L1 figures found in the current study (48.3%) are very similar to the figure given by Bohnacker & Rosén (2009) for German L1 informal letters (50%). This seems to point in the direction that Dutch is similar to German L1 in written material, but closer to Swedish L1 in oral descriptions. Differences in distribution patterns of prefield constituents for Swedish and Dutch seem to depend on genre, unlike the results for Swedish and German found by Bohnacker & Rosén (e.g. 2009), where differences were stable for both oral and written informal data, German L1 having a substantially lower proportion of subjects in the prefield than Swedish L1. However, picture descriptions have not been studied for German L1 and there is thus the possibility that this genre differs from other genres. Comparing other oral and written genres than picture descriptions and narratives could also reveal more stable differences between Dutch L1 and Swedish L1.

Turning now to referent introductions and comparisons with previous studies, in Lindgren (2009b), the informant exhibited mainly an existential perspective, both in his Dutch L1 and Swedish L2. The Swedish native controls used both spatial and existential perspectives. In the current study, although the referent introductions in all three languages were mainly existential, some speakers had very high proportions of spatial referent

\(^{78}\) See Bouma (2008:95f) for a table of the percentage of subjects in the prefield. The total amount of main clauses, i.e. prefields, studied was 70485 (Bouma 2008:90).

\(^{79}\) This can be compared with studies of German, another closely related Germanic language, where Bohnacker & Rosén have found a tendency to place more other constituents than subjects in the prefield. They give the figure of 50% subjects in the prefield for German informal oral material is (Bohnacker 2010:115).

\(^{80}\) The material consists of a total of 535 clauses.
introductions. Again, this shows the large variation between individual speakers for all three languages. The learners often kept the individual pattern they had in their native tongue also in their L2 (see Section 4.1.1), just as the learner in Lindgren (2009b) did. However, as has been discussed in Section 5.1, the learners’ productions in their L2 may have been influenced by the fact they had already performed the task in their L1. There is thus the possibility that the collected data does not reflect the true patterns of the L2, if such patterns exist. Another possibility is that the learners’ use of different syntactic constructions or information-structural patterns differs to a large extent between one occasion and another, i.e. the learners may not necessarily have fixed patterns of language use in their L2. This question, which concerns the variability of interlanguage, will be discussed further in Section 5.4.3.

This comparison between the current study and my earlier pilot study (Lindgren 2009b) points toward the importance of individual variation among learners and native speakers and possible variability of the learner language.

5.4 Pronouns in learner language

Much has been written about pronouns in L1 and L2 and the discussion here cannot be exhaustive. Rather, I have chosen to mention two studies that I found interesting in relation to the results of the current study.

Hendriks (2003:292) writes that learners “use fuller forms than expected given the forms that are allowed in the L2”. This means that one can expect more nominal phrases (NPs) and nouns than pronouns for referent maintenance in learner languages, what she calls over-explicitation, i.e. making the referent maintenance overly explicit. In her study of Chinese L1 learners of English, French and German she finds that the learners only use more explicit forms (i.e. more nominal phrases instead of pronouns) in their German L2 as compared to native speakers, and not in their English L2 or French L2. However, she claims that “over-explicitation indeed occurs in learner data, but that the extent to which it occurs varies across source-target language pairs” (2003:305). She, thus, calls for language-specific explanations. She also points out that there can be more or less optimal contexts for pronoun use and that the degree to which learners create these contexts and whether or not they actually use pronouns in the optimal contexts vary across language-pairs.\(^81\)

In the current study, the Swedish L2 learners use pronouns for 27.6% of their referent maintenances. This is slightly less than the Swedish native controls (33%), but the same

\(^{81}\) And, one can assume, also across individual speakers and maybe even with different situations.
amount as in their L1 Dutch (27.6%). Also, the learners do not use more NPs than are used in the L1 descriptions. Instead, the learners use more indefinite forms to maintain reference, mainly due to repetitions because of uncertainty concerning lexical items (See section 4.1.2). This indicates that the learners are not more explicit than the natives. However, it is hard to compare the current study of two closely related languages with the typologically distant language pairings (Chinese-German/English/French) in Hendriks’ (2003) work. As Odlin (2003:443) writes concerning transfer: “language distance matters”; it is very likely that this is also true in the case of pronouns use for referent maintenance. It is also possible that the given picture description task encourages the speakers in general to be more explicit and that this affects both native speakers and learners. Neither can we ignore the possibility of individual differences in the current study.

When looking at pronouns in general, we find that in the oral material the learners have the same proportion of prefield pronouns as do the native controls, whereas in the written material the proportion of prefield pronouns is lower for the learners. However, the Dutch L1 data contains an even lower number of prefield pronouns than do the Swedish L2 data. Thus, it seems likely that the learners are trying to accommodate to the target language pattern. It is also possible that the differences are just individual differences between the speakers (for more about individual differences, see Dörnyei 2005,) and may not reflect ‘real’ differences between the languages. In order to exclude this possibility, a much larger study would need to be undertaken. There are, unfortunately no relevant studies of Dutch L1 learners of Swedish L2, as this combination is not a very common one and has, thus, not been widely researched.

Looking at the overall rates of pronouns in the current study, one notices an interesting difference between the oral and the written material (see Section 4.3). Whilst there is almost no difference in the rates of pronouns between oral and written for the learners, there are substantial differences for both Swedish L1 and Dutch L1, with higher rates of pronouns in the written material. The learners have the highest rate of pronouns in the oral material, but the lowest in the written material. A possible explanation for this can be found in Bohnacker (1997). In her study of the girl Embla (age 1:8-2:1), she explains the girl’s low amount of pronouns in terms of utterance-length where shorter utterances “leave fewer opportunities for pronouns” (1997:77). Even though it may not be completely relevant to compare the language (L1) of a small child to that of adult L2 acquisition, I believe that length of utterance may
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82 This figure excludes the 11.2% pronominal adverbs used for referent maintenance in the Dutch L1 data, as this resource is not available in Swedish.

83 These are very frequent in the descriptions of Learner 5 which is to be expected, as her overall level in general and her vocabulary in particular is not as developed as those of the other learners.
indeed explain why there are fewer pronouns per clause in the Swedish L2 written data (1,00) compared to in both L1s (1,27 pronouns per clause for Swedish L1 and 1,10 pronouns per clause for Dutch L1). For the oral material, the L2 actually contains more pronouns per clause than the L1s do (0,95 compared to 0,73 for Swedish L1 and 0,56 for Dutch L1). In the current study, clauses and not utterances were counted. Still, I believe that the principle can be said to be the same. The average declarative clause length in the oral material is almost identical for all three languages (11,4 for Dutch L1, 11,8 for Swedish L1 and 11,0 for Swedish L2), whereas the clauses in the Swedish L2 written material are considerably shorter (9,8) than those in the Swedish L1 material and the Dutch L1 material (13,8 and 13,2 respectively, see section 3.3 for details). As only declarative clauses have been counted in this material, it is hard to draw any strong conclusions - in order to do that, one would have to look closer at non-declarative clauses as well as exclude all signs of hesitations from the oral material. However, the Swedish L2 material does not contain any long non-declarative clauses, so including these in the ‘clause-count’ would most likely not change the patterns seen, which leads me to assume that this tendency may in fact be correct.

The explanation offered by Bohnacker (1997) is logical and I believe that there is indeed a relationship between clause/utterance length and pronoun rate, also in the material of the current study. This could also explain why some authors (e.g. Hendriks 2003) seem to draw the conclusion that pronouns are generally hard to acquire for learners. I therefore suggest that finding lower frequencies of pronouns to be in learner data than in data from native speakers does not have to mean that there is a problem with the acquisition of L2 pronoun systems (or lexical items). In fact, in most Germanic languages (such as German, English, Swedish, Dutch) pronouns are short, phonologically simple words - these are, when looking at form alone, simpler than many other types of lexical items. Also, when comparing closely-related languages, the types of pronoun systems may be very similar. This is indeed the case for Dutch and Swedish, where the overlap between the personal pronouns is complete, and there is also a striking similarity for other types of pronouns. (See de Rooy & Wikén Bonde (2005:70-103) for more about pronouns in Dutch compared to the Swedish ones). There is, thus, no reason to believe that there would be any specific problems that would explain the differences in pronoun frequencies, related to the acquisition of the Swedish pronoun system for the Dutch L1 learners.

Which would lead to a problem concerning which ‘words’ to count, as there are fragment of words etc, in the oral material. Thus, such a count would alter the nature of the oral material substantially and actually rob the oral material of some of its qualities as oral discourse.
5.5 Variability in learner language

Much has been written about variability in learner language. Here it is not possible to give a full review of this topic. Of course L1 speakers vary their language use as well, but variability in learner language is different as it does not only concern register/style but also how much the learner adheres to target-like structures and patterns.

Ellis & Barkhuizen (2005:20ff, 48) write about what they term the ‘variability problem’, i.e. that learners have a tendency to vary both in their grammaticality judgments and in actual production. Because of this, the results one gets may depend on the task given to the learners, as well as on the time of the data collection and this, thus, poses a problem for researchers. Also Chaudron (2003:808) notes that the variability of learner language may be a problem when designing studies, as not all procedures and tests can be used to measure their competence. The impact of the tasks on the results has already been discussed (see Section 5.1.1 above). Thus, I will here discuss some aspects related to the possible variance in the learner languages that are not related to the tasks given. The question of learner language variation is large and complicated, and here only some few reflections can be brought up.

Two aspects of variability need to be considered. There is variation in the interlanguages between speakers, i.e. where acquisition varies due to individual factors, and there is variability within speakers, i.e. the fact that the interlanguage systems of learners may vary to a large extent from one occasion to another, something which may in some cases be connected with the situations, the interlocutors or the topic of conversation. There is also the fact that variation can be both systematic and non-systematic (Towell et al 1993), i.e. regular, following patterns, and irregular. These aspects need to be addressed in order to validate the results of the current study, just as is the case with any empirical study. However, in order to do this fully, it would be most likely necessary to collect further data.

Individual traits are generally hard to measure. There are many aspects of individuality: aptitude, motivation, environment, earlier learning history, to mention a few. The current study has looked at the interlanguage of 6 learners and has found individual variation between the learners for all aspects researched. In order to see if this is systematic variation or any variation at all, one would need to collect similar data from the same learners and compare them with the data of the present study. However, there is still the factor of time - the learners who, at the time of the data collection, had recently moved to Sweden would probably have
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85 See also Ellis (1985) for more about sources of variability in interlanguage or Tarone (1983) for an overview of variability from the perspective of three different research paradigms. See Ellis (1987) for an example of an empirical study of variability in narrative discourse. See Hardison (2003) for a study about variability in learners’ pronunciation.
increased their Swedish proficiency over the course of some months. To solve this problem, one would have had to have the learners perform the tasks repeatedly within a short time period. Still, repeating the tasks may in itself be problematic, since, in the case of the picture description task, the learners would be able to remember content which could make their descriptions similar. Another possibility to look into the question of systematic variation within learner languages would be to examine the data for possible correlations between different aspects of language, i.e. to see if certain aspects may occur together in the learner languages. Yet another possibility would be to look into the question of variation with respect to different situations, interlocutors, topics. To do this, it would be necessary to collect material from a wide range of genres and situations. The importance of making comparisons across tasks is also emphasized by Chaudron (2003:777).

In order to be able to measure variation between learners, something which, to a certain extent, has been done in the current study, e.g. for types of referent introductions, use of constructions with demonstrative pronouns etc., it would not only be necessary to carry out a more detailed analysis of the current data but also to collect data from more learners. None of the above suggested actions are possible within the limits of this MA thesis, but should be kept in mind for further studies.

This section has mainly served to show that the question of variability of the learner language has not gone unnoticed by the author and that it is indeed an important factor to consider when studying learner language in general. However, it is not possible to come to any more extensive conclusions than that there is in fact variation between the learners as well as between the genres studied here. In order to assess the variability of the learners of this study - or even more so, the interlanguages of Dutch L1 learners of Swedish in general, a much larger amount of data would be needed. To do this is unfortunately outside the scope of this study.

6. Conclusion

In this section some short, general conclusions are drawn (Section 6.1). Further, some problems with this study are discussed (Section 6.2) and some suggestions for further research are made (Section 6.3).
6.1 General conclusions

The study reported in this paper builds on the study carried out in my bachelor’s thesis in linguistics (Lindgren 2009b) as well as on the work on the prefield and information structure done by Bohnacker (2007, 2010) and Bohnacker & Rosén (2007, 2008, 2009) and the research on perspectives of referent introduction and maintenance by Carroll & von Stutterheim (1993, 2003) and Carroll et al. (2000).

The method used in this paper is an analysis at clause level of oral picture descriptions and (informal) written narratives. The material came from 6 Dutch L1 adult learners of Swedish L2, with material collected from the same speakers both in Dutch L1 and in Swedish L2, and from 6 Swedish L1 adult native controls. All speakers were university students, aged 19-25, living in Uppsala, Sweden, at the time of the data collection. Data were collected November 2009-February 2010. The oral material consisted of 3383 words of Dutch L1, 3361 words of Swedish L1 and 3625 words of Swedish L2. The written material consisted of 2729 words of Dutch L1, 2794 words of Swedish L1 and 2353 words of Swedish L2. Since the amount of data collected is fairly small, no statistical significance tests were made. Referent introduction and maintenance and constituents of the prefield were counted, analysed and compared between Dutch L1, Swedish L1 and Swedish L2, with focus on how the learners adjust to the linearization patterns and patterns of referent introduction and maintenance of the target language (Swedish). Pronouns and adverbials were also analysed further in depth.

The following four research questions were posed for the current study. Below these questions will be answered.

1. Do Dutch L1 and Swedish L1 differ in their patterns of information structure within the area of referent introductions and maintenance in oral picture descriptions?
2. Do Dutch L1 and Swedish L1 differ in the distributional patterns of prefield constituents in oral picture descriptions and written narratives?
3. Do the learners follow the target language (Swedish), the mother tongue (Dutch) or does the interlanguage exhibit different patterns? Can a case be made for L1 transfer?
4. Do the patterns observed here inform and uphold existing proposals of typological differences in information structure?

Concerning research question 1, the current study found small differences between the languages in referent introductions and somewhat larger differences regarding referent
maintenance in the oral picture descriptions. There was no difference between the three languages how referents were introduced in terms of definite/indefinite. Existential referent introductions predominated in all three language varieties, even though Dutch L1 had a slightly higher proportion of spatial introductions (28%, i.e. 6.1% higher than Swedish L1 and Swedish L2). However, there was a high amount of individual variation. The most striking feature concerning referent introduction was not the patterns of the three language varieties in relation to each other, but the high proportion of non-fitting cases found for all of them. Roughly 25% of the introductions made were neither spatial nor existential, and 6 different types of such non-fitting constructions were found. The non-fitting cases were typically objects whose existence was presupposed in the discourse; thus, these were not cases of introductions in the traditional sense. Still, it is necessary to take such referents into account and this, it was argued, makes it necessary that the simple, binary model proposed by Carroll et al (2000) be amended and revised. Concerning referent maintenance, the following patterns were observed: Swedish L1 uses NP’s for referent maintenance to a greater extent than Swedish L2 and Dutch L1 do. Even though there were individual differences, the learners generally used the pattern from their native tongue for referent maintenance. Swedish L2 more frequently used indefinite forms for referent maintenance, than native Swedish and Dutch, which is partly due to repetitions of words that the learners struggled to remember. Dutch has pronominal adverbs, one construction not available in Swedish, which are used for 11.2% of the maintenances, and this construction was not used by the learners in their L2 Swedish.

Concerning research question 2 and the prefield data, the current study indicates that there may be a difference in the distribution patterns of prefield constituents between Dutch and Swedish. In written narratives, Dutch exhibited a clear tendency to place more adverbials (42.5%) in the prefield than Swedish (29.2%). Dutch had only 48.3% prefield subjects in the written material compared to 64.8% for Swedish. On the other hand, no such differences were found in the oral descriptions, where all three language varieties followed a pattern of two thirds subject-initial and one third is adverbial-initial clauses.

In the Dutch L1 oral material, higher proportions of subject NP’s as well as of place adverbials and fewer subject pronouns were found in the prefield. Swedish L2 had an even lower proportion of subject NP’s than Swedish L1 - a pattern opposite to that in the native tongue. However, no explanation for this could be found.

Another interesting trend found is the following: In the oral material there was a high proportion of time adverbials in the Swedish L1 material, and an even higher one in the
Swedish L2 material and a low one in the Dutch L1 data. The very high figure found in the Swedish L2 material was largely due to an overuse of så ‘so’, mainly by a few of the learners. The low proportion in Dutch L1 as compared to Swedish L1 is thought to be related to the fact that no such device as så exists in Dutch.

Swedish L2 has a higher amount of expletives in the pref field of the written material, than the other languages. The proportion of adverbials in the pref field (37.5%) of the Swedish L2 written material is in between Swedish L1 (29.2%) and Dutch L1 (42.5%), possibly showing a tendency that the learners have started to move towards the patterns of the target language. Also the proportion of subject pronouns in Swedish L2 (27.8%) is in between the higher figure for Swedish L1 (33.6%) and the lower for Dutch L1 (23.5%). Concerning subject NP’s, Swedish L2 has a very similar proportion as Swedish L1.

In contrast to some existing studies on L2 pronominal use, pronouns did not pose a problem for the learners in the current study. They used different types of pronouns (personal and other types) and used them for different syntactic functions (subject and object), and were not less prone to use pronouns than are the Swedish L1 speakers. This may be connected to the similarity between the Swedish and Dutch pronominal systems, i.e. there is a one-to-one relationship between most Swedish and Dutch pronouns. An indication of the similarity of the pronoun systems is the fact that the most frequently used pronouns were found to be the same for all three language varieties in both the oral and the written material.

The paper also looked closer at subcategories of adverbials. Here some indications of possible differences between types of place adverbials were found in the oral material from Dutch L1 and Swedish L1, where the learners either followed the pattern of their native tongue or a pattern that is not characteristic of Dutch L1 or Swedish L1. The learners had a higher tendency to include left/right in their place adverbials, which is also the case in Dutch L2. The learners also had a higher proportion of time adverbials in the oral material than both Swedish L1 and Dutch L1. The learners used place adverbials correctly, which was not the case with time adverbials in the written material. The mistakes made with time expressions in the written material were, however, not directly related to differences in distribution patterns, but rather problems with producing correct expressions (i.e. use of preposition and/or definite/indefinite form). Still, the non-targetlike L2 forms were found to closely correspond in form to the time expressions in their L1, and so the results from the analysis of the time adverbials in the written material seem to indicate that transfer takes place in second language acquisition.
To summarize the answer to research question 3, the learners, in their Swedish L2, partly adhered to the patterns of the target language, partly to those of their L1 and partly showed patterns that are different from those of both L1s, as has been shown above. There seems to be some transfer from the L1 concerning the aspects studied, even if we take individual differences into account. However, the differences found between Swedish L1 and Swedish L2 are not large and mainly concern subcategories of syntactic categories (e.g. time adverbials, subject pronouns and subject NP’s) and types of referent maintenance, and more research is needed in order to verify the results.

Looking closer at the question of transfer, the current study does not give a conclusive answer. Both for existential/spatial referent introductions and for prefield constituents, considerable individual variation was found both for native informants and L2 learners. Characteristic of the learners was that they in their L2 often adhered to the pattern they themselves used in their L1. The results of the present study point toward the importance of individual variation among learners and native speakers and possible variability between different occasions and/or situations of the learner language. The results do not exclude the possibility of transfer, but also point towards the idea of individual transfer; i.e. that the learners show the same idiosyncratic patterns in their L2 as they do in their L1. This is especially evident when looking at referent introduction in terms of existential/spatial construction, where all possible types of patterns are found in all three language varieties and the learners have the same patterns in their L2 as they do in their L1. However, it may be the case that the individual differences are so prominent in the current study because of the small size of the material. In a larger study, it may be possible to find more general trends for the different languages. Therefore, more data is needed in order to look closer into the question of transfer.

Turning now to the fourth and final research question, the conclusions found in this study, some final comments will be made. The results of the current study cast some doubt on the theory of existential and spatial perspective of referent introduction and maintenance, proposed by e.g. Carroll et al (2000) and Carroll & von Stutterheim (2003). The critique brought forward here is twofold. Firstly, there is the high amount of non-fitting, presupposed cases: the binary model of Carroll et al (2000) does not mention or include such cases. Secondly, there are the highly individual patterns found in the current study: There existence casts doubt on how easily, without backing up this classification quantitatively, Carroll et al (2000) place languages into the binary system as being ‘existential’ or ‘spatial’. Large-scale studies, with carefully chosen genres are called for in order to determine whether or not any
differences exist between native Swedish and Dutch, as well as to look deeper into the question of the non-fitting cases; however, the results of the current study indicate that the system used by e.g. Carroll et al (2000) may be overly simplified.

Bohnacker (e.g. 2010) and Bohnacker & Rosén (e.g. 2009) argue that Swedish, as compared to German, has a higher tendency to place phonologically ‘light’ elements, i.e. subjects and especially expletives, in the prefield and to place ‘heavier’ elements, such as adverbials, later in the clause. The results of the current study, both of the oral and written material, support this, in the sense that the prefield in the Swedish data indeed contains many light elements, including expletives. Interesting to note is that in the oral material, Dutch L1 also follows this principle, with a majority (two thirds) of subject-initial clauses, whereas in the written material, the pattern of Dutch L1 is more similar to the figures found by Bohnacker & Rosén (2009) for German (50% adverbial-initial clauses in German L1 as compared to 42,5% for Dutch L1 in the current study). The figure found for the Dutch L1 oral material is also similar to the figure (ca 70% subject-initial clauses) found for oral Dutch L1 in Bouma (2008). More studies are called for here, to shed light on the relation between Dutch, German and Swedish as well as other closely related Germanic languages.

Earlier studies have shown that languages structure information in different ways and that learners have problems accommodating to the patterns of the L2 regarding the use of the prefield and patterns of theme-rheme (e.g. Bohnacker & Rosén 2009) and referent introductions and maintenance (Carroll & von Stutterheim 2003). The results of the current study indicate that learners may have some problems adjusting to the patterns of the target language concerning distribution patterns of prefield elements and referent maintenance, but also that the patterns found for native Swedish and Dutch are not radically different for all genres; for oral picture descriptions the distribution patterns of prefield constituents are very similar. However, more studies of Dutch and Swedish are needed in order to validate the results of the current study.

6.2 Problems & weaknesses with the study

I have not experienced any problems regarding data collection or analysis. This may be related to the relatively simple and straight-forward method of analysis.

As was the case with my earlier pilot study (Lindgren 2009b), the amount of data collected in the current study is small, though larger than the one analysed in the pilot study. This means that the conclusions drawn should be viewed only as indicating potential differences between the languages. The small size of the sample should be regarded as the
main weakness with the current study. One further potential weakness may be the difference in genres between the oral and the written material, which does not allow a simple comparison. However, this only means that one has to be more careful when drawing conclusions from the current study. The type of written data used (narratives) also meant that it was not possible to study referent introduction and maintenance for the written material for two reasons: 1) there were few referents introduced in the text, since it was centred mainly around activities and not objects and 2) the objects introduced in the narratives differed between the different speakers and therefore the results from the different speakers would not have been comparable in a completely meaningful way.

6.3 Suggestions for future research

Below four suggestions for possible future research projects are made. Since language acquisition for the language combination Dutch/Swedish has not been widely researched, these four proposals are but among many possible ones. I have limited myself to suggestions for further research on the same language pair and with the same focus as in the current study.

- To collect a larger amount of similar data, from more Dutch L1 learners and Swedish L1 native controls, in order to be able to see if the results from the current study are stable for a larger group. In addition to this, it would be valuable to collect Dutch L1 data from speakers who do not speak Swedish (or another Scandinavian language) to see if the results from the Dutch L1 speakers in this study are influenced by the fact that they have learned Swedish (and are aware of the fact that the tasks performed in Dutch L1 are also to be performed in Swedish L2).

- To collect data from the reverse language combination, i.e. from Swedish L1 learners of Dutch L2. This would be interesting and give further insights into how these closely related languages interact with each other and how learners cope with subtle information structural differences for this combination. It would also be of interest to study Swedish-Dutch bilingual speakers to see if their patterns differ from monolingual speakers of Dutch/Swedish and learners of the languages.

- To collect data from other genres on referent introduction and maintenance and prefield constituents both from Dutch L1/Swedish L2 and Swedish L1/Dutch L2.
- To compare the results for the prefield constituents and referent introduction and maintenance with data from a translation corpus, preferably one that contains both Dutch and Swedish original texts, as well as their translations (See Rawoens 2010 for more about the compilation of such a corpus).
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Appendix 1: Questions about language skills

The following questions were answered in writing by the learners. The questions were given to the learners in Swedish. Here both Swedish and English versions of the questions are included.

**Svenska - Swedish**

- Hur gammal var du när du började lära dig svenska? How old were you when you started to learn Swedish?
- Hur länge har du studerat/lärt dig svenska? (räkna antalet månader/år). For how long have you studied/learned Swedish? (Count the number of months/years).
- Har du haft någon formell undervisning? Did you have any formal instruction?
- Om ja, hur många timmars undervisning skulle du uppskatta att du haft? If yes, how many hours would you estimate that you have had?
- Har du bott i Sverige? Have you lived in Sweden?
- Om ja, hur länge? (räkna den totala tiden som du varit i Sverige). If yes, for how long? (Count the total time you have been in Sweden).
- Har du gjort något test för att bedöma din nivå? Have you done any test to assess your level?
- Var skulle du placera dig på Europarådets skala för språkkunskaper (nivåer A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, C2)? Where on the Council of Europe’s scale of language skills (levels A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, C2) would you place yourself?

**Andra språk - Other languages**

- Vilka andra språk talar du? Which other languages do you speak?
- När började du lära dig dessa språk? When did you start to learn these languages?
- Hur många år har du lärt dig språken? For how many years have you learned the languages?
- Har du endast lärt dig dessa språk i skolan/på universitetet eller har du även bott i något land där man talar språket? Have you only learned these languages t school/university or did you also live in a country where the language is spoken?
- Hur väl talar du språken? (nybörjare, ganska bra, flytande etc.) How well do you speak the languages? (beginner, fairly well, fluent, etc.)
Appendix 2: Detailed information about the data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WA</th>
<th>OA Picture 1</th>
<th>OA Picture 2</th>
<th>Total OA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dutch L1*</td>
<td>words clauses</td>
<td>length words clauses</td>
<td>length words clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native 1</td>
<td>347 26</td>
<td>01:27 187 17</td>
<td>02:05 223 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native 2</td>
<td>422 31</td>
<td>02:16 303 34</td>
<td>02:56 405 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native 3</td>
<td>374 34</td>
<td>03:13 236 27</td>
<td>04:59 371 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native 4</td>
<td>493 30</td>
<td>03:19 418 33</td>
<td>03:01 429 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native 5</td>
<td>380 27</td>
<td>01:53 252 22</td>
<td>02:12 273 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native 6</td>
<td>713 59</td>
<td>01:16 136 12</td>
<td>01:18 150 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* all natives are the same as the Swedish L2 learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Swed. L1</th>
<th>words clauses</th>
<th>length words clauses</th>
<th>length words clauses</th>
<th>length words clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native C 1</td>
<td>639 51</td>
<td>02:16 337 26</td>
<td>02:49 338 16</td>
<td>05:05 675 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native C 2</td>
<td>390 37</td>
<td>03:13 225 17</td>
<td>02:50 174 14</td>
<td>06:03 399 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native C 3</td>
<td>398 28</td>
<td>02:30 249 21</td>
<td>03:22 363 36</td>
<td>05:52 612 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native C 4</td>
<td>498 45</td>
<td>01:36 207 19</td>
<td>02:15 323 34</td>
<td>03:51 530 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native C 5</td>
<td>398 24</td>
<td>01:22 113 14</td>
<td>01:47 223 16</td>
<td>03:09 336 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native C 6</td>
<td>471 18</td>
<td>04:42 532 46</td>
<td>02:38 277 27</td>
<td>07:20 809 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2794 203</td>
<td>15:39 1663 143</td>
<td>15:41 1698 145</td>
<td>31:20 3361 288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Swed. L2</th>
<th>words clauses</th>
<th>length words clauses</th>
<th>length words clauses</th>
<th>length words clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learner 1</td>
<td>346 32</td>
<td>02:45 229 20</td>
<td>04:56 440 38</td>
<td>07:41 629 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner 2</td>
<td>320 36</td>
<td>03:05 237 31</td>
<td>04:06 335 29</td>
<td>07:11 572 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner 3</td>
<td>480 48</td>
<td>04:59 334 28</td>
<td>05:31 385 29</td>
<td>10:30 719 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner 4</td>
<td>538 54</td>
<td>03:01 367 36</td>
<td>03:22 449 32</td>
<td>06:23 816 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner 5</td>
<td>267 29</td>
<td>05:07 352 31</td>
<td>04:23 262 22</td>
<td>09:30 614 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner 6</td>
<td>402 42</td>
<td>02:32 135 17</td>
<td>02:23 140 16</td>
<td>04:55 275 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2353 241</td>
<td>21:29 1654 163</td>
<td>24:41 2011 166</td>
<td>46:10 3625 329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WA = Written Assignment  OA = Oral Assignment
Appendix 3: The pictures for the oral task

Picture 1

Picture 2
Appendix 4: Instructions for the written task

**Instruktioner för skriftlig uppgift (svenska - Swedish)**
Skriv en berättelse om vad du har gjort den senaste veckan. Försök att vara så detaljerad som möjligt. Tänk inte på stavningen - den är inte viktig! Du har 20min på dig för denna uppgift.

**Instructies voor schriftelijke opdracht (nederlands - Dutch)**
Schrijf een verhaal over wat je laatste week hebt gedaan. Probeer zo vele details als mogelijk te geven. Denk niet aan de spelling - die is niet belangrijk. Je hebt 20min voor deze opdracht.

**Instructions for the written task (English)**
Write a story about what you have done last week. Try to be as detailed as possible. Don’t think about the spelling - it is not important! You have 20min to complete this task.
### Appendix 5: Raw figures for prefield constituents

#### Oral material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral Prefield</th>
<th>Swedish L1</th>
<th>Swedish L2</th>
<th>Dutch L1</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. expletives</td>
<td>66,4%</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>63,6%</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. pronouns</td>
<td>22,9%</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>19,9%</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. full NP's</td>
<td>16,5%</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>23,8%</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Adverbials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. time</td>
<td>32,6%</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>34,9%</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. place</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>26,8%</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. pron advl</td>
<td>16,5%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3,4%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. other</td>
<td>0,7%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1,7%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Objects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,5%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100% Σ288

#### Written material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Prefield</th>
<th>Swedish L1</th>
<th>Swedish L2</th>
<th>Dutch L1</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. expletive</td>
<td>64,3%</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>48,3%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. pronouns</td>
<td>32,6%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42,5%</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. full NP's</td>
<td>10,4%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6,8%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. left out</td>
<td>6,9%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Adverbials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. time*</td>
<td>29,2%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>42,5%</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. place</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3,4%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. pron advl</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. other</td>
<td>6,4%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4,3%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Objects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,4%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Clause</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Predicative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0,5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100% Σ203