



Western Norway  
University of  
Applied Sciences

# MASTER'S THESIS

A comparison of Norwegian learners'  
adverbial placement in English and  
Norwegian written texts.

**Charlotte Lie Mathisen**

Master's in Education with English Didactics  
Department of Language, Literature, Mathematics and  
Interpreting

Stephanie Hazel Wold

15.09.2020

I confirm that the work is self-prepared and that references/source references to all sources used in the work are provided, cf. Regulation relating to academic studies and examinations at the Western Norway University of Applied Sciences (HVL), § 10.

## Acknowledgements

I am grateful to my supervisor Stephanie for guiding me through the writing process as well as providing me with invaluable feedback both regarding the topic and grammatical correctness. Even after the corona virus arrived Norway and the campuses closed, Stephanie still guided me online on zoom-meetings and kept answering my questions regarding the research project via online-chatting on the Canvas platform. Thanks to her guidance and help, an MA thesis was created. I would also like to thank all the participants, without whom this study would not have been possible.

## Abstract in Norwegian

I forskningsprosjektet har fokuset vært å sammenligne adverbialplassering i norske og engelske elevtekster, skrevet av elever i en 7. klasse på en norsk barneskole. Hovedfokuset var på hvor elevene plasserer adverbialer og om det var mulig å oppdage tegn på overføring av norske strategier vedrørende adverbialplassering når det gjaldt elevenes engelske L2-skriving. For å besvare dette, ble følgende problemstilling tatt i bruk: 1) Er det forskjeller i bruk av adverbialer, særlig med tanke på plassering, når elever i en 7. klasse skriver L1 norske og L2 engelske tekster? For å besvare denne problemstillingen, valgte jeg fem delspørsmål: a) er det forskjell på antall adverbialer i norske og engelske elevtekster, b) er det forskjell på antall *adverbialplasseringer* i norske og engelske elevtekster, c) er det forskjeller på antall *adverbialtyper* i norske og engelske elevtekster, d) er det sammenheng mellom adverbialtyper og plassering i norske og engelske elevtekster, og e) er det indikasjoner på norsk L1 påvirkning vedrørende adverbialplassering i elevenes engelske tekster. For å identifisere tverrspråklig påvirkning, ble Jarvis' metode og de tre bevisene, intragroup homogeneity, crosslinguistic congruity og intergroup heterogeneity, tatt i bruk. Metoden som ble brukt hadde en kvantitativ tilnærming av tekstanalyse i form av en innholdsanalyse. For å få innsyn i elevenes L1 og eventuell annen språklig innflytelse, ble spørreundersøkelse benyttet. For å identifisere tverrspråklig påvirkning, ble Jarvis' metode og de tre bevisene, intragroup homogeneity, crosslinguistic congruity og intergroup heterogeneity, tatt i bruk. I forskningsprosjektet ble det avdekket funn om elevers læring av et andrespråk, og at det til en viss grad kunne vise seg å være funn av overføring fra elevenes L1 når de skrev tekster på deres L2-språk.

## Abstract in English

The main focus of the present research project has been to compare adverbial placement in Norwegian and English pupils' texts written by pupils in a 7th grade in a Norwegian primary school. The aim of the study was to investigate where the pupils place the adverbials, and if it was possible to discover transfer patterns from Norwegian strategies regarding adverbial placement in the pupils' English L2 writing. Therefore, the following research question was asked: 1) Are there differences in the use of adverbials, particularly with regard to placement, when pupils in a Norwegian 7<sup>th</sup> grade are writing L1 Norwegian and L2 English texts? To answer the research question, five sub-questions were chosen: a) Is there any difference in the overall frequency of adverbials in the English and Norwegian texts? b) Are there differences regarding the frequency of adverbial *placements* in the Norwegian and English texts? c) Are there differences regarding the frequency of adverbial *types* in the Norwegian and English texts? d) Is there a correlation between adverbial placement and adverbial type in the Norwegian and English texts? e) Are there any indications of Norwegian L1 influence regarding adverbial placement in the pupils' English texts? A quantitative approach of content analysis was used in the study. To get insight in the pupils L1 and other possible influential languages, a questionnaire was used. When identifying crosslinguistic influence, Jarvis' method and the three evidence, intragroup homogeneity, crosslinguistic congruity and intergroup heterogeneity, were used. In the present research project, possible transfer from pupils' Norwegian L1 word order and adverbial placement in their English L2 texts were discovered.

## Innhold

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Acknowledgements .....                       | ii  |
| Abstract in Norwegian .....                  | ii  |
| Abstract in English.....                     | iii |
| 1 Introduction.....                          | 1   |
| 1.1 The importance of grammar .....          | 1   |
| 1.2 Aim and scope .....                      | 2   |
| 1.3 Defining the project.....                | 3   |
| 1.4 The variables studied .....              | 3   |
| 1.5 Research questions and hypothesis .....  | 3   |
| 1.6 Structure of the thesis .....            | 4   |
| 2 Theoretical foundation.....                | 5   |
| 2.1 Language acquisition .....               | 5   |
| 2.1.1 Interlingual identification.....       | 5   |
| 2.1.2 Learning syntax .....                  | 6   |
| 2.1.3 Contrastive analysis .....             | 6   |
| 2.2 Adverbials in English .....              | 8   |
| 2.2.1 Adjuncts .....                         | 9   |
| 2.2.2 Subjuncts .....                        | 12  |
| 2.2.3 Disjuncts .....                        | 14  |
| 2.2.4 Conjuncts .....                        | 16  |
| 2.2.5 Summary of adverbial types .....       | 17  |
| 2.2.6 Placement of English adverbials .....  | 18  |
| 2.2.7 English word order.....                | 21  |
| 2.3 Adverbials in Norwegian.....             | 22  |
| 2.3.1 Obligatory adverbials .....            | 23  |
| 2.3.2 Optional adverbials .....              | 23  |
| 2.3.3 Sentence adverbials.....               | 24  |
| 2.3.4 Placement of Norwegian adverbials..... | 24  |

|       |   |    |
|-------|---|----|
| 2.3.5 | Norwegian word order .....                          | 27 |
| 2.4   | Contrastive points in placement of adverbials ..... | 28 |
| 2.5   | Summary of adverbial placement.....                 | 29 |
| 2.6   | Previous research .....                             | 31 |
| 2.6.1 | Su (2001) .....                                     | 31 |
| 2.6.2 | Truelson (2017) .....                               | 33 |
| 2.6.3 | Selinker (1983) .....                               | 34 |
| 2.6.4 | Summary of the three studies.....                   | 35 |
| 3     | Method .....  | 36 |
| 3.1   | Investigating crosslinguistic influence.....        | 36 |
| 3.2   | Intersubjective approach .....                      | 37 |
| 3.3   | Cross-sectional study .....                         | 38 |
| 3.4   | Evidence of crosslinguistic influence .....         | 38 |
| 3.5   | Quantitative approach.....                          | 40 |
| 3.6   | Textual analysis and content analysis.....          | 40 |
| 3.7   | Background information/questionnaire .....          | 41 |
| 3.8   | Data collection .....                               | 42 |
| 3.8.1 | Type of task and topic .....                        | 42 |
| 3.8.2 | Ethical concerns .....                              | 43 |
| 3.8.3 | Participants.....                                   | 44 |
| 3.8.4 | Computer or pen and paper?.....                     | 45 |
| 3.8.5 | Data analysis.....                                  | 46 |
| 3.8.6 | Shortcomings.....                                   | 47 |
| 4     | Analysis and discussion .....                       | 48 |
| 4.1   | Frequency .....                                     | 48 |
| 4.2   | Placement .....                                     | 50 |
| 4.2.1 | Comparison of adverbial placement .....             | 51 |
| 4.2.2 | Word order .....                                    | 52 |
| 4.3   | Type.....   | 54 |
| 4.3.1 | Main groups.....                                    | 55 |

|       |                                |    |
|-------|--------------------------------|----|
| 4.3.2 | Sub-groups.....                | 56 |
| 4.4   | Types and placement.....       | 57 |
| 4.4.1 | Placement in main groups ..... | 58 |
| 4.4.2 | Placement in sub-groups .....  | 62 |
| 4.5   | Norwegian influence .....      | 64 |
| 4.5.1 | Evidence 1 .....               | 64 |
| 4.5.2 | Evidence 2.....                | 65 |
| 4.5.3 | Evidence 3.....                | 66 |
| 5     | Conclusions.....               | 71 |
|       | References .....               | 73 |
|       | Appendix.....                  | 76 |

## List of tables

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Table 1: Adverbial types .....  | 17 |
| Table 2: English adverbial placement .....  | 21 |
| Table 3: Type and placement of adverbials in English and Norwegian .....                          | 30 |
| Table 4: Analysis tool .....  | 46 |
| Table 5: Overview of number of clauses by language .....  | 49 |
| Table 6: Overview of number of clauses by gender .....  | 49 |
| Table 7: Clauses and placement .....  | 49 |
| Table 8: Overview of number of clauses by language and gender .....                               | 49 |
| Table 9: Adverbial frequency by language .....  | 50 |
| Table 10: Adverbial placement by language and gender .....  | 52 |
| Table 11: Adverbial types by language and gender .....  | 56 |
| Table 12: Sub-groups of adverbial types by language .....   | 57 |
| Table 13: Adverbial types and placement .....   | 58 |
| Table 14: Adverbial types and placement in English texts by gender .....                          | 60 |
| Table 15: Adverbial types and placement in Norwegian texts by gender .....                        | 61 |
| Table 16: Sub-groups of adverbial types and placement in English texts .....                      | 63 |
| Table 17: Sub-groups of adverbial types and placement in Norwegian texts .....                    | 64 |
| Table 18: Individual comparison of adverbials placed in initial position in English texts .....   | 67 |
| Table 19: Individual comparison of adverbials placed in medial position in English texts .....    | 67 |
| Table 20: Individual comparison of adverbials placed in final position in English texts .....     | 68 |
| Table 21: Individual comparison of adverbials placed in initial position in Norwegian texts ..... | 69 |
| Table 22: Individual comparison of adverbials placed in medial position in Norwegian texts .....  | 69 |
| Table 23: Individual comparison of adverbials placed in final position in Norwegian texts .....   | 70 |

# 1 Introduction

The introduction presents the importance of grammar and how teachers and pupils can benefit from increasing their knowledge of grammar. The aim and scope of the current research project will be outlined, the project and the variables investigated in the study will be explained, and the chosen research questions and hypotheses of the current project and the structuring of the MA thesis will be presented.

According to Ortega (2013), humans use language to “make meaning and communicate with other fellow humans” (Ibid, p. 1). This can be interpreted in the way that an important aspect of language learning is the ability to make other people understand what is meant. In this case, people may not think of grammar and syntax as the most important aspects of language learning. What might not be considered is that the structuring of a sentence may affect the meaning and the focus, which makes syntax relevant also in language understanding. An example where syntax alters the meaning in a sentence, is presented in sentences 1 and 2 below.

- 1) *The dog (S) chased (V) the girl with the big teeth (dO).*
- 2) *The dog with the big teeth (S) chased (V) the girl (dO).*

The syntax of sentence 1 has focus on the girl’s big teeth, while sentence 2 focuses on the dog’s big teeth. In this case, it can seem like the change in syntax from sentence 1 to sentence 2, is significant. By changing the phrase *with the big teeth* from the object to the subject of the sentence, the meaning is changed from being a dental problem for the poor girl with the big teeth to involve the scary dog’s big teeth.

## 1.1 The importance of grammar

Dypedahl, Hasselgård & Løken (2016) quote David Crystal in saying that grammar is when a language is taken to pieces, to find out how it works (p. 11). A problem of taking something apart is that it is likely to lose its function. Therefore, it is important to piece the language back together when the form and function is learned about (Ibid, p. 11).

According to Myhill, Jones, Lines & Watson (2011), the debate regarding grammar’s place in the English curriculum has been a hot topic for more than fifty years (p. 1). During the past



thirty years, research in the linguistic field has led to greater understanding of how language works, how it is acquired by learners, how it is developed, what it is like to be bilingual and how languages act similarly or differently. Awareness of language structures and increased knowledge of linguistic areas can make it possible to analyse development of reading and writing, and to discover patterns of error (Ibid, pp. 1-2). Increased knowledge regarding learner language development can be beneficial to teachers in the way that they can evaluate teaching methods which, based on the new information, will be considered reasonable to expect the learners to manage (Lightbown & Spada, 2013, p. 40).

A better understanding of how language works in different contexts may have a positive effect on learning literacy. Linguistic knowledge has the potential of improving approaches to language study in classrooms. Myhill et al., (2011) refer to Hudson (2004) when claiming that education needs linguistics, distinguishing between grammar in its traditional form (prescriptive) and grammar in its modern form (descriptive) (p. 2). Many teachers are still sceptical to grammar teaching, and some teachers even consider it to be harmful for pupils' language learning (Ibid, p. 2).

According to Hognestad (2013), the pupils' texts and their development of writing throughout primary school is mentioned as important reasons for the teacher to have knowledge of syntax (p. 162). Syntactic knowledge is also considered an important aspect when teachers evaluate teaching aids. To judge whether a text is easy or difficult for the pupils to read, it is not only dependent on the vocabulary in it, but it is also highly dependent on the sentence structure (Ibid, p. 162).

## **1.2 Aim and scope**

The aim of the research project is to investigate adverbial placement. The research project will focus on the adverbial placement in Norwegian and English pupils' texts written by 14 pupils in a Norwegian primary school. Pupils in a 7<sup>th</sup> grade were chosen as participants in the research project, due to an expectation that their sentence structures would be more complex compared to lower levels. More complex sentence structures are desired because it could hopefully provide the data material with a larger quantity of adverbials.

### **1.3 Defining the project**

The research project will not involve all syntactic variation but will involve adverbial placement among 14 pupils in a Norwegian 7<sup>th</sup> grade. This choice is based on a wish to compare their use of Norwegian and English sentence structure. In an MA thesis, it is difficult to look at all syntactic features in both the Norwegian and English language. After having read previous research in this area and discovered how adverbial placement in the two languages may vary, I decided to investigate this syntactic aspect further. The relevant differences between Norwegian and English adverbial placement will be outlined in chapter 2.

### **1.4 The variables studied**

The research project investigates the placement of adverbials in pupils' text production and compares their Norwegian and English writing. When comparing the adverbial placement in the two languages, I considered it important to have a look at learner acquisition and the way learners' L1 may or may not affect their use of English L2. Placement of adverbials: initial, medial and final, are investigated in both Norwegian and English pupils' texts. Different adverbial types: adjuncts, disjuncts, subjuncts and conjuncts in both Norwegian and English texts, are commented on. The different adverbial types in both languages are counted, and then compared in a contrastive analysis to see whether adverbial placement depends on type and whether there are differences regarding placement in the two languages. With these variables in mind, research questions were created.

### **1.5 Research questions and hypothesis**

According to Hatch & Lazaraton (1991), research, in the scientific sense, is categorized as "the organized, systematic search for answers to the questions we ask" (p. 1). The current research project has taken a quantitative approach and will be based on an organized and systematic way of answering the chosen research questions of the present study.

The main research question of the current study is:

- 1) Are there differences in the use of adverbials, particularly with regard to placement, when pupils in a Norwegian 7<sup>th</sup> grade are writing L1 Norwegian and L2 English texts?

The sub-questions are:

- a) Is there any difference in the overall frequency of adverbials in the English and Norwegian texts?
- b) Are there differences regarding the frequency of adverbial *placements* in the Norwegian and English texts?
- c) Are there differences regarding the frequency of adverbial *types* in the Norwegian and English texts?
- d) Is there a correlation between adverbial placement and adverbial type in the Norwegian and English texts?
- e) Are there any indications of Norwegian L1 influence regarding adverbial placement in the pupils' English texts?

The research hypothesis, or the alternative hypothesis, is that Norwegian learners of English L2 may transfer adverbial placement from their L1 when writing English texts. The null hypothesis is that there is no syntactic transfer from Norwegian learners' L1 to their L2 regarding adverbial placement. The alternative hypothesis is a directional hypothesis, meaning that there is an expectation about the behaviour of the participants (Levshina, 2015, p. 9).

## **1.6 Structure of the thesis**

Chapter one presents a brief introduction of the MA thesis. The second chapter presents the theoretical foundation of the present study which I consider important knowledge to possess when analysing the pupils' texts, including explanation of language acquisition, adverbials in English and Norwegian and their most common placement. The methods of the current research project are presented in chapter three, and aims to outline research methods, data collection and levels of analysis. The fourth chapter includes both analysis and discussion of the gathered data material. The analysis consists of quantitative statistics which show in numbers how often or seldom different adverbial types are used in initial, medial and end position, and the results are commented on. Chapter five offers concluding remarks on the current study.

## 2 Theoretical foundation

This chapter presents the theoretical foundation of the current research project. The theory is structured to better be able to answer the research questions and hypothesis, and is divided into language acquisition, adverbials in English, adverbials in Norwegian, contrastive points in adverbial placement, and previous research.

### 2.1 Language acquisition

Lightbown & Spada (2013) state the obvious, that “all second language learners (...) have already acquired at least one language” (p. 36). Ortega (2013) says that L2 acquirers have knowledge of an L1 and that they often have knowledge of other languages when they start learning the additional language (p. 31). Learners' previous language knowledge may have an impact on the development of their L2 acquisition, either in a positive or a negative way (Ortega, 2013, p. 31). The positive aspect is that learners may get an idea of how languages work, while the negative aspect is that learners' knowledge of other languages can result in errors which L1 learners would not make, where the errors would be based on guesses regarding how the second language works (Lightbown & Spada, 2013, p. 36).

#### 2.1.1 *Interlingual identification*

Odlin (2003) defines interlingual identifications as "the judgment that something in the native language and something in the target language are similar" (p. 454). Interlingual identifications do not necessarily need to involve consciousness, as transfer often occurs subconsciously. According to Ortega (2013), interlingual identifications are affected by three factors. These factors include 1) the L2 phenomenon and the forces that shape its development, 2) learners' perceptions and intuitions of transfer and distance between the L1 and the L2 and 3) learners' relative level of proficiency (pp. 33-34). In the present research project, there will be focus on the first aspect of interlingual identifications, because L1 influence is one of the forces that shape L2 development. Even though it is not possible for L1 transfer to radically alter the route of L2 acquisition, it can affect the rate of learners' progress of development (Ortega, 2013, pp. 34-35). The aspect of influence between the learners' L1 and the L2 is compared in the present study, and similarities between Norwegian and English adverbial placement will be discussed in the analysis part of section 4.

### *2.1.2 Learning syntax*

Syntax has been assumed to be immune to crosslinguistic influence effects. Yet, studies, e.g. by Su (2001), Truelson (2017) and Selinker (1983), have shown examples of syntactic transfer in various types of data. This will be elaborated on in chapter 2.6 regarding previous research. Syntactic transfer includes both word order and gamuts of well-formedness constraints and has been discovered in production and reception (Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2010, p. 96). The present study investigates pupils' production of language. A future study could focus on the receptive domain of language.

### *2.1.3 Contrastive analysis*

In the 1950s and 1960s, Contrastive Analysis was introduced as methodology. The Contrastive Analysis implied that the L2 difficulties experienced by particular learner groups with the same L1, were caused by differences between the L1 and the L2. Researchers started comparing differences and similarities between two languages. The theory was that systematic comparisons between the L1 and the L2 could make it possible for teachers and researchers to predict when negative transfer would find place. It was believed that it could be possible to discover patterns of which errors would be made by specific L1 background groups of L2 learners. In the 1960s and 1970s, researchers started analysing actual learner language and conducting research projects using new methodologies of first Error Analysis and then Performance Analysis. The research from this showed that it was not the case that linguistic knowledge and linguistic behaviour was "slavishly determined" by differences in learners' L1 and L2. Researchers found that similarities between learners' L1 and L2 do not necessarily help. The other way around, researchers found that certain differences between L1 and L2 cause no attested difficulties in the regards of L2 learning. Because of these types of findings, Contrastive Analysis was largely abandoned (Ortega, 2013, pp. 31-32). According to Kellerman (1997), the change in the 1970s was initiated by Chomsky, who started a revolution in linguistic thinking, where the result was a new research area called second language acquisition (SLA) (p. 267). A new and radical way of thinking was that the influence of L1 was overrated and that second language learning was like starting from the beginning with a first language. Kellerman also states how several researchers found errors that showed a considerable percentage which was not possible to trace back to the first language, which was already anticipated by French in 1949. This activity resulted in the thought that one should rather consider the origins of experiences regarding difficulties, than

predicting what is not possible to predict in the linguistic field of comparison. In Kellerman's research, he found himself in between the theory of the L1 influence on the L2 and the theory considering L1 and L2 learning equal (Kellerman, 1997, pp. 276-279).

Kellerman (1997) discusses different cases regarding second language acquisition theory and learning of a language which is typologically close to the mother tongue (p. 275). He looked particularly at the Dutch and the English language, which share similar language features, and this makes it relatable to research projects regarding English and Norwegian. Even though Norwegian and English have quite similar sentence structures, there are still some differences, which lead to the question of how these differences are handled by learners who are acquiring a typologically related language. One of these differences are that Norwegian is a V2-language, while English has SVO-order. This will be further explained in chapters 2.2.6 and 2.3.5 in the present study.

Although Kellerman tried not to focus on the behaviouristic theory regarding L1 influence, which says that language learning is a verbal behaviour, he found that a lot of Dutch learners of English L2 made the same types of errors. This made him think that it could not just be a coincidence. According to Kellerman (1997), intuitions which limit the possibility of something being transferred from the L1, could not be predicted based on just a structural comparison between two languages (p. 279). He points out that the probability of it being easier to learn a related language is higher than when learning an exotic language. To investigate whether it is easier for learners to learn a language which is related to their L1, he looked at psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic factors which are important in shaping the transfer of L1 structures. He found it more likely to discover constraints when the languages were related because of the similarities and because they would not have been learned in the classroom, and that the constraints are theoretically interesting because they see through the principle of "similar is simpler". Kellerman (1997) found that Dutch learners can make errors which are unpredictable and that they are systematically not using their L1 when they could have done so, which shows that L1 can influence L2 in more than one way (Ibid, pp. 278-281). This means that learners' L1 can also influence their L2 learning in the way that the learners avoid using structures of their L1 because they consider them incorrect even though it could be perfectly correct usage in their L2 as well. In the present study, there may be occurrences where pupils have changed their English sentence structures when they could have kept the Norwegian structure. In the present research project, it will be investigated

whether the Norwegian L1 learners of English L2 have chosen similar or different sentence structures regarding their placement of adverbials in the Norwegian and English texts.

Kellerman (1997) discovered that Dutch learners of English L2 could reach a high level of proficiency without having to spend longer periods in English-speaking countries (p. 289). In the present research project, some of the pupils have spent years in English-speaking countries, which could be considered an advantage in their English writing. The way I interpret Kellermans' findings, the amount of time spent in an English-speaking country does not necessarily correlate with the learners' English L2 writing skills. This means that pupils who have spent a couple of weeks in an English-speaking country during holiday, could possibly possess the same English writing skills as a pupil having spent years there.

“The role of the L1 in SLA is complex” (Kellerman, 1997, p. 283), even when comparing two typologically close languages like English and Norwegian. From a research and a teacher point of view it is still important to create good comparative descriptions of L1 and L2, because research on second language acquisition will provide more information regarding the topic, to better be able to understand the aspects of grammar which learners of different nationalities may struggle with (Kellerman, 1997, pp. 283 & 289). In the present research project, there will be comparisons between differences and similarities in order to discover patterns regarding adverbial placement occurring in the Norwegian and the English pupils' texts, to better be able to understand which syntactic aspects Norwegian learners of English L2 may find difficult.

## **2.2 Adverbials in English**

The fourth chapter involves distinction between different types of adverbials in English, their usual placement in sentences and English word order. Each adverbial type is separately defined, and their typical placement is presented in a paragraph following the different types of adverbials. This is done because it is considered neater to explain relevant aspects of each adverbial type, before moving on to their placements.

Adverb phrases can work as adverbials, but other phrases and clauses may also work as adverbials (Dypedahl et al., 2016, p. 84). According to Parrott (2010), adverbials are normally phrases starting with an adverb, a noun, or a preposition (p. 302).

Some examples of adverbials, influences by Dypedahl et al. (2016 p. 84), are:

- 3) *She came home yesterday* (adverb phrase).
- 4) *She came home at ten o'clock* (prepositional phrase).
- 5) *She came home last night* (noun phrase).
- 6) *She arrived a little late, because her bus was delayed* (finite dependent clause).
- 7) *Having travelled for many hours, she made it home* (non-finite dependent clause).

To find out if a phrase or a clause works as an adverbial, one must look at the meaning of the phrase or clause (Dypedahl et al., 2016, p. 84). Dypedahl et al. (2016) operate with three categories of adverbials: adjuncts, disjuncts and conjuncts (pp. 85-87). According to Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech & Svartvik (2010) there are four main types of adverbials: adjuncts, subjuncts, disjuncts and conjuncts (p. 501). The difference between the two mentioned references, is that the group of subjuncts used in Quirk et al. (2010), is within the group of adjuncts in Dypedahl et al. (2016). This may be due to the difficulty of separating subjuncts from the group of adjuncts. In this research project, the following categories of adverbials are chosen, and will be used in the analysis part: adjuncts, subjuncts, disjuncts and conjuncts.

### 2.2.1 Adjuncts

The chapter of Adjuncts will thoroughly explain different categories of adjuncts because the different types may occur in different positions. Later in the study, I will show that the different types of adjuncts will be more or less likely to occur in different positions.

Adjuncts is the only grammatical category which can appear and act like other sentence elements like subject, complement and object. In a cleft sentence, an adjunct can take the focus. Similarly, adjuncts can be compared to subject, complement and object regarding alternative interrogation or negation or the potentiality for taking the focal point of focusing subjuncts (Quirk et al., 2010, p. 504). In the following sentence: *Sarah nursed Ben due to his motorcycle accident*, it is possible to direct the focus to the subject (sentence 8), the object (sentence 9) or the adverbial (sentence 10). Example 6-10 are inspired by Quirk et al. (2010, p. 504).

- 8) *It was Sarah (S) who nursed Ben due to his motorcycle accident.*
- 9) *It was Ben (D.O.) that Sarah nursed due to his motorcycle accident.*
- 10) *It was due to his motorcycle accident (Adv.) that Sarah nursed Ben.*



The adjunct in the sentence above can be found by asking the question; “Why did Sarah nurse Ben?”. The answer to this question is the adverbial; *due to his motorcycle accident* (Quirk et al., 2010, p. 505). According to Dypedahl et al. (2016), adjuncts refer to circumstances of an action and answer questions like *when* (time), *where* (place), *how* (manner) and *why* (reason) (p. 85). Some examples of adjuncts, inspired by Dypedahl et al. (2016, p. 85), are:

11) *She intentionally (manner adjunct) kicked the football across the football field (place adjunct) because she was angry (reason adjunct).*

12) *The football practice lasted for two hours (obligatory time adjunct).*

Other questions to elicit adjuncts may start with periphrastic forms of questions *How long, How well, How much, To what extent, In what way*. General characteristics of adjuncts are already discussed, but there are three sub-categories of adjuncts: obligatory predication adjuncts, optional predication adjuncts and sentence adjuncts (Quirk et al., 2010, p. 505). The categories are separately explained below.

### Obligatory predication adjuncts

The obligatory predication adjunct has similar features to the direct object, and similarities between Verbal Object and Verbal Adjunct are shown in the Object and Adverbial fronting (sentences 13 and 14). There are still differences between the obligatory adjunct and the direct object in permitting interruption between the verbal and itself (sentences 15 and 16). In a sentence with a subjunct as adverbial, this type of interruption is rare (sentence 17). Due to the low number of verbs containing sufficient semantic meaning, it is considered common to use a complementation. Copular verbs, like *be* and *turn*, are used to link a subject with a complement or an obligatory adjunct (sentence 18). Intransitive verbs, like *disappear* and *apologize*, do not require complementation, even though adjunct-less intransitive clauses are considered rare. When adding an adjunct in intransitive clauses, the importance of the verb may be lessened (sentence 19). Some verbs contain a broad meaning regarding posture or motion, like *sit, stand, come* and *go*, and can take an obligatory adjunct of respect in the *-ing* clauses (sentence 20 below). By doing this, the meaning of the verb is weakened by the adjunct. The progressive can combine expressions of verbal inflection and obligatory adjunct of respect (sentence 21 and 22). When *come, go* and *try* take the infinitive form *to* in a clause, the obligatory adjunct takes the main focus in the sentence (sentence 23). Adjectives with

complementation (sentence 24) have less weight than adjectives without complementation (sentence 25). Prepositional verbs can be compared to, and their meaning can be weakened due to complementation of obligatory adjuncts (sentence 26 and 27 below). The prepositional verbs can be transitive with obligatory direct object or intransitive with obligatory adjunct (Quirk et al., 2010, pp. 505-510).

- 13) Ben (D.O.) *she loves* and Ben (D.O.) *she has always loved*.
- 14) In Paris (Obligatory Adjunct) *she lives* and in Paris (Obligatory Adjunct) *she has always lived*.
- 15) *She loves* at the time Ben (D.O.).
- 16) *She lives* at the time in Paris (Obligatory Adjunct).
- 17) \**She woke in bed* up (Obligatory Adjunct).
- 18) *He was a* librarian (Compliment) / *in a* hurry (Obligatory Adjunct).
- 19) *The dog* disappeared (intransitive verb) in the park (Obligatory Adjunct).
- 20) *He sat reading* to the homeless children (Obligatory Adjunct).
- 21) *They went backpacking* in Europe (Obligatory Adjunct).
- 22) *They were engaged* in the activity of backpacking (Obligatory Adjunct).
- 23) *We will try* to do better (Obligatory Adjunct).
- 24) *They are likely* to compete (Obligatory Adjunct).
- 25) *She is good* at sports (Obligatory Adjunct).
- 26) *It was* at the picture (Prepositional Phrase+ Obligatory Adjunct) *that he looked*.
- 27) *It was* the picture (D.O.) *that he looked at* (Intransitive Verb).

The examples are inspired by examples from Quirk et al., (2010, pp. 505-510).

### Optional predication adjuncts

It is not always easy to investigate whether an adjunct is obligatory or optional. In the paragraph regarding obligatory predication adjuncts, Quirk et al., (2010) state that when adding an adjunct in intransitive clauses, the semantic weight is reduced, and the importance of the verb may be lessened (pp. 505-510). In sentence 28 and 29 below, the relation between the subject and verbal is not completely changed when the adjunct is complemented. This means that any adjuncts of sentence 29 can be omitted, and the content of the sentence will still make sense and provide the reader with sufficient information. The relation between the subject and verbal in sentence 29 do not differ from the relation between the subject and

verbal in sentence 28, which makes the adjunct optional. Another way of testing if the adjunct is obligatory or optional in SVO clauses, is by investigating whether the relations between the verbal and object remain the same regardless of the adjunct's presence (sentence 30) (Quirk et al., 2010, p. 510).

28) *She (S) arrived (V).*

29) *She (S) arrived (V) (in a red dress) (Optional Adjunct).*

30) *She scratched her dog (on the stomach) (Optional Adjunct).*

The examples are based on examples in Quirk et al. (2010, p. 510).

## Sentence adjuncts

Sentence adjuncts differ from obligatory and optional predication adjuncts because they possess the relative freedom to occur at initial position and final position. In sentence 31 and 32 below, fronting can seem rather awkward, but it seems more natural to apply fronting when the two adjuncts in sentences 31 and 32 are combined (sentence 33 below). In sentence 34, *on the couch* is expected to appear further from the centre of the clause than *on the mouth*. The sentence adjunct can be detached from the clause by a comma, without needing a context to provide meaning (sentence 35) (Quirk et al., 2010, pp. 511-512).

31) *He kissed his girlfriend on the mouth.*

32) *He kissed his girlfriend on the couch.*

33) *On the couch (Sentence Adjunct), he kissed his girlfriend on the mouth (Optional Predication Adjunct).*

34) *He kissed his girlfriend on the mouth (Optional Predication Adjunct) on the couch (Sentence Adjunct).*

35) *In London (Sentence Adjunct), she studied mathematics.*

The examples above are influenced by Quirk et al. (2010, pp. 511-512).

### 2.2.2 Subjuncts

The category of subjuncts is used in Quirk et al. (2010) but is not mentioned in Dypedahl et al. (2016). The research project will compare all four groups of adverbials, including this category. According to Quirk et al. (2010), subjuncts are adverbials that to an extent take on a subordinate role (p. 566). It may be difficult to separate subjuncts from adjuncts, but the

subjuncts do not fit grammatically into the ways of discovering adjuncts. It is important to be aware that a subjunct in a sentence (sentence 36 below) can be an adjunct in another sentence (sentence 37). In sentence 36, the adverbial *visually* is used in the semantic role of respect, while the same adverbial in sentence 37 is used in the semantic role of process. There are two orientations of subjuncts: the *wide* and the *narrow orientation*. The wide orientation applies to the whole clause, while the narrow orientation applies to the individual clause elements (normally subject) or to an element which is part of a clause element (Quirk et al., 2010, p. 566-567). In the present research project, the wide orientation of subjuncts will be used in the analysis of the pupils' texts. This is a priority which is done because it is considered more relevant to the project to focus on placement of subjuncts in the wide orientation. The narrow orientation of subjuncts can seem to be more dependent on other sentence items and can seem to occur in all positions both in Norwegian and English, which makes it unnecessary to the research project to elaborate and investigate further.

36) *The film presents visually (Subjunct) a distant topic to the audience.*

37) *They viewed the film visually (Adjunct).*

The examples above are inspired by Quirk et al. (2010, pp. 566-567).

## A wide orientation of subjuncts

The wide orientation of subjuncts addresses viewpoint and courtesy. Viewpoint subjuncts are usually put together by an adjective and the suffix *-ly* (sentence 38 below) but can also consist of a noun and the suffix *-wise* (sentence 39). Adverbs ending with the suffix *-ly* (sentence 40) or which consist of the frame *from a/ an .... point of view* (sentence 41), have a corresponding participle clause or a corresponding prepositional phrase, which are also viewpoint subjuncts. Courtesy subjuncts mainly consist of a small group of adverbs which are used in expressions of propriety and politeness (sentence 42 below). That the active subject or the passive agent of a courtesy subjunct is of personal reference is important. The use of courtesy subjuncts in questions makes the questions a request (sentence 42). The adjunct *very* can modify courtesy subjuncts, but there are some exceptions. *Very* can only to an extent modify *kindly* (sentence 43 below) and the adjunct cannot modify *please* (Quirk et al., 2010, pp. 567-571).

38) *Morally (Viewpoint Subjunct), the decision is far from great.*

39) *Weatherwise (Viewpoint Subjunct), the summer will be beautiful.*

40) *Many companies suffer, economically speaking (Viewpoint Subjunct), due to the corona crisis.*

41) *He has better values from a moral point of view (Viewpoint Subjunct) than any of my closest friends.*

42) *Would you please (Courtesy Subjunct) take a seat?*

43) *He very (Adjunct of manner) kindly (Courtesy Subjunct) invited me to the prom.*

The examples are retrieved from Quirk et al. (2010, pp. 567-571) and there have been made some changes.

### 2.2.3 Disjuncts

According to Quirk et al. (2010), compared to other sentence elements, disjuncts take on a superior role and are syntactically more removed or distant and in certain cases subordinate, in the way they appear to extend over a sentence as a whole (Quirk et al., 2010, p. 613).

Dypedahl et al. (2016) consider disjuncts an expression of speakers' comment on a clause.

Some disjuncts, like *perhaps*, *certainly* and *probably*, convey speakers' evaluation of the truth value of a clause, while other disjuncts, like *luckily* or *to put it bluntly* convey opinions of what is presented or comments on the style or choice of words (Dypedahl et al., 2016, p. 85).

When writing an utterance, it can be difficult to make it completely objective, as subjective thoughts often appear implicitly expressed. The adverbials can be named disjuncts when sentences like sentence 45 below convey the same meaning as sentence 44. Sentences 44 and 45 make it clearer why disjuncts to some extent take on a superordinate role in sentences (Quirk et al., 2010, pp. 613-614).

44) *I tell you frankly (Disjunct) that she spilled the milk.*

45) *Frankly (Disjunct), she spilled the milk.*

The examples are inspired by Quirk et al. (2010, pp. 613-614).

According to Quirk et al. (2010), there are two main classes of disjuncts: *style disjuncts* and *content disjuncts* (p. 615). While style disjuncts express speakers' comments on the style and form of what is uttered by the speakers, content disjuncts observe the content of an utterance and its conditions of truth (Quirk et al., 2010, p. 615).

## Style disjuncts

Quirk et al. (2010) operate with two sub-categories of style disjuncts: 1) *modality and manner* and 2) *respect* (p. 615). Some examples of modality and manner disjuncts are *truthfully*, *frankly*, *bluntly* and *if I may say so* (sentence 46 below). This type of style disjuncts can be realized by prepositional phrases and by clauses (sentences 47 and 48). Examples of respect disjuncts are *in broad terms*, *generally*, *strictly* and *personally* (sentence 49). Respect disjuncts are often realized by longer phrases or by clauses (sentence 50 and 51). Clauses starting with *because* can also be respect style disjuncts but will be placed in final position (sentence 52 below). In this usage, clauses of *if* and *since*, which usually behave like content disjuncts, frequently take on the role of style disjuncts. They may occur in initial, medial or final position. It is possible to reinforce a style disjunct by another to highlight the speaker's authority (Quirk et al., 2010, pp. 615-617).

46) Truthfully (Modality and Manner Style Disjunct), *I spilled the milk.*

47) Putting it bluntly (Modality and Manner Style Disjunct), *there is a limited possibility of hiring.*

48) In short (Modality and Manner Style Disjunct), *the carrot cake is perfectly imperfect.*

49) Personally (Respect Style Disjunct), *I do not feel like running.*

50) *They seemed to enjoy their meal, to judge from their facial expressions* (Respect Style Disjunct).

51) Generally speaking (Respect Style Disjunct), *there are more citizens in the cities than on the country sides.*

52) *She was new in her job, because she had to rely on her co-workers* (Respect Style Disjunct).

The examples above are retrieved from Quirk et al. (2010, pp. 615-617) and have been modified.

## Content disjuncts

According to Quirk et al. (2010), there are two sub-categories of content disjuncts: 1) *degree of truth* and 2) *value judgment* (p. 615). Some examples of the first type of content disjuncts are *really*, *certainly* and *if he'd listen* (Quirk et al., 2010, pp. 615). The first group of content disjuncts, degree of truth, comments the truth value of what is communicated. They also

express to what extent and under what circumstances the speaker believes in his own words. The degree of truth consists of three groups which express: 1) *conviction as a claim or as a perception*, 2) *an extent of doubt* and 3) *the speaker's judgment of whether his communication is truth or false*. Some examples of content disjuncts from the group of conviction are *certainly, definitely, obviously* and *evidently*. The group of doubt content disjuncts has, among others, these examples: *apparently, likely, maybe, definitely* and *clearly*. Some examples from the third group of degree of truth are *really, actually, only, officially, theoretically* and *basically* (Quirk et al., 2010, pp. 620-621).

Examples of value judgment disjuncts are *understandably, wisely* and *to everyone's surprise* (Quirk et al., 2010, p. 615). The second group of content disjuncts, value judgment, express evaluation of or attitude towards what is communicated. Value judgment can be realized by phrases and clauses which are prepositional. The group of value judgment consists of two groups which express: 1) *judgment of what is communicated where the same judgment is usually applied to the subject in the clause* and 2) *judgment which does not necessarily apply to the subject in the clause*. Some examples of content disjuncts from the first group of value judgment are *correctly, incorrectly, rightly, wrongly, foolishly, reasonably, unreasonably, wisely* and *unwisely*, while some examples from the second group of value judgment are *remarkably, incredibly, suspiciously, unexpectedly, naturally, understandably, annoyingly, pleasingly, fortunately, unfortunately, happily, unhappily, luckily, unluckily, sadly* and *hopefully* (Quirk et al., 2010, pp. 621-622).

#### 2.2.4 Conjuncts

Conjuncts are used to mark connections between paragraphs (*first, secondly, finally, to conclude*), clauses and sentences (*furthermore, thus/ therefore, alternatively, incidentally*) (Dypedahl et al., 2016, p. 85). Conjuncts and disjuncts share some similar features when taking on a relatively detached superordinate role compared to other clause elements, but conjuncts still have some conjunct-specific semantic roles, like the ability of combining independent units. The units can be of different sizes: sizing from smaller constituents of a phrase realizing an element of a clause, to bigger units like sentences, paragraphs or bigger text parts (sentences 53 and 54 below) (Quirk et al., 2010, pp. 631-632).

53) *She is a great supervisor, a broadcaster of some experience, and a respected woman.*

*In addition, she has taught me a lot of life itself.*

54) *With support and guidance from my supervisor, I have become a hardworking, patient, reflecting, and in addition highly efficient student.*

The examples above are inspired by Quirk et al. (2010, pp. 631-632).

Quirk et al. (2010), distinguish between seven conjunctive roles: *listing, summative, appositional, resultive, inferential, contrastive* and *transitional*, of which the three groups of listing, contrastive and transitional also consist of different sub-groups (p. 634). The seven types of conjuncts will not be elaborated on in the present study.

### 2.2.5 Summary of adverbial types

Table 1: Adverbial types

| Adverbial type  |  | Example  |
|---|--|--|
| <b>Adjuncts modify a whole clause or the verb phrase and can be obligatory or optional because they can be needed by the verbal or work as an addition to the obligatory clause elements. It is possible to add more adjuncts in a clause, but there can only be one obligatory adjunct. Adjuncts normally answer the questions <i>when, where, how, why</i>.</b> | Place; where, where to, where from, how far?   | <i>They live <u>in Bergen</u>.</i><br><i>He wants to travel <u>to London</u>.</i><br><i>I drove <u>50 miles</u>.</i>   |
|   | Time; when, how frequent, what is the duration?                                      | <i><u>Yesterday</u> I went for a walk.</i><br><i>Tom <u>often</u> goes to the store.</i><br><i>The due date is not <u>until June</u>.</i>                      |
|   | Manner; how, using which tool?   | <i>She kissed him <u>softly with her lips</u>.</i><br><i>He travelled <u>by plane</u>.</i>   |
|   | Participant; to/by/for whom?   | <i>The film was directed <u>by Nancy Meyers</u>.</i><br><i>I gave "The Holiday" <u>to my friend</u>.</i>   |
|   | Reason; why?   | <i>He travelled <u>to meet up with his boss</u>.</i><br><i><u>Because it was Monday</u>, he was sad.</i>   |
|   | Condition; what reservation or condition?  | <i><u>If I were a millionaire</u>, I would buy an expensive yacht.</i><br><i><u>Although I am a millionaire</u>, I am not happy.</i>                           |
|   | Degree; how much, to what extent?  | <i>Harry hates homework <u>terribly</u>.</i><br><i>She loves school <u>more than she can express</u>.</i>  |
| <b>Subjuncts take on a subordinate role. The wide orientation applies to the whole clause.</b>  | Focus and approximation; focuses on another part of the sentence.                    | <i>He likes the English subject <u>in particular</u>.</i><br><i>She <u>almost</u> threw up.</i><br><i>I <u>only</u> drink soft drinks without added sugar.</i> |
|   | Courtesy; politeness and propriety.  | <i>I <u>kindly</u> offered him a favour.</i><br><i>Take a seat <u>please</u>.</i>  |
| Viewpoint; from a ... point of view.  | <i><u>Theoretically</u>, humans might find out how to survive on another planet.</i> |  |



|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  |  | <i><u>Economically</u>, it is important that the government acts.</i>   |
| <b>Disjuncts convey the speaker's comment or evaluation regarding a topic and are not an obligatory element in a sentence.</b>                       | Expresses how certain the speaker is.                              | <i>I am right, <u>certainly</u>.<br/>The film is <u>most likely</u> in the store.</i>   |
|  | Expresses the speaker's opinion or evaluation of something.        | <i><u>Unfortunately</u>, she was too late.<br/><u>To her great relief</u>, it stopped raining.<br/><u>Wisely</u>, she prepared herself for the grammar test.<br/>William is moving to another country, <u>which is sad</u>.</i>             |
|  | Expresses the comment on speaker's choice of words.                | <i>It was awful, <u>to say the least</u>.<br/><u>In other words</u>, you broke up with him.</i>   |
| <b>Conjuncts mark connections between clauses, sentences or paragraphs and help organizing the text. They are not obligatory elements in a text.</b> | Addition, contrast, similarity, exemplification, summarising, etc. | <i><u>However</u>, you misunderstood what I meant.<br/>They <u>therefore</u> decided to give their relationship a second chance.<br/><u>Furthermore</u>, the statement is false.<br/><u>To conclude</u> I will present a brief summary.</i> |

The table is based on theory from Dypedahl et al. (2016) and Quirk et al. (2010).

### 2.2.6 Placement of English adverbials

#### Placement of adjuncts

Obligatory and optional predication adjuncts are usually placed in final position. It is rather rare for predication adjuncts to be placed in initial position. Sentence adjuncts can occur both in initial and final position. When a sentence adjunct is placed in initial position, it can relate to the whole sentence (sentence 55 below). The same adjunct, when placed in final position, will usually be predicational and relate to the clause it is placed within (sentence 56) (Quirk et al., 2010, pp. 510-512).

55) *In France, (Sentence Adjunct) they travelled a lot before they settled down.*

56) *They travelled a lot before they settled down in France (Obligatory Predication Adjunct).*

The examples are based on examples in Quirk et al. (2010, pp. 510-512).

## Placement of subjuncts

While viewpoint subjuncts tend to take the initial position and are not to be graded (sentence 57 below), courtesy subjuncts usually take the medial position, with the exception of imperative clauses. In these, the courtesy subjunct *kindly* has initial position as its obligatory placement (sentence 58). Another courtesy subjunct, *please*, is usually placed initially (sentence 59) with possibilities for placement in medial position (sentence 60), and with good chances of placement in final position (sentence 61 below) (Quirk et al., 2010, pp. 569-570).

57) From a political point of view (Viewpoint Subjunct), *the issue was not easily solved.*

58) Kindly (Courtesy Subjunct) *be quiet.*

59) Please (Courtesy Subjunct) *do not be rude.*

60) *Do not* please (Courtesy Subjunct) *be rude.*

61) *Do not be rude,* please (Courtesy Subjunct).

The examples above are influenced by Quirk et al. (2010, pp. 569-570).

## Placement of disjuncts

Clauses of content disjuncts can be quite freely moved around in a question, but it is different when content adverbials are realized by adverbs. Most content disjuncts, when realized by adverbs, cannot be placed in any position of direct or indirect questions. Style disjuncts can be placed in any position (including initial position) in both direct and indirect questions (sentence 62 below). Most content disjuncts are not to be placed in imperatives, while some style disjuncts can be placed in imperatives and can even take initial position (sentence 63). Disjuncts can be placed almost anywhere in a clause structure but initial position is considered the most usual placement of a disjunct. It is normal for some of the content disjuncts with degree of truth, group 2) (sentence 64) and for all content disjuncts of value judgment, group 1) to appear in medial position. In a negative clause, it would be natural to place the disjunct in medial position (sentence 65 below) (Quirk et al., 2010, pp. 627-628).

62) Frankly (Style Disjunct), *is she even aware of it?*

63) Seriously (Style Disjunct), *keep it to yourself.*

64) *She would have* certainly (Content Disjunct) *missed her ride.*

65) *He* frankly (Style Disjunct) *does not give a damn/ He doesn't* frankly (Style Disjunct) *give a damn.*

The examples are influenced by Quirk et al. (2010, pp. 627-628).

## Placement of conjuncts

Conjuncts often go hand in hand with, and are placed immediately after, conjunctions, like *and* (Conjunction) *so* (Conjunct), *but* (Conjunction) *instead* (Conjunct), *or* (Conjunction) *else* (Conjunct). Different classes of conjuncts can work together (Sentence 66 and 67 below). The initial position is a usual position to place conjuncts, and several conjuncts very often take initial position, for example, *so*, *else*, *besides*, *again*, *still* and *yet*. When placed in initial position, it is usual for conjuncts to be followed by a comma. Many of the conjuncts are quite commonly placed in medial position, like *in other words*, *however* and *nevertheless*. The conjuncts *in other words* and the informal *though*, *anyhow* and *anyway* are often placed in final position. When placed in final position, it is usual for conjuncts to have a comma in front (Quirk et al., 2010, pp. 642-644).

66) *And so* (Resultive Conjunct) *all in all* (Summative Conjunct) *the interviewer figures that despite the candidate's nervous breakdown he has nonetheless (Concessive Conjunct) the qualities required for the job.*

67) *So* (Resultive Conjunct) *the interviewer thinks nonetheless (Concessive Conjunct) the candidate will get the job in other words (Inferential and Appositional Conjunct).*

The examples are gathered from Quirk et al. (2010, pp. 642-644) and some changes have been made.

## Summary of English adverbial placement

Table 2: English adverbial placement

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Adjuncts</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Obligatory predication adjuncts</li> <li>- Optional predication adjuncts</li> <li>- Sentence adjuncts</li> <li>- Time adjuncts</li> <li>- Place adjuncts</li> <li>- Short/ long</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Usually final position</li> <li>- Usually final position</li> <li>- Initial + final position</li> <li>- Initial (usually)</li> <li>- Initial (usually)</li> <li>- Short adjuncts in medial</li> <li>- Longer adjuncts in initial or final</li> </ul> |
| <b>Subjuncts</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Viewpoint subjuncts</li> <li>- Courtesy subjuncts</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Usually initial position</li> <li>- Usually medial position (exception: imperative clauses which can be placed in all positions)</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Disjuncts</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Short/ long</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Usually initial position but can be placed in all positions</li> <li>- Often short disjuncts</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Conjuncts</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Short/ long</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All positions (usually initial position, many can be placed medially, some take initial position)</li> <li>- Often short conjuncts</li> </ul>  |

### 2.2.7 English word order

English has the preferred word order SVO, which means that the word order of the sentence is subject, verbal, object (Hognestad, 2013, p. 161). Biber et al. (1999) claims that the flexibility of change in clause elements is rare, but that there is more flexibility for the adverbials to alter their position (p. 188). English is not a V2-language. This means that if an adverbial is moved in front of the sentence, the rest of the sentence items will be moved one place backwards in the sentence (sentences 68 and 69 below).

Fronting is not common in the English language, although it does occur. In the English language, the subject or an adverbial is usually placed at the beginning of a sentence (Dypedahl et al., 2016, pp. 166-167).

Inversion is a term which will be further elaborated on in section 2.3.5 regarding Norwegian word order, as it is not that common in the English language, because the SVO word-order usually applies even when fronting occurs (Hognestad, 2013, p. 162). According to Dypedahl et al. (2016), the subject-verbal inversion in English occurs when the subject is realized by a noun phrase with a noun as a head, and the verbal needs to consist of a simple verb phrase (p. 167). This type of inversion can arise in the following three contexts; after fronted obligatory

adverbial, after fronted participle clause and in reporting clauses. The first one will be further elaborated on because of its relevance to the research project regarding placement of adverbials. After a fronted obligatory adverbial, the subject-verbal inversion is applied. Adverbial types most suited for this are place adjuncts (sentence 70 below) (Dypedahl et al., 2016, p. 167).

68) *He (S) went (V) to school (dO).*

69) *Yesterday (Adv), he (S) went (V) to school (dO).*

70) *Next to her (ADV) played (V) a little girl (S).*

The examples above are influenced by Hognestad (2013, p. 162).

### 2.3 Adverbials in Norwegian

The fifth chapter presents Norwegian adverbials, their usual placement and word order. Each adverbial type is separately defined, and their typical placement is presented in a paragraph following the different types of adverbials. This is done because it is considered neater to explain every relevant aspect of each adverbial type, before moving on to their placements. The Norwegian adverbial types will not be as thoroughly explained as the English adverbials because I would like to rely more on the English categorization of adverbials of adjuncts, subjuncts, disjuncts and conjuncts, and then hopefully implement the following Norwegian adverbial placement of Table 2 in chapter 2.2.6 regarding Placement of English adverbials.

According to Faarlund, Lie & Vannebo (2012) adverbials are either linked to the verb or are sentence links on the outside of the predicate consisting of phrases of prepositions, adverbs, adjectives or clause (and sometimes noun phrases), which indicate the time, place, manner, reason, purpose and other similar semantic relations (p. 45). Faarlund et al. (2012) refer to *bundne adverbial* (obligatory adverbials), *frie adverbial* (optional adverbials), and *setningsadverbial* (sentence adverbials), which they choose to divide adverbials into (pp. 43-44). The division of adverbials is based on the adverbials' relation to the verbal and the predicate (Faarlund et al., 2012, p. 773). The adverbial categories presented by Faarlund et al. (2012) differ from the categories presented by Quirk et al. (2010) in section 2.2. The fact that Faarlund et al. (2012) operate with different categories of adverbials than Quirk et al. (2010), makes it difficult to compare the placement of the different adverbial types in Norwegian and English, which will be further problematized in chapter 2.5.

### 2.3.1 Obligatory adverbials

Obligatory adverbials function as complement to the verbal (Faarlund et al., 2012, p. 773). The frequency of obligatory adverbials depends on the kind of verb which is in the sentence and the adverbials are not to be switched with a different adverbial. A characteristic of the obligatory adverbials is that if the verbal is changed to “to do” (*å gjøre*), the adverbial must be removed (Ibid, p. 773). According to Faarlund et al. (2012), the obligatory adverbials are normally placed in final position in Norwegian clauses or sentences and can denote a place or a movement towards a place (sentences 71 and 72) (p. 43).

71) *Hun* (S) *bor* (V) *i byen/ ved butikken/ der* (Obligatory adv). / *She* (S) *lives* (V) *in the city/ by the store/ there* (Obligatory adv).

72) *De* (S) *dro* (V) *til landet/ gjennom landsbygden/ hit* (Obligatory adv). / *They* (S) *went* (V) *to the countryside/ through the village/ here* (Obligatory adv).

The examples above are inspired by Faarlund et al. (2012, pp. 43-44 & 773).

### 2.3.2 Optional adverbials

Optional adverbials have a freer connection to the verb and can modify the whole predicate. In this way, they can have different semantic meanings. This type of adverbials can be placed in all three positions in a Norwegian sentence or a clause (sentences 73, 74 and 75). Optional adverbials can be a preposition phrase, a sentence link, an adjective phrase, an adverb, an adverb phrase, or a noun phrase (Faarlund et al., 2012, p. 44). This type of adverbials does not function as complement to the verbal but can freely be combined with different kinds of predicates and several optional adverbials can be placed in the same sentence (sentence 76). Optional adverbials can keep their position in a sentence even if the verb is replaced with “to do” (Ibid, p. 773).

73) *På restauranten* (Optional adv) *møttes* (V) *de* (S). / *In the restaurant* (Optional adv) *they* (S) *met* (V).

74) *Vi* (S) *ønsker* (V) *på denne måten* (Optional adv) *å si* (V) *takk* (dO). / *In this way* (Optional adv), *we* (S) *would like to say* (V) *thank you* (dO).

75) *De* (S) *dro* (V) *på kveldstid* (Optional adv). / *They* (S) *left* (V) *in the evening* (Optional adv).

76) *Han* (S) *reiste* (V) *til Oslo* (Obligatory adv) *i går* (Optional adv). / *He* (S) *travelled* (V) *to Oslo* (Optional adv) *yesterday* (Optional adv).

The examples above are inspired by Faarlund et al. (2012, pp. 43-44 & 773).

### 2.3.3 Sentence adverbials

Another type of adverbials is *setningsadverbial* (sentence adverbials), which are adverbials placed outside of the predicate (sentence 77) (Faarlund et al., 2012, p. 773). Sentence adverbials are usually placed medially and modify the whole sentence. This type usually consists of a simple adverb like *ikke* (not), *jo* (yes/ well), *derfor* (therefore/ thus), *vel* (well) (Ibid, p. 44).

77) *Han* (S) *reiste* (V) *ikke* (Sentence adv). / *He* (S) *did not* (Sentence adv) *travel* (V).

The examples above are inspired by Faarlund et al. (2012, pp. 43-44 & 773).

### 2.3.4 Placement of Norwegian adverbials

The three positions of *forfelt*, *midtfelt* and *sluttfelt* which Faarlund et al. (2012, p. 858) operate with, correspond to initial, medial, and final position and the latter terms will be used in the present study with regard to both English and Norwegian placement.

## Initial position

Norwegian adverbials are commonly placed initially, but there are also several adverbials which should not occur in that position. Among others, these are short sentence adverbials with modal meaning: *jo* ('yes'), *vel* ('well'), *nå* ('now') and *da* ('then'). If these are placed initially, their meaning can be altered (sentences 78 and 79). In sentence 78, the sentence adverbial *visst* means *apparently*, while the same sentence adverbial in sentence 79 means *certainly*. Longer sentence adverbials like *heldigvis* ('luckily'), *dessverre* ('unfortunately'), *trolig* ('likely') and particularly adverbials which function as sentence connectors like *derfor* ('therefore'/ 'thus'), *likevel* ('still'), *dessuten* ('furthermore'/ 'after all') and *altså* ('so'/ 'for this reason') can be placed in initial position. The adverbial of negation *ikke* ('do not') is rarely placed initially by itself, but can be placed in front of verbs in imperative sentences (sentence 80 below) or together with *heller* ('either') placed finally (sentence 81) and sometimes when the word has emphasis. Most optional adverbials can be placed in initial position (sentence 82), and obligatory adverbials can often be placed initially. When

obligatory adverbials are placed initially, they are often distinct or contain a contrastive function (sentences 83 and 84). When a prepositional phrase functions as adverbial, the complement can be placed in initial position while the preposition is placed in final position (sentence 85). This accounts particularly for obligatory adverbials, but also for optional adverbials. Some adverbial clauses can also be placed initially (sentence 86) (Faarlund et al., 2012, pp. 874-875). Two adverbials can be placed in initial position, like time and place adverbials, but two adverbials of time can also be placed initially. The order of time and place adverbials is not rigid (sentence 87) (Ibid, p. 879).

- 78) *Han* (S) *er* (V) *visst* (Sentence adv) *snill* (dO). / *Apparently* (Sentence adv) *he* (S) *is* (V) *kind* (dO).
- 79) *Visst* (Sentence adv) *er* (V) *han* (S) *snill* (dO). / *Surely* (Sentence adv) *he* (S) *is* (V) *kind* (dO).
- 80) *Ikke* (Adv of negation) *reis* (V)! / *Do not* (Adv of negation) *go* (V)!
- 81) *Ikke* (Adv of negation) *går* (V) *de* (S) *på ski* (Adv) *heller* (Adv). *They* (S) *are* (V) *not* (Sentence adv) *skiing* (V) *either* (Adv).
- 82) *I dag* (Optional adv) *skjer* (V) *det* (S). / *Today* (Optional adv) *it* (S) *happens* (V).
- 83) *I London* (Obligatory adv) *bodde* (V) *hun* (S) *ikke* (Adv of negation) *lenger* (Adv). / *In London* (Obligatory adv) *she* (S) *did not* (Adv of negation) *live* (V) *anymore* (Adv).
- 84) *Pent* (Obligatory adv) *oppførte* (V) *de* (S) *seg* (V) *ikke* (Adv of negation). / *Nicely* (Obligatory adv) *they* (S) *did not* (Adv of negation) *behave* (V).
- 85) *Dette huset* (Obligatory adv) *sover* (V) *de* (S) *i* (Preposition). / *In this house* (Obligatory adv) *they* (S) *sleep* (V).
- 86) *Når du kommer hit* (Adv clause), *må* (V) *du* (S) *ta med* (V) *sjokolade* (dO). / *When you arrive* (Adv clause), *you* (S) *need to bring* (V) *chocolate* (dO).
- 87) *På hytten* (Adv) *i vinter* (Adv) *skal* (V) *jeg* (S) *stå* (V) *på ski* (dO). / *On the cottage* (Adv), *this winter* (Adv) *I* (S) *am going to* (V) *go skiing* (dO).

The examples above are influenced by Faarlund et al. (2012, pp. 874-875).

## Medial position

Both sentence adverbials and optional adverbials can be placed in medial position. While all kinds of sentence adverbials can appear in medial position, it is more usual for the optional adverbials of time and manner to occur in this position. If more than one adverbial is placed



medially, it is usual to place the sentence adverbial in front of the optional adverbial (sentence 88). Of the optional adverbials, it is more common for the adverbials of time to be placed before the adverbials of manner and degree (sentence 89 below). Sentence adverbials have a tendency of keeping the word order of the following pattern: modal, context, empathy, epistemic, focus and negation (sentence 90). In this case, the adverbials expressing the truth are divided into two groups of epistemic and negation adverbials. While adverbials of negation are *ikke* (not), epistemic adverbials are other adverbials expressing the value of truth like *kanskje* (perhaps), *sikkert* (certainly), *trolig* (likely/ probably) and *visstnok* (apparently). Adverbials of negation and focus adverbials can still take other placements, which both can be part of another sentence link. The same internal order of adverbials is recognised when the subject is placed in medial position. When the subject is not a light pronoun, the adverbials of modality are usually placed in front of the subject (sentence 91) (Faarlund, 2012, pp. 887-889).

88) *De* (S) *skal* (V) *jo* (Sentence adv) *dessuten* (Optional adv) *gå* (V) *til skolen* (Adv). /  
*They* (S) *are* (V) *after all* (Optional adv) *off* (V) *to school* (Adv).

89) *Vi* (S) *har* (V) *i det siste* (Time adv) *langsomt* (Manner adv) *fått* (V) *det bedre* (dO). /  
*Lately* (Time adv), *we* (S) *have* (V) *slowly* (Manner adv) *made* (V) *improvements* (dO).

90) *Hun* (S) *har* (V) *vel* (Modal adv) *dessverre* (Empathetic adv) *ikke* (Negation adv) *klart seg* (dO). / *She* (S) *has* (V) *unfortunately* (Empathetic adv) *not* (Negation adv) *made it* (dO).

91) *I så fall* (Adv) *er* (V) *jo* (Modal adv) *alt* (S) *mulig* (V). / *In this case* (Adv), *anything* (S) *is* (V) *possible* (dO)

## Final position

The internal order of adverbials in final position is not entirely rigid because it depends on multiple factors. One of these factors is that obligatory adverbials are usually placed before optional adverbials (sentence 92 below). Adjective phrases which function as adverbials of manner often appear in front of obligatory adverbials (sentence 93). The type of phrase is also a factor of importance. The usual order is first adjective phrases functioning as manner adverbials, followed by prepositions without links and adverbs, then noun phrases and preposition phrases, and finally sentence links. Prepositional phrases mostly function as time

and place adverbials, whereas place adverbials usually occur before time adverbials (sentence 94). A general tendency, also with adverbials, is that the new information is presented later in the sentence than the already known information, which can overrule the positioning of place adverbials in front of time adverbials (sentence 95) (Faarlund et al., 2012, pp. 895-897).

92) *Han* (S) *reiste* (V) *til Bergen* (Obligatory adv) *i går* (Optional adv). / *Yesterday* (Optional adv), *he* (S) *travelled* (V) *to Bergen* (Obligatory adv).

93) *Boken* (S) *ble lagt* (V) *pent* (Manner adv) *på bordet* (Obligatory adv). / *The book* (S) *was* (V) *nicely* (Manner adv) *placed* (V) *on the table* (Obligatory adv).

94) *De* (S) *skal* (V) *på butikken* (Place adv) *i morgen* (Time adv). / *Tomorrow* (Time adv) *they* (S) *are going* (V) *to the store* (Place adv).

95) *Vi* (S) *har tilbragt* (V) *to uker* (Time adv) *i Oslo* (Place adv). / *We* (S) *have spent* (V) *two weeks* (Time adv) *in Oslo* (Place adv).

### 2.3.5 Norwegian word order

According to Hognestad (2013), Norwegian is a language with a relatively strict sentence structure but with possibilities of changing the position of some sentence items (pp. 159-160). Statistically, it is normal to find the subject placed first in sentences of Norwegian texts. Adverbials are more likely than other sentence items to fit most of the positions in a Norwegian sentence. Like English, Norwegian also has an SVO-word order, even though it is more commonly called a V2-language, meaning that the finite verbal is commonly placed as the second sentence item. English, on the other hand, is not a V2-language (Ibid, pp. 159-162). This can be interpreted in the way that Norwegian can more freely move around other sentence items as long as the verbal is the second item, while English is stricter regarding the word order of subject, verbal, object. It can seem like the Norwegian language has more freedom regarding the structure of sentence items compared to the English language (sentences 96 and 97 below). It is possible to alter the primary word order by placing an obligatory element (besides the subject) initially in a clause.

When a direct object, subject predicative or a verb is fronted, they will be easy for the reader to spot because they will stand out. Writers can use fronting for example to emphasise a word. Sometimes fronting in Norwegian is not transferable to English. In some cases, it is possible to find different ways of placing an element first. When an object, predicative, verbal or an obligatory adverbial is placed in initial position of a sentence, it is emphasized and stressed

(sentence 98, 99 and 100). Fronting is more used in the Norwegian than the English language (Dypedahl et al., 2016, pp. 166-167).

*Inversion* is when the basic word order of subject and verbal is reversed or altered, which is the usual order for interrogative sentences in both languages. Declarative sentences may also have inversion under certain circumstances. Subject-verbal and subject-auxiliary are two types of inversion which are possible to find in declarative clauses if particular types of clause elements (other than the subject) are placed initially in the clause (Dypedahl et al., 2016, p. 167). As Norwegian is a V2-language, inversion is a common phenomenon in Norwegian. Because of inversion, the subject of the sentence will have to be placed as the third sentence item when an adverbial is moved in front of the finite verbal (Hognestad, 2013, pp. 161-162). Changing the principle of word order can result in ungrammatical sentences or the wrong meaning being expressed (Ibid, p. 174).

96) \*Yesterday (Adv) played (V) we (S) football (dO) (Norwegian sentence structure).

97) Yesterday (Adv) we (S) played (V) football (dO) (English sentence structure).

98) Supper (dO) she ate occasionally.

99) He wanted to give her a surprise, and surprised (SP) she was.

100) Society will not change overnight, but change (V) it will.

The examples are inspired by examples from Hognestad (2013, pp. 159-162).

## 2.4 Contrastive points in placement of adverbials

Medial position is more widely used in Norwegian than in English, which is considered one of the biggest differences between the two languages regarding the placement of adverbials. The Norwegian language may have long adjuncts in medial position, while the English language often has shorter adjuncts in medial position and long adjuncts in initial and final position (sentence 101 and 102). While conjuncts and disjuncts are more commonly placed in the middle of a sentence in Norwegian, they are more commonly placed at the beginning of a sentence in English (sentence 103 and 104). Clauses that contain a complex verb phrase may place the adverbial in medial position, meaning in front of or behind the auxiliary verb, but in front of the lexical verb. In English, it is common to place the adverbial between the auxiliary verb and the lexical verb, as shown in sentences 105 and 106. English uses the same word order in main and dependent clauses, while Norwegian uses another pattern in dependent clauses. In sentences 107 and 108, we see that Norwegian places the adverbial in front of the

verb phrase, while English places the adverbial after the finite verb. English allows for the placement of more than one adverbial in initial position, which in Norwegian is more difficult because the finite verb is usually placed as the second clause element. As shown in sentence 109 and 110, the Norwegian sentence only had one adverbial in initial position and placed the other adverbials in final position (Dypedahl et al., 2016, pp. 164-165).

- 101) *Hun (S) har (V) i et par uker (Adv) jobbet (V) som bibliotekar (Adv).*
- 102) *For a couple of weeks she has worked as a librarian / She (S) has worked (V) as a librarian (Adv) for a couple of weeks (Adv).*
- 103) *Hun (S) har (V) imidlertid (Adv) jobbet (V) som bibliotekar (Adv).*
- 104) *However (Adv), she (S) has worked (V) as a librarian (Adv).*
- 105) *Siri (S) har (V) aldri (Adv) spilt (V) bedre (Adv).*
- 106) *Siri (S) has (V) never (Adv) played (V) better (Adv).*
- 107) *Siri (S) sa (V) at hun (S) ofte (Adv) hadde spilt (V) bedre (Adv).*
- 108) *Siri (S) said (V) that she (S) had (V) often (Adv) played (V) better (Adv).*
- 109) *However (Adv), 12 weeks ago (Adv) she (S) quit (V) her job (dO) as a librarian (Adv).*
- 110) *For 12 uker siden (Adv) sluttet (V) hun (S) imidlertid (Adv) som bibliotekar (Adv). / Imidlertid (Adv) sluttet (V) hun (S) som bibliotekar (Adv) for 12 uker siden (Adv).*

The examples above are inspired by Dypedahl et al. (2016, pp. 164-165).

## 2.5 Summary of adverbial placement

It turned out to be a more difficult task than expected, to place the Norwegian and the English adverbial types in a table, showing the difference and similarities regarding adverbial placement. This is because Faarlund et al. (2012) operate with different adverbial categories (obligatory adverbials, optional adverbials, and sentence adverbials), than what Quirk et al. (2010) and Dypedahl et al. (2016) do (adjuncts, disjuncts, subjuncts and conjuncts). To resolve this issue, I chose to rely primarily on the English categories provided by Quirk et al. (2010). Therefore, the Norwegian adverbial placements, involving different categories, had to be placed within the English categories. A difficult aspect of this, was that the three Norwegian categories of obligatory adverbials, optional adverbials and sentence adverbials were more based on semantics than the four English categories. The usual placement of the

three Norwegian categories needed to be picked apart sentence for sentence and placed within the four different categories of English adverbials.

Table 3: Type and placement of adverbials in English and Norwegian

| Adverbials  |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| Type  | Placement   |  |
|   | English   | Norwegian  |
| <b>Adjuncts</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Obl. predication adjuncts</li> <li>- Opt. predication adjuncts</li> <li>- Sentence adjuncts</li> <li>- Time adjuncts</li> <li>- Place adjuncts</li> <li>- Short/ long</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Usually final position</li> <li>- Usually final position</li> <li>- Initial + final position</li> <li>- Initial (usually)</li> <li>- Initial (usually)</li> <li>- Short adjuncts in medial</li> <li>- Longer adjuncts in initial or final</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Initial (usually)</li> <li>- Finally and initially (often before time adv)</li> <li>- Can have long adjuncts in medial</li> </ul>         |
| <b>Subjuncts</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Viewpoint subjuncts</li> <li>- Courtesy subjuncts</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Usually initial position</li> <li>- Usually medial position (exception: imperative clauses which can be placed in all positions)</li> </ul>  |  |
| <b>Disjuncts</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Style disjuncts</li> <li>- Content disjuncts</li> <li>- Short/ long</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Usually initial position but can be placed in all positions</li> <li>- Often short disjuncts</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Often medial position</li> <li>- Longer sentence adv can be placed initially, <i>trolig</i> 'likely' or 'certainly'</li> <li>-</li> </ul> |
| <b>Conjuncts</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Short/ long</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All positions (usually initial position, many can be placed medially, some take initial position)</li> <li>- Often short conjuncts</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Often medial position</li> <li>- Initially when obligatory adv contain contrast+ when adv function as sentence connectors</li> </ul>      |

The table is based on theory from Dypedahl et al. (2016), Quirk et al. (2010) and Faarlund et al. (2012).

## 2.6 Previous research

In this section, a review of literature which is directly or indirectly related to the current research project will be presented. Some theses regarding syntax, adverbials and adverbial placement have been produced. Still, I only found a few studies that were similar to the present research project, which made it difficult to find relevant literature. There were some studies that were relevant in some way, but not directly comparable to my study. According to Su (2001), many results made in second language acquisition research have suggested that the role of first language in second and foreign learning is influential (Dulay & Burt, 1974; Dulay, Burt, & Krashen, 1982) (p. 83). Phonological transfer (Eckman, 1981; Flege & Eeftig, 1987; Thompson, 1991), syntactic transfer (Gass, 1980; White, 1985), lexical-semantic transfer (Ard & Homburg, 1983; Palmberg, 1987), discourse transfer (Scarcella, 1983), transfer in reading skills (Brown & Haynes, 1985; Koda, 1990), and transfer in handwriting (Sassoon, 1995), are identified (Su, 2001, p. 83). In search of other studies similar to the present study, studies with focus on syntactic transfer, were further analysed. The present study has focus on the participants' production. Therefore, studies by Su (2001) and Selinker (1983) will be elaborated on. Even though Truelson's (2017) study did not investigate the participants' production, but their translations, this study will also be elaborated on, as it shares similar features with the present study.

### 2.6.1 *Su (2001)*

The study by Su (2001) tried to find answers to how the relation between proficiency and transfer is manifested at the level of sentence processing (p. 87). He wanted to find more information regarding L2 learners' transfer from L2 to L1 because this area needs more investigation to get a complete picture of language transfer. Thirdly, he sought answers to whether there is universal domination of semantics in both learning and processing of language. Therefore, he investigated transfer of sentence interpretation strategies by English learners of Chinese L2 and Chinese learners of English L2 at beginning, intermediate and advanced levels of L2 proficiency. The study examined to what extent the participants rely on their L1-based strategies when writing L2 sentences and to what extent participants at successive levels of L2 proficiency rely on their L2-based strategies in their L1. Both languages investigated in the study relied on the SVO word order, but there are still some syntactic differences. The Chinese language can omit the subject of a sentence if it is understood what or who it is referred to, but there are also other differences between English

and Chinese. There were 122 participants in the study, which consisted of Chinese native speakers and English native speakers. In total, there were eight groups of participants, where a Chinese and an English group functioned as control groups. The six remaining groups consisted of language learners varying from beginner to advanced level of L2 proficiency. The control group carried out one test day, while the other groups had five to seven days in between the sessions to avoid the second test to be influenced by the first test (Ibid, pp. 87-90). The seven days in between the two test days was also carried out in the present research project, which will be elaborated on in section 3.8.

The results of Su (2001) showed that English learners of Chinese L2 and Chinese learners of English L2 do rely heavily on L1-based strategies at the level of beginner, but that the learners at the intermediate and advanced levels rely less on their L1-based strategies in their L2. The monolingual control groups showed that they rely on their L1-strategies. The Chinese test groups showed that they mostly rely on their semantic strategies regarding noun animacy (86% of the experimental variance), while the English test groups relied even more on their syntactic strategies regarding word order (99% of the experimental variance). The advanced level learners of L1 Chinese showed more results of word order strategies than the beginner and intermediate learners. There were statistically significant findings of animacy and word order in the group of Chinese advanced learners of English L2 and this group experimented more with the variance of word order than the two other groups. This means that the advanced participants were more dependent on strategies of word order in their English learning. Both the intermediate and the advanced learner groups of English L2 were more sensitive to word order in their learning of English, but they preferred the animacy cue when there was a disagreement between word order and animacy. According to Su (2001), results showed how English foreign language learners (EFL) at different levels all carried their L1 strategies into their L2 learning (p. 94). Still, evidence indicated how learners could adopt word order strategies from their L2 in their learning of L2, and that their awareness regarding the significant role of word order in L2 learning grew according to their ability in the L2. On the test of Chinese learners influence on their L1, the participants at beginner level showed higher reliance on semantic strategies of animacy (84%), while intermediate learners showed that they relied almost similarly on both semantic (52%) and syntactic strategies (43%), and advanced EFL learners relied mostly on their syntactic strategies of word order (63%). It was also revealed that learners who acquire an L2 show different L1 performance than monolinguals (Ibid, p. 91-101).

Evidence showed that Chinese foreign language learners (CFL), regardless of their level, transferred English syntactic strategies in their interpretation of Chinese sentences. There was also evidence showing that English learners of Chinese L2 increased their awareness of Chinese semantics according to their increased proficiency. Considering the evidence and the arguments presented, it seems like acquiring both strategies of semantics and strategies of syntax are similarly difficult. The effect of word order on the CFL learners' English sentences was strong in all learner levels (96%, 99%, 92% of the experimental variance). Three types of transfer patterns of language learning strategies were found in English learners' Chinese processing. Forward transfer was found where CFL learners mostly used English word order strategies when processing Chinese. A hint of transfer from Chinese L2 strategies to their L1 English processing were found in the advanced level participants. Intermediate learners used different strategies in Chinese and English. Both Chinese and English learner groups showed evidence of forward transfer at beginner, intermediate and advanced levels. Despite the strong evidence for L2 strategies transferred to L1 processing by EFL learners, particularly among the intermediate learners, the CFL learners showed a small amount of L2 influence evidence, only among the advanced learners. Among CFL learners at intermediate level, different strategies in L1 and L2 processing was found, but among the EFL learners, none of them distinguished between English and Chinese. EFL participants at advanced level used both strategies of native English and native Chinese in language processing (Su, 2001, pp. 102-108). In the present research project, the learner levels may play a role in the Norwegian pupils' English L2 writing, but this will not be looked at in the present project, as this was not tested.

### *2.6.2 Truelson (2017)*

According to Truelson (2017), English and Swedish are closely related, but they differ in the way that long adverbials in English are seldom placed between the subject and verbal, while this often occurs in Swedish (p. 1). She says that this can be problematic for Swedish learners of English L2 because they tend to keep their Swedish word order when writing English texts, and that the change in adverbial positions can alter the meaning of the sentences. The aims of the study were to investigate to what extent adverbs and adverbials take the same or another position in original Swedish texts and the English translations, how different adverbial placements can affect the meaning of sentences, and to find out if some adverbial types favour certain placements. Truelson's (2017) data material consists of three texts in both English and



Swedish, translated from Swedish to English and the other way around, where two of the texts in both languages are fiction and one is non-fiction (p. 2). The data material consists of some pages analysed from already existing novels and academic prose. She distinguishes between adjuncts, disjuncts, subjuncts and conjuncts and points out that it is common in grammars to use the positions of initial, medial and final, which is also used in her research project (Ibid, pp. 1-15).

Truelson (2017) found that the Swedish translators of English L2 participating in her study mostly kept the original meaning and placement of adverbials when translating texts in both languages (p. 40). Her research did not show any significant findings indicating that there were differences between fiction and non-fiction texts, but it showed that the participants' preferred placement of most adverbial types in both English and Swedish was final position. She found that it is common for adverbials to keep their position in translation (Ibid, pp. 40-43).

The most relevant findings to my research project are the ones involving fiction texts. This is because the learners in the present research project translated narratives. Therefore, the translations of fiction texts in Truelson's (2017) study will be elaborated on. She found that 8 percent of adverbials in English fiction changed their placement when translated into Swedish, and 10 percent of adverbials in Swedish fiction translated to English changed their placement (Ibid, p. 42). Because my research project contains different writing tasks than translating, providing the participants with more freedom in their writing process, it could be considered more likely to find adverbials more freely moved around in sentences when comparing the Norwegian and the English pupils' texts.

### *2.6.3 Selinker (1983)*

Selinker's (1983) study involves L1 Hebrew speakers of English L2 and their positioning of adverbials of time and place (Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2007, p. 42). A challenge investigating Selinker's (1983) study, was that I did not manage to find the first-hand source. I decided to rely on Jarvis & Pavlenko's (2007) interpretation of the study. According to Jarvis & Pavlenko (2007), Selinker (1969, 1983) wanted to identify transfer effects regarding time and place adverbials from L1 Hebrew speakers of English L2 (p. 42). The findings showed that Hebrew speakers preferred the positioning of place adverbials before direct objects in both Hebrew and English. Selinker also discovered that speakers of Hebrew L1 did not show a

particular preference of the order of time and place adverbials in English or Hebrew (Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2007, pp. 42-43).

#### *2.6.4 Summary of the three studies*

From the three studies described above, I have learned that L1 syntax may influence the L2, but that this may not always apply. Su (2001) found that the learners at more advanced levels relied less on their L1, and more on their L2 strategies, while the learners at beginner levels relied mostly on their L1 strategies. This result was present both among Chinese and English foreign learners. Even though Su's findings were more focused on the influence of L2 on L1, he still had results which showed that English foreign language learners transferred their L1 strategies to their L2 learning. Another of his results showed that the EFL and CFL learners both found strategies of semantics and syntax similarly difficult to acquire. Both the last-mentioned findings of Su (2001) are relevant to the present research project because it shows how syntactic strategies can be transferred from one language to another, which will be investigated in this study. It also shows that learners' in some cases transfer their L1 strategies to their L2 learning, which will also be investigated in the present research project.

Truelson (2017) found that the participants mostly kept the original placement of adverbials when translating both Swedish and English fiction and non-fiction. She also found that final position was the preferred placement of adverbials in English and Swedish. These are exciting findings because Swedish and Norwegian are quite similar languages, which makes it possible to also find similar results in the present study.

Selinker (1983) found that Hebrew speakers preferred the positioning of place adverbials before direct objects in both Hebrew and English, and that speakers of Hebrew L1 did not show a particular preference of the order of time and place adverbials in English or Hebrew. Selinker's findings are relevant because they will be compared to the findings of the present study, which will be elaborated on in section 4.5.2.

## 3 Method

According to Mackey & Gass (2007), the choice of one method over another depends on the research questions asked (p. 4).

The main research question (1) and the sub-questions (a-e) of the present study are:

- 1) Are there differences in the use of adverbials, particularly with regard to placement, when pupils in a Norwegian 7<sup>th</sup> grade are writing L1 Norwegian and L2 English texts?
  - a) Is there any difference in the overall frequency of adverbials in the English and Norwegian texts?
  - b) Are there differences regarding the frequency of adverbial *placements* in the Norwegian and English texts?
  - c) Are there differences regarding the frequency of adverbial *types* in the Norwegian and English texts?
  - d) Is there a correlation between adverbial placement and adverbial type in the Norwegian and English texts?
  - e) Are there any indications of Norwegian L1 influence regarding adverbial placement in the pupils' English texts?

These research questions are chosen because the present study investigates adverbial placement across English and Norwegian text production by a Norwegian 7<sup>th</sup> grade. The focus will be on different adverbial types, their respective frequency, and their different placements in both Norwegian and English. In this chapter, the methods of the current study are presented, elaborating on the concepts crosslinguistic influence, intersubjective approach, and cross-sectional study. I distinguish between qualitative and quantitative approach, I explain the methods of textual analysis and content analysis, questionnaire, and the way the data material was gathered.

### 3.1 Investigating crosslinguistic influence

When identifying transfer of language features, it is possible to distinguish between the level of the individual (speech) and the level of society (language) (Weinreich, 1953, p. 11). Even though crosslinguistic influence (CLI) can be examined at either level, the present research project is based on the level of society and language.

It is common to investigate transfer as a societal phenomenon regarding consequences of language contact, for instance influence from the Norwegian to the English language, in this case as an L2 in a group of learners. This type of research is used when explaining patterns of language contact and when investigating to what extent a language is influenced by another language, and how the language contact outcomes are bound by common sociocultural history and by language structures. The research methodology can involve data collection from conducting questionnaires, observing language use, and gathering modern oral or written language use from a random sample of the speakers of the languages (Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2007, p. 29).

The data collection is analysed for quantitative and/ or qualitative evidence of language impact. It is possible for the analysis to also involve investigation of the frequency of occurrence of transferred structures, investigation of types of structures most likely to be transferred, investigation of languages most likely to transfer from another, and investigation of how different social and linguistic factors influence observed phenomena (Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2007, p. 29).

In the current research project, the transfer of language is examined at the level of society and language. The project investigates data sampled from modern written language use from a 7<sup>th</sup> grade in Norway, where the main object of the study is to investigate whether there are differences between Norwegian and English adverbial placement and how the Norwegian language may possibly influence the pupils' English writing in this regard. Language structures of the Norwegian and the English language are examined, the possibility for the Norwegian language to influence the English language is examined and occurrences of adverbials are counted. Different types of adverbials (adjuncts, subjuncts, disjuncts and conjuncts) and the adverbials' placement (initial, medial and final position) are quantified and analysed in both the Norwegian and the English texts.

### **3.2 Intersubjective approach**

There are two psycholinguistic approaches: intersubjective and intrasubjective. Whereas the intersubjective approach is more group-oriented, the intrasubjective approach is more individual-oriented (Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2007, pp. 30-31). In this research project, the intersubjective approach is chosen, due to the group-oriented focus. According to Jarvis & Pavlenko (2007), an important aim for the intersubjective research is "to investigate

hypotheses and formulate generalizations about populations of language users” (p. 33). The present research project tries to fulfil these criteria regarding investigating hypotheses and making generalizations, even though it can be difficult to make generalizations with a small number of participants. Despite this, the present study is relevant because there is a possibility of discovering patterns of language influence from Norwegian learners’ L1 to their English L2. If transfer patterns are discovered, the awareness of this may make it possible to find out what parts of the language learning which will need more focus, which may be useful in the process of learning and teaching an L2. It will also be possible for other researchers to elaborate on the study by collecting a larger number of Norwegian and English learner texts to investigate whether the findings of the future research shows the same findings as the present study, or if there are differences.

### **3.3 Cross-sectional study**

It is possible to distinguish between two types of pseudolongitudinal designs: cross-sectional or longitudinal. Cross-sectional methodology usually involves collecting data from language users within a short period, while longitudinal methodology in pseudolongitudinal design involves language users who represent successive levels of language ability where the aim is to track crosslinguistic influence effects regarding changes in language ability. True longitudinal studies would, on the other hand, collect data material from the same learners at different points in time (Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2007, pp. 36-37). According to Jarvis & Pavlenko (2007), questions concerning whether different types of transfer occur or what constraints the types of transfer consist of, usually take a crosslinguistic design (p. 41). A cross-sectional approach is chosen in the research project and the data material was collected within a short period of time, during two school lessons.

### **3.4 Evidence of crosslinguistic influence**

According to Jarvis & Pavlenko (2007), there are three types of evidence for identification of crosslinguistic influence (CLI) (p. 35). The research project will rely on all three of these evidence types when identifying transfer of syntactical features, regarding adverbial placement, from participants’ L1 to their English L2.

The first evidence is called intragroup homogeneity, which is evidence that the behaviour is a common tendency of a group of language users who know the same language combination

(Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2007, p. 41). The researcher should establish that the group of participants performs consistently with respect to a specific language feature (Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2007, p. 229). The research project consists of participants who are or will shortly be turning 12 years old at the time of the collection, and who all have Norwegian as their L1 (source language) and English as their L2 (recipient language). This was revealed in the questionnaire regarding background information. The main aim of the research project is to find out whether the group performs consistently regarding a specific language feature, which in this case is the placement of adverbials.

The second evidence is intergroup heterogeneity, which is evidence that the behaviour may or may not differ between a group of language users' performance regardless of the combinations of their L1s and L2s (Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2007, p. 43). The researcher needs to show that a group of speakers of different source languages act differently regarding a particular language feature in the recipient language (Ibid, p. 229). This type of evidence is not present within the research project, but by comparing the project to other studies of adverbial placement in L2 English, it is possible to cover this type of evidence. The research project will be compared to Selinkers' (1969, 1983) study regarding Hebrew speakers of English L2 and their placement of time and place adverbials.

The third type of evidence is crosslinguistic congruity, which is evidence that a group of language users' behaviour in one language is motivated by their use of another language (Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2007, pp. 46-47). The researcher needs to compare performance in the source and recipient language to show that performance in the recipient language is directly motivated by the language structures and patterns of the speakers' production in the same contexts in the source language. The researcher will also need to consider which outside factors may interact with CLI to affect the performance of the participants (Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2007, pp. 229-230). The present research project seeks answers regarding transfer of adverbial placement from the Norwegian language to the English language, which is compared through pupils' texts, written both in English and Norwegian. The context is similar in the way that the pupils received the same written task in both languages and that the topic was Christmas traditions. The instructions were the same ones provided in both languages and the tasks were written the first lesson of the first day of the week, a week apart. This will be elaborated on in section 3.8 regarding data collection in the present research project.

CLI identification should rely on these types of evidence: intragroup homogeneity, intergroup heterogeneity, and crosslinguistic performance congruity, in order to make the project more reliable (Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2007, pp. 35-36).

### **3.5 Quantitative approach**

In search of an appropriate research method to answer the research questions, differences between quantitative and qualitative research were considered. A preliminary definition of the distinction between qualitative and quantitative approach is that quantitative research collects numerical data, which is primarily analysed by statistical methods, while qualitative research collects open-ended, non-numerical data which is primarily analysed non-statistically. But there is also a third research approach to empirical investigation, mixed methods, which combines qualitative and quantitative research in the data collection or in the analysis part (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 24).

A quantitative approach is chosen in the present research project, which is a comparative study. The research project contains quantitative features where occurrences and non-occurrences of adverbials are counted. The numerical data is based on controlled measurement due to the objectivity of numbers. In the data collection, there are still some qualitative features, including non-numerical information like the gender of the participants. Therefore, it is important to state that the research project is based on quantitative research, but there will always be traces of qualitative features because the study involves people.

### **3.6 Textual analysis and content analysis**

In a textual analysis, the purpose is to describe the content, structure and function of a text. By using the research method textual analysis, it is possible to analyse parts of a text or context (Christoffersen, 2012, p. 158). In the current research project, the focus is on textual analysis regarding grammatical features in the text, more explicitly the syntax. The quantitative content analysis, which is an approach to textual analysis, is used.

According to Dörnyei (2007), content analysis originates from the quantitative method of investigating written texts, which involves “counting of instances of words, phrases or grammatical structures” within categories (p. 245). The method consists of predetermined categories and is a descriptive and objective account of the surface meaning of the data

(Dörnyei, 2007, pp. 245-246). The quantitative content analysis is chosen because the research project will involve counting of adverbials occurring across Norwegian and English texts to look at the similarities and differences between the placement of adverbials in the texts.

### **3.7 Background information/questionnaire**

The study contains a short questionnaire where the learners fill in a few basic questions, regarding background information. Brown (2001) defines the self-administered pencil-and-paper questionnaires as “any written instruments that present respondents with a series of questions or statements to which they are to react either by writing out their answers or selecting them among existing answers” (p. 6). In the research project, this type of questionnaire was used, where questions were created in advance for the participants to answer on a sheet (see Appendix A).

According to Dörnyei (2003), questionnaires can provide the researcher with data about the participants, which are either factual, behavioural or attitudinal (p. 8). To avoid misunderstanding when participants in a research project are going to fill in their answers in a questionnaire, the researcher needs to create simple questions (Dörnyei, 2003, p. 10). Therefore, the questions created in this research project are factual questions, used to find out who the respondents are. The questions in the questionnaire includes the pupils’ gender and language background.

There are two types of questionnaire items. A closed item question is one in which the researcher determines the possible answers, whereas an open-ended question allows respondents to answer in any manner they see fit (Mackey & Gass, 2015, p. 102). One item type that is seemingly open-ended but works as closed, is a numeric item. These items ask for a specific numeric value (Dörnyei, 2003, p. 46). This matches the questionnaire regarding background information, where age and number of foreign languages spoken are asked for. But there were also questions regarding which languages that were spoken, which is an open-ended question.



### 3.8 Data collection

The data collection relies on primary research, and the empirical investigation consists of research based on original data. The pupils' texts, written both in Norwegian and English, are collected and analysed in a way which compares the pupils' placement of adverbials in the two languages, before conclusions are drawn from this set of data material.

#### 3.8.1 Type of task and topic

The pupils were instructed to write two narratives, and each pupil received a set of written guidelines of how to write a narrative, first in the Norwegian (see Appendix E) and then in the English subject (see Appendix F). The guidelines given in the Norwegian subject were written in Norwegian, and the guidelines given in the English subject were in English. The introduction to their writing was a brief PowerPoint presentation in Norwegian (see Appendix C) and in English (see Appendix D). The pupils were used to following instructions on the Smartboard and to be provided with both written and oral information for the teacher to be able to reach out to most pupils. After the introduction, the pupils were handed written guidelines to what a narrative should include. The guidelines explained what should be included in the introduction, main part and ending. In the introduction, the pupils should describe the main character(s) and their environment or surroundings. They should state what the person looked like, what the person was or acted like and where the action took place. In the main part, the pupils should write about a problem that occurred in their story, and as an ending, they should write how the problem was solved or clarified.

The pupils were given a time frame of approximately 45 minutes per text. The two texts were written during the first lesson of two separate Monday mornings to keep the circumstances for the two lessons as similar as possible. The first lesson on the first Monday, the pupils were given 45 minutes to write a narrative in Norwegian about "*Juletradisjoner*" (Christmas traditions) and how Christmas is typically spent in Norway, where they were to include at least five out of the ten words; "*julenissen* (Santa Claus), *juletre* (Christmas tree), *julestrømpe* (Christmas stocking), *peis* (fireplace), *reinsdyr* (reindeer), *presanger* (presents), *julaften* (Christmas Eve), *adventskalender* (advent calendar), *pinnekjøtt* (lambs' ribs), *ribbe* (pork ribs)". A week later, the first lesson of the second Monday, the pupils were again given an introduction in the form of a PowerPoint presentation and written guidelines to a narrative. The second time, the pupils were given 45 minutes to write a narrative in English about the

theme; “*Christmas traditions*” and how Christmas is typically spent in England. To keep the pupils motivational, the two texts were written a week apart. If the two texts were written the same day, the pupils would probably lack motivation to write. They were to include at least five out of the following ten words or phrases; “*Santa Claus, Christmas tree, Christmas stocking, presents, Christmas Eve (December 24<sup>th</sup>), Christmas day (December 25<sup>th</sup>), carol singing, New Year’s Eve, fireworks, turkey*”. Some of the words/phrases were translation equivalents and some of the words/phrases were different, from the Norwegian to the English narrative. This was due to different traditions in the two countries, but also to provide the pupils with an opportunity to write a different story, to keep them motivated. In the English story, the pupils could for instance choose to write about New Year’s Eve and fireworks, which in the Norwegian text writing was not an explicit option. The questionnaire was filled in after the final text was written, and the pupils were given an additional ten minutes to complete the questionnaire.

The teacher and I were both present in the 7<sup>th</sup> grade classroom while the pupils completed the tasks. In cooperation with the 7<sup>th</sup> grade teacher, the topic Christmas traditions/ Juletradisjoner was agreed upon. The topic was chosen because the project was conducted in December, only a few weeks before Christmas, and because the pupils could learn about similarities and differences between Christmas spent in Norway and Christmas spent in England. The choice of including a selection of ten words or phrases was to inspire and to motivate the pupils to write to avoid pupils struggling with finding something to write about within the topic. The pupils were given the freedom to choose five out of ten words to help the pupils remembering some of the features of Christmas traditions in Norway and in England. To keep the project as identical as possible, the two texts had the same topic and were written by the same pupils, to allow for individual as well as group comparison.

### 3.8.2 *Ethical concerns*

The questionnaire regarding background information contains personal information, which requires consent from the Norwegian Centre of Research Data (NSD). An application to the NSD was therefore required, containing information regarding the research project including the consent form and the questionnaire. The research project was approved by the NSD, which allowed me to gather learner texts from a 7<sup>th</sup> grade in a Norwegian primary school and to let the pupils fill in a questionnaire, if their parents or legal guardian signed the consent form.

The participants were not randomly chosen but selected via acquaintances. According to Mackey & Gass (2015), even though there are personal contacts in a specific school, it is a good idea to address the head teacher first in order to ask for consent before the teacher is approached and asked to conduct research within the class (p. 61). I first approached the principal and received an oral consent to approach a teacher. Then I turned to the teacher to ask for consent regarding participation in the research project. The teacher agreed to take part in the research project, and the pupils were handed a consent form (see Appendix B) to bring back to their parents. The pupils received this consent form, which outlined the aims, the methods, the design of the project, and possible learning outcomes the pupils could benefit from. The consent form was handed to the pupils at school, during week 46, a few weeks before the project started. Even though the consent form only consisted of two pages, the process of handing out and getting the consent form delivered back to school could potentially be time consuming. This is because pupils may not hand their parents or legal guardian the consent form the same day as they receive it. All consent forms, except for one, were delivered back to school within a week.

### *3.8.3 Participants*

The collected texts were written by 7<sup>th</sup> graders in a Norwegian primary school. The reason for choosing 7<sup>th</sup> grade, was due to an expectation of more advanced complexity in sentence structure compared to lower levels. According to Parrott (2010), sentence complexity depends on the complexity of the ideas expressed (p. 444). Complex sentences are used in writing and speaking, but it is considered easier to increase the level of sentence complexity in written language. This is because it can be easier for the reader to look carefully at different sentence parts to match them together in a way that the sentence can express what it is supposed to. The use of complex sentences may also be due to individual differences. Some people think of complex sentences as linguistic mastery and an elegant way of expression, while others may consider it a way of over-elaboration. Many learners may experience difficulties with understanding because the sentences are complex. The difficulties can increase when the number of subordinate clauses increase or when the basic word order and clause constituents are changed (Parrott, 2010, p. 444). I study to become a teacher in the primary school (1-7), which is why I did not want to go above 7<sup>th</sup> grade even though that could possibly provide me with even more complex sentences. The data material is written both in English and Norwegian by the same pupils, due to the comparison between the text structures of the mentioned languages.

The 7<sup>th</sup> grade chosen as participants in the research project consists of 15 pupils. Fourteen pupils from the 7<sup>th</sup> grade participated in the project; only one was not given consent from home. This means that 14 texts written in Norwegian, 14 English texts and 14 questionnaires, could be legally retrieved. It can be considered a challenge of studying learners' language that it is difficult to gather material that will be large enough to make sure that the findings are not based on just a few learners (Lightbown & Spada, 2013, p. 72).

The pupils wrote the Norwegian text on December 9<sup>th</sup>, and the English text was written, and the questionnaire was filled in on December 16<sup>th</sup>. The Norwegian text was written before the English text because it would be considered an easier task for the pupils to write in their L1 before they received a task in their L2. I judged it to be more encouraging for the pupils to write in their L2 English after already have been given a nearly identical writing task in their L1. The only differences between the two writing sessions are the language used and some of the words they were to choose between.

While all the 15 pupils were present and able to write the texts on December 9<sup>th</sup>, only 11 out of 15 pupils were able to write the English text and to fill in the questionnaire on December 16<sup>th</sup>, due to illness. On December 17<sup>th</sup> and December 19<sup>th</sup>, two pupils wrote their English text and filled in the questionnaire. Unfortunately, one of the pupils was absent the entire last week before the Christmas holiday and was not able to write the English text and fill in the questionnaire before January 8<sup>th</sup>. It may have affected the study that the three last pupils finished the tasks at a later point than the rest of the class, and that the last pupil was given a couple of extra weeks between the Norwegian and the English text writing. Nevertheless, I do not think the effect is strong enough to exclude them from the study.

### *3.8.4 Computer or pen and paper?*

The texts are written on computers, because prior research has shown that pupils tend to write longer texts when they type on computers, compared to when they write on paper. According to the PhD thesis by Bård Uri Jensen (2017), where Jensen examined texts written by 60 16-year old pupils on both paper and computers, he found that some pupils write longer texts when typing on computers, compared to when writing on paper. It would be considered an advantage to the present study that the pupils write longer texts and hopefully more complex sentence structures which may contain more adverbials. This is because the chances that pupils write adverbials in their texts will be increased with longer texts.

### 3.8.5 Data analysis

In the data analysis of the research project, the different types of adverbials are analysed. The three types of adverbials; adjuncts, subjunct, disjunct and conjuncts are analysed according to their different positions. Their placement is commented on according to the following three positions: *initial*, *medial* and *final*. The adverbial types and their placement are analysed according to a table made in an excel sheet, which looks like Table 4. An example is created in the table, and more adverbial placements are added according to the number of adverbials a clause consists of.

Table 4: Analysis tool

| Line | Learner | Text | Gender | Language | Clause                                    | A1            | Position | Type         | A2          | Position | Type          |
|------|---------|------|--------|----------|---|---------------|----------|--------------|-------------|----------|---------------|
| 1    | 1       | 1    | M      | English  | Every weekend I like to play in the park. | Every weekend | I        | Time adjunct | in the park | F        | Place adjunct |
| 2    | 1       | 1    | M      | English  |   |               |          |              |             |          |               |
| 3    | 1       | 1    | M      | English  |   |               |          |              |             |          |               |

A challenge of comparing the Norwegian and English placement of adverbials, was that the two main sources used regarding the English and Norwegian adverbial types were divided into different categories. Quirk et al. (2010) used different categories of adverbial types; adjuncts, disjuncts, subjuncts and conjuncts, than the categories which Faarlund et al. (2012) used; obligatory adverbials, optional adverbials and sentence adverbials.

The adverbial categories presented by Faarlund et al. (2012) could seem to be more semantic, while the categories presented by Quirk et al. (2010) were more categorical regarding syntax. This means that adverbial categories in Quirk et al. (2010) could fit more of the categories in Faarlund et al. (2012). For instance, the group of adjuncts presented in Quirk et al. (2010), could fit both the obligatory and optional group of adverbials in Faarlund et al. (2012), as discussed in section 2.5, where an attempted comparison between Norwegian and English placement of adverbial types was made.

### 3.8.6 *Shortcomings*

An important issue in quantitative data analysis is to find out to what extent results are generalizable. One should not over-generalize, which means that the findings should not be generalized to a sample which it is not representative of. There is hardly research which is representative for all age groups, ethnicities, or school levels during a single study (Dörnyei, 2003, pp. 212-213). Because the findings of the research project only considered one Norwegian 7<sup>th</sup> grade, it is not possible to generalize it to cover all 7<sup>th</sup> grades in Norway, but the results may contribute to further research in the field of syntax. It could be possible for future researchers to elaborate on the present study's findings. The present study could contribute by creating an image of a tendency among a 7<sup>th</sup> grade regarding, whether there is syntactic transfer from pupils' Norwegian L1 to their English L2 or not, and for future researchers to investigate whether this accounts for more than one Norwegian 7<sup>th</sup> grade.

## 4 Analysis and discussion

This chapter seeks answers to the research question: 1) Are there differences in the use of adverbials, particularly with regard to placement, when pupils in a Norwegian 7<sup>th</sup> grade are writing L1 Norwegian and L2 English texts?, and is divided by the sub-questions presented in section 1.5. The chapter presents the analysis and discussion regarding the findings in the data material, including comparison between Norwegian and English placement of adverbials and the different types used in the pupils' texts and discussing crosslinguistic influence by using crosslinguistic evidence.

### 4.1 Frequency

In this section, sub-question a) Is there any difference in the overall frequency of adverbials in the English and the Norwegian texts?, will be investigated. A presentation of frequency of clauses and adverbials will be made. In all, the participants in the present research project produced 886 clauses, consisting of 580 Norwegian and 306 English clauses (see Table 5). Of the 886 clauses in total, 633 clauses were written by female participants, while 253 clauses were written by male participants (see Table 6). This shows that the participants produced more Norwegian clauses.

The current study consists of 14 participants, nine female and five male participants. There were a larger number of female participants in the project, as there were a larger number of girls in the class. The data material consists of more clauses written by female than by male participants. In this case, it appeared interesting to also present the average findings. A positive aspect of presenting the average findings is that it is easier to compare the results of the female and male participants, as there were significantly more female than male participants in the current study. 253 clauses divided by 5 male participants equals 50,6 clauses written on average per male participant, and 633 clauses divided by 9 female participants 70,33 clauses written on average per male participant (see Table 6). The data material consists of a larger number of clauses written by female than by male participants in the present research project.

Table 5: Overview of number of clauses by language

| Language | English | Norwegian | Total |
|----------|---------|-----------|-------|
| Clauses  | 306     | 580       | 886   |
| Average  | 64,44   | 34        | 98,44 |

Table 6: Overview of number of clauses by gender

| Gender  | Female | Male | Total |
|---------|--------|------|-------|
| Clauses | 633    | 253  | 886   |
| Average | 70,33  | 50,6 | 63,29 |

The total number of clauses (886) is interesting, compared to the total of adverbials which shows 614. In percentage, adverbials were represented in 69,3% out of the clauses, as 30,7% of the clauses did not contain adverbials (see Table 7). I have decided to focus on the clauses where adverbials were present, as the present research project has adverbial placement as its main focus. Of the 633 clauses written by female participants, 205 were English clauses and 428 were Norwegian clauses (see Table 8). Of the 253 clauses written by male participants, 101 were English clauses and 152 were Norwegian clauses (see Table 8). This shows that both female and male participants produced more Norwegian than English clauses. It is also an interesting finding that both female and male participants wrote notably more clauses in their Norwegian L1 than in their English L2. The number of clauses written by female and male participants of the present study is not that interesting in numbers, as there was a higher representation of female participants.

Table 7: Clauses and placement

|         | Initial     | Medial       | Final        | (Empty)     | Total             |
|---------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Clauses | 225 (25,4%) | 120 (13,54%) | 269 (30,36%) | 272 (30,7%) | <b>886 (100%)</b> |

Table 8: Overview of number of clauses by language and gender

| Clauses      | English             | Norwegian           | Total             |
|--------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Female       | 205 (32,39%)        | 428 (67,61%)        | 633 (100%)        |
| Male         | 101 (39,92%)        | 152 (60,08%)        | 253 (100%)        |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>306 (34,54%)</b> | <b>580 (65,46%)</b> | <b>886 (100%)</b> |



Table 9 shows the total number of adverbials presented in the present research project, which were 614 adverbials. Of the 614 adverbials, 219 appeared in the English pupils' texts, while 395 adverbials were found in the Norwegian texts (see Table 9). In percentage, the adverbial frequency in English texts was 35,66%, while there were 64,33% of adverbials in the Norwegian texts (see Table 9). According to Table 9, the number of adverbials in the Norwegian texts were much higher than the number of English adverbials. This is not a surprising finding, as the pupils' L1 is Norwegian, which may make it easier for them to write more complex sentences which can contain more adverbials. Another thing to take into consideration is that the pupils also wrote notably more clauses in Norwegian than English.

Table 9: Adverbial frequency by language

| Adverbials   | Adverbial frequency |
|--------------|---------------------|
| English      | 219 (35,66%)        |
| Norwegian    | 395 (64,33%)        |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>614 (100%)</b>   |

## 4.2 Placement

In this section, the different placement of adverbials will be commented on. The second sub-question, b) Are there differences regarding the frequency of adverbial *placements* in the Norwegian and English texts?, will be discussed. The three different positions of adverbials used in the present research project: initial, medial, and final position, which were explained in sections 2.2.6 and 2.3.4, will be analysed. The word order will be discussed, and the question whether fronting or inversion occurs in English and Norwegian texts, will be investigated. This will be investigated and discussed in light of the theoretical foundation presented.

Table 10 shows a total of 614 adverbials in the present study, where 225 adverbials were placed in initial position, 120 were placed in medial position, and 269 were placed in final position. In percentage, 36,64% of the adverbials were placed in initial position, 19,54% of the adverbials were placed in medial position, and 43,81% of the adverbials were placed in final position (see Table 10).

Initial position was the second most common adverbial placement for the pupils in the Norwegian 7<sup>th</sup> grade, participating in the present research project, to place their adverbials. In total, the pupils placed 75 out of 219 English adverbials and 150 out of 395 Norwegian

adverbials in initial position. This is a percentage of 34,25% English adverbials in initial position, and a percentage of 37,97% Norwegian adverbials in initial position (see Table 10). On average, the frequency of adverbials placed in initial position was quite similar in English (34,25%) and in Norwegian (37,97%).

Medial position was the least used position for the participants of the present research project to place their adverbials. In total, the pupils placed 45 out of 219 English adverbials and 75 out of 395 Norwegian adverbials in medial position. This is a percentage of 20,55% English adverbials and 18,99% Norwegian adverbials in medial position (see Table 10). The relative frequency of adverbials placed in medial position was quite similar in English (20,55%) and in Norwegian (18,99%).

The data material of the present study shows that the most common adverbial placement was final position. In total, the pupils placed 99 out of 219 English adverbials and 170 out of 395 Norwegian adverbials in medial position. This is a percentage of 45,21% English adverbials and 43,04% Norwegian adverbials in final position (see Table 10). On average, the frequency of adverbials placed in final position was quite similar in English (45,21%) and Norwegian (43,04%).

#### *4.2.1 Comparison of adverbial placement*

A smaller number of adverbials occurs medially than initially and finally. The most common adverbial placement of the present study was final position (45,21% of the English adverbials and 43,04% of the Norwegian adverbials). The second most common placement of adverbials was initial position (34,25% of the English adverbials and 37,97% of the Norwegian adverbials). The least common adverbial placement was medial position (20,55% of the English adverbials and 18,99% of the Norwegian adverbials). These are quite similar findings of adverbial placement in both English and Norwegian texts. According to Dypedahl et al. (2016), the most common position for adverbials to be placed is in final position, the second most common position is the initial position and the least common adverbial placement is in medial position (p. 164). This is similar to the findings of the present research project.

As pointed out in section 2.4, medial position is more widely used in Norwegian than in English, which is considered one of the biggest differences between the two languages regarding the placement of adverbials. The Norwegian language may have long adjuncts in medial position, while the English language often has shorter adjuncts in medial position and

long adjuncts in initial and final position (Dypedahl et al., 2016, pp. 164-165). The findings of the present research project show that the relative frequency of adverbials placed in medial position was quite similar in English (20,55%) and in Norwegian (18,99%) (see Table 10). This means that there is no correlation with the theoretical foundation and the findings in the present study regarding adverbials placed medially in Norwegian and English sentences. The findings of the medial position in the present study even shows the opposite, that there is a slight higher percentage of adverbials placed in medial position in the English texts, compared to the Norwegian texts, even though the difference is minimal.

Table 10: Adverbial placement by language and gender

| Adverbial placement | Initial             | Medial              | Final               | Total             |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| <b>English</b>      | <b>75 (34,25%)</b>  | <b>45 (20,55%)</b>  | <b>99 (45,21%)</b>  | <b>219 (100%)</b> |
| F                   | 54 (37,24%)         | 36 (34,83%)         | 55 (37,93%)         | 145 (100%)        |
| M                   | 21 (28,38%)         | 9 (12,16%)          | 44 (59,46%)         | 74 (100%)         |
| <b>Norwegian</b>    | <b>150 (37,97%)</b> | <b>75 (18,99%)</b>  | <b>170 (43,04%)</b> | <b>395 (100%)</b> |
| F                   | 115 (37,58%)        | 57 (18,63%)         | 134 (43,79%)        | 306 (100%)        |
| M                   | 35 (39,33%)         | 18 (20,22%)         | 36 (40,45%)         | 89 (100%)         |
| <b>Total</b>        | <b>225 (36,64%)</b> | <b>120 (19,54%)</b> | <b>269 (43,81%)</b> | <b>614 (100%)</b> |

#### 4.2.2 Word order

Fronting is more used in the Norwegian than the English language, which was explained in section 2.3.5. Fronting is not common in the English language, although it does occur. In the English language, the subject or an adverbial is usually placed at the beginning of a sentence, which was explained in section 2.2.7 (Dypedahl et al., 2016, pp. 166-167). As Norwegian is a V2-language, inversion is a common phenomenon in Norwegian. Because of inversion, the subject of the sentence will have to be placed as the third sentence item when an adverbial is moved in front of the finite verbal. As explained in section 2.2.7, Inversion is not that common in the English language, because the SVO word-order usually applies even when fronting occurs (Hognestad, 2013, pp. 161-162).

To investigate whether inversion does occur when adverbials are fronted, I will use examples from the clauses and sentences produced by the participants of the present study. In clause 111 below, there is fronting of the time adjunct *litt etter middag* (*shortly after dinner*) (Appendix G), which also functions as an adverbial phrase. When this happens, an inversion occurs, and the word order is changed from SVO to V2, which is described as a common

tendency of the Norwegian language. If the Norwegian sentence were to be translated to English, inversion would not occur, as English would normally keep the word order of SVO even when fronting occurs.

In sentence 112, the concessive conjunct, *anyways*, is fronted. If we were to translate the sentence to Norwegian, inversion would occur because the verb would be placed as second sentence item in the sentence. This is another example which shows the difference between Norwegian and English word order, as the English language keeps the SVO word order even when fronting occurs. In this case, there is an absence of inversion. If a Norwegian L1 learner were to transfer the word order from L1 to English L2, this could be done by changing the word order from SVO to V2 (sentence 113), which in this case would be grammatically incorrect. This is not the case in this example, and the Norwegian L1 pupil did not transfer L1 strategies regarding inversion to his/ her L2 writing.

This type of L1 transfer was found in some of the pupils' texts. In the two examples from learner number 2 (sentences 114 and 115), the V2 order is applied even when the SVO would have been the correct word order. The correct word order would be to place the subject in front of the verb. Another example from the same learner is clause 116, which is part of clause 117, where it is clear that this is not a case of inversion, but rather an omission of the subject "a loving family" (Appendix H), which was already mentioned in the first clause. A noteworthy case is that the learner who wrote clause 115 can seem to have transferred the Norwegian word order (sentence 118), when correct usage of English syntax would be to change the positions of the adverbial and the verbal. The two first examples revealed in this paragraph, represent findings of Norwegian L1 transfer regarding use of inversion when fronting in English L2 occurs.

L1 transfer of inversion was also found in three other English texts. In sentence 119, learner number 7 have placed the verbal "can" before the subject "all the children". Another example from this learner (sentence 120), can be discussed whether it is transfer or a grammatical error, as the V2 order in this case may not necessarily be a sign of L1 transfer, as this can be seen as omission of the subject "it" and a grammatical error. There are also signs of Norwegian L1 transfer regarding fronting and inversion in a clause of learner 10's English text (sentence 121). In sentence 120, the verb "are" and the subject "the whole family" should switch positions.

The findings of word order show that fronting does occur in the Norwegian pupils' texts, and that inversion takes place because of this. It also shows that some clauses are not to be directly translated from Norwegian to English, as the word order in some cases is different. This is due to the fact that Norwegian is a V2-language, which means that when an adverbial is fronted, the verbal is still placed secondly, as explained in section 2.3.5. While most learners participating in the present study did not show transfer patterns from their Norwegian L1 strategies regarding fronting and inversion, there were signs of this type of transfer in three participants' English texts.

- a) *litt etter middag* (Adv) *hører* (V) *BOB* (S) *er telefonen ringe* (dO) (Appendix G)  
/shortly after dinner (Adv), Bob (S) hears (V) the phone ringing (dO).
- b) *But anyways* (Adv) *we* (S) *had* (V) *also decorated* (V) *the christmas tree* (dO)  
(Appendix G).
- c) *\*But anyways* (Adv) *had* (V) *we* (S) *also decorated* (V) *the Christmas tree* (dO).
- d) *\*Now* (Adv) *am* (V) *i* (S) *going to tell* (V) *you* (iO) *about a boy called Ethan* (dO)  
(Appendix H).
- e) *\*and there* (Adv) *was* (V) *mom, dad and Leah* (S) (Appendix H).
- f) *\*who always* (Adv) *is* (V) *there* (dO) *for him* (iO) (Appendix H).
- g) *He* (S) *has* (V) *a loving family* (dO) (Appendix H).
- h) *Som alltid* (Adv) *er* (V) *der* (dO) *for ham* (iO).
- i) *\*nwa* (Adv) *can* (V) *all the children* (S) *take* (V) *a person* (dO).
- j) *\*now* (Adv) *is* (V) *the 24. December* (dO).
- k) *\*On the Christmas eve* (Adv) *are* (V) *the whole family* (S) *listening* (V) *to carol singing* (dO).

### 4.3 Type

In this section, the different adverbial types will be commented on. The third sub-question, c) Are there differences regarding the frequency of adverbial types in the Norwegian and English texts?, will be discussed. The types of adverbials produced in the present study: adverbials, adjuncts, subjuncts, disjuncts and conjuncts, presented in sections 2.2 to 2.5, will be analysed. Numbers and percentages will be investigated and discussed in light of the theoretical foundation.

#### 4.3.1 *Main groups*

Table 11 shows a total of 614 adverbials, whereof 552 of them were adjuncts, 55 were conjuncts and 7 were disjuncts in the pupils' texts. This means an absence of subjuncts represented in the present research project. This may be due to the difficulty of separating subjuncts from adjunct, as a subjunct in a sentence can be an adjunct in another sentence, as explained in section 2.2.2 (Quirk et al., 2010, p. 566-567). Criteria for each of the main groups and their sub-groups, including the group of subjuncts and its sub-groups of courtesy and viewpoint (Table 1), were frequently used as support during the analysis of the pupils' texts, which makes this less likely to be a cause of lack of subjuncts in the present study.

It was a much higher number of adjuncts (552), which represents 89,90% of the adverbials in the texts. The group of conjuncts (55) represents a percentage of 8,96% of the total amount of adverbials, which is approximately 10 percentage points compared to the group of adjuncts. The disjuncts (7) only make a percentage of 1,14% of the total amount of adverbials found in the pupils' texts of the present study.

When comparing language and gender, there is a much higher number and percentage of adjuncts represented in the present research project. The findings show that 88,13% of the adverbials in the English texts were adjuncts, 10,5% were conjuncts and 1,37% were disjuncts (see Table 11). The findings also reveal that female and male participants' adverbial usage in English texts was quite similar in percentage and were mainly of the type of adjuncts. Of the total number of adverbials written by female participants in English texts, 86,9% were adjuncts, 11,03% were conjuncts and 2,07% were disjuncts (see Table 11). Among the male participants, their use of adverbials in English texts were also mainly adjuncts (90,54%), and to some extent conjuncts (9,46%), while there were no findings of disjuncts among the male participants in the English texts of the present study (see Table 11).

Similar findings were revealed regarding adverbial usage in Norwegian texts, where 90,89% of the adverbials in the Norwegian texts were adjuncts, 8,1% were conjuncts and 1,01% were disjuncts (see Table 11). In the Norwegian texts, as well as in the English texts, results showed that female and male participants' use of adverbials in Norwegian was very similar in percentage. Of the total number of adverbials written by female participants in Norwegian texts, 91,5% were adjuncts, 7,52% were conjuncts and 0,98% were disjuncts (see Table 11). Among the male participants, their use of adverbials in Norwegian texts were also mainly adjuncts (88,76%), and to some extent conjuncts (10,11%) and disjuncts (1,12) (see Table 11).

Table 11: Adverbial types by language and gender

| <b>Adverbials</b> | <b>Adjunct</b>      | <b>Conjunct</b>   | <b>Disjunct</b>  | <b>Total</b>      |
|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| <b>English</b>    | <b>193 (88,13%)</b> | <b>23 (10,5%)</b> | <b>3 (1,37%)</b> | <b>219 (100%)</b> |
| Female            | 126 (86,9%)         | 16 (11,03%)       | 3 (2,07%)        | 145 (100%)        |
| Male              | 67 (90,54%)         | 7 (9,46%)         |                  | 74 (100%)         |
| <b>Norwegian</b>  | <b>359 (90,89%)</b> | <b>32 (8,1%)</b>  | <b>4 (1,01%)</b> | <b>395 (100%)</b> |
| Female            | 280 (91,5%)         | 23 (7,52%)        | 3 (0,98%)        | 306 (100%)        |
| Male              | 79 (88,76%)         | 9 (10,11%)        | 1 (1,12%)        | 89 (100%)         |
| <b>Total</b>      | <b>552 (89,9%)</b>  | <b>55 (8,96%)</b> | <b>7 (1,14%)</b> | <b>614 (100%)</b> |

### 4.3.2 Sub-groups

In this section, findings of adverbials within the sub-categories of adjuncts, conjuncts and disjuncts, will be discussed. It is clear that the groups of time adjunct (228) and place adjuncts (198) were more frequently used in the present research project (see Table 12). When the total number of time adjuncts is divided by total number of adverbials and divided by 100, the answer is 37,13%, which is the total percentage that time adjuncts take up of space in the present research project. When the total number of space adjuncts is divided by total number of adverbials and divided by 100, the answer is 32,25%, which is the total percentage that place adjuncts take up of space in the present research project. When adding the percentage of time and place adjuncts, the answer is 69,38%, which is the percentage that time and place adjuncts take up of the total amount of adverbials, which is a large part of the total amount.

The least used adverbial types were of the groups of style disjuncts and inferential conjuncts, where both these groups show absence of Norwegian adverbials within these categories. The number of style disjuncts occurring in the present study were 1, while the number of inferential conjuncts occurring in the study were 2. The small amount of style disjuncts may be due to difficulties with expressing speakers' comments on style and form of utterances regarding modality and manner, and respect, which was based on the theoretical foundation in section 2.2.3. This may also simply be a result of the text genre which was narratives. If the pupils were given a genre where there were more room for debates and argumentations, there may have been a larger number of style disjuncts conveying the speakers' comments on style and form of utterances. The small number of inferential conjuncts may also be due to the text

genre, where another genre with a tone of more argumentation and debating, could possibly have led to a higher production of this type of conjuncts.

Another finding of interest was the number of approximation adjuncts, which shows an absence of English approximation adjuncts, but a few Norwegian approximation adjuncts (7). This finding may be due to a more complex sentence structure in the participants' Norwegian texts, compared to their English texts.

Table 12: Sub-groups of adverbial types by language

| Adverbial type        | English             | Norwegian           | Total             |
|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Time adjunct          | 78 (34,21%)         | 150 (65,79%)        | 228 (100%)        |
| Place adjunct         | 72 (36,36%)         | 126 (63,64%)        | 198 (100%)        |
| Degree adjunct        | 19 (45,24%)         | 23 (54,76%)         | 42 (100%)         |
| Manner adjunct        | 2 (10%)             | 18 (90%)            | 20 (100%)         |
| Focus adjunct         | 7 (41,18%)          | 10 (58,82%)         | 17 (100%)         |
| Participant adjunct   | 9 (42,86%)          | 12 (57,14%)         | 21 (100%)         |
| Reason adjunct        | 5 (35,71%)          | 9 (64,29%)          | 14 (100%)         |
| Condition adjunct     | 1 (25%)             | 3 (75%)             | 4 (100%)          |
| Approximation adjunct |                     | 7 (100%)            | 7 (100%)          |
| Enumerative conjunct  | 5 (55,56%)          | 4 (44,44%)          | 9 (100%)          |
| Concessive conjunct   | 5 (27,78%)          | 13 (72,22%)         | 18 (100%)         |
| Reinforcing conjunct  | 4 (44,44%)          | 5 (55,56%)          | 9 (100%)          |
| Resultive conjunct    | 7 (38,89%)          | 11 (61,11%)         | 18 (100%)         |
| Inferential conjunct  | 2 (100%)            |                     | 2 (100%)          |
| Content disjunct      | 2 (33,33%)          | 4 (66,67%)          | 6 (100%)          |
| Style disjunct        | 1 (100%)            |                     | 1 (100%)          |
| <b>Total</b>          | <b>219 (35,67%)</b> | <b>395 (64,33%)</b> | <b>614 (100%)</b> |

#### 4.4 Types and placement

The adverbial types and their placement were analysed according to Table 4, which was presented and explained in section 3.8.5. In this section, the different adverbial types and their placements in initial, medial or final position, will be commented on. The fourth sub-question, d) Is there a correlation between adverbial placement and adverbial type in the Norwegian and English texts?, will be discussed. Numbers and percentages will be investigated and discussed in light of the theoretical foundation.



#### 4.4.1 Placement in main groups

Table 13 shows that the most common placement for adjuncts was final position (47,64%), while the second most common placement was initial position (32,79%), and the least common placement was medial position (19,56%). The most common placement for conjuncts was initial position (72,73%), the second least common placement was medial position (20%), and the least common position was final (7,27%) (see Table 13). The most common placement for disjuncts was initial position (57,14%), the second most common placement was final position (28,57%), and the least common placement was medial position (14,29%), even though the numbers of disjuncts were very small (see Table 13).

Table 13: Adverbial types and placement

| Adverbials   | Initial             | Medial              | Final               | Total             |
|--------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Adjunct      | 181 (32,79%)        | 108 (19,56%)        | 263 (47,64%)        | 552 (100%)        |
| Conjunct     | 40 (72,73%)         | 11 (20%)            | 4 (7,27%)           | 55 (100%)         |
| Disjunct     | 4 (57,14%)          | 1 (14,29%)          | 2 (28,57%)          | 7 (100%)          |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>225 (36,64%)</b> | <b>120 (19,54%)</b> | <b>269 (43,81%)</b> | <b>614 (100%)</b> |

As previously mentioned in section 4.2, the most frequent placement of adverbials in the English texts was final position (45,21%), the second most common placement was initial position (34,25%), and the least common placement was medial position (20,55%) (see Table 14). In the English texts, the most common placement for adjuncts was final position (49,74%), the second most common placement was initial position (29,53%), and the least common placement was medial position (20,73%) (see Table 14). The two most usual placements for English adjuncts were final and initial position. These are the same findings as presented in the theoretical foundation regarding placement of adjuncts, where both obligatory and optional adjuncts are usually placed finally and seldom in initial position, and sentence adjuncts can be placed both initially and finally, as presented in section 2.2.6. From the theoretical foundation, I would expect the most common placement of English adjuncts to be final position, the second most common placement to be initial position, and the least common placement to be medial position.

If there were any English subjuncts presented in the present research project, I would expect viewpoint subjuncts to be placed in initial position and courtesy subjuncts to be placed in medial position, as discussed in the theoretical foundation in section 2.2.6.

The most common placement for conjuncts in the English texts was initial position (73,91%), the second least common placement was medial position (21,74%), and the least common placement was final position (4,35%) (see Table 14). As explained in section 2.2.6, conjuncts may be placed in all positions, but it is stated in section 2.4 that English conjuncts are commonly placed at the beginning of a sentence. Therefore, it was an exciting result that a large part of the conjuncts were placed in initial position, as there is correlation between the theoretical foundation and the findings in the present study.

In the English texts, the most common placement for disjuncts was final position (66,67%), while the second most common placement was initial position (33,33%) (see Table 14). There were no findings of disjuncts placed in medial position in the English texts. According to the theoretical foundation presented in section 2.2.6, the most usual placement of a disjunct is in initial position, even though they can be placed in all positions. The findings of the present study do not correlate with the theoretical foundation in section 2.2.6, but maybe the result would have been different if there were a larger number of disjuncts in the English texts. This may be something for future researchers to elaborate on.

Regarding gender variations in the English texts, the placement of adjuncts differed among female and male participants. Even though both gender shared the same common placements of adjuncts, the female participants showed more similar placements in final (41,27%) and initial position (34,13%) than the male participants showed in their placements of adjuncts in final (65,67%) and initial position (20,9%) (see Table 14). There were no findings of disjuncts among the male participants, while the female participants of the present research project placed a disjunct in initial position and two disjuncts in final position (see Table 14). The findings of this feature are not large enough to draw conclusions from but may be something for future researchers to elaborate on.

Table 14: Adverbial types and placement in English texts by gender

| Adverbial type  | Initial            | Medial             | Final              | Total             |
|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| <b>Adjunct</b>  | <b>57 (29,53%)</b> | <b>40 (20,73%)</b> | <b>96 (49,74%)</b> | <b>193 (100%)</b> |
| Male            | 14 (20,9%)         | 9 (13,43%)         | 44 (65,67%)        | 67 (100%)         |
| Female          | 43 (34,13%)        | 31 (24,6%)         | 52 (41,27%)        | 126 (100%)        |
| <b>Conjunct</b> | <b>17 (73,91%)</b> | <b>5 (21,74%)</b>  | <b>1 (4,35%)</b>   | <b>23 (100%)</b>  |
| Male            | 7 (100%)           |                    |                    | 7 (100%)          |
| Female          | 10 (62,5%)         | 5 (31,25%)         | 1 (6,25%)          | 16 (100%)         |
| <b>Disjunct</b> | <b>1 (33,33%)</b>  |                    | <b>2 (66,67%)</b>  | <b>3 (100%)</b>   |
| Female          | 1 (33,33%)         |                    | 2 (66,67%)         | 3 (100%)          |
| <b>Total</b>    | <b>75 (34,25%)</b> | <b>45 (20,55%)</b> | <b>99 (45,21%)</b> | <b>219 (100%)</b> |

As already mentioned in section 4.2, the most frequent placement of adverbials in the Norwegian texts was final position (43,04%), the second most common placement was initial position (37,97%), and the least common placement was medial position (18,99%) (see Table 15). This is an interesting finding, as the theoretical foundation in section 2.3.4 states that Norwegian adverbials are commonly placed in initial position. The difference between Norwegian adverbials placed initially (37,97%) and finally (43,04%) is not that big, but this indicates a difference between findings in the present study and the theoretical foundation. Truelson (2017) found that the Swedish translators of English L2 participating in her study showed a preferred placement of final position regarding most adverbial types in both English and Swedish (pp. 40-43), which was presented in section 2.6.2. The findings of the present research project also show that there is a preferred placement of English adverbials in final position (45,21%) (see Table 14). This also applies for the Norwegian adverbials, where 43,03% of the adverbials are placed in final position (see Table 15).

In the Norwegian texts, the most common placement for adjuncts was final position (46,52%), the second most common placement was initial position (34,54%), and the least common placement was medial position (18,94%) (see Table 15). An interpretation of Table 3 is that Norwegian adjuncts are often placed initially, but also in final position, and sometimes in medial position. An expectation would be that the participants of the study would place most of their adverbials in initial position, that the second most common placement of adjuncts would be final position, and that the least common placement of Norwegian adjuncts would

be medial position. This did to an extent correlate with the findings of the present study, but not entirely, as there were more Norwegian adverbials presented in final (46,52%) than in initial position (34,54%).

The most common placement for conjuncts in the Norwegian texts was initial position (71,88%), the second least common placement was medial position (18,75%), and the least common placement was final position (9,38%) (see Table 15). As mentioned in section 2.4, Norwegian conjuncts are more commonly placed in medial position, which does not correlate with the findings in the present research project.

In the Norwegian texts, the most common placement for disjuncts was initial position (75%), while the second most common placement was medial position (25%) (see Table 15). There were no findings of disjuncts placed in final position in the Norwegian texts. Section 2.4 explains that Norwegian disjuncts are commonly placed in medial position. By this means, there is no correlation between the theoretical foundation and the findings in the present study.

Regarding gender variations in the Norwegian texts, the findings in percentage were quite similar, but they differ in placement of disjuncts. A male participant has placed a disjunct in medial position, while findings from female participants show a few disjuncts (3) placed in initial position (see Table 15). The findings are not large enough to draw any conclusions from, but this may be a feature for future research projects to investigate.

Table 15: Adverbial types and placement in Norwegian texts by gender

| Adverbial type  | Initial             | Medial             | Final               | Total             |
|-----------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| <b>Adjunct</b>  | <b>124 (34,54%)</b> | <b>68 (18,94%)</b> | <b>167 (46,52%)</b> | <b>359 (100%)</b> |
| Male            | 29 (36,71%)         | 15 (18,99%)        | 35 (44,30%)         | 79 (100%)         |
| Female          | 95 (33,93%)         | 53 (18,93%)        | 132 (47,14%)        | 280 (100%)        |
| <b>Conjunct</b> | <b>23 (71,88%)</b>  | <b>6 (18,75%)</b>  | <b>3 (9,38%)</b>    | <b>32 (100%)</b>  |
| Male            | 6 (66,67%)          | 2 (22,22%)         | 1 (11,11%)          | 9 (100%)          |
| Female          | 17 (73,91%)         | 4 (17,39)          | 2 (8,7%)            | 23 (100%)         |
| <b>Disjunct</b> | <b>3 (75%)</b>      | <b>1 (25%)</b>     |                     | <b>4 (100%)</b>   |
| Male            |                     | 1 (100%)           |                     | 1 (100%)          |
| Female          | 3 (100%)            |                    |                     | 3 (100%)          |
| <b>Total</b>    | <b>150 (37,97%)</b> | <b>75 (18,99%)</b> | <b>170 (43,04%)</b> | <b>395 (100%)</b> |

#### 4.4.2 *Placement in sub-groups*

An interesting finding in the group of adjuncts, was how frequent the participants in the present study used time and place adjuncts. In the present study, the overall findings showed that time adverbials were mostly placed initially, while place adverbials were mostly placed in final position. This was true when differentiating between the English and Norwegian texts. In the English texts, 58,97% of the time adverbials were placed initially, while 83,33% of the place adverbials were placed finally (see Tables 16 and 17). In the Norwegian texts, 62,67% of the time adverbials were placed initially, while 76,19% of the place adverbials were placed finally (see Tables 16 and 17). According to the theoretical foundation presented in Table 3, both English time and place adjuncts are usually placed initially, while Norwegian time adjuncts are usually placed in initial position and Norwegian place adjuncts can be placed in final and initial position. In this case, there are possible findings of Norwegian L1 transfer and crosslinguistic influence regarding placement of English place adjuncts in final position.

There was a small number of disjuncts occurring in the Norwegian and English texts, and there were findings of style and content disjuncts. When differentiating between the English and Norwegian texts, the number of Norwegian content disjuncts were 4, while the number of English content disjuncts were 2. Of the 4 Norwegian content disjuncts, three were placed initially and one was placed in medial position (see Table 17). The 2 English content disjuncts were both placed in final position (see Table 16). There was only production of one style disjunct in the present study, which were written in English and placed in initial position. As discussed in section 4.3.2, this may be due to the chosen genre. These findings are not large enough to draw conclusions from, but these may be features for other researchers to investigate.

In the present research project, the most frequent conjuncts were of the concessive and resultive types, which will be elaborated on. An exciting result is that the production of concessive conjuncts differs a lot between the English and Norwegian texts. In the English texts, there was a production of 5 concessive and 7 resultive conjuncts, while there were findings of 13 Norwegian concessive conjuncts and 11 Norwegian resultive conjuncts (Tables 16 and 17). The English concessive conjuncts were all placed in initial position, while the Norwegian concessive conjuncts were commonly placed initially (76,92%), but also in medial (15,38%) and final position (7,69%). This shows a preferred placement of concessive conjuncts in initial position both in Norwegian and English texts. The same finding regarding preferred placement of resultive conjuncts in initial position was found in the English

(85,71%) and Norwegian texts (100%) (Tables 16 and 17). The theoretical foundation of section 2.2.6 explains that initial position is a common placement for English conjuncts to be placed, which correlates with the findings of the present study.

Table 16: Sub-groups of adverbial types and placement in English texts

| <b>Adverbial type</b> | <b>Initial</b>     | <b>Medial</b>      | <b>Final</b>       | <b>Total</b>      |
|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Time adjunct          | 46 (58,97%)        | 14 (17,95%)        | 18 (23,08%)        | 78 (100%)         |
| Place adjunct         | 8 (11,11%)         | 4 (5,56%)          | 60 (83,33%)        | 72 (100%)         |
| Condition adjunct     | 1 (100%)           |                    |                    | 1 (100%)          |
| Degree adjunct        | 1 (5,26%)          | 17 (89,47%)        | 1 (5,26%)          | 19 (100%)         |
| Manner adjunct        |                    |                    | 2 (100%)           | 2 (100%)          |
| Participant adjunct   |                    | 1 (11,11%)         | 8 (88,89%)         | 9 (100%)          |
| Focus adjunct         | 1 (14,29%)         | 3 (42,86%)         | 3 (42,86%)         | 7 (100%)          |
| Reason adjunct        |                    | 1 (20%)            | 4 (80%)            | 5 (100%)          |
| Content disjunct      |                    |                    | 2 (100%)           | 2 (100%)          |
| Style disjunct        | 1 (100%)           |                    |                    | 1 (100%)          |
| Concessive conjunct   | 5 (100%)           |                    |                    | 5 (100%)          |
| Enumerative conjunct  | 4 (80%)            | 1 (20%)            |                    | 5 (100%)          |
| Inferential conjunct  | 2 (100%)           |                    |                    | 2 (100%)          |
| Reinforcing conjunct  |                    | 4 (100%)           |                    | 4 (100%)          |
| Resultive conjunct    | 6 (85,71%)         |                    | 1 (14,29%)         | 7 (100%)          |
| <b>Total</b>          | <b>75 (34,25%)</b> | <b>45 (20,55%)</b> | <b>99 (45,21%)</b> | <b>219 (100%)</b> |

Table 17: Sub-groups of adverbial types and placement in Norwegian texts

| Adverbial type        | Initial     | Medial      | Final               | Total             |
|-----------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Time adjunct          | 94 (62,67%) | 26 (17,33%) | 30 (20%)            | 150 (100%)        |
| Place adjunct         | 22 (17,46%) | 8 (6,35%)   | 96 (76,19%)         | 126 (100%)        |
| Approximation adjunct | 1 (14,29%)  | 4 (57,14%)  | 2 (28,57%)          | 7 (100%)          |
| Condition adjunct     | 3 (100%)    |             |                     | 3 (100%)          |
| Degree adjunct        |             | 17 (73,91%) | 6 (26,09%)          | 23 (100%)         |
| Manner adjunct        |             | 4 (22,22%)  | 14 (77,78%)         | 18 (100%)         |
| Participant adjunct   |             | 3 (25%)     | 9 (75%)             | 12 (100%)         |
| Focus adjunct         | 3 (30%)     | 5 (50%)     | 2 (20%)             | 10 (100%)         |
| Reason adjunct        |             | 1 (11,11%)  | 8 (88,89%)          | 9 (100%)          |
| Content disjunct      | 3 (75%)     | 1 (25%)     |                     | 4 (100%)          |
| Concessive conjunct   | 10 (76,92%) | 2 (15,38%)  | 1 (7,69%)           | 13 (100%)         |
| Enumerative conjunct  | 3 (75%)     | 1 (25%)     |                     | 4 (100%)          |
| Reinforcing conjunct  |             | 3 (60%)     | 2 (40%)             | 5 (100%)          |
| Resultive conjunct    | 11 (100%)   |             |                     | 11 (100%)         |
| <b>Total</b>          | <b>150</b>  | <b>75</b>   | <b>170 (43,04%)</b> | <b>395 (100%)</b> |

## 4.5 Norwegian influence

In this section, the three evidence of crosslinguistic influence, which were presented in section 3.4, will be discussed in light of the present study.

### 4.5.1 Evidence 1

The first evidence of crosslinguistic influence, intragroup homogeneity, which was explained in section 3.4, is evidence which show that the behaviour is common in a group with the same language combination. The question is whether the group performs consistently regarding adverbial placement.

The findings of a group comparison of the participants show that they perform quite similar in the two languages. They produce more clauses in the Norwegian than in the English texts, as explained in section 4.1. The placements showed very similar results in Norwegian and English texts of the present study, as discussed in section 4.2, and the same accounted for adverbial types presented in Table 11 of section 4.3. In percentage, the adverbial types and

placement were very similar in the two languages, as shown in tables 14 and 15, and further explained in section 4.4. Based on the analysis made in sections 4.1 to 4.4, I would consider the first evidence of crosslinguistic influence as covered.

#### *4.5.2 Evidence 2*

As mentioned in section 3.4 of the theoretical foundation, to cover the second crosslinguistic evidence of intergroup heterogeneity, a comparison of the present study and another study would need to be made. The choice of study to be compared to the present research project, fell on Selinker (1969, 1983), where transfer effects regarding time and place adverbials from L1 Hebrew speakers of English L2 were studied.

Selinker's study showed that Hebrew speakers preferred the positioning of place adverbials before direct objects in both Hebrew and English (Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2007, pp. 42-43). In the present study, the overall findings showed that time adverbials were mostly placed initially (61,40%), while place adverbials were mostly placed in final position (78,79%). This was also true when differentiating between the English and Norwegian texts. In the English texts, 58,97% of the time adverbials were placed initially, while 83,33% of the place adverbials were placed finally. In the Norwegian texts, 62,67% of the time adverbials were placed initially, while 76,19% of the place adverbials were placed finally. As we can see, the results regarding placement of time and place adverbials, were quite similar in the Norwegian and English texts. When comparing the results of the present study with Selinker's findings, it shows two different results when comparing two learner groups who share a common L2 of English. The findings in the present study reveal that Norwegian speakers of English L2 preferred the positioning of time adverbials as the first sentence element, and that place adverbials were usually placed last in a clause, while Selinker's study showed that direct object was usually placed after a place adverbials. This may be due to more advanced sentence structures in Selinker's study, as his data material could have more findings of direct objects than the present study, but this is just based on assumptions.

Selinker also discovered that speakers of Hebrew L1 did not show a particular preference of the order of time and place adverbials in English or Hebrew (Ibid, pp. 42-43). The findings of the present study, shows that the speakers of Norwegian L1 had a preference regarding placement of time and place adverbials, as the pupils mostly placed time adverbials in initial position and place adverbials in final position in both Norwegian and English texts. When



comparing the present study's results with Selinker's results, it shows that the findings in the two studies were different. As the present study was compared to another similar study, I would consider the second evidence of crosslinguistic influence as covered.

### 4.5.3 Evidence 3

Crosslinguistic congruity, which is the third evidence, will compare the participants' performance in their L1 Norwegian and L2 English to prove that their L2 performance is due to the language structures of the participants' L1 production in the same context. As explained in section 3.4, the participants of the study were or would shortly be turning 12 years old at the time of the data collection, and they had Norwegian as their L1 and English as their L2, meaning that their preconditions would be quite similar. The type of task and topic, and the frames surrounding the participants were also similar, which was explained in section 3.8.1. A difference was that some of the ten words in the word bank were different from the Norwegian to the English text writing, but this was done because of different traditions in Norway and England, and to hopefully keep the pupils motivated to write sufficient amounts of clauses when writing two very similar texts with only a week in between.

In this case, an individual comparison would also need to be made. Table 18 shows the number of English adverbials produced by each learner in initial position. The English adverbial production in initial position varies from one adverbial (learner 6) to 18 adverbials (learner 14) (see Table 18). Table 19 reveals the number of English adverbials produced in medial position. The number of English adverbials placed in medial position is quite similar among the participants, varying from 0 (learner 1 and 11) to 6 adverbials (learner 4). In Table 20, numbers of English adverbials placed in final position, are investigated. Table 20 shows a variation from 2 (learner 10) to 15 (learner 1) adverbials. In table 18, it is clear that English time adjuncts (46) was the most frequent adverbial type placed initially, as all participants of the present study placed at least one time adjuncts in initial position. The participants had also placed some English conjuncts in initial position (17) (see Table 18). In table 19, the placement of English degree adjuncts (17) is dominant in medial position and occurs in almost every participants' English text. There is also a high number of English time adjuncts in the texts (14) (see Table 19). Table 20 reveals a large number of English place adjuncts (60) occurring in the participants' English texts, where each participant has placed at least one place adjunct in final position. The number of time adjuncts is also high in final position (18) (Table 20).

Even though the numbers of each participants' adverbial production in Norwegian and English texts varied between the participants in the present research project, there was a clear pattern revealing that almost every pupil showed production of the most common adverbial type occurring in the different positions in both English and Norwegian texts. Based on this analysis, I would also consider the third evidence of crosslinguistic influence as covered.

Table 18: Individual comparison of adverbials placed in initial position in English texts

| Learner #             | 1        | 2        | 3        | 4        | 5        | 6        | 7        | 8        | 9        | 10       | 11       | 12       | 13       | 14        | Total     |
|-----------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| Approximation adjunct |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |           |           |
| Condition adjunct     |          |          |          |          | 1        |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |           | 1         |
| Conjunct              | 4        |          |          | 1        | 2        |          | 2        |          | 2        |          |          | 2        |          | 4         | 17        |
| Degree adjunct        |          |          |          |          | 1        |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |           | 1         |
| Disjunct              |          |          |          |          |          |          | 1        |          |          |          |          |          |          |           | 1         |
| Focus adjunct         |          |          |          | 1        |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |           | 1         |
| Manner adjunct        |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |           |           |
| Participant adjunct   |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |           |           |
| Place adjunct         |          | 1        |          |          |          |          |          | 1        | 1        | 2        |          |          | 1        | 2         | 8         |
| Reason adjunct        |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |           |           |
| Time adjunct          | 3        | 3        | 2        | 2        | 2        | 1        | 4        | 1        | 2        | 6        | 1        | 4        | 3        | 12        | 46        |
| <b>Total</b>          | <b>7</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>6</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>7</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>5</b> | <b>8</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>6</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>18</b> | <b>75</b> |

Table 19: Individual comparison of adverbials placed in medial position in English texts

| Learner #           | 2        | 3        | 4        | 5        | 6        | 7        | 8        | 9        | 10       | 12       | 13       | 14       | Total     |
|---------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| Conjunct            | 2        |          |          | 1        | 1        |          |          |          | 1        |          |          |          | 5         |
| Degree adjunct      | 1        |          | 2        | 1        | 4        | 1        |          | 3        | 1        | 2        | 1        | 1        | 17        |
| Focus adjunct       |          |          |          |          |          | 1        |          |          |          |          |          | 2        | 3         |
| Participant adjunct |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | 1        |          |          | 1         |
| Place adjunct       |          |          |          |          |          |          | 2        |          | 1        |          |          | 1        | 4         |
| Reason adjunct      |          | 1        |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | 1         |
| Time adjunct        | 1        |          |          | 4        |          |          | 2        | 2        | 1        | 2        | 1        | 1        | 14        |
| <b>Total</b>        | <b>4</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>6</b> | <b>5</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>5</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>5</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>5</b> | <b>45</b> |

Table 20: Individual comparison of adverbials placed in final position in English texts

| Learner #             | 1         | 2         | 3        | 4        | 5        | 6        | 7        | 8        | 9        | 10       | 11       | 12       | 13        | 14       | Total     |
|-----------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| Approximation adjunct |           |           |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |           |          |           |
| Condition adjunct     |           |           |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |           |          |           |
| Conjunct              |           | 1         |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |           |          | 1         |
| Degree adjunct        |           |           |          | 1        |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |           |          | 1         |
| Disjunct              |           | 1         |          |          |          |          | 1        |          |          |          |          |          |           |          | 2         |
| Focus adjunct         | 1         |           | 1        |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | 1        |          |           |          | 3         |
| Manner adjunct        |           |           |          |          |          | 1        |          |          |          |          |          |          | 1         |          | 2         |
| Participant adjunct   | 2         |           |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | 1        | 1        | 2        | 2         |          | 8         |
| Place adjunct         | 9         | 6         | 2        | 3        | 4        | 6        | 2        | 4        | 3        | 1        | 3        | 6        | 5         | 6        | 60        |
| Reason adjunct        | 2         |           |          | 1        |          |          |          |          | 1        |          |          |          |           |          | 4         |
| Time adjunct          | 1         | 4         | 1        | 1        | 2        | 1        | 2        |          | 3        |          |          |          | 3         |          | 18        |
| <b>Total</b>          | <b>15</b> | <b>12</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>6</b> | <b>6</b> | <b>8</b> | <b>5</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>7</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>5</b> | <b>8</b> | <b>11</b> | <b>6</b> | <b>99</b> |

In table 21, it is clear that Norwegian time adjuncts (94) was the most frequent adverbial type placed initially, as almost all participants of the present study placed at least one time adjuncts in initial position, except from learner 11. The participants had also placed some English conjuncts in initial position (24) (see Table 21). In table 22, the placement of English time adjuncts (26) and degree adjuncts (17) is dominant in medial position and occur in almost every participants' English text. Table 23 reveals a large number of English place adjuncts (96) occurring in the participants' English texts, where almost each participant has placed at least one place adjunct in final position. The number of time adjuncts (30) is also large in final position (see Table 23).

Table 21: Individual comparison of adverbials placed in initial position in Norwegian texts

| Learner #             | 1         | 2        | 3         | 4        | 5         | 6         | 7         | 8         | 9        | 10        | 12       | 13        | 14        | Total      |
|-----------------------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Approximation adjunct |           |          |           |          | 1         |           |           |           |          |           |          |           |           | 1          |
| Condition adjunct     |           |          |           |          |           |           |           |           |          | 3         |          |           |           | 3          |
| Conjunct              | 2         |          | 1         |          | 2         | 1         | 3         | 2         | 2        | 3         | 2        | 2         | 4         | 24         |
| Disjunct              |           |          |           |          |           |           |           | 1         |          |           |          |           | 2         | 3          |
| Focus adjunct         | 2         | 1        |           |          |           |           |           |           |          |           |          |           |           | 3          |
| Place adjunct         | 4         |          | 3         |          |           | 2         | 3         | 6         |          |           | 3        |           | 1         | 22         |
| Time adjunct          | 4         | 3        | 6         | 2        | 10        | 11        | 5         | 10        | 3        | 14        | 4        | 14        | 8         | 94         |
| <b>Total</b>          | <b>12</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>10</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>13</b> | <b>14</b> | <b>11</b> | <b>19</b> | <b>5</b> | <b>20</b> | <b>9</b> | <b>16</b> | <b>15</b> | <b>150</b> |

Table 22: Individual comparison of adverbials placed in medial position in Norwegian texts

| Learner #             | 1        | 3        | 4        | 5        | 6        | 7         | 8         | 9        | 10       | 11       | 12        | 13       | 14       | Total     |
|-----------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| Approximation adjunct |          |          |          | 1        |          |           |           |          |          |          | 2         |          | 1        | 4         |
| Conjunct              | 1        |          | 1        | 1        |          | 2         |           |          |          |          | 1         |          |          | 6         |
| Degree adjunct        | 1        |          | 1        | 2        | 3        | 2         | 5         | 2        |          |          |           |          | 1        | 17        |
| Disjunct              |          |          | 1        |          |          |           |           |          |          |          |           |          |          | 1         |
| Focus adjunct         |          | 1        | 1        |          | 1        |           |           |          |          |          |           |          | 2        | 5         |
| Manner adjunct        |          |          |          |          |          | 1         | 1         |          |          |          | 2         |          |          | 4         |
| Participant adjunct   |          |          |          |          | 1        |           |           | 1        |          | 1        |           |          |          | 3         |
| Place adjunct         |          | 1        |          |          |          | 3         |           | 1        |          |          | 1         | 1        | 1        | 8         |
| Reason adjunct        |          |          |          |          |          |           |           |          |          |          |           |          | 1        | 1         |
| Time adjunct          | 1        | 2        |          | 3        | 2        | 3         | 4         | 3        | 1        | 1        | 4         | 1        | 1        | 26        |
| <b>Total</b>          | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>7</b> | <b>7</b> | <b>11</b> | <b>10</b> | <b>7</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>10</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>7</b> | <b>75</b> |

Table 23: Individual comparison of adverbials placed in final position in Norwegian texts

| Learner #             | 1         | 2        | 3         | 5         | 6         | 7         | 8         | 9         | 10       | 11       | 12        | 13       | 14        | Total      |
|-----------------------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|------------|
| Approximation adjunct |           |          |           | 1         |           |           | 1         |           |          |          |           |          |           | 2          |
| Conjunct              |           |          | 1         |           |           | 1         |           | 1         |          |          |           |          |           | 3          |
| Degree adjunct        | 1         |          | 1         | 2         | 1         |           |           |           |          |          | 1         |          |           | 6          |
| Focus adjunct         |           | 1        |           |           |           |           | 1         |           |          |          |           |          |           | 2          |
| Manner adjunct        |           |          | 5         | 1         | 1         | 1         |           | 3         |          | 1        | 1         |          | 1         | 14         |
| Participant adjunct   |           |          |           | 2         | 1         | 1         |           |           | 1        |          | 2         |          | 2         | 9          |
| Place adjunct         | 6         | 6        | 17        | 12        | 12        | 5         | 1         | 5         | 6        | 5        | 9         | 5        | 7         | 96         |
| Reason adjunct        |           |          | 1         |           |           |           | 1         |           | 1        |          |           | 2        | 3         | 8          |
| Time adjunct          | 3         |          | 1         | 5         | 3         | 3         | 7         | 2         |          |          | 4         | 1        | 1         | 30         |
| <b>Total</b>          | <b>10</b> | <b>7</b> | <b>26</b> | <b>23</b> | <b>18</b> | <b>12</b> | <b>10</b> | <b>11</b> | <b>8</b> | <b>7</b> | <b>16</b> | <b>8</b> | <b>14</b> | <b>170</b> |

## 5 Conclusions

This chapter presents concluding thoughts regarding the current study, including the most essential points from the thesis, to be able to answer the research questions in a concise way. The aim of the present research project was to investigate where the participants place their adverbials, and if it was possible to discover transfer patterns from Norwegian strategies regarding adverbial placement in the pupils' English L2 writing. As mentioned in section 1.1, grammar is important, as it is important to gain increased knowledge in this field to be able to analyse learner development of reading and writing, and to potentially discover patterns of error. Based on the analysis of the three evidence of crosslinguistic influence, I would consider these types of evidence covered, which makes it possible for crosslinguistic influence to occur in the present study. As mentioned in section 3.4, the reliance on these types of evidence, makes the project more reliable.

In order to answer the main research question, 1) Are there differences in the use of adverbials, particularly with regard to placement, when pupils in a Norwegian 7<sup>th</sup> grade are writing L1 Norwegian and L2 English texts?, the five sub-questions were discussed.

An interesting finding regarding adverbial types and placement was the placement of time and place adverbials occurring in Norwegian and English texts. The overall findings of the present study revealed a very large number and percentage of time and place adverbials, and showed that time adverbials were mostly placed initially, while place adverbials were mostly placed in final position. The same findings were revealed when differentiating between time and place adverbial occurrence in the English and Norwegian texts. Table 3 showed that English time and place adjuncts were usually placed initially. Norwegian time adjuncts were usually placed in initial position, while Norwegian place adjuncts could be placed in both final and initial position (Table 3). In this case, these findings were likely to be Norwegian L1 transfer and crosslinguistic influence regarding placement of English place adjuncts in final position.

There were also a few differences regarding the participants' word order, where they mainly kept their L2 English SVO word order in the English texts. Some exceptions were discussed in section 4.2.2, where three of the participants' English texts revealed signs of Norwegian L1 transfer and crosslinguistic influence regarding the V2-order and inversion where adverbials were fronted. This would be a feature for future researchers to elaborate on, with possibilities of including more data material and compare this feature across a larger data material. There were also some findings of the present study indicating interlingual identification, as there

were results of similarities between the Norwegian and English adverbial usage and placements presented in numbers and percentage.

Some of the new insights which the present study has contributed with, are whether pupils in a Norwegian 7<sup>th</sup> grade, transfer different strategies of adverbial placement from their L1 Norwegian to their written L2 English production. The findings of time and place adverbials revealed a possible transfer pattern from Norwegian L1 to English L2 writing. This result may be something for teachers to be aware of in their language teaching, as this may be an subconscious or conscious grammatical error occurring in Norwegian L1 learners' English L2 text production. Even though the data material is not large enough to make any generalisations, it can provide guidance of specific Norwegian L1 crosslinguistic influence which may or may not occur in a Norwegian 7<sup>th</sup> grade's English L2 production of narratives. For future research projects, a suggestion is to elaborate on the present research project by providing more data material, and possibly compare results across several Norwegian 7<sup>th</sup> grades.

## References

- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S. & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Brown, J. D. (2001). *Using Surveys in Language Programs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Christoffersen, L. & Johannessen, A. (2012). *Forskningsmetode for lærerutdanningene*. Oslo: Abstrakt forlag.
- Denham, K., and A. Lobeck (2005). *Language in the schools: Integrating linguistics into K12 teaching*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Dypedahl, M., Hasselgård, H. & Løken, B. (2016). *Introducing English Grammar* (2nd ed.). Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2003). *Questionnaires in Second Language Research- Construction, Administration and Processing*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Elbow, P. (1981). *Writing with power: Techniques for mastering the writing process*. New York: Oxford.
- Faarlund, J. T., Lie, S. & Vannebo, K. I. (2012). *Norsk Referansegrammatikk*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Hatch, E. M. & A. Lazaraton (1991). *The research manual: Design and statistics for Applied Linguistics*. New York: Newbury House.
- Hognestad, J. K. (2013). Syntaks. In H. Traavik & B. K. Jansson (Eds.), *Norskboka 1- Norsk for grunnskolelærerutdanning 1-7*. (pp. 147-162). Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Hudson, R. (2004). Why education needs linguistics. *Journal of Linguistics* 40, no. 1: 105–30.
- Jarvis, S. & Pavlenko, A. (2007). *Crosslinguistic Influence in Language and Cognition*. New York: Routledge.
- Jensen, B.U. (2017). *Leksikosyntaktiske trekk og skriveverktøy. En kvantitativ undersøkelse av tekster skrevet for hånd og på tastatur av elever i VG1* (Doctoral thesis). Retrieved from: <https://bora.uib.no/handle/1956/16998> .



- Kellerman, E. (1997). *Why typologically close languages are interesting for the study of second language acquisition*. Departments of English and Applied Linguistics & University of Nijmegen.
- Levshina, N. (2015). *How to do Linguistics with R: Data exploration and statistical analysis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Lightbown, P. M. & Spada, N. (2013). *How languages are learned* (4th edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mackey, A. & Gass, S. M. (2015). *Second Language Research: Methodology and Design*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Mackey, A. & Goo, J. (2007). Interaction research in SLA: a meta-analysis and research synthesis. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational Interaction in Second Language Acquisition: A Series of Empirical Studies* (pp. 407-452). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Masters, G. & Forster, M. (1997). *Literacy standards in Australia*. Melbourne: Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Myhill, D., Jones, S., Lines, H. & Watson, A. (2011). *Re-thinking grammar: The impact of embedded grammar teaching on students' writing and students' metalinguistic understanding*. Research Papers in Education. 27. 1-28.  
10.1080/02671522.2011.637640.
- Odlin, T. (2003). Crosslinguistic influence. In C. J. Doughty & M. H. Long (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 436-486). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Ortega, L. (2013). *Understanding second language acquisition*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Parrott, M. (2010). *Grammar for English Language Teachers* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Postholm, M. B. & Jacobsen, D. I. (2018). *Forskningsmetode for masterstudenter i lærerutdanning*. Oslo: Cappelen Damm Akademisk.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. & Svartvik, J. (2010). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. India: Pearson.

Su, I. (2001). Transfer of sentence processing strategies: A comparison of L2 learners of Chinese and English. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 22(1), 83-112.

doi:10.1017/S0142716401001059

Truelson, C. (2017). Adverbial placement in Swedish and English translations.

United States Department of Education. 2002. *No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001*. Washington, DC: US GPO.

Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in contact*. The Hague: Mouton.

## Appendix

Appendix A- Questionnaire regarding background information

Appendix B- Consent form

Appendix C- PowerPoint introduction Norwegian

Appendix D- PowerPoint introduction English

Appendix E- Writing frame Norwegian

Appendix F- Writing frame English

Appendix G- Sample of a Norwegian and an English text written by Learner 1

Appendix H- Sample of a Norwegian and an English text written by Learner 2

## **Bakgrunnsinformasjon (fyll ut og lever til lærer)**

Navn: \_\_\_\_\_.

Alder: \_\_\_\_\_ (år gammel).

**Velg en boks ( ) i hver oppgave og kryss ut ett alternativ ( x ).**

### **1. Kjønn:**

Jente ( )

Gutt ( )

### **2. Kan du andre språk enn norsk og engelsk?**

Nei ( )

Ja, jeg snakker \_\_\_\_\_.

### **3. Har en eller begge foreldrene dine, eller andre foresatte, et annet morsmål enn norsk?**

Nei ( )

Ja, mor/far/foresatte snakker \_\_\_\_\_.

### **4. Har du noen gang bodd i et engelsktalende land, gått på internasjonal skole, eller i andre sammenhenger hatt engelsk som dagligspråk?**

Nei ( )

Ja, i.... 1-2 måneder ( ) 3-6 måneder ( ) 6-12 måneder ( ) lenger ( )

**5. Har du nær familie du vanligvis pleier å snakke engelsk med?**

Nei ( )

Ja, ... daglig ( ) flere ganger i uken ( ) flere ganger i måneden ( ) sjeldnere ( )

**6. Har du andre du vanligvis pleier å snakke engelsk med?**

Nei ( )

Ja, ... daglig ( ) flere ganger i uken ( ) flere ganger i måneden ( ) sjeldnere ( )

## **Vil barnet ditt delta i forskningsprosjektet**

### **” En sammenligning av norske elevers adverbialplassering i norske og engelske elevtekster”?**

Dette er et spørsmål til deg om du ønsker at ditt barn skal få delta i et forskningsprosjekt hvor formålet er å finne ut hvordan elever i norske barneskoler bygger opp setningene sine når de skriver engelske tekster sammenlignet med tilsvarende bruk i norske tekster. I dette skrevet gir jeg deg informasjon om målene for prosjektet og hva deltakelse vil innebære for ditt barn.

#### **Formål**

Formålet med prosjektet er å innhente tekster skrevet på engelsk og på norsk av elever i den norske skolen, for å finne ut om det er forskjeller eller likheter i hvordan setningene er oppbygde. Dette er til forskning som inngår i en masteroppgave, som del av lærerutdanningen ved Høgskulen på Vestlandet. Informasjonen vil være nyttig for å finne ut hvordan elevers overføringsevne er fra det norske til det engelske skriftspråket, og hvordan man kan forebygge eventuelle overføringsfeil.

#### **Hvem er ansvarlig for forskningsprosjektet?**

Høgskulen på Vestlandet er ansvarlig for prosjektet.

#### **Hvorfor får barnet ditt spørsmål om å delta?**

Utvalget er basert på 7.klasse-elever, på grunn av at de har mer erfaring med å skrive engelske tekster enn på lavere trinn. Dette er en henvendelse alle elevene i denne klassen får.

#### **Hva innebærer det for ditt barn å delta?**

Hvis du velger å la barnet ditt delta i prosjektet, innebærer det at barnet skriver en tekst på norsk og en tekst på engelsk. Tekstene vil bli innhentet og bli brukt i forskningsprosjektet. Det vil i forbindelse med dette bli innhentet grunnleggende personopplysninger om barnet; navn, alder, kjønn, og morsmålsbakgrunn. Disse skal kun brukes til statistiske formål, samt for å oppnå hensiktsmessig databehandling.

#### **Det er frivillig å delta**

Det er frivillig å delta i prosjektet. Hvis du velger å la barnet ditt delta, kan du eller barnet ditt når som helst trekke samtykket tilbake uten å oppgi noen grunn. Alle opplysninger om ditt barn vil bli anonymisert. Det vil ikke ha noen negative konsekvenser for ditt barn hvis det ikke vil delta eller senere velger å trekke seg.

#### **Ditt barns personvern**

Jeg vil bare bruke opplysningene om ditt barn til formålene jeg har fortalt om i dette skrevet. Jeg behandler opplysningene konfidensielt og i samsvar med personvernregelverket.

- De som vil ha tilgang til elevtekstene er jeg og min veileder ved Høgskulen på Vestlandet.
- For å sikre at ingen uvedkommende får tilgang til personopplysningene, vil jeg erstatte navnet og kontaktopplysningene med en kode som lagres på egen navneliste adskilt fra øvrige data.
- Ved publikasjon av forskningsprosjektet, vil ikke ditt barn kunne gjenkjennes, ettersom opplysningene vil være anonymiserte.

#### **Hva skjer med opplysningene dine når jeg avslutter forskningsprosjektet?**

Prosjektet skal etter planen avsluttes 01.01.21. Etter prosjektet er avsluttet, vil elevtekstene oppbevares anonymisert.

#### **Dine rettigheter**

Så lenge du kan identifiseres i datamaterialet, har du rett til:

- innsyn i hvilke personopplysninger som er registrert om deg,

- å få rettet personopplysninger om deg,
- få slettet personopplysninger om deg,
- få utlevert en kopi av dine personopplysninger (dataportabilitet), og
- å sende klage til personvernombudet eller Datatilsynet om behandlingen av dine personopplysninger.

### **Hva gir meg rett til å behandle personopplysninger om ditt barn?**

Jeg behandler opplysninger om ditt barn basert på ditt samtykke.

På oppdrag fra Høgskulen på Vestlandet har NSD – Norsk senter for forskningsdata AS vurdert at behandlingen av personopplysninger i dette prosjektet er i samsvar med personvernregelverket.

### **Hvor kan jeg finne ut mer?**

Hvis du har spørsmål om forskningsprosjektet, eller ønsker å benytte deg av dine rettigheter, ta kontakt med:

- Forsker - Charlotte Lie Mathisen, på e-post ([charlotte.lie\\_95@hotmail.com](mailto:charlotte.lie_95@hotmail.com)) eller mobiltelefon: 98 44 14 51
- NSD – Norsk senter for forskningsdata AS, på e-post ([personverntjenester@nsd.no](mailto:personverntjenester@nsd.no)) eller telefon: 55 58 21 17.

Med vennlig hilsen

Charlotte Lie Mathisen

---

### **Samtykkeerklæring**

Jeg har mottatt og forstått informasjon om prosjektet «Positioning of adverbials in learner texts, written in Norwegian and English – a comparative study», og har fått anledning til å stille spørsmål.

Jeg samtykker til:

- At barnet mitt kan delta i prosjektet med innhenting av elevtekster.

Jeg samtykker til at mitt barns opplysninger behandles frem til prosjektet er avsluttet, ca. 01.01.21.

---

(Signert av foreldre/foresatte, dato)

Barnets navn:

---

# Overskrift: Juletradisjoner

- ▶ Opprett et Google Document og lagre som «**Juletradisjoner**».
- ▶ Skriv en fortelling om hvordan man kan feire jul i Norge.
- ▶ Du skal bruke **minst fem** av disse ordene: **julenissen**, **juletre**, **julestrømpe**, **peis**, **reinsdyr**, **presanger**, **julaften**, **adventskalender**, **pinnekjøtt**, **ribbe**.
- ▶ Husk innledning, hoveddel og avslutning.



# Overskrift: Christmas traditions

- ▶ Opprett et Google Document og lagre som «**Christmas traditions**».
- ▶ Skriv en fortelling om hvordan man kan feire jul i **England**.
- ▶ Du skal bruke **minst fem** av disse ordene: **Santa Claus, Christmas tree, Christmas stocking, presents, Christmas Eve (December 24<sup>th</sup>), Christmas day (December 25<sup>th</sup>), carol singing, New Year's Eve, fireworks, turkey.**
- ▶ Husk beginning, main section og ending.

# Skriveramme



## Innledning:

### Beskriv hovedpersonen:

Hvordan ser personen ut?

Hvordan er personen?

### Beskriv miljøet:

Hvor foregår fortellingen?

## Hoveddel:

Hva er problemet i din historie?

## Avslutning:

Hvordan løses problemet?

# Writing a story



## Beginning:

**Describe the main character(s):**

What does the person(s) look like?

What is the person like?

**Describe the environment:**

Where does the action take place?

## Main section:

What is the problem of your story?

## Ending:

How is the problem solved?

## 1 Juletradisjoner

Denne historien foregår i en liten by 30min unna geilo, byen heter skybyen. Dette er om en gutt som heter BOB, Han er blond og går alltid med dongeri bukse og hettegenser, Han er ganske grei men noen ganger blir han sulten og da blir han ikke så snill.

I skybyen opp et fjell sving til venstre der er det et hus der dette foregår, Det er julelys på veggene utenfor og inni er det et stort juletre på peisen henger det julestrømper.

Det var 3 dager før julaften var her de sang julesanger og åpnet adventskalender, alle syntes det var gøy, Det BOB gledet seg mest til var gavene men han elsket også og være med familien spesielt

3 meningene sine de hadde det alltid så gøy og lekte og løpte men 3 meningene til BOB var ikke der enda men var det BOB gledet seg til, litt etter middag hører BOB er telefonen ringe Det er

3 meningene de sier at det snør veldig mye så bilen var blitt snødd ned.

Det var 2 dager siden nå er det bare 1 dag til julaften 3 meningene har overnattet på hotell fordi veiene er stengt så det ser ikke ut som de kommer "Det banker på døren" BOB går og åpner døren det er

3 meningene, BOB spør hvordan de klarte og komme seg her de sier at de lånte en bil også bare kjørte de til hos

Der er historien om BOB

## 1 Christmas traditions

This story is about a boy named Leon. He lives in London and has a little brother named Ben. Leon and Ben were really nice to each other, most brothers would be fighting with each other but not Leon and Ben.

Thanksgiving had just past they eat a massive turkey, The christmas spirit was real for Ben he really hoped he would see Santa Claus This year and he was to excited for opening presents. But anyways we had also decorated the christmas tree so we were ready for christmas eve. Next day it began snowing me and Ben had so much fun playing in the snow, when we were done playing in the snow we went inside to warm us up at the fireplace. Next day Ben got a cold so i he had to be inside for the full day it was pretty boring having no want to play with so i helped mom take care of Ben. Ben got better and Better so i hope he is ready for to tomorrow. Next day it's now desember 24 it's christmas eve Leon rusht to Ben's room to see if he was awake  
he opened Ben's door to see Ben sitting in his bed looking at his phone Leon

## 2 Juletradisjoner

No skal eg fortelle deg om en gutt som heter Tobias.

Tobias er elleve år og har en lillesøster som er 5 år, hun heter Lise.

Tobias har mørkebrunt hår, han har lyseblå øyne. Tobias har fregner som dekker han fra topp til tå.

Tobias er en veldig glad gutt, han elsker å være aktiv og være med venner.

Han er veldig flink på skolen spesielt i matte.

Tobias bor i et rikt nabolag i et stort hvit moderne hus sammen med moren, faren og lillesøsteren.

Han har mange venner i nabolaget, Tobias sin beste venn heter Sanne hun er en jente.

Sanne har brunt hår med lyse tupper hun bor rett ovenfor Tobias i et stort hvit hus.

Moren og faren til Lise og Tobias synes at nabolaget de bor i har et fint miljø, spesielt om julen da pynter alle sammen husene sine med julepynt, glitter, julenisser, reinsdyr og julestrømper.

Vær julaften samles hele nabolaget på ute for å se det store juletreet blir tent, men det de ikke vet er at denne julaften blir ikke den samme vanlige julaften.

Julaften 24/12.2019

Tobias kjenner at det kiler i magen

## 2 Christmas traditions

Now am i going to tell you about a boy called Ethan.

Ethan has a mom and a dad, he also has a big sister but she is really annoying, mom says it's because of puberty but she is nice sometimes to.

His sister's name is Leah she is 13 years old

Ethan has brown hair and blue ocean eyes his face i full of freckles.

His favorite color is blue off course.

Ethan is 10 years old.

He has a lot off friends and he is very nice and playful.

He has a loving family who always is there for him .

He lives in Liverpool in England

Ethan's favorite season of the year is winter, that's because it's a lot of snow and you can build a snowman and make snow angels. He also love christmas, what Ethan likes to do when it's christmas is to go carolsingin, shopp christmas presents, drink hot chocolate with the fireplace.

24/12.2019

“ETHAN!!” screams mom “ WAKE UP BREAKFAST I READY.”

“I'm coming” replies Ethan

Ethan jumps in his bathrobe and goes down stairs, but he stops when he sees the living room it's like to be in a christmas movie when the house is full of christmas decorations.

When he finished the stairs he walked to into the kitchen and there was mom, dad and Leah.