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Abstract

This thesis investigates the use of word order variation, in particular the variable use of subject-verb inversion and non-inversion in main declarative clauses, among adolescents in contemporary multilingual settings in Sweden. The use of non-inversion in contexts that in standard Swedish require inversion is sometimes claimed to be characteristic of varieties of Swedish spoken among adolescents in multilingual urban areas. The present study includes a wide range of data, both spontaneous and elicited, and explores how common the use of non-inversion is among a relatively large group of participants in different contexts, and how the use of non-inversion is influenced by different demographic, linguistic and socio-pragmatic factors.

The results show that non-inversions are used to a limited extent in all types of data in the studied population. Only certain individuals frequently employ non-inversions in some contexts. Further, no direct link is found between second language acquisition and the use of non-inversion in this study. Factors related to the issue of nativeness, for example participants’ reported age of onset of Swedish acquisition, only marginally explain the results. In general, examples of non-inversion are employed more extensively, and by more participants, in peer-peer interaction than with adults. The use of non-inversion appears to be part of some adolescents’ spontaneous language use in certain contexts. More importantly, however, the results suggest that some adolescents employ non-inversions as an active linguistic resource to express their identification with the multilingual environment and the different varieties of Swedish spoken there, to show solidarity with peers, to contest official school discourses, and to play around with linguistic stereotypes.
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Chapter One

Introduction

1.1 The purpose and aim of the study

Due to increased immigration to Sweden in the last few decades and due to greater
global mobility, an increasing number of children and adolescents in Sweden grow
up multilingual. In some contemporary urban areas in Sweden, the majority of the
population speak at least one more language in addition to Swedish. There has
been a steadily growing interest for language development among youths in these
settings in the last few years (see chapter 2). In some multilingual areas, young
speakers have been noted to use certain interesting linguistic features when they
speak Swedish that are characterized by influences from the multilingual environ-
ment (e.g., Kotsinas 1994, 1998; see also section 2.2). The present thesis tries to
describe and understand the use of variable syntax, primarily the variable use of
subject-verb inversion and non-inversion in linguistic contexts that in standard
Swedish require inversion, among adolescents in some multilingual settings in
Stockholm, Göteborg and Malmö. The thesis was carried out within the frame-
work of a larger research project Language and language use among adolescents
in multilingual urban settings (Bijvoet, Boyd, Ekberg, Fraurud, Källström &
Lindberg, 2001)\(^1\) that includes the work of several senior researchers and doctoral
students.

The present thesis is part of the current research trend that focuses on language
development among young people in multilingual urban areas (see section 2.2) but
it is also situated within the field of variation research (see section 3.1) and
discusses issues related to syntactic development during first and second language
acquisition of Swedish (see section 2.1) and the importance of age-related factors
in the development of syntax in SLA (see section 3.2).

The participants of this study are 127 adolescents from eight upper secondary
schools in different multilingual areas of Stockholm, Göteborg and Malmö. All
participants have conducted an oral retelling task, a written composition task, and
a grammaticality judgment test. A sub-sample of twenty participants, i.e. the focus

\(^1\) The project Language and language use among adolescents in multilingual urban settings was
funded by the Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation.
sample, was drawn from the large sample in order to be able to conduct more in-depth inter-individual and intra-individual analyses of the variation produced. In addition to the tasks already mentioned, data was analyzed with the focus participants when they interacted with different interlocutors in spontaneous and semi-directed oral contexts. Participants’ use of more spontaneous language, including an increased use of non-inversion, was hypothesized to increase if the speakers could be recorded together with friends (cf. Lainio, 1982). The study thus includes a wide range of data; both spoken and written, and both spontaneous and elicited.

The thesis investigates variation in the placement of the subject in relation to the finite verb in different types of clauses, but primarily in main declarative clauses that begin with a clause-initial non-subject (e.g., *igår gick jag dit*, literally ‘yesterday went I there’ vs. *igår jag gick dit*, literally ‘yesterday I went there’). The second position of a main clause is the most common position for the finite verb in Swedish and whenever a main clause begins with something other than a subject, subject-verb inversion typically occurs. Speakers who learn Swedish as a second language are, however, known to commonly produce non-inversion in clauses that in standard Swedish require subject-verb inversion (e.g., Bolander, 1988a, 1988b; Hyltenstam, 1977, 1978; Håkansson, 1992, 2004). Some studies indicate that adolescents in multilingual settings also frequently use non-inversions in these contexts, even when they are not obvious second language learners of Swedish (e.g., Kotsinas, 1994, 1998). The present study intends to contribute more empirically substantiated data about the current use of non-inversion and subject-verb inversion among adolescents in multilingual settings and explore how different factors condition and motivate the use of variation in the studied population. The study was initially guided by the following research questions and hypotheses.

*Research Question 1:* How common is the use of word order variation among the adolescents studied?

*Research Question 2:* Are there any interesting differences and similarities between different groups of participants?

*Research Question 3:* Which factors determine the variable use of subject-verb inversion and non-inversion among the participants studied?

*Research Question 4:* Is the use of non-inversion a conventionalized characteristic of contemporary multiethnic youth language varieties in Sweden?

Hypotheses: At the outset of the study, I was inspired by a line of studies that focused on the importance of age of onset for second language acquisition (see section 3.2 for more details) and these studies in addition to other previous studies gave me good reasons to hypothesize that one of the factors that might primarily
influence the use of syntactic variation among the participants in this study might be their age of onset of Swedish acquisition, i.e. I believed that participants with a later age of onset of Swedish acquisition would produce more word order variation than participants with an early age of onset. Based on previous studies, I also hypothesized that greater variation would be found in the more multilingual schools compared to the less multilingual schools included in the sample, and that more variation would be produced by participants with a multilingual background compared to participants with a monolingual background (see section 3.3 for a critical discussion of the terms multilingual and monolingual, and related terms, and a description of how they are used in this thesis). Research question four was guided by one of the general aims of the larger project Language and language use among adolescents in multilingual urban settings (Bijvoet et al., 2001), which was to describe and analyze linguistic features typical of multietnic youth language varieties in Sweden.

The thesis work reflects a journey, however, and as the work progressed and I was able to analyze some of the collected material, the data seemed to suggest that the importance of different sociolinguistic and socio-pragmatic factors needed to be explored in more detail, and that these factors might play a more significant role in the variation produced than age-related SLA-factors or other issues concerned with nativeness. As the discussion in section 7.10 reflects I also began to doubt the importance of answering research question four.

The thesis attempts to address the initial research questions in addition to new questions that were raised as the study progressed, and describe how the participants’ use of inversion and non-inversion is determined by different demographic, linguistic and socio-pragmatic factors.

1.2 Structure of the thesis

The thesis consists of seven chapters. Chapter 1 introduces the thesis and presents its purpose and aims, and outlines the structure of the thesis. The purpose of chapter 2 is two-fold; it first describes the word order rules that determine the use of subject-verb inversion and non-inversion in standard Swedish, and presents a review of research that describes how these word order rules are acquired in first and second language acquisition of Swedish. Chapter 2 then continues with a review of current research that focuses on language use and language practices among multilingual urban youths in Sweden and around the globe, with a special focus on syntax.

The theoretical framework for the thesis is presented in chapter 3. The chapter situates the thesis within a variationist framework and reviews some of the different trends within the variationist paradigm that have had a profound impact on the field in general and on this thesis in particular. Chapter 3 also reviews some research that deals with the influence and importance of age factors for the acquisition of a second language. Finally, chapter 3 presents a critical discussion of the use of certain terminology related to the issue of nativeness and standard
language use, which is essential to bring up in a study that deals with variation in a multilingual context, since the line between monolingual or multilingual speakers, or first or second language speakers of Swedish is not clear-cut in these contexts, and since little is known about the different linguistic norms that speakers in these areas may adhere to.

Chapter 4 covers the methodology, research procedures, the participants and the different types of data studied.

Chapter 5 describes the procedure of analysis.

Chapter 6 presents the results. The chapter begins with an overview of the general results of the large sample (126 participants) and continues with an overview of the results of the focus sample (20 participants). The chapter then presents the results of the analyses of the influences of different demographic, linguistic and socio-pragmatic factors. Chapter 6 ends with an overview of the results of the elicited grammaticality judgment test.

The most important findings from chapter 6 are elaborated and discussed in more detail in chapter 7. The implications of the present study are also discussed and the chapter ends with suggestions for future research.
Chapter Two

Previous Research

The purpose of this chapter is twofold. First, it describes the patterns and rules for word order in spoken and written Swedish (section 2.1.1-2.1.3), and accounts for some of the research that has investigated the development of syntax in first (section 2.1.4.1) and second language acquisition (section 2.1.4.2) of Swedish. Secondly, the chapter reviews some of the previous studies that have dealt with language use and language practices among adolescents in contemporary multilingual settings in Sweden and other parts of the world (section 2.2).

2.1 Swedish Word Order

In the following section, I will describe the word order rules in Swedish, and account for what previous research on word order in first and second language acquisition has concluded. The main focus in this section lies on the order between the subject and the finite verb in main declarative clauses, but a brief account of the word order in interrogative clauses and subordinate clauses is also given. For a more exhaustive description of Swedish word order patterns, the interested reader is recommended to turn to SAG (1999).

2.1.1 Word order in main declarative clauses

Swedish, like the other Germanic languages except English, is a so-called verb second language (from now on referred to as a V2-language). In V2-languages the finite verb typically occurs in second position in main clauses with one constituent in clause-initial position, i.e. only one constituent precedes the finite verb. Whenever a main clause begins with something other than the subject, subject-verb inversion is therefore obligatory in Swedish (see example 2.1a-d), and other V2-languages. Typologically, Swedish is regarded as an SVO language, since the most common word order pattern in main declarative clauses is when the subject occupies first position followed by the finite verb (see example 2.1a). However, in a study of word order in spoken Swedish, Jörgensen (1976) showed that as many as 40% of the main declarative clauses began with a clause-initial non-subject, and consequently had VSO-order. This pattern has been shown to be consistent in
different social, stylistic, and regionalized varieties of Swedish, and both in adult and child language (Jörgensen, 1976; Håkansson, 1988; Håkansson & Nettelbladt, 1996). Jörgensen (1976) claimed that the proportion of main clauses beginning with a clause-initial subject was somewhat higher in written texts compared to spoken language (see also Westman, 1974).

Swedish main declarative clauses may begin with any kind of constituent, e.g., subjects, adverbials, direct or indirect objects, or occasionally a predicative (see example 2.1a-d). When a main clause begins with a clause-initial non-subject, the subject most commonly occupies the position immediately to the right of the finite verb.2

**Example 2.1a.** SVO-order, clause-initial subject.

Hon såg en björn.
S V O
‘She saw a bear’

**Example 2.1b.** XVS-order, clause-initial adverbial.

Igår såg hon en björn
X = adv V S O
‘Yesterday she saw a bear’

**Example 2.1c.** XVS-order, clause-initial direct object.

En björn såg hon igår
X = O V S adv
‘A bear she saw yesterday’

**Example 2.1d.** XVS-order, clause initial predicative.

Förvånad blev hon när hon såg en björn
X = pred V S adv
‘Surprised she was when she saw a bear’

In a limited number of linguistic contexts exceptions to the V2-rule are allowed in Swedish, for example when the declarative clause contains the adverb *kanske* ‘maybe’, (Andréasson, 2002, 2007; Egerland, 1998; Platzack, 1998; SAG, 1999). The adverb *kanske* ‘maybe’ can be found in all positions of main declarative clauses (see example 2.2a-g), and non-inversion is optional after a clause-initial *kanske* (see example 2.2a-b). When *kanske* is located directly after the clause-initi

---

2 In sentences with inverted word order, a sentence adverbial sometimes occupies the position between the finite verb and the subject, e.g., *här bor faktiskt/ju/nog jag* literally ‘here live actually/of course/probably I’ (Jörgensen, 1976: 116).

3 And also the less common adverbs *kanhända* and *måhända* ‘maybe, perhaps’ (Andréasson, 2002, 2007; SAG, 1999).
initial element, i.e. in second position of the clause, non-inversion is more common than subject-verb inversion (see example 2.2f-g).

Example 2.2a. Placement of the adverb 

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Kanske} & \quad \text{såg hon björnen} \\
X = \text{maybe} & \quad S \quad O \\
\text{‘Maybe she saw the bear’}
\end{align*}
\]

Example 2.2b. Placement of the adverb 

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Kanske} & \quad \text{hon såg björnen} \\
X = \text{maybe} & \quad S \quad V \quad O \\
\text{‘Maybe she saw the bear’}
\end{align*}
\]

Example 2.2c. Placement of the adverb 

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Hon} & \quad \text{kanske såg björnen} \\
S & \quad \text{maybe} \quad V \quad O \\
\text{‘She maybe saw the bear’}
\end{align*}
\]

Example 2.2d. Placement of the adverb 

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Hon} & \quad \text{såg kanske björnen} \\
S & \quad V \quad \text{maybe} \quad O \\
\text{‘She saw maybe the bear’}
\end{align*}
\]

Example 2.2e. Placement of the adverb 

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Hon} & \quad \text{såg björnen kanske} \\
S & \quad V \quad O \quad \text{maybe} \\
\text{‘She saw the bear maybe’}
\end{align*}
\]

Example 2.2f. Placement of the adverb 

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Då} & \quad \text{kanske hon blev rädd} \\
X = \text{adv} & \quad \text{maybe} \quad S \quad V \quad \text{predicative} \\
\text{‘Then maybe she got scared’}
\end{align*}
\]
Example 2.2g. Placement of the adverb kanske after a clause-initial subordinate clause, XSV-word order.

När hon såg björnen kanske hon blev rädd
X = sub. clause maybe S V predicative
‘When she saw the bear maybe she got scared’

In narratives, the finite verb occasionally occupies the first position of the declarative clause, with the subject in second position, i.e. examples of so-called narrative inversion (see example 2.3) (Ekberg, 1997; Håkansson, 1994; Mörnsjö, 2002; Vamling & Dahlbäck, 1983).

Example 2.3. (X)VS-order, clause-initial finite verb.
Ø Såg hon en björn
ø V S O
‘She saw a bear’

The Swedish adverbial så ‘then/so’ is also interesting to mention, since så is obligatorily followed by subject-verb inversion in some contexts but not in others (Bohnacker, 2006; SAG, 1999). Så has many different and common functions in Swedish. One type of connective så that commonly occurs in clause-initial position of main declarative clauses in spoken Swedish indicates temporal succession and requires subject-verb inversion (example 2.4a). This type of så can optionally be preceded by a coordinating conjunction, i.e. å så ‘and then’ (e.g., Bohnacker, 2006: 453). Another type of så that may occur in clause-initial position indicates conclusion/consequence and does not require subject-verb inversion (example 2.4b). By contrast to the first så, this så cannot be preceded by a coordinating conjunction. In addition, there is an adverbial så that indicates manner and requires subject-verb inversion when located in clause-initial position (example 2.4c). To make things even more complicated, så is often adjuncted as a topic placeholder after clause-initial adverbs or subordinate clauses in spoken language (see example 2.4d), and a så in this position also requires following subject-verb inversion (see Ekerot, 1988 for more details about this type of så-construction).

Example 2.4a. Function of the adverb så, temporal succession, XVS-word order.
(Å) så gjorde vi det
X = adv V S O
‘(And) then we did it’

Example 2.4b. Function of the adverb så, conclusive/consequential, XSV-word order
Så vi ville inte göra det
X = adv S Vf neg Vinf O
‘So we didn’t want to do it’
Example 2.4c. Function of the adverb så, manner, XVS-word order.

Så gör man inte
X = adv V S neg
‘That’s not how to do it’

Example 2.4d. Function of the adverb så, topic placeholder, XVS-word order

Om du vill så gör vi det
X = sub. clause topic placeholder V S O
‘If you want [topic placeholder] we’ll do it’

2.1.2 Word order in questions

In Swedish, subject-verb inversion is one means by which questions are distinguished from declaratives. Yes/no-questions are formed with the finite verb in first position followed by the subject (see example 2.5a)⁴, and question word-questions (i.e. wh-questions) begin with the question word in first position, followed by the finite verb in second position, and the subject in third position (see example 2.5b)⁵. In spoken Swedish, questions are sometimes formed without subject-verb inversion (see example 2.5c). Intonation is then the only means by which these questions are distinguished from declaratives.

Example 2.5a. Word order in yes/no-questions.

Såg hon en björn?
V S O
‘Did she see a bear?’

Example 2.5b. Word order in question word-questions.

Vad såg hon?
Q V S
‘What did she see?’

Example 2.5c. Questions without subject-verb inversion.

Hon såg en björn?
S V O
‘She saw a bear?’

2.1.3 Word order in subordinate clauses

The word order of subordinate clauses is different from the word order of main clauses in Swedish. Subordinate clauses most commonly display canonical

⁴ Sentence adverbials may intercede between the finite verb and the subject, e.g., Såg inte hon en björn? literally ‘Saw not she a bear?’.
⁵ If it is not the subject that is questioned, e.g., Vem säger det? ‘Who says that?’.
subject-verb order. They begin with a subordinator (which may be left out in certain contexts, see example 2.6c) followed by the subject of the subordinate clause, and subsequently the finite verb (examples 2.6a-c).

Example 2.6a. Word order in subordinate clauses, subordinator-s-v.
Hon blev rädd när hon såg björnen.
main clause subordinator s v
‘She got scared when she saw the bear’

Example 2.6b. Word order in relative subordinate clauses, subordinator-s-v.
Björnen som hon såg var skrämmande.
S subord. s v V predicative
‘The bear that she saw was frightening’

Example 2.6c. Word order in relative subordinate clauses, (subordinator)-s-v.
Björnen o hon såg var skrämmande
S (subord.) s v V predicative
‘The bear (that) she saw was frightening’

Subordinate clauses may display main clause word order in certain contexts, which is especially common in spoken Swedish (e.g., Källström, 2000; Platzack, 1987; SAG, 1999; Teleman, 1967). For example, if an adverbial is inserted immediately to the right of the subordinator, this may result in subject-verb inversion (see example 2.7a). Rogative conditional subordinate clauses are also formed with subject-verb inversion and appear only in clause-initial position (see example 2.7b) (SAG, 1999). In addition, interrogative subordinate clauses are sometimes formed with subject-verb inversion typical of direct questions in spoken Swedish (see example 2.7c), often to create a rhetoric effect (Källström, 2000; see also SAG, 1999). Att-clauses (‘that-clauses’) in object position, and så att/därför att-clauses, are under certain conditions also commonly produced with main clause word order in the sense that the sentence adverbial in these clauses may be placed to the right of the finite verb instead of to the left of the finite verb (see example 2.7d), which is the typical placement for sentence adverbials in subordinate clauses in Swedish (e.g., Andersson, 1975; Platzack, 1987; SAG, 1999).

Example 2.7a. Subordinate clauses with main clause word order, subordinator-adverbial-v-s.
Han sa att då vill han följa med
main clause that adv vf s vinf
‘He said that then he wants to come along’
Example 2.7b. Subject-verb inversion in clause-initial conditional subordinate clauses, vs-order.

Går du går jag

vf s Vf S

‘If you go I go’

Example 2.7c. Subject-verb inversion in interrogative subordinate clauses, subordinate-v-s

Jag vet inte vad är detta

main clause subordinator vf s

‘I do not know what this is’

Example 2.7d. Word order in that-clauses, placement of sentence adverbials.

Jag tycker att det passar inte här

main clause that s vf neg here

‘I think that it doesn’t fit here’

2.1.4 The acquisition of word order in Swedish

2.1.4.1 Second language acquisition of word order

For learners of Swedish as a second language, the verb second rule is one of the most difficult rules to master, and the incidence of non-inversion in contexts for inversion is often long-lived in learner language (e.g., Bolander, 1987, 1988a, 1988b; Hammarberg & Viberg, 1977, 1984; Hyltenstam, 1977, 1978; Häkansson, 1992, 2004; see also Pienemann & Häkansson, 1999 for an overview of studies that have focused on the acquisition of subject-verb inversion in Swedish SLA). The situation is the same in the second language acquisition of other V2-languages (e.g., Holmen, 1993 (Danish SLA); Hagen, 1992 (Norwegian SLA); Meisel, Clahsen & Pienemann, 1981; and Pienemann, 1998 (German SLA)). In the development of the rule for subject-verb inversion, second language learners have been found to progress in a similar way, irrespective of their different first languages (e.g., Meisel, Clahsen & Pienemann, 1981; Hyltenstam, 1978; Häkansson, 1992; Häkansson & Nettelbladt, 1993, 1996; Häkansson, Salameh & Nettelbladt, 2003; Pienemann, 1998; Pienemann & Häkansson, 1999). Learners initially use canonical subject-verb word order only, but as they progress they learn how to prepose non-subjects, without subject-verb inversion. At the next

---

6 There are researchers who object to claims that the V2-rule is necessarily difficult to acquire for second language learners (e.g., Brautaset, 2004; Bohnacker, 2004, 2006). Brautaset (2004) studied the acquisition of inversion by learners of Norwegian as a second language, and she observed that the learners in her study produced relatively few violations of the V2-rule in writing after only eight months in Norway. Brautaset thus suggests that her results disprove the general claim that inversion is always difficult for L2-learners to acquire. Bohnacker’s (2004, 2006) reservation is limited to contexts when the learners’ first language is also a V2-language, for example when Swedes begin to learn German as a second language.
stage, learners acquire the rule for subject-verb inversion and are able to invert main clauses that begin with non-subjects. The learners then go through a stage when they temporarily also overgeneralize the rule for inversion to subordinate clauses (e.g., Hyltenstam, 1978; Pienemann & Håkansson, 1999; Pienemann, 1998, Viberg, 1990), but in the end they are able to cancel inversion in subordinate clauses.

Several studies have investigated if certain factors in the linguistic context favor or disfavor Swedish learners’ acquisition of subject-verb inversion (e.g., Bolander 1987, 1988a, 1988b, Dahlbäck, 1981; Hyltenstam, 1978; Håkansson, 1992, 1994, 1997, 2004; see also Hagen, 1992, and Brautaset, 1996 for Norwegian). For example, they have looked at whether the function and the nature of the clause-initial element, and/or the type and nature of the subject and the finite verb influence learners’ application of the rule for subject-verb inversion. Bolander (1988a, 1988b) found that variation between subject-verb inversion and non-inversion in learner language was influenced by all three of these linguistic elements. For example, the learners in her study often produced non-inversion after clause-initial sen ‘then’ and after clause-initial subordinate clauses, but they often produced subject-verb inversion after clause-initial objects. So-called tag-structures were also correctly produced with subject-verb inversion most of the time (see example 2.8).

Example 2.8. Word order of tag-structures, VS-order.

Det är bra, tycker jag
main clause, [tag] V S
‘It’s good, I think’

Bolander (ibid.) also found evidence that the type and nature of the subject influenced learners’ variable subject-verb order. Lexical noun phrases favored subject-verb inversion more than pronouns, as did first person pronouns compared to second and third person pronouns, she claimed. There was also a tendency for certain verbs (for example the verb komma ‘come’) to favor subject-verb inversion more than others in her study (see also Håkansson, 2004). By contrast, Hyltenstam (1978) found no evidence for the influence of the subject on learners’ application of subject-verb inversion in his study. He also found that the finite verb being main or auxiliary was of no importance for the learners’ subject-verb order in main declarative clauses (see also Dahlbäck, 1981). In interrogative clauses, however, Hyltenstam (ibid.) found that sentences containing an auxiliary verb were more often inverted than those that contained a main verb. A possible reason for these partly contradictory results may be that different linguistic contexts are more or less favorable for the production of subject-verb inversion at different stages in second language development, and that the participants of the different studies were not at the same stage at the moment they were tested (cf. Hyltenstam, 1978). Bolander’s (1988a, 1988b) study also covers a more extensive material.
than Hyltenstam (ibid.), and her study includes analyses of oral production in addition to grammaticality judgments.

In a Norwegian study of the influence of different linguistic elements on the production of subject-verb inversion by learners of Norwegian as a second language, Hagen (1992), like Bolander, found that the nature of the clause-initial element, and certain characteristics of the subject and the finite verb facilitated or not the learners’ application of subject-verb inversion.

Håkansson (e.g., 1992) has argued that some second language learners avoid producing contexts for inversion to escape the difficulty of applying the rule for subject-verb inversion, and as a result produce very few violations of the V2-rule. The avoidance of X-clauses (i.e. all main clauses that begin with a non-subject) does not cause any errors per se, but Håkansson (ibid.) argues that it gives the impression of non-idiomaticity, since the proportion of SVO-word order in relation to VSO-word order is too low in comparison to idiomatic Swedish (see also Håkansson & Nettelbladt, 1993).

The acquisition of subject-verb inversion in question clauses appears to be less problematic for second language learners than subject-verb inversion in declaratives (e.g., Hammarberg, 1985; Hyltenstam, 1978; Håkansson, 1992, Philipsson, 2007). Håkansson (1992) suggests that the reason for this is that the function of subject-verb inversion is more transparent in questions (p. 320, see also Hammarberg, 1985).

2.1.4.2 First language acquisition of word order

In first language acquisition of Swedish, the V2-rule seems to be acquired without difficulties (Eneskär, 1978; Håkansson, 1988, 1992; Lange & Larsson, 1973). Far fewer studies have investigated first language acquisition of subject-verb order in Swedish compared to the number of SLA-studies that exist on this matter, probably because children with Swedish as their first language, in comparison to second language acquirers of Swedish, rarely make V2-errors. There are, however, a few studies that systematically explore verb-second phenomena in first language acquisition (e.g., Håkansson, 1988, 1992, 1997, 2001; Santelmann, 1995; Platzack, 1996, 1997). These studies have shown that children with Swedish as their first language use subject-verb inversion correctly as soon as they start producing topicalized clauses, already from around two years of age, and they rarely violate the verb-second rule (e.g., Håkansson, 2001; Håkansson & Nettelbladt, 1993, 1996; Santelmann, 1995; Platzack, 1996; 1997). Before age three, children are generally able to apply subject-verb inversion to mark the difference between declarative and interrogative clauses (Heningsson & Håkansson, 1989), and already from when they start producing multiword sentences they tend to use an

---

7 An exception is the language development of speakers with aphasic specific language impairment, who have been shown to develop their Swedish syntax in similar sequences to that of second language acquirers of Swedish (e.g., Håkansson & Nettelbladt, 1993, 1996).
adult-like proportion of word order variation with about 60% of their main declarative clauses displaying SV-order and about 40% VS-order (Håkansson, 1994:60, cf. Jörgensen, 1976).

By age three, children with Swedish as their first language are also able to produce all basic types of subordinate clauses, and although they produce occasional examples of subject-verb inversion in subordinate clauses, in contexts where this is not allowed in adult standard Swedish, they do this to a very limited extent (Lundin, 1987: 100-101).

To my knowledge, there are no studies that specify how (un)common violations of subject-verb inversion in main clauses are in native Swedish in general. Jörgensen (1976) presents a few examples of declarative sentences displaying non-inversion after clause-initial *sedan*/*sen* ‘then’ (reproduced in examples 2.9a-c) in his study of spoken Swedish, but these examples do not make up more than 0.4% of all the sentences produced in his material. Jörgensen does not discuss these examples in any detail, perhaps because they are regarded as mere production errors. Bohnacker (2004, 2006: 454) briefly discusses the occurrence of non-inversion after clause-initial *så* ‘so’ and *sen* ‘then’ in native Swedish in two articles and she presents a few authentic examples (two of which are reproduced in examples 2.9d-e).

*Example 2.9a.* Example of non-inversion in non-learner Swedish [taken from Jörgensen, 1976: 109].

```
sen         mat- å dietproblemen måste väl  va ganska svåra iblann
X = adv S            Vf adv Vinf
‘then the food and diet problems must however be pretty difficult sometimes’ (my translation)
```

*Example 2.9b.* Example of non-inversion in non-learner Swedish [taken from Jörgensen, 1976: 109].

```
sedan    dom här rivningsfastigheterna dom e väl mer på gott å ont
X = adv S             V adv
‘then these condemned buildings they are probably more for good and for bad’ (my translation)
```

*Example 2.9c.* Example of non-inversion in non-learner Swedish [taken from Jörgensen, 1976: 109].

```
sen        att dom ska lära sej svenska / de e  nog helt naturli
X = adv S        V adv
‘then that they are going to learn Swedish that is probably completely natural’ (my translation)
```

\[
\text{sen} \quad \text{X = adv S} \quad \text{V} \\
\text{han gick} \quad \text{‘then he went’}
\]


\[
\text{och sen} \quad \text{X = adv S} \quad \text{V} \quad \text{sub. clause} \\
\text{man undrar om allt det där var så smart egentligen} \\
\text{‘and then you wonder if all this was so good really’}
\]

It is interesting that most of the examples of non-inversion in both Jörgensen (ibid.) and Bohnacker (ibid.) occur after a clause-initial sen ‘then’. As mentioned earlier sen is commonly followed by non-inversion in learner Swedish (e.g., Bolander, 1988a, 1988b, see also section 2.1.4.1), but these two sources indicate that non-inversions may sporadically be produced after clause-initial sen ‘then’ in native Swedish as well, although likely to a limited extent considering the few examples these two authors present and how rarely this kind of violation of the V2-rule is mentioned in the literature.

2.2 Language use in contemporary multilingual settings

As a result of increased immigration to Europe in the last decades, European countries have become more linguistically and ethnically diverse, and this is not least visible in many urban settings. Ulla-Britt Kotsinas (e.g., 1988a, 1988b, 1989, 1990, 1994, 1996, 1998, 2000, 2001) was the first Swedish researcher to show an interest in the language use of adolescents in multilingual settings in the 1980’s, but although her studies received a lot of interest from the media and the public, relatively little research followed in the same field in the next few years. Lately, there has been a growing interest for language development in multilingual settings in Sweden and around the world, and a number of recent Swedish studies have investigated different aspects of language use and practices among multilingual youths (e.g., Almér, in prep.; Bijvoet 2002, 2003; Bijvoet & Fraurud, forthcoming; Bodén, 2004, 2005; Bodén & Svensson, 2004; Ekberg, 2006, 2007; Engblom, 2004; Fraurud, 2004; Fraurud & Bijvoet, 2004; Grosse, in prep.; Haglund, 2002, 2005; Jonsson, 2007; Kahlin, in prep.; Nordenstam, 2004; Nygren-Junkin & Extra, 2003; Otterup, 2004; Svensson, 2007, in prep.; Tingsell, 2007; Utrzén, in prep.; Werndin, in prep.).

Ulla-Britt Kotsinas’ studies (ibid) focused primarily on the language use of a group of adolescents and children in Rinkeby, a multilingual suburb of Stockholm. In her articles, Kotsinas’ began to refer to the adolescents’ language use as rinkebysvenska ‘Rinkeby Swedish’, a term she claims that the adolescents
themselves employed to refer to their way of speaking Swedish, and that was later picked up by the public and the media. Typical for the adolescents’ use of ‘Rinkeby Swedish’ was, according to Kotsinas, an abundant use of new slang words and expressions, many originating in the minority languages used in the multilingual area, “choppy” prosody, and the use of certain non-standard grammatical features (op. cit.). The youths often confused grammatical genders, violated rules for agreement, replaced inverted word order with non-inversion and overgeneralized the use of a few prepositions, she claimed. Most of these grammatical characteristics are often mentioned as typical of Swedish as a second language, but Kotsinas suggested that the adolescents’ use of these features was not mainly the result of “errors” or of their status as second language speakers of Swedish, but rather a means for them to mark their group identity, and their identity as multilingual youths (e.g., 1989, 1996). Kotsinas also explained that the variety appeared to be employed by youths of all different kinds of linguistic backgrounds, also by individuals with monolingual Swedish backgrounds. Further, Kotsinas described how the use of ‘Rinkeby Swedish’ varied with the situational context and that some adolescents were frequent users of ‘Rinkeby Swedish’ whereas others did not use it at all. She also claimed that the variety was generally employed more extensively in peer-peer interactions than with adults, and boys tended to use it more frequently and extensively than girls (e.g., Kotsinas, 1988a, 1988b). Finally, Kotsinas also claimed that the youths in her studies were able to switch between ‘Rinkeby Swedish’ and more standard-like Swedish varieties when they wished to do so (ibid.).

Although Kotsinas’ studies were groundbreaking at the time they were conducted they were very explorative in nature, and many of her claims, although reasonable, need to be substantiated with empirical data. Kotsinas’ studies on ‘Rinkeby Swedish’ should perhaps best be viewed as inventories of what needs to be studied more in depth (cf. Kotsinas, 1988b: 266). Her observations are based on limited samples of data, mainly interviews conducted with 15 youths in Rinkeby and interviews with students from a high school class in Flemingsberg, another multilingual suburb of Stockholm (Kotsinas, 1988b; see also Fraurud, 2004: 10).

Fraurud (2004) and Fraurud & Bijvoet (2004) discuss the use of ‘Rinkeby Swedish’ and similar varieties in two more recent articles, and they, like Kotsinas (e.g., 1988b), emphasize that these varieties are perhaps best viewed as youth languages.

Ur ett inifrånperspektiv är alltså rinkebysvenska inte en varietet som talas av alla som bor i Rinkeby, inte ens av alla ungdomar där, och inte heller av alla med invandrarbakgrund eller av andraspråksinlärare eller personer med brytning. Istället är rinkebysvenska ett gruppsspråk som – i varierande grad – talas av ungdomar med eller utan invandrarbakgrund som bor i flerspråkiga bostadsområden eller är nära vänner till dem som bor där (Fraurud, 2004: 6).

From an inside perspective Rinkeby Swedish is, thus, not a variety that is spoken by everyone in Rinkeby, not even by all adolescents in this area, not by all speakers with an
immigrant background, nor by all second language speakers [of Swedish] or by every person who speaks with a foreign accent. Instead, Rinkeby Swedish is a group language that – to varying degrees – is spoken by adolescents with or without an immigrant background who live in multilingual settings or who are close friends with people who live there (Fraurud, 2004: 6). (my translation)

Because the term ‘Rinkeby Swedish’ has come to be used so often to describe all kinds of Swedish spoken by people of immigrant background, and since the term has negative connotations for many people and fails to include similar varieties of more or less conventionalised youth language spoken in other multilingual settings, Fraurud & Bijvoet (2004) suggest the use of the term multiethnic youth language (p. 411) instead of ‘Rinkeby Swedish’. However, as Jaspers (2007) points out, all attempts to name the linguistic practices of these young speakers run the risk of essentializing the speakers and marginalizing their language use (see also Bucholtz, 2003; Bijvoet & Fraurud, forthc.; Stroud, 2004). But for lack of a better solution, I will continue to sometimes refer to the use of multiethnic youth language varieties in this thesis.

Developments of new language varieties in multilingual urban settings, with linguistic characteristics similar to those observed in ‘Rinkeby Swedish’ by Kotsinas (see above), have also been noted in other Scandinavian and European countries, and there are some recent investigations that try to describe and understand the use of these varieties (e.g., Aasheim, 1997 (Norway); Appel & Schoonen, 2005 (The Netherlands); Doran, 2000, 2001, 2004 (France); Jacobsen, 2000, 2001 (Greenland); Kallmeyer & Keim, 2003 (Germany); Kusters & Krieken, 2005 (The Netherlands); Nortier, 2000 (The Netherlands); Quist, 2000a, 2000b, 2005 (Denmark)). Similar developments have also been observed in multilingual urban contexts in several African countries (e.g., Abdulaziz & Osinde, 1997; Kiessling & Mous, 2004).

To name a few of these studies; in Denmark, Pia Quist (2000a, 2000b) conducted an investigation similar to that of Kotsinas’. She studied the language used by adolescents in several multilingual areas of Copenhagen. Like Kotsinas (op. cit.), Quist observed certain linguistic characteristics that she claimed was typical of the language used by many of the youths in these areas. For example, they employed many lexical borrowings from various minority languages, tended to overgeneralize the n-gender (uter), often produced non-inversions in contexts for inversion, and displayed certain distinctive features of pronunciation and prosody (cf. Kotsinas’ findings summarized above).

In France, Meredith Doran (2000, 2001, 2004) has conducted studies of ‘Verlan’, a kind of street language spoken by some youths who live in multilingual communities around Paris and other major French cities. Doran’s studies focus primarily on the social meaning behind the use of ‘Verlan’ and how its use might be connected to questions of identity. ‘Verlan’ has been described as typically containing alterations of Standard French words and expressions, borrowings from Arabic, Senegalese, Wolof, Rap English etc, and certain distinctive prosodic and
discourse-level features. Doran’s studies have showed that the youths typically use ‘Verlan’ among friends, as a peer-group language, often to mark their ethnic difference in relation to an imagined homogenous French community, and in order to emphasize their status as multiethnic youths. Doran (2001) found that young boys in her study tended to use the variety differently than young girls and more frequently and extensively than the girls (cf. Kotsinas, 1988a, 1988b). Similar observations of the use of multiethnic youth language varieties have been made in Amsterdam, Nijmegen and Utrecht in the Netherlands (e.g., Appel & Schoonen, 2005; Kusters & Krieken, 2005; Nortier, 2000), and in Mannheim, Germany (Kallmeyer & Keim, 2003).

Interestingly, the emergence of multiethnic youth language varieties have also been observed in many multilingual urban areas around Africa, for example in Kenya, The Ivory Coast, Cameroon, and South Africa (Abdulaziz & Osinde, 1997; Kiessling & Mous, 2004). These various varieties also tend to be used as group languages to mark peer affiliation, social class, and to show off the speakers’ identification as urban youths, and the varieties share similar characteristics in the way the speakers manipulate form and meaning of words by adding affixes from one language to words from another, in the way they reverse syllables in words, and in the way they employ semantic extensions (ibid.).

None of the studies within this line of research have, to my knowledge, focused primarily on word order variation among youths in multilingual settings, although both Kotsinas (e.g., 1988a, 1988b, 1994, 1998) and Quist (2000a, 2000b) mention that the use of non-inversion in contexts for inversion is characteristic of the varieties they have studied.

Very frequent is the replacement of the inverted word order by a SV order in sentences with a topicalized short temporal or locative adverbial, e.g., *igår jag var sjuk* ‘yesterday I was ill’ (correct in English but not in Swedish) instead of idiomatic *igår var jag sjuk* literally ‘yesterday was I ill’. (Kotsinas, 1998: 137)

Neither Kotsinas nor Quist substantiate their claims about frequent use of non-inversion with quantitative data, however, so it is difficult to assess their observations and relate them to the findings of this study.
Chapter Three
Theoretical Framework

One of the purposes of this chapter is to situate this study within the field of research on sociolinguistic variation and account for some of the history and current status of the variationist research paradigm (section 3.1). The chapter also intends to briefly summarize what is known today about the importance of age in processes of language acquisition (section 3.2). The chapter ends with an attempt to problematize the use of certain notions related to the discussion of standard language use and the issue of nativeness, since these notions are particularly difficult to employ in a study that deals with variation in a multilingual context where the boundaries between standard and non-standard, native and non-native, first and second language learner are far from clear-cut (section 3.3).

3.1 Variation research

The present study is concerned with syntactic variation, in particular how the word order variation produced by the participants is constrained by different social, stylistic, geographic, language-internal, and socio-pragmatic factors. These are all issues that have been dealt with before in variation studies, as is explained in this section of the thesis, but none of the earlier studies have focused primarily on syntactic variation among adolescents in multilingual urban settings. In this section I try to summarize some relevant parts of the history of variation research and account for different trends within this field of research that are of importance for the present study.

3.1.1 Early variation studies – The Labovian paradigm

A significant challenge to early linguistic theory, which had paid little attention to language variation and had focused mainly on standardized forms of language and ideal speakers-listeners in homogeneous speech communities, came with William Labov’s (e.g., 1966, 1970, 1972a) launch of the variationist paradigm. Labov focused primarily on language variation and maintained that variability in language is structured and systematic and may occur as a result of internal and external factors of the linguistic, situational and psycholinguistic context. He
emphasized the importance of using natural data irrespective of how messy the data might be.

Early variation studies established broad correlations between linguistic variables, geographically and ethnically distinctive variables, and the primary social categories of socio-economic class, sex and age (e.g., Labov, 1966, 1970, 1972a, 1972b; Trudgill, 1974; Wolfram, 1969). By identifying how speakers varied their language use and by relating these patterns of observed variation to contextual variables, they were able to show how different aspects of the context affect language use. As regards the role of variation in language change, the early variation studies showed, among other things, that the source of most linguistic innovation is found in the speech of upper working and lower middle classes, that adolescents often lead other age groups in the use of linguistic variants, and that women in general tend to be more conservative in their use of stigmatized variants than male speakers and use more standard and prestige forms, at the same time as they tend to lead linguistic changes in progress (e.g., Eckert, 1997, 2005; Ellis, 1994; Kerswill, 1996; Labov, 2001).

Labov’s (ibid.) primary interest lay in obtaining and identifying data that represented, as closely as possible, people’s casual and natural speech. He distinguished between social factors (such as social class, age, and sex/gender) and stylistic factors (the stylistic shifts that occur in some linguistic variables as the social context or topic changes). According to Labov, the social factors were responsible for inter-speaker variation while the stylistic factors were responsible for intra-speaker variation. He claimed that all speakers style shift, although some may be more frequent style shifters than others with a wider range of style shifting. Labov believed that style shifts were triggered primarily by the amount of attention people paid to their speech, i.e. how self-conscious people were and how much attention they paid to language form (Labov, 1970, 1972a). He claimed that speakers paid more attention to their speech in formal situations than in more informal situations, when speaking the vernacular. Labov’s work indicated that style shifting was systematic and predictable and that stylistic variation was closely intertwined with social class variation. His studies showed that the same variants used in more casual styles were used with greater frequency in lower social class groups, while those that were used in more formal styles were associated with higher class groups (Labov, 1970, 1972a; Schilling-Estes, 2002). In other words, stylistic variation paralleled social class variation.

Later, the Labovian paradigm was met by considerable criticism (e.g., Bell, 1984; Ellis, 1987b, 1994; Giles, Coupland, N. & Coupland, J., 1991; Hulstijn, 1989; Schilling-Estes, 2002; Rampton, 1987; Rickford & McNair-Knox, 1994; Young, 1991). The main criticism was directed at Labov’s use of attention to speech as a causative factor in style shifting, and the fact that he viewed speakers as passive respondents who altered their speech in response to changes in the external situation rather than crediting them with agency in their use of stylistic resources. The Labovian paradigm was also criticized for ignoring the effect that
the interlocutors might have on the interaction, its uni-dimensionality, its preoccupation with standardness, its focus on the role of formality-informality of context, and for its use of the notion “vernacular”, since speakers may exhibit different types of casual speech in different casual settings.

The work of William Labov also exerted a profound impact on the study of variability in second language acquisition research (from now on referred to as SLA), and provided the methodology and/or theory for many SLA-studies (see for example Tarone, 1983, Ellis & Roberts, 1987; see also Ellis, 1994 for a survey of SLA-studies that followed the Labovian paradigm). Several studies by Tarone (e.g., 1982, 1983, 1985, 1988), for example, followed in Labov’s footsteps and pointed to similar patterns of variation for learners as those found for native speakers in Labov’s studies. Tarone suggested that the stylistic continuum of the second language learner operated more or less like that of a native speaker, and that the more attention the learner paid to speech, the more target language forms s/he would produce. However, several studies showed that the picture concerning second language use was more complicated than this, and learners were sometimes shown to produce less target-like language in careful language when they were able to pay more attention to form (e.g., Ellis & Roberts, 1987: 14). The criticism directed at the Labovian paradigm in general (see above) also applied to the second language studies following this research paradigm.

3.1.2 Speech accommodation theory and audience design

3.1.2.1 Speech accommodation theory

The first publications concerning speech accommodation theory (from here on SAT) emerged in the beginning of the 1970’s. The SAT was born in the context of a critique of traditional sociolinguistics and the Labovian paradigm (Giles, N. Coupland & J. Coupland, 1991). A group of social psychologists led by Howard Giles, argued that sociolinguistics should not limit itself to viewing speech only as a reflection of social variables such as sex/gender, age, socio-economic class, etc. Instead, they suggested a model that combined sociolinguistic variables with social psychological variables such as speakers’ subjective attitudes, perception of situations, and cognitive and affective dispositions (Thakerar, Giles & Cheshire, 1982; Beebe & Zuengler, 1983). The SAT was devised in an attempt to explain interactional sociolinguistic variation, and explain the motivations behind the style shifts people perform in interaction with other people (ibid; see also Beebe & Giles, 1984). According to SAT, people adjust their speech in order to express their feelings, values and intentions to their interlocutor, and this results in the language becoming either more similar or dissimilar to that of the interlocutor.

Convergence refers to the linguistic strategy a speaker may employ to adapt her/his speech to become more similar to an interlocutor’s and divergence refers to the way in which speakers may emphasize verbal and nonverbal differences between themselves and others. According to the supporters of the SAT, conver-
gence and divergence may affect all linguistic levels, the shifts may include non-verbal features and can be made both within one language or between different languages (e.g., Giles, Coupland & Coupland, 1991; Giles & Powesland, 1975; Thakerar et al, 1982). The convergence and divergence strategies may be either upward or downward, where upward refers to a shift toward a socially more valued variety and downward to modifications toward more stigmatized or less socially valued forms of language (ibid.).

The speech accommodation theory was built by integrating four already established social psychological theories that could be applied to the study of language variation. The SAT is based on the similarity-attraction theory (which suggests that we are more attracted to people whose attitudes and beliefs are similar to our own), social exchange theory (which suggests that we weigh the rewards and costs of different alternatives prior to acting, and that we normally choose the alternative which promises the greatest reward and the lowest cost), causal attribution theory (which suggests that we perceive and evaluate other people’s behavior in terms of what we think their motives are or what we know about the causes of their behavior), and the intergroup distinctiveness theory (which suggests that when people who are members of different groups interact, these people make social comparisons across groups, and their group member identity is maintained as long as they are able to retain a distinctiveness from their interlocutor) (Thakerar et al, 1982, Beebe & Zuengler, 1983; Beebe, 1988). It is argued that any number of these four social psychological processes could be operating simultaneously to cause variation in a speaker’s language (ibid.).

Thakerar et al. (1982) argued that the notion of prototypicality was also of relevance in SAT since stereotyped responses to social groups might influence how speakers are heard to sound. They argue that one should distinguish between psychological and linguistic levels of convergence and divergence. For example, in several empirical studies it was found that participants shifted their speech style toward where they believed their interlocutor to be, irrespective of how the interlocutor actually sounded (ibid.). This means that although the speakers appeared to diverge linguistically, they were psychologically converging, since their speech represented an attempt at convergence toward a stereotype of their interlocutor’s speech (e.g., Thakerar et al, 1982; Giles, N. Coupland and J. Coupland, 1991).

Trudgill (1981) has suggested that the features that are most likely to undergo accommodative shifts are those that speakers are most conscious of, so-called “stereotypes” (see also Zuengler, 1988, 1991).

3.1.2.2 Speech accommodation theory in SLA

Beebe and Giles’ (1984) were among the first to discuss the relevance of SAT to explain second language data, and the SAT has since then been referred to as a major explanatory theory in many SLA-studies. Few have, however, substantiated the SAT with empirical SLA-data (cf. Zuengler, 1991: 224). One factor argued to
create accommodative shifts in second language learner’s speech is the interlocutor’s ethnic identity (e.g., Beebe, 1981; Beebe and Zuengler, 1983) but some researchers claim that the ethnicity of the interlocutor is but one of many different attributes that may cause second language learners to style shift, and that it is, therefore, difficult or impossible to separate the influence from this factor from the influence of other factors (e.g., Young, 1988; 1991).

3.1.2.3 Audience design

Basing his theory on the earlier formulations of the speech accommodation theory, Bell (1984) formulated a theory of style shifting that he called audience design. The proposed framework assumed that speakers respond mainly to other people and design their style for an audience. Bell (ibid.) claimed that although speakers accommodate primarily to their addressee, other people present who are not directly addressed might also affect a speaker’s style, and non-audience factors such as topic and setting might also create style changes by association with addressee types. For example, topics normally brought up in conversation with intimates might cause the speaker to use the speech style normally employed with these intimates.

A central feature of audience design was its attempt to relate inter-speaker (social) and intra-speaker (stylistic) variation. Bell (ibid.) argued that variation on the style dimension always derived from the social dimension and, consequently, linguistic variables could always have both social and style variation, or only social variation, but never style variation only (p.151).

Like the Labovian paradigm, Bell’s audience design was criticized for its’ focus primarily on the effect of only one independent variable on variation, i.e. audience effects (e.g., Rickford & McNair-Knox, 1994: 241). It was also critiqued for not being able to show which personal characteristics of the addressee speakers respond to in their style shifts, i.e. whether it is mainly ethnicity, familiarity, age, gender, or other factors (Schilling-Estes, 2002: 387).

3.1.3 Linguistic constraints on variation

The majority of the earlier variation studies emphasized the importance of social (such as class, sex/gender, age, socio-economic status) and situational variables (such as participants, setting, purpose, topic etc.) as explanations for language variation, but there were also studies that focused on how language-internal variables constrain linguistic variation, i.e. how the linguistic environment influences the variation produced.

In some of his early studies, Labov (e.g., 1969) investigated the influence of the linguistic environment on the contraction and deletion of the copula verb in African American English Vernacular (AAVE). Labov found that a number of phonological features constrained the variation, the most important being the
nature of the element preceding the copula (see also Wolfram & Fasold, 1974, for linguistic constraints on t/d-deletion in Detroit African-American speech).

A relatively large number of SLA-studies have investigated the effect of the linguistic environment on learner language variation, and the interplay between variation caused by the linguistic context and factors related to development (e.g., Dickerson, 1975; Bayley, 1994; Bebee, 1980; Ellis, 1985, 1987a, 1988, 1994; Hyltenstam, 1977, 1978, Wolfram, 1985, 1989; Young, 1991; see for example Ellis, 1988, 1994 for a review of SLA-studies that focus on the effects of the linguistic context on variation).

The majority of the variation studies that investigate the effect of language internal variables on the production of variation are concerned with phonological or morphological variation. Far fewer studies have focused on syntactic variation. The reason for this may be that it is often a more straightforward task to identify the different values that a given linguistic variable may take at the phonological or morphological levels, whereas in syntax it is often difficult to identify which forms to count as alternative ways of saying the same thing (e.g., Bayley, 2002; Ellis, 1988; Jacobson, 1979, 1989; Young, 1991).

Dickerson (1975) and Beebe (1980) studied the effect of the linguistic environment on the production of different phonological features in the language production of Japanese and Thai second language learners of English, and both of them found that the production was influenced by the nature of the preceding and following phonemic elements, and also by the location of the phoneme within a word, whether appearing in initial or final position of the word. Bayley (1994), Ellis (e.g., 1988), Wolfram (e.g., 1985, 1989) and Young (1991) have studied how morphological variation in learner language is constrained by different particularities of the linguistic context. For example, Young (1991) found that both phonological and syntactic features of the surrounding linguistic environment influenced the variation in -s plural marking in the interlanguage of Chinese learners of English. Prenominal modifiers strongly favored plural marking, as did preceding or following vowels, whereas preceding sibilants tended to inhibit plural marking. The variation also turned out to be somewhat differently constrained by the linguistic environment for learners at different stages in their second language development (p. 149, see also Bayley, 1994).

There are a few studies that have tried to look at the effect of the linguistic environment on the production of syntactic variation, mainly in SLA-research. Ellis (1984), for example, found that the application of subject-verb inversion in wh-questions in English learner language varied depending on the clause-initial wh-pronoun. The participants were substantially more likely to produce subject-verb inversion after clause-initial ‘what’ than after ‘when’. As mentioned in section 2.1.4.1, the two Swedish researchers Hyltenstam (1977, 1978) and Bolander (1988a, 1988b) have investigated the effect of language-internal factors on the production of subject-verb inversion and placement of negations in the acquisition of Swedish as a second language.
3.1.4 Psycholinguistic constraints on variation

As mentioned above, the early variation studies, following Labov, often focused on ‘attention to speech/form’ as the main explanatory/causative variable for stylistic variation. After extensive critique of this view (see above), cognitively-oriented variation research shifted toward other explanatory variables such as planning (e.g., Crookes, 1989). Within this framework, language is argued to vary systematically as a result of the amount of time a speaker has to organize what s/he wants to say and how s/he wants to say it, and if speakers are provided with time to plan their utterances this tends to result in more complex language use overall, both for second language learners and for native speakers (e.g., Crookes, 1989; Danielewicz, 1984; Ellis, 1987b; Ochs, 1979).

Several studies have found that language production varies with different tasks, but there is no agreement as to exactly which factors related to a particular task type influence variation (e.g., Beebe, 1980; Duff, 1993; Hyltenstam, 1983; Philipsson, 2007; Tarone, 1979, 1982, 1983, 1985, 1988; Tarone & Parrish, 1988). A comparison between different studies is also complicated by the fact that the studies focus on different linguistic structures. In any case, Duff (1993) argues that data obtained from only one or a few task types will fail to give an accurate reflection of a speaker’s range of language use, and one should, therefore, always attempt to include a wide range of task types.

3.1.5 The need for multivariate analyses

Most early variation studies were concerned with the influence of only one or a handful of factors on a linguistic variable, but an increasing number of researchers felt the need to be able to account for a more complex interaction between linguistic environment and sociolinguistic factors in order to explain language variation properly (e.g., Bayley, 1994, 2002; Ellis, 1989; Young, 1991; Tarone, 1989). A new wave of variation studies emerged within the quantitative paradigm that tried to map out how various different, intersecting and independent external and internal variables simultaneously constrain variable linguistic features (e.g., Bayley, 1994, 2002; Schilling-Estes, 2002; Young, 1991). It was argued that any linguistic or social influence that a researcher has good reasons to believe might affect the variable feature under investigation, based on earlier research, should be included in an analysis. With help of the VARBRUL program (Cedergren & Sankoff, 1974), a statistical logistic regression model for variationist analysis, the researcher could then establish the nature, extent, and differential contribution of each conditioning factor, and the possible interactions between different factors.

Bayley (1994), for example, conducted a study of how seven different variables related to the learners’ developmental stage, the linguistic environment and the participants’ social status influenced the variable production of past tense marking by adult Chinese learners of English. In the multivariate analysis of the material, Bayley was able to show how the variation produced was simultaneously
influenced by verb type, preceding and following linguistic segment, grammatical aspect, the participants’ English proficiency, their participation in English-speaking networks, and the interview type.

3.1.6 Ethnographic studies of variation

Many recent variation studies focus primarily on speakers’ practise of variation, how people use variation as an active resource with which to create social meaning (e.g., Bucholtz, 1999; Cheshire, 2002; Eckert, 1989, 2000, 2005; Fought, 1999; Gunnarsdotter Grönberg, 2004; Mendoza-Denton, 1996, 2002; Miller, 2004; Quist, 2005; Zhang, 2005). These studies are characteristically ethnographic in nature and try to search for the meanings that motivate variable performances, and discover social categories that speakers themselves find meaningful and exploit in their language. The findings from several of these studies stress the importance of looking beyond frequency levels for variable features when pondering questions of speaker meaning, since even single occurrences of certain features might carry strong social connotations (cf. Schilling-Estes, 2002: 394).

Already in the 1960’s, Labov (1963) conducted an ethnographic variation study of sound change in Martha’s Vineyard. He studied how the speakers of a small speech community called upon local pronunciation of phonological variables as symbolic of the struggle between the Vineyard and the mainland.

Cheshire (1982) spent several months studying the spontaneous speech of adolescents in the town of Reading, and she found that the adolescents’ use of certain non-standard morphological and syntactic features was correlated with the extent to which they adhered to vernacular culture. The use of variation was also influenced by the speakers’ gender. Male and female speakers exploited their linguistic resources in different ways, and the male speakers generally employed non-standard features more frequently than the female speakers. Cheshire’s findings (1982) exemplify how the use of the same linguistic features may carry different meaning for different groups of speakers (see also Cheshire, 2002).

3.2 The importance of age in SLA-research

Since the Swedish verb second rule appears to be difficult for most second language learners to acquire, and since the incidence of non-inversion is often long-lived in learner language (see section 2.1 for more details), I initially hypothesized that the use of non-inversion in the present material would be related to the fact that many of the participants have learned Swedish as a second language, even if most of them started acquiring Swedish at an early age (see also chapter 1).

An increasing number of studies contradict the often-earlier assumption that early second language acquirers will always eventually reach nativelike proficiency in a second language (e.g., Abrahamsson & Hyltenstam, in press; Ekberg, 1997, 1998, 1999a, 1999b, 2004; Hene, 1993; Hyltenstam, 1988, 1992;
Hyltenstam & Abrahamsson, 2000, 2003a, 2003b; Ioup, 1989; McDonald, 2000). These studies present examples of early second language acquirers who have not reached nativelike proficiency in their second language despite an early age of onset. In many cases, the differences may be subtle, perhaps only a question of frequency of use of certain features, a degree of less stereotypical language use and more online creativity, but at other times, the early second language acquirers are easily distinguished from native speakers because of a distinctive use of phonology or a distinctive use of certain morphosyntactic structures (e.g., Abrahamsson & Hyltenstam, in press; Ekberg, 1997, 1998, 1999a, 1999b, 2004; Ioup, 1989). Hyltenstam (1992) suggests that an early acquisition of a second language is necessary for the attainment of nativelike proficiency in a second language but it is not always sufficient (page 364; see also Abrahamsson & Hyltenstam, in press).

The importance of age has received considerable attention in studies of second language acquisition, in particular in studies concerned with the relationship between age of onset and ultimate attainment (e.g., Abrahamsson & Hyltenstam, in press; Birdsong, 1992; DeKeyser, 2000; Hyltenstam & Abrahamsson, 2000, 2003a, 2003b; Johnson, 1992; Johnson & Newport, 1989; White & Genesee, 1996). Some recent studies within this field indicate that the most common pattern for second language learners is that they differ in certain respects in their language use from native speakers, irrespective of when they started learning the second language, although the differences are sometimes so subtle that they are found only if the speaker’s language is scrutinized in detail (e.g., Abrahamsson & Hyltenstam, in press; Hyltenstam & Abrahamsson 2003b).

Most researchers agree that early second language acquisition has long term advantages compared to late acquisition, but there is a lot of controversy surrounding how to account for these differences. Supporters of the critical period hypothesis (CPH), that was originally introduced by Lenneberg (1967) in the late 1960’s, believe that age-related differences in second language acquisition is the result of maturational changes in the brain and that only learners who begin their second language acquisition pre-puberty will be able to achieve nativelike proficiency in a second language. Different suggestions have been given about the specific age limit for achieving nativelike second language proficiency. Lenneberg (ibid.) originally suggested that an offset occurs around puberty, but others have claimed that this offset occurs much earlier, already around 6-7 years of age (e.g., Johnson & Newport, 1989; Hyltenstam, 1992). Recently, some researchers have suggested that maturational constraints on second language acquisition are the result of a continuous decline in language acquisition abilities from birth and over the entire lifespan rather than a critical age offset (e.g., Hyltenstam & Abrahamsson, 2000, 2003a8). Irrespective of the disagreement regarding the age offset, supporters of the CPH agree that early second language learners will

---

8 See however their own reservation to this interpretation in Abrahamsson & Hyltenstam (in press: 30, footnote 13).
outperform adult second language learners in the long run. Some supporters of the CPH believe that age may constrain phonology and morphosyntax differently, and that a critical period for phonology most likely ends sooner than for morphology or syntax (e.g., Flege, Yeni-Komshian & Liu, 1999; Long, 2005), and there are also suggestions that there may be different limits for different grammatical structures (e.g., Abrahamsson & Hyltenstam, in press; McDonald, 2000).

Skeptics of the CPH base their critique on studies that have identified individuals who have learned a second language after puberty or as adults, and who appear to have a nativelike command of their second language (e.g., Birdsong, 1992; Bongaerts, 1999; Ioup, Boustagi, El Tigi & Moselle, 1994; White & Genesee, 1996). However, these studies have been strongly criticized for methodological weaknesses, and several researchers claim that the adult second language acquirers found to pass as natives would only be nativelike in certain aspects of their second language if their language were investigated in closer detail (e.g., Abrahamsson & Hyltenstam, in press; Hyltenstam and Abrahamsson 2000, 2003a, 2003b; Long, 2005).

In relation to my hypothesis about the importance of age of onset for the acquisition of subject-verb inversion and the production of word order variation in this study (see introduction), it is interesting to note that a Swedish study on internationally adopted children showed that the only child in the study who was adopted after age four sometimes produced examples of non-inversion in contexts for inversion unlike all the children who were adopted at an earlier age (De Geer, 1992, 1997). The same child also produced far fewer contexts for inversion, i.e. he began fewer of his main declarative clauses with non-subjects. Another Swedish study by Schlyter and Håkansson (1994) indicates that the weaker language in a bilingual child’s repertoire may develop more like a second language than a first language, and regarding the morphosyntactic development they found that the bilingual children in their study who had Swedish as their weaker language produced relatively many examples of non-inversion after clause-initial non-subjects, unlike the bilingual children who had Swedish as their stronger language. As explained earlier in section 2.1, the use of non-inversion is typically associated with second language acquisition of Swedish and not first language acquisition.

3.3 Problematic use of terminology

Considering that one of the aims of this study is to explore the relationship between the use of syntactic variation and speakers’ different ages of onset of Swedish acquisition and other factors related to nativeness, it is of current interest to discuss how several of these notions are used in the literature and how they apply to the participants in the present context. It is also necessary to discuss how one should relate to the discussion of standard language norms in a study that deals with variation, in particular since this study investigates variation in a context where little is known about the different linguistic norms that speakers may adhere to.
Fraurud and Boyd (2006) argue that most of the participants of the larger project Language and language use among adolescents in multilingual urban settings (Bijvoet et al., 2001), i.e. also the participants of this study, do not fit the traditional dichotomies between native speaker and non-native speaker, monolingual and multilingual, and/or second language learners and first language learners, that rest on the assumption of a native speaker norm. They argue that these binary distinctions are too narrow to capture the diversity that the adolescents represent, and that this is probably the case in most multilingual settings (ibid.; see also Norryby & Håkansson, 2007; Nygren-Junkin & Extra, 2003). I agree with Fraurud and Boyd that these concepts are difficult to employ in the present context, but at the same time I find it necessary for me to use and relate to several of these notions in the analysis and discussion of my findings.

Traditionally, the criteria used to define who is a native speaker, and/or who is a second language speaker, often center around factors that concern the speaker’s age of exposure to the language, her/his continual use of the language, proficiency in the language, and how s/he identifies herself/himself and is identified by others (e.g., Fraurud & Boyd, 2006: 57, see also Davies, 2003). The idealized native speaker is typically a monolingual speaker who has learned the native language in a more or less homogeneous environment and identifies herself/himself as a native speaker (ibid.). There are, however, a number of researchers who question the validity of this native speaker model, especially in multilingual contexts (e.g., Davies, 2003; Firth & Wagner, 1997, 1998; Fraurud & Boyd, 2006; Kramsch, 2003). For example, if the idealized definition of a native speaker would be employed in the present study, hardly any of the participants would be considered native speakers of Swedish. In fact, many participants would not even qualify as native speakers of any language if this definition were used (cf. Fraurud & Boyd, 2006). All the participants in this study come from more or less heterogeneous settings, they attend more or less multilingual schools, all of them study at least one more language in addition to Swedish at school, and all of them meet different languages and language varieties through media and through friends in their everyday lives. Let us briefly consider two of the focus participants, Åsa (L37) and Ekmel (B05) to illustrate the complexity of the matter (see Appendix A (large sample) and B (focus sample) for a selection of the participants’ background information). Åsa (L37) was born in Sweden and grew up in a family where only Swedish was spoken. At first sight, she would, thus, qualify as a native speaker. Nevertheless, Åsa lives, and has always lived in a multilingual suburb, she attends a relatively multilingual upper secondary school, she has many friends who speak a number of other languages in addition to Swedish, she claims to have learned Spanish and Yugoslavian (her term) through friends and sometimes communicates through these languages with them in addition to slang (as she puts it) and regular Swedish. Åsa also studies English and Spanish through the regular curriculum at school. The other participant, Ekmel (B05) was also born in Sweden but to parents of Turkish origin, the mother coming to Sweden as a child. Ekmel reports that he
has spoken Swedish along with Turkish from a very early age, from before he
started kindergarten. Ekmel thinks that Swedish might be his first language and he
considers Swedish his best language. However, despite his long-term history with
Swedish, Ekmel’s language displays certain characteristics, especially in some
contexts, that are often taken as typical for Swedish as a second language (see
however my comments regarding this below). But is it possible to define someone
who has “always” known Swedish and has Swedish as one of his first languages as
a second language speaker of Swedish? And if we do not consider Swedish to be
Ekmel’s native language, which language is his native language? Both these
participants illustrate that no clear-cut distinctions can be made between native
and non-native speakers in this material, nor between first language or second
language speakers, or monolingual and multilingual speakers, and if strict defini-
tions of these concepts were to be used in the present study, the majority of the
participants would be excluded from the analyses (cf. Fraurud & Boyd, 2006). At
the same time, the intention in the present thesis is to explore the relationship
between the variation produced and various factors that bring the issue of native-
ness to the fore, such as for example age of onset of Swedish acquisition and
whether the participants are of a monolingual or a multilingual background, so
there is a need to define the use of these terms in the present context despite the
difficulties that this may represent. Where I have felt the need to distinguish
between monolingual and multilingual participants in the analyses of my results,
“monolingual” has been operationalized as someone who has spoken only
Swedish at home with her/his parents and siblings during childhood and who
continues to speak only Swedish with the family. Participants who do not fit this
operationalization of a monolingual speaker of Swedish have been considered
multilingual participants.

The binary distinction between monolingual and multilingual is of course
problematic in this study for the same reasons as the native speaker concept is. In
some sense none of the participants in this study are monolingual. They all study
at least one other language in addition to Swedish at school and they all attend
schools in more or less multilingual settings where they come into contact with
speakers of a number of different languages. Many of them also report to have
acquired different levels of knowledge of several of their friends’ languages (cf.
Haglund, 2005; Otterup, 2005), and it is unknown how this may affect the
speakers’ language use. For most part, the categorization of mono- and multilin-
gual participants according to the operationalization mentioned above was,
however, relatively unproblematic, but there were a few occasions when I felt
unsure whether to categorize a participant as multi- or monolingual, and
consequently made decisions that could be disputed. For example one participant,
Tommy (S08), reported that he was born in the Philippines and learned Tagalog as
his first language. He came to Sweden when he was between one and a half and
two years old and said that he started learning Swedish at home from about age
three. It is unclear whether his father, who is of Swedish origin, was present
during the years in the Philippines. Nowadays, Tommy claims that he speaks only Swedish at home with both parents and with his sibling, and he says that he no longer knows or uses Tagalog. Apart from Swedish, the only other languages that Tommy reported to have knowledge of were English and German that he studied at school. These reports indicate that part of Tommy’s childhood was multilingual and part of his childhood monolingual. Because of these circumstances, Tommy (S08) was categorized as a monolingual participant with an age of onset of Swedish acquisition at age three\(^9\), which may seem rather contradictory. There were also a few cases where participants reported that one of their parents, usually the father, had a first language other than Swedish but that only Swedish had always been spoken in the family. These participants were also categorized as monolingual.

As described earlier, I wished to explore what impact participants’ age of onset of Swedish acquisition has for their production of word order variation. In many studies, age of onset (AO) is operationalized by replacing onset with age of arrival in the second language country (e.g., Abrahamsson & Hyltenstam, in press; Flege, Yeni-Komishian & Liu, 1999; Fraurud & Boyd, 2006; Hyltenstam & Abrahamsson, 2000, 2003a, 2003b; Johnson & Newport, 1989; McDonald, 2000). Age of onset is then taken to be the same as when a person arrived in the new country, despite the fact that arriving in a country does not necessarily mean that one starts to acquire the new language right away. In this study, there is no direct link between an early age of arrival in Sweden and an early age of onset, so it has not been possible to operationalize AO by replacing it with age of arrival in Sweden (see also Fraurud & Boyd, 2006). Some of the participants who were born in Sweden report ages of onset at seven years of age, and some of the participants who arrived in Sweden as one year olds report ages of onset at around three or four years of age at the point when they started attending daycare. For example, Kostas (B17), a boy whose parents are of Greek origin, was born in Sweden but claims to have learned Swedish first when he started school at seven years of age. Before school, he only hung out with other Greek children and he attended a Greek-speaking daycare, he says. We have no way of knowing the nature of exposure to Swedish that Kostas, and others like him, may have had previously to school. Most likely Kostas must have come into some contact with Swedish, considering that he lived in Sweden, but the literature does not give us any clear directions as to what conditions need to be fulfilled for a person’s exposure to a language to count as the age of onset for language acquisition (e.g., Fraurud & Boyd, 2006). For these reasons, in the project Language and language use among adolescents in multilingual urban settings we have had to rely on participants’ reported ages of onset of Swedish acquisition (see chapter 4 for more details).

\(^9\) It is important to point out that when I have analyzed the results in chapter 6, I have looked at whether any findings would change as a result of Tommy (S08) being categorized as monolingual or multilingual, and the result is negative. None of the findings are dependent on whether Tommy is viewed as a speaker with a monolingual or a multilingual background.
In the present context one also has to remember that it is far from obvious in relation to which norm one should assess participants’ nativeness. Most of the participants have grown up in environments characterized by great linguistic diversity and we know little about how the adolescents adhere to different linguistic norms. As described in section 2.2, certain grammatical features that are typically taken as characteristic of Swedish learner language are sometimes claimed to be characteristic of youth language varieties emerging in multilingual urban settings in Sweden (e.g., Kotsinas, 1994, 1998). Hence, some of the participants that at first sight may appear as second language speakers because of their distinctive use of certain second language features may in fact display these features in their language in accordance with local linguistic norms. The picture may also be even more complex. It is possible that the use of these linguistic features is sometimes the result of the participants still being in the process of learning Swedish as a second language but sometimes the result of them adhering to variable norms of the vernacular variety, or that both these factors are simultaneously influential.

Of current interest here is also to problematize the use of standard language norm as a measure of how standard-near or standard-distant the adolescents’ language use may be. When speaking about the adolescents’ use of word order variation in this study I am speaking about variation in relation to the standard Swedish norm for word order, as also indicated by my use of the term ‘non-inversion’ rather than some more norm-neutral term. The norm that I am referring to in this case is based on descriptive grammars and studies of spoken and written Swedish. As explained in section 2.1, the use of non-inversion is not described as an option, except in a limited number of linguistic contexts, in any standard or regionalized varieties of Swedish. It is only in Swedish as a second language that non-inversions are said to occur more than sporadically. However, as mentioned in section 2.2, Kotsinas (e.g., 1988a, 1988b, 1989, 1990, 1994, 1996, 1998, 2000, 2001) has claimed that non-inversions are commonly used in youth language varieties in contemporary multilingual urban settings in Sweden. I find that it is important to point out that the reason why the use of non-inversion among the youths in these setting has attracted relatively much attention in recent research and in the media and the literature is because it deviates from expected Swedish language norms for speakers who are not obvious second language learners. Based on descriptions of Swedish language use, variation between inversion and non-inversion tends to occur only in a limited number of linguistic contexts and only sporadically, and in the light of this norm the variation found in Kotsinas’ studies (op. cit.) and in this study becomes interesting to investigate.
Chapter Four

Method and Data

This chapter describes the methods used for data collection, it introduces the participants of the study and it gives a detailed description of the data selection process and the different types of data used.

A variety of different methods were used to gather data, ranging from quantitative to more qualitative. Participants’ syntactic variation was investigated through different spontaneous and semi-directed oral data (section 4.2.2-4.2.5), written essays (section 4.2.7) and a grammaticality judgment test (section 4.2.8). The participants were recorded in various contexts with a number of different interlocutors. Large amounts of data were needed in order to be able to see possible regularities in the variation produced (cf. Hyltenstam, 1977: 384-385). More directed data types were included in order to have a degree of control over the data being collected and to make sure that all the structures of interest would be included.

The chapter begins with a description of the participants; how they were selected, the schools they went to, and what types of data there are for each of them (section 4.1). The various data types are then described in detail in the following section (4.2).

4.1 Participants

A total of 127 adolescents from Stockholm, Göteborg and Malmö participated in this study. The participants were all part of the larger research project, Language and language use among adolescents in multilingual urban settings (Bijvoet et al., 2001). All participants who were selected for this study completed a retelling task, a composition-writing task and a grammaticality judgment test. This was done in order to be able to look for syntactic patterns among a larger group of individuals in different types of situations (see section 4.1.3, the large sample). For more in-depth inter-individual and intra-individual analyses, a sub-sample of adolescents was selected from the large sample (see section 4.1.4, the focus sample). Oral data from group conversations, self-recordings and school presentations was analyzed in addition to other data in the focus sample.
4.1.1 Selection process

As mentioned previously, this thesis is part of a larger research project, which was initiated by the project leaders before any of the PhD students were involved. The participant sampling for the larger project was more or less decided by the time I started working on my thesis.

The sampling is based on a judgment sample, i.e. the project members identified the type of speakers they were interested in for the current project, and then set out to look for schools and students who fit these categories (Milroy 1987: 26). The aim of the larger project was to investigate language use among adolescents in different multilingual urban settings in Sweden’s three largest cities; Stockholm, Göteborg and Malmö. The project intended to select two classes in each city, one in a school with a large proportion of students of foreign background and one in a school with less but still a significant number of students of foreign background\(^{10}\), in order to be able to study similarities and/or differences in the language use of students from more multilingual schools compared to students from less multilingual schools. After studying the social and demographic characteristics of Stockholm, Göteborg and Malmö; the schools that best matched the preferences and expectations of the research team were selected. Unsurprisingly, the more multilingual schools that were selected were located in the most multilingual areas of each city (with the exception of Malmö, see section 4.1.2) while the less multilingual schools were located in less multilingual areas of the cities.

In the larger project, we decided to focus on students in the second year of upper secondary school (Sw. ‘gymnasium’) studying a theoretical program, in most cases the program for social sciences. We had various reasons for selecting adolescents at this age. In Sweden, adolescents begin upper secondary school level at approximately age 16, and for most of the students it is the first time they attend a school situated outside the local environment where they live. When starting upper secondary school the adolescents’ social networks expand and they become part of new peer groups. They are likely to come into contact with a larger variety of spoken Swedish than they previously have. At this age, young people know how to use a variety of language styles in everyday conversation and they are often motivated to use innovative language and non-standard language forms (e.g., Eckert, 2000; Labov, 1972a; Milroy, 1987). By the second year of upper secondary school, we reasoned that the adolescents would have had time to get to know their new school environment and their new classmates.

The schools and the students were all approached in accordance with the ethical guidelines for arts and social science research proposed by The Swedish Research Council. All participants were asked to sign an agreement paper that gave us

\(^{10}\) The term ‘of foreign background’ refers here to all individuals who were born outside Sweden, or who have one or two parents who were born outside Sweden, i.e. the definition used in official statistics in Sweden until the year 2001.
Table 4.1. The selected schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stockholm</th>
<th>Göteborg</th>
<th>Malmö</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bullerbyskolan*</td>
<td>Platonskolan*</td>
<td>Cypresskolan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Körsbärsskolan*</td>
<td>Sokrateskolan</td>
<td>Dahliaaskolan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lönnebergaskolan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ekskolan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The more multilingual schools are marked with *

permission to record them in different contexts. An information sheet was also sent to their parents. We promised that all material gathered would be used for research purposes only, that they would remain anonymous and that they could withdraw from participation in the project at any time.

We informed the adolescents about the purpose of the larger project but we were rather vague about the exact nature of our different studies. The students knew that we were interested in how young people in Sweden speak today in different situations and with different people.

4.1.2 Schools

In the end, a total of eight upper secondary school classes were selected; three in Stockholm, two in Göteborg and three in Malmö (see table 4.1).11

Stockholm. In Stockholm, three different schools were selected, two located in suburban areas of the city that are highly multilingual, and one school that was more centrally located. We selected two different multilingual schools in Stockholm since we wished to explore if there were any interesting similarities and/or differences in language use between different multilingual suburbs. Bullerbyskolan and Körsbärsskolan are the more multilingual schools in Stockholm. Bullerbyskolan is located in a northern suburb and Körsbärsskolan in a southern suburb. In both schools, the majority of students have a multilingual background but most of them were born in Sweden or came to Sweden at an early age. Most students in these two schools live in areas near the school. Lönnebergaskolan is the less multilingual school in Stockholm. It is located at the outskirts of the inner city of Stockholm. Although Lönnebergaskolan is less multilingual than Bullerbyskolan and Körsbärsskolan it still has a significant number of students with foreign background, approximately 40 % at the time of the study. The intake of students in Lönnebergaskolan is less locally driven than in the other selected Stockholm schools. The majority in the selected class in Lönnebergaskolan lived in the inner city or in southern suburbs of Stockholm. A few students lived in northern suburbs of Stockholm, in the same areas as students from Bullerbyskolan. Whereas the students from Bullerbyskolan and Lönnebergaskolan generally

11 All names used for participants and schools in this thesis are pseudonyms in order to maintain the participants' anonymity. The same code names are used by everyone within the project *Language and language use among adolescents in multilingual urban settings* (Bijvoet et al., 2001). The participants’ code names are intended to reflect their complex language backgrounds.
showed an interest in the project and wished to participate, the situation in Körsbärskolan was different. Although the adolescents were always welcoming when we came to Körsbärsskolan, many of them were suspicious of our research and most of them did not wish to be interviewed about their language background. In the end only 11 of the 21 students in the selected class in Körsbärsskolan participated actively in all the different aspects of the data collection process.

**Göteborg.** In Göteborg, two schools were selected, Platonskolan in a highly multilingual suburban area of Göteborg and Sokratesskolan in a less multilingual suburban area. The majority of the adolescents in the selected classes lived in areas near their respective school.

**Malmö.** The situation in Malmö is different from both Stockholm and Göteborg since almost all upper secondary schools in Malmö are located in the center of the city. The student intake in the schools is less locally driven than in Stockholm and Göteborg. All upper secondary schools receive students from many different areas of the city. Because of this, students of foreign background are more spread out over the schools. There are no schools like the most multilingual schools in Stockholm and Göteborg. However, in the selected classes in Cypresskolan and Eksskolan the proportion of students with foreign background reached approximately 70%. The selected class in Dahliaskolan had the lowest proportion of students with foreign background among the selected Malmö classes, with approximately 60%.

### 4.1.3 The large sample

A total of 222 participants were included in the database for the larger project *Language and language use among adolescents in multilingual urban settings*. The participants of the present study were selected from this pool of participants if there was data from them on a background interview, a written composition, a retelling task, and grammaticality judgment test (see section 4.2 for more information about each data type). This resulted in a total of 126 participants, which is referred to as ‘the large sample’ from now on in this thesis (see Appendix A for a selection of background variables for the participants of the large sample). The distribution of the large sample over the three cities and the different schools is presented in table 4.2.

The large sample was selected in order to be able to say something about syntactic variation in the studied population as a whole, and in order to be able to explore inter-individual variation in relation to factors such as age, gender, and location.

### 4.1.4 The focus sample

In order to be able to make more in-depth analyses of inter-individual and intra-individual syntactic variation, a group of 20 focus participants from the three Stockholm schools was selected. The focus participants are part of the large
Table 4.2: The large sample distributed over the cities and the schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm (N = 58)</td>
<td>Bullerbyskolan</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Körshärsskolan</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lönnerbergaskolan</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Göteborg (N = 22)</td>
<td>Platonskolan</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sokratesskolan</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malmö (N = 46)</td>
<td>Cypressskolan</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dahlaskolan</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ekskolan</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

sample,¹² but in addition to the retellings, written essays and the grammaticality judgment test, data has been analyzed from them when they participate in group conversations, conduct self-recordings and make a presentation in front of the class (for more details about the different data types, see section 4.2). The data has been analyzed in close detail both quantitatively and qualitatively. The selection of a sub-sample of participants was crucial in order to be able to explore participants’ syntactic repertoires and study the variation from a more qualitative angle.

The initial intention was that the focus participants should represent individuals who had acquired Swedish at different ages, in order to be able to explore the importance of age of onset of Swedish acquisition for the variation produced (see chapter 3.2). Although I later departed from the original selection criteria for the focus sample, I wish to account for these criteria since they have affected which participants ended up in the sub-sample. Three groups of focus participants were initially supposed to be selected that differed from each other regarding their mono- or multilingual background and at what age they started learning Swedish (see section 3.3 for a definition of how these terms are used in the present thesis). One group was to be formed from participants who were considered monolingual speakers of Swedish who had learned Swedish from birth, one group from participants of a multilingual background who reported an age of onset before age four, and one group from participants of a multilingual background who reported an age of onset after age six. The age intervals were chosen based on findings of different ages that are important for first and second language acquisition of Swedish. As mentioned in section 2.1, children learning Swedish as their first language normally know how to use the verb second rule (V2) already by age two when they start producing multiword utterances (e.g., Håkansson, 2001; Håkansson & Nettelbladt, 1993, 1996; Santelmann, 1995; Platzack, 1996, 1997, 1998). I therefore wished to form a group with multilingual participants who learned

¹² Except one focus participant, Åsa (L37), who did not conduct a retelling and was, therefore, excluded from the large sample.
Swedish around this age, but since the majority of the multilingual participants with an early acquisition of Swedish in this study started learning Swedish sometime around age three to four, it turned out to be more natural to draw a limit between earlier and later Swedish acquisition around this age. The decision to form a group with participants who had learned Swedish after age six was based on findings that have shown that age six to seven may be an upper limit for a second language learner’s ability to acquire nativelike proficiency in a second language (e.g., Hyltenstam, 1992; Johnson & Newport, 1989; Long, 1993). Some Swedish SLA-studies have argued that individuals who learn Swedish before age six to seven often develop an automatized syntax similar to that of first language acquirers of Swedish whereas later learners often do not (e.g., Hyltenstam, 1988, 1992: 364, Ekberg, 2004: 262). Finally, a group of monolingual participants was to be formed in order to be able to investigate if even small delays in the acquisition of Swedish might have an effect on the word order variations produced, and in order to find out whether or not non-inversions were produced by both multilingual and monolingual speakers of Swedish in the current context.

In addition to the age criteria, the original idea was to select speakers for the focus sample whom I thought were possible users of non-inversion, and possible speakers of so called multilethnic youth language varieties. My judgment of this was done based on informal observations made in class and the information gathered through the background interviews.

Because it was essential to collect data with the same participants interacting in a number of different comparable situational contexts, I had to select the focus participants early on in the data collection process. The choice of focus participants therefore rests on the assumptions and hypotheses that I had in the early stages of my thesis work (see chapter 1 for more details). As mentioned earlier, I initially had good reasons to believe that age of onset of Swedish acquisition might be one of the most important factors explaining the variation produced, and the criteria originally used to select the focus participants reflect this. As the investigation moved on, however, data began to push me in a different direction and suggested that AO might only marginally be able to explain the variation found and that factors of a more socio-pragmatic nature had to be studied in order to understand possible meanings behind an active use of variation by different participants. Because of these circumstances, I found it necessary to include more focus participants in the sub-sample that were recorded in spontaneous contexts with friends, irrespective of whether they fit the three age groups or not. Among the final twenty focus participants there are, therefore, participants who fall in between the three age groups. The selection of the focus sample was also dependent on which participants were interested in taking a more active part in the

13 During the semester prior to data collection the project members visited the selected schools and classes on several occasions. We participated in class and made pilot recordings as a means to get to know the participants, let them grow accustomed to the researchers and the recording equipment, as well as to defuse the research issue.
Table 4.3. Size and distribution of the focus sample and the large sample; participants and situational contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Focus sample</th>
<th>Large sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of participants</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Interview</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retellings</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written essays</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJT</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-recordings</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group conversations</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A +/- sign means that there is missing data from one or a few focus participants in a context.

project, since they had to take part in a number of recordings and tests throughout a year.

Initially, the sub-sample was also supposed to be drawn from all three cities but for practical reasons and due to time constraints, in the end only participants from Stockholm were included in the focus sample. The size and distribution of the final focus sample is presented in table 4.3 and a comparison is made with the size and distribution of the large sample.

In Appendix B, there is an overview of the twenty focus participants that includes participants’ selected background information and an account of all the situations that they were recorded in. Unfortunately, not all the selected focus participants ended up taking part in all the pre-selected tasks and recording contexts. For example, there were occasions when participants did not turn up for a task/recording, or were absent on the day of a recording. Some of the focus participants did not want to conduct self-recordings.

4.2 Data

Several different types of data were collected for this study; spontaneous and semi-directed oral data, written essays and a grammaticality judgment test (GJT). The different types of data were chosen in an attempt to explore participants’ syntactic repertoires. The different data types are described in detail in section 4.2.1-4.2.8.

Oral data was recorded on minidiscs, either Sharp MD MT-190 or SONY Net MD Walkman MZ-N707, using SONY ECM-717 microphones. A few audio-recordings were conducted on a SONY TCM-40DV tape recorder using a SONY ECM-F8 microphone.

Approximately 60 hours of recorded speech was analyzed for this thesis. It was essential to study large amounts of oral data in order to be able to see possible regularities in the syntactic variation produced and in order to explore participants’
language use in different contexts and with different interlocutors. The likeliness of being able to catch the adolescents’ spontaneous speech, and their production of non-inversion, was hypothesized to increase if the speakers could be recorded in well-known environments together with friends (cf. Lainio, 1982). In order to achieve this, all the focus participants were recorded in at least one situation where they interacted with peers, either at home or in school. The recording equipment and the recording situation may have influenced participants’ language use in all situational contexts, but the pressure on members of a group to speak in accordance with how they usually speak in a group has hopefully outweighed the effects of the recording context at least in the group conversations and self-recordings (cf. Labov, 1972a, 1972b; Nordberg, 1982).

4.2.1 Background interviews

Within the larger project *Language and language use among adolescents in multilingual urban settings*, background information was collected about participants through structured interviews based on a questionnaire. All interviews were audio-recorded. In total, 222 adolescents were interviewed. The aim of the interviews was to explore each participant’s linguistic background, linguistic environment, patterns of language use in different domains, age when first exposed to Swedish, length of residence in Sweden, length of residence in the multilingual urban area, the parents' socio-economic background, and the participant’s perception of her/his own competence in Swedish and her/his other languages. The interviews were carried out at the beginning of the data collection process. A project researcher interviewed one participant at a time and filled in the questionnaire while the participant was speaking.

In the present study, the background interviews were mainly used in order to gain information about each participant’s linguistic background. The interviews were not analysed linguistically, except in a limited number of cases. Only a subset of the background information variables was included in the different statistical inter-individual analyses made (see table 4.4), although additional background variables will sometimes be referred to in the discussion of findings (chapter 7).

A problem factor in this study, and many other studies, is that it relies on reported background information. Participants have, for example, been asked at what age they started learning Swedish, where they first started learning Swedish, and which language/s was their first language/s. There are several problems inherent in these and similar questions. Participants may have different interpretations or opinions of what it means to start learning a language, what a first language entails, and whether it is possible to have several first languages. They may also be unused to discussing these types of issues and some of them may not remember what the circumstances were when they were growing up. The information we have about these questions is, thus, rather uncertain.
Table 4.4. Background variables included in the statistical analyses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of onset of Swedish acquisition (AO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of residence in Sweden (LOR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthplace (whether in Sweden or not)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilingual or monolingual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the present study the nature and extent of the Swedish input that participants received growing up might be a relevant issue to consider, since some studies have indicated that the weaker language in a bilingual child’s repertoire may develop more like a second language than a first language, at least as far as morphosyntactic development is concerned (e.g., Schlyter & Håkansson, 1994), and since little is known about how much input is needed for first language processes to occur. In the background interviews we did not ask participants anything about the nature of the input they received as children, however. We know that many of them grew up in multilingual settings but we have no information about how much Swedish they met growing up, nor about the quality of the input they received.

4.2.2 Self-recordings

The aim of the self-recordings was to attempt to catch participants’ everyday speech in a natural way. Participants who agreed to make self-recordings were equipped with a mini-disc and a microphone and were asked to record their interactions with peers and family in a number of situations over a few days, preferably after school hours and at least outside the classroom environment. No researcher was present during the recordings and the content was completely up to the participants. We could not control the number or identity of all other speakers that participated in the self-recordings. The amount and quality of the self-recordings varies greatly. While some participants recorded several full discs from many different contexts, others recorded only 15-30 minutes during a school break on one single occasion. For the purposes of this thesis, I have selected one self-recording occasion per focus participant.

The recording equipment occasionally appears to have distracted speakers during the self-recordings. At times, they discussed the equipment or the recording situation, or even addressed the listener (i.e. the researchers) directly to support information about something going on in the background, but on the whole, participants appear to have been able to relax and speak naturally during their self-recordings.
Unfortunately, only thirteen of the selected twenty focus participants conducted self-recordings due to different circumstances.

4.2.3 Group conversations

The participants were recorded while engaging in semi-directed group conversations. The group discussions were organised in different ways for different groups. A few groups were recorded at a time when the research team had asked the selected classes to read the short story *Elixir* (Leiva Wenger, 2001) and discuss it in class. The participants were recorded while they discussed the short story in smaller groups of three to five people. They were given a sheet of paper with questions about the story that they could use as a point of departure for their discussion if they wished to do so. The conversations lasted between 7 and 30 minutes and no researcher or adult was present during the recordings, except on one occasion when a teacher partly participated in a conversation between four boys. Although many of the conversations might have started out as semi-directed, they often ended up being more or less spontaneous. Participants jumped back and forth between the given theme and other themes of their interest.

It might be relevant to point out that the plot of the short story *Elixir* (ibid.) and the language used in the story is not mainstream. The plot centers around a group of boys in a multilingual suburb of Stockholm who experiment with a drink that makes them become more Swedish. The language used is unconventional and characterized by an abundant use of non-inversions and slang words, among other things (cf. Källström, 2005).

Other group conversations were recorded during on-going lessons. On these occasions, the conversations were part of normal classroom activity and the teachers directed the content of the conversations and formed the groups. The conversations, therefore, center around a number of different topics. These recordings were included in the analysis in addition to the *Elixir* discussions because I wanted to have group recordings with as many as possible of the focus participants.

4.2.4. Presentations

The focus participants were recorded while giving a speech or a presentation in front of the class. These presentations were part of normal on-going classroom activities and they were hoped to generate more formal language use from the participants than the group conversations or self-recordings. The research team did not direct the presentations in any way. Most presentations were both audio-recorded and videotaped.

Many of the participants maintained a relatively high level of formality during their presentations, compared to their language use in other contexts inside and outside the classroom. Whereas some participants more or less read their presentations from a paper, others were able to improvise more and be less constrained
by written text. For obvious reasons, the nature, content, and length of the presentations vary from class to class and from individual to individual.

4.2.5. Retellings

In order to obtain longer stretches of continuous talk with each participant, semi-directed retellings of movies were recorded. Each participant was asked to retell a movie of her/his own choice, and talk about the plot of the movie, how the movie started, how it ended, and what she/he thought of the movie. Except on four occasions, participants spoke one on one with the researcher during the retelling. The retellings lasted between 5-15 minutes. Whenever needed, the researcher asked questions to push the retelling forward, but she tried to interfere as little as possible. Although the participants could speak freely about whichever movie they wished to talk about, the peculiarities of the recording situation inhibited some speakers.

Participants chose to speak about a wide range of different movies, most of which were showing in movie theaters at the time. Twenty-one participants spoke about the same movie, *Lilja 4-ever* (directed by Lukas Moodysson, 2002). Most of Sweden’s secondary schools went to see this movie and the classes in three of our selected schools had seen *Lilja 4-ever* the same week or the week before the retellings took place.

4.2.6 Transcripts

All oral data, except three retellings, was transcribed by the author following a modified CHAT format, part of the CHILDES network (Mac Whinney, 2000). CHILDES (‘Child Language Data Exchange System’) is an international network for the study of conversational interaction and CHAT (‘Codes for the Human Analysis of Language’) is the standard transcription system used for this network (see http://childes.psy.cmu.edu/). All transcripts were written in a modified standard orthography. Everyone within the larger project *Language and language use among adolescents in multilingual urban settings* followed the same transcription standards. Table 4.5 gives a list of the transcription symbols used in the examples presented in the thesis.

4.2.7 Written data

In Sweden, all upper secondary students have to complete a national test in Swedish or Swedish as a second language when they are in the third grade of upper secondary school (see www.nordiska.uu.se/natprov/). The written parts of this national test were collected from all the classes studied. The national test in Swedish comprises one oral assignment and two written assignments. Three retellings were transcribed by PhD-student Gudrun Svensson and later checked by the author. Students studying Swedish as a second language complete only one written assignment.
Table 4.5. Transcription symbols.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>short pause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>##</td>
<td>longer pause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>interrupted/unfinished enunciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[=]</td>
<td>explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[=!]</td>
<td>extralinguistic material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[?]</td>
<td>unsure transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[?]=</td>
<td>unsure transcription with possible alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[% text]</td>
<td>comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%com</td>
<td>comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>unintelligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[: text]</td>
<td>standard form of a word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(de)</td>
<td>standard orthographic addition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

weeks before the national test, students are told about the overarching theme of the test and they receive a compilation of texts that they have to read and discuss in class and at home before taking the test. The written part of the national test is composed of two different assignments, A and B. In assignment A, students have to write a letter about a given issue directed to a known recipient and they have 80 minutes to complete the task. In the letter, they have to make references to and support their arguments with examples from the texts given in the compilation. Assignment B requires students to write an extended essay on a given theme\(^\text{16}\), and they are given 300 minutes to complete the essay. Students have to make references to the texts in the compilation and relate these to experiences and opinions of their own. The assignments are written either by hand or on a computer.

No researcher was present when the participants took the national test. The respective teachers of Swedish provided us with copies of the written parts of the national test at a later date. All the participants selected for the present study completed the national test.\(^\text{17}\) I decided to only select and analyze assignment B from each participant, except in five cases where part A was selected since I was unable to get hold of assignment B.

\(^{16}\) The theme given the year in question was “Har du tid?” or “Människan och tiden”, Eng. ‘Do you have time?’ or ‘Man and time’.

\(^{17}\) I was, however, unable to get a copy of the national test written by one focus participant, Kalifa (L26). Because of this, I decided to include a written assignment with Kalifa that she completed for Tingsell’s (2007) PhD-project. This text is not as extensive or formal as the Swedish national test, but it gives me a means to compare Kalifa’s oral production with her written production in some sense, which is the most important aspect here.
The essays were transcribed into a word processor, without being edited, by a research assistant. The transcripts were then analyzed in the same way as oral data (see chapter 5 for more details).

4.2.8 Grammaticality Judgment Test

In addition to other data, participants were asked to complete a grammaticality judgment test (from now on referred to as GJT) in order to gain some insight into participants’ intuitions about Swedish word order, i.e. their metalinguistic performance (Birdsong, 1989), and explore the relationship between their GJT performance and oral and written production.

One advantage of the GJT is that the researcher is given a degree of control over the data being collected, which is not possible when relying on spontaneous language production (e.g., Milroy, 1987; Ellis, 1991). Another advantage, especially when the GJT is presented as a pencil-and-paper task, is that it gives the researcher the possibility to test large numbers of participants simultaneously at a single session, and the test is fairly simple to prepare and administer (e.g., Cowart, 1997; Ellis, 1991).

GJTs have been used extensively in research since the mid 70’s, especially in research on universal principles (e.g., White, 1988, 2003; Schachter, 1989) and the critical period hypothesis (e.g., Abrahamsson & Hyltenstam, in press; Johnson & Newport, 1989; Johnson, 1992; DeKeyser, 2000; Birdsong, 1989, 1992; White & Genesee, 1996; Hyltenstam & Abrahamsson, 2003a, 2003b). In early studies, it was often assumed that grammaticality judgment tests could provide a direct window into an individual’s competence, but today researchers agree that judgments also involve performance and are open to the influence of a number of linguistic and extralinguistic factors (e.g., Altenberg & Vago, 2004; Sorace, 1996).

The use of GJTs has been widely debated, both from methodological and theoretical points of view. One methodological issue raised has been whether one should use written or aural GJ-tests, but there are problems inherent in both forms (e.g., Cowart, 1997; Hedgcock, 1993; Johnson, 1992; Murphy, 1997). Auditory GJTs present participants with a bigger processing load than written GJTs, and people often find it more difficult to recognize grammatical errors and are slower at detecting violations aurally than in written form (e.g., Johnson, 1992; Murphy, 1997). One problem with written GJTs, however, is that they involve orthographic decoding and may present difficulties for participants who are slow readers (ibid.). One aspect that may have important implications for the present study is that speakers may have different expectations or tolerances for syntax in sentences presented aurally and in writing (Birdsong, 1989; Cowart, 1997: 64; Schütze, 1996). The participants in the present study were asked to judge structures that may be part of their daily spoken repertoire on a written GJT, and writing is often associated with more formal language use, which may have created a certain indecisiveness for some of the participants. In general, people have been shown to
score the highest on GJTs if the stimuli are presented in two modalities, both aurally and written (Murphy 1997: 38).

The validity of GJTs has been questioned in a number of studies. For example, it has been discussed what GJTs actually test, and whether one can ever infer anything about linguistic competence on the basis of judgment data (e.g., Ellis, 1991; Hedgcock, 1993; Murphy, 1997; Mandell, 1999; Sorace; 1996). Some researchers are concerned that one can never be certain that individuals do not rely on conscious reasoning and declarative formulations of grammatical rules rather than implicit knowledge when they give answers to a judgment test, in particular if they are tested in a non-native language (Coppieters, 1987; Hedgcock, 1993; Johnson, 1992; Johnson, Shenkman, Newport & Medin, 1996; Schütze, 1996; Sorace, 1996). There are also those who question the value of GJTs since one can never be certain that everyone means the same thing when they judge sentences as correct or incorrect (e.g., Birdsong, 1989). The issue of what it is people actually judge on a GJT is of particular interest for the present study since many of the so-called ungrammatical test sentences might be part of some participants’ vernacular varieties of Swedish, despite not being grammatical in standard Swedish. For all participants, there is the possibility that they feel unclear about what norm they are supposed to make their judgments in relation to (cf. Sorace, 1996; Philipsson, 2007). It is also possible that participants, in contexts such as the present one, vacillate between what they ‘know’ is correct or incorrect and what they ‘feel’ is correct and incorrect. In addition, different participants may have different opinions about the importance of correctness, and some of them may answer the GJT based on their personal judgment of whether it is ‘ok’ or not, in their opinion, to produce sentences of type X, rather than base this judgment on their grammatical intuition. Another important aspect of the GJT in the present context is that one can never assume that if a participant has accepted a grammatical sentence as ‘correct’, s/he will reject the ungrammatical counterpart, which is the case in most other studies that have employed GJTs. In this study, it is possible that participants accept both grammatical and ungrammatical sentences of a pair as ‘correct’, as a reflection of the existing variation.

The relationship between GJT performance and other measures of performance has been discussed in various studies (e.g., Arthur, 1980; Chaudron, 1983; Coppieters, 1987; Ellis, 1991; Munnich, Flynn & Martohardjono, 1994; Philipsson, 2007; Sorace, 1996). Whereas some researchers suggest that performance on a GJT will normally be consistent with other types of performances (e.g., Arthur, 1980; Chaudron, 1983), especially for native speakers of a language (e.g., Ellis, 1991; Sorace, 1996), others claim that there is never a straightforward relationship between language production and grammaticality judgment, neither for native speakers nor for non-native speakers (e.g., Coppieters, 1987).
4.2.8.1 Description of the task and procedure

In the present study, a written GJT was used to test participants’ judgments of word order variation in Swedish. The decision to use a written GJT was made mostly for practical reasons. It would have been too time-consuming to perform the GJT both aurally and in written form individually for all participants. Distributed as a pencil-and-paper task, it was possible to administer the GJT to a whole class on a single occasion. The adolescent participants were also thought to be familiar with the procedure of a pencil-and-paper task.

All participants were tested in group in their respective classrooms. They received both oral and written instructions on how to respond to the GJT (see Appendix C for the written instructions given to the participants). An example on how to fill in the test was given on the blackboard (see example 4.1). The example given was intended to help participants understand that the test focused on form rather than content, without revealing the structures under investigation. Grammaticality was not mentioned explicitly in the test instruction since it was uncertain whether participants would have any clear notion of the concept of grammaticality or acceptability (cf. Schütze, 1996: 131).

Example 4.1. Test example for the GJT.

Det står en träd framför huset (Eng. ‘There is a tree in front of the house’)

Rätt   Fel

The original GJT consisted of a total of 60 typewritten sentences. Three test sentences at a time were displayed on an A4 page, spaced widely apart. After each sentence participants were given a binary choice; they could judge the sentence as right or wrong (see example 4.1). The terms ‘right’ and ‘wrong’ are, of course, problematic to use in a study that deals with variation, since a connotation to prescriptivism is inherent in the terms. I could, however, not come up with any terms that would have been unproblematic to use. When the GJT was pilot tested the terms ‘right’ and ‘wrong’ proved to be the easiest to use in order to prevent misunderstandings of the test. These terms are also the easiest to use considering how people in general tend to use the terms when they speak about language use.

Participants were instructed to read each sentence carefully and then decide if they thought the sentence was correct (‘right’) in Swedish or not. Performances were not paced. If the participants judged a sentence as ‘wrong’ they were instructed to locate the error in the sentence by underlining or circling the

---

18 En träd ‘a tree’ is the wrong grammatical gender in standard Swedish. The test sentence does not represent the type of structures tested in the actual GJT.
perceived error. This was done in order to ensure that participants’ rejection of sentences was actually based upon the structure of interest. As Kellerman (1984, 1985) points out, it is dangerous to assume that participants will always focus on the theoretically interesting element of a sentence when their judgment might be influenced by so many other things, such as sentences’ truth-value, lexical choices, explicitly taught rules etc. As it turned out, the built-in error was the most likely reason for rejection of sentences in this study, but there are instances where participants have indicated a perceived error other than the target (see chapter 5 for more details). For accepted sentences, the participants are assumed to have accepted every part of the sentence.

A small number of participants were not present when the author administered the GJTs in their respective classes, and they, therefore, completed the test at a later date. In these cases, a teacher distributed the tests to the participants who were allowed to complete them during class. The teachers then sent the completed tests to the author by post. The exact circumstances surrounding the completion of these tests are not known, but the author asked the teachers to read the test instruction aloud to the students. The teachers were also instructed to write a test example (see example 4.1) on the blackboard. It is, however, unknown to what extent these suggested procedures were followed. There are several participants among this group who have not located the errors of the sentences they judged as ‘wrong’, and this might be an indication that they received insufficient instructions on how to fill in the test (see also chapter 5).

Only GJ-tests completed by participants with whom I also had data from a retelling task and a written essay (i.e. all participants of the large sample) were selected for analysis. The results of the GJT were analysed using the statistical package SPSS 14.0. A detailed description of how the tests were scored and analyzed is given in chapter 5.

4.2.8.2 Test sentences

As mentioned above, the original GJT consisted of 60 sentences, 27 grammatical and 33 ungrammatical. The sentences tested participants’ judgment of variable placement of the subject in relation to the finite verb in main clauses and subordinate clauses, as well as participants’ judgment of variable placement of negations and other sentence adverbials in different clauses. For the purposes of this study, only sentences that tested subject-verb order were analyzed, which left a total of 32 test sentences, 15 grammatical and 17 ungrammatical (see Appendix D). For every grammatical sentence there was at least one matching ungrammatical sentence of more or less the same length in words, but the sentences of a pair were never identical. Sentence counterparts were placed in opposite halves of the test

---

19 In total, 7 participants from Bullerbyskolan and 2 from Platonskolan.
20 Grammatical refers here to sentences that follow standard Swedish word order rules whereas ungrammatical refers to sentences that violate standard Swedish word order rules in different ways.
and test sentences were presented in a semi-randomised order. There were five sets of the GJT with different sentence orders in order to control for order effects (e.g., Birdsong, 1989, 1992; Ellis, 1991; White & Genesee, 1996; Murphy, 1997; Schütze, 1996). Generally, people tend to judge sentences presented in the beginning of a test more severely than sentences presented later in a task (Greenbaum, 1973 in Birdsong, 1989: 67; 1992). Participants’ judgments are also influenced by whether a sentence is preceded by several grammatical or ungrammatical sentences in a row (e.g., Sorace, 1996). Apart from controlling for order effects, multiple versions were also used as a means to prevent the adolescents from looking at and copying each other’s answers. Participants sitting next to each other in the classroom were always given tests with different orders of presentation.

Many of the ungrammatical test sentences included in the GJT were based on authentic examples of non-inversion found in pilot recordings conducted at the outset of the larger project. These were modified to fit the GJT and matching grammatical counterparts were constructed. In addition, ungrammatical test sentences (and grammatical counterparts) that are known to be common in the language of second language learners of Swedish were included in the test (see section 2.1 for more details). Sentences were constructed so as to reflect whether different characteristics of the clause-initial element, the finite verb, or the subject would affect participants’ judgment of subject-verb order in a clause.

The GJT was pilot tested in several turns with both native and non-native speakers of Swedish, and with both adults and adolescents. This was done in order to ensure that test items tested what they were supposed to and in order to eliminate features that could distract test takers from the target.
5.1 Analysis of oral data

Immediately after oral data was transcribed, a linguistic analysis was made of each transcript. All main clauses and subordinate clauses were excerpted. Subsequently, the linguistic elements of interest were marked, see example 5.1-5.3. For each clause it was specified whether it was a main declarative clause, a main question clause or a subordinate clause. The word order between the subject and the finite verb was also marked. In addition, the clause-initial element was specified as well as its syntactic function, i.e. whether it was an adverbial, object, predicative, question word, etc. Finally, the type and nature of the finite verb (whether main, auxiliary or copula) and the subject (whether a noun or a pronoun) was specified for each clause. Examples 5.1a and 5.1b typify how excerpted main declarative clauses were analyzed and example 5.2 how wh-question clauses were analyzed. For subordinate clauses, information about the subordinator and the type of subordinate clause, i.e. whether a temporal adverbial subordinate clause, a conditional subordinate clause, etc., was specified in addition to the other information (see example 5.3).

Example 5.1a. Oral text example, declarative clause with XVS-order, and how it was analyzed. [Lillian (B36), group conversation].

men då kan du skriva ut de(t) här
X = adv Vf S Vinf
‘but then you can print this’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause type</th>
<th>Word order</th>
<th>Clause-initial element</th>
<th>Syntactic function of the clause-initial element</th>
<th>Nature of the finite verb</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>declarative</td>
<td>XVS</td>
<td>då</td>
<td>adverbial</td>
<td>auxiliary</td>
<td>kan skriva ut</td>
<td>Pro2sg*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Second person singular pronoun.

Sentence fragments were also included if they contained at least a subject and a finite verb.
Example 5.1b. Oral text example, declarative clause with XSV-order, and how it was analyzed. [Lillian (B36), self-recording].

Å nu i år ja(g) jobbar såhär lördagar bara
X = adv S V
‘And now this year I work like Saturdays only’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause type</th>
<th>Word order</th>
<th>Clause-initial element</th>
<th>Syntactic function of the clause-initial element</th>
<th>Nature of the finite verb</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>declarative</td>
<td>XSV</td>
<td>nu i år – PP*</td>
<td>adverbial</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>jobbar</td>
<td>Pro1sg**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Prepositional phrase  
**First person singular pronoun

Example 5.2. Oral text example, wh-question clause, and how it was analyzed. [Lillian (B36), self-recording]

När (r) börja(r) lektionen?
Q V S
‘When does the lesson start?’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause type</th>
<th>Word order</th>
<th>Clause-initial element</th>
<th>Syntactic function of the clause-initial element</th>
<th>Nature of the finite verb</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>question</td>
<td>QVS</td>
<td>när</td>
<td>question word</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>börjar</td>
<td>lexical noun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 5.3. Oral text example, subordinate clause, and how it was analyzed. [Lillian (B36), self-recording]

Ha(r) ru [: du] bestämt att du vill jobba så
subordinator (that)-s-vf-vinf
‘Did you decide that you want to work like that?’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause type</th>
<th>Word order</th>
<th>Type of subordinate clause</th>
<th>Subordinator</th>
<th>Nature of the finite verb</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>sub-sv</td>
<td>that-clause</td>
<td>att ‘that’</td>
<td>auxiliary</td>
<td>vill jobba</td>
<td>Pro2sg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.1 Analysis of main declarative clauses

The results showed that the word order variations produced in main declarative clauses were the most interesting to focus on, and consequently main declarative clauses occupy most of the presentation and discussion of results in this thesis (see chapter 6). In this section I wish to give a more detailed account of how the analysis of main declarative clauses was conducted. For each transcript, I specified
the number and proportion of contexts for subject-verb inversion in main declarative clauses (i.e. all the X-clauses). The proportion of X-clauses was counted in relation to the total number of main declarative clauses produced (from now on simply referred to as main clauses). All main clauses that began with a clause-initial non-subject were considered contexts for inversion. The X-clauses were then divided into different word order patterns based on the relationship between the subject and the finite verb; XVS-clauses (i.e. X-clauses displaying subject-verb inversion, see example 5.4), XSV-clauses (i.e. X-clauses displaying non-inversion, see example 5.5), pXSV-clauses (i.e. X-clauses displaying possible instances of non-inversion, see example 5.6, and see also comment below), ADV-V-clauses (i.e. X-clauses produced without an explicit subject, see example 5.7), and Other-clauses (i.e. X-clauses produced with a mixture of word order combinations, which sometimes happens in speech, see example 5.8). The number and proportion of the different word order patterns were counted in relation to the total number of X-clauses produced in each context.

**Example 5.4. XVS-order.** [Freja (L32), retelling]

\[
\text{så får han en dotter}
\]

\[
X = \text{adv V S O}
\]

‘then he gets a daughter’

**Example 5.5. XSV-order.** [Zada (K35), retelling]

\[
då alla börja(de) hata henne
\]

\[
X = \text{adv S Vf Vinf O}
\]

‘then everyone started hating her’

**Example 5.6. pXSV-order (possible XSV-order or possible restart).** [Daniella (K29), retelling]

\[
å så dom börjar träna
\]

\[
X = \text{adv pause S Vf Vinf}
\]

‘and then they start training’

**Example 5.7. ADV-V.** [Linus (E01), retelling]

\[
å så skulle träffa kusinerna
\]

\[
X = \text{adv Vf Vinf O}
\]

‘and then would meet the cousins’

---

22 Main clauses that began with the type of clause-initial så that does not require following subject-verb inversion were not included (see section 2.1.1, example 2.3b).

23 Examples of narrative inversion (e.g., Mörsjö, 2002, see also section 2.1.1, example 2.3), with the finite verb in clause-initial position, and so-called tag-structures (see section 2.1.4, example 2.8) are included among the XVS-clauses.
Table 5.1. Assessment of the GJT answers. Answers scored in points 0-1 and the number and proportion of examples produced with each answer combination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GJT answer</th>
<th>Score (in points)</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rRu* (incl rRo =3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1796</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wWt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1577</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wRu (incl wRo =2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wWu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rWo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rWo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wWo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rWt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wRt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w-t</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- (missing values)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4064</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The first letter refers to whether the sentence is considered ‘right’ (r) or ‘wrong’ (w) according to standard Swedish norms for word order. The second letter refers to how the participants have judged the sentence, whether they have put a cross in the box marked ‘right’ (R) or the box marked ‘wrong’ (W). The third and last letter refers to whether participants have also marked the target structure (t), if they have marked something other than the target (o), or whether they have refrained from marking anything in the sentence, i.e. unmarked (u). Sentences judged as correct are supposed to be left unmarked since participants are assumed to have accepted every part of the sentence when they mark it as correct.

Example 5.8. Other (XSVS). [Mehmet (B09), retelling].

så hon hon inte rädda sin pojkvän då
X = adv V S V neg
so did she did not

‘so she did not have time to save her boyfriend then’

The examples of possible non-inversion (i.e. pXSV-clauses, see example 5.6) deserve a special mention. These refer to X-clauses that because of a pause or an interruption of some kind, or because they were accompanied by a special intonation were not possible to analyze as clear examples of non-inversion. In some cases they may be restarts rather than examples of non-inversion (consider example 5.6, for example, where a pause intercedes between the clause-initial element and the following subject). I have listened through all the recordings many times and most of the same examples remain cases of possible non-inversion (i.e. pXSV) from one listening to another. In the results I specify the number and proportion of X-clauses that display clear examples of non-inversion versus the number and proportion of X-clauses that display possible examples of non-inversion. The latter may, thus, be open to alternative interpretation.
5.2 Analysis of written data

As explained earlier, the written essays were transcribed into a word processor without being edited (see chapter 4). The transcripts were then analyzed in the same way as oral data (see section 5.1).

5.3 Analysis of the grammaticality judgment test

The answers to the grammaticality judgment test (GJT) had to be turned into scores that could be compared for different groups of individuals. Several aspects had to be taken into consideration during the process of transforming the GJT answers into comparable scores. The assessment of the GJT answers was made based on standard Swedish word order norms (see section 2.1). In Table 5.1 the different answer combinations given are presented, and it is specified how the researcher scored these answers. Information is also given about how many instances of each answer combination were produced.

Sentences were given points; one point was given to answers that were in accordance with standard Swedish norms and zero points to answers that were not. Consequently, grammatical test sentences that were judged as ‘correct’ (i.e. rRu in Table 5.1) and ungrammatical test sentences that were judged as ‘incorrect’, and had had the target marked as the perceived error (i.e. wWt in Table 5.1), both received one point. Zero points were given to ungrammatical test sentences judged as ‘correct’ (i.e. wRu) and grammatical test sentences that were judged as ‘incorrect’ and had had the target marked as the perceived error (i.e. rWt). Grammatical test sentences judged as ‘incorrect’ but where participants had not indicated what it was in the sentence that they found ‘incorrect’ (i.e. rWu) were also given zero points. Up to this point, the scoring was fairly unproblematic. However, a number of answer combinations were more difficult to interpret. For example, it was not as straightforward to know how to assess ungrammatical test sentences that were judged as ‘incorrect’ but where participants failed to mark a perceived error (i.e. wWu). In the end, I decided to give these examples one point, despite the fact that one cannot be sure that it was the target that participants reacted to and not something else in the sentences. As other researchers have noted, it is not for sure that participants are able to locate errors in sentences they judge as ‘incorrect’ despite being able to recognize them as ‘deviant’ in some sense (Birdsong, 1989; Schütze, 1996; White, 1988). They may sometimes reject sentences based on a rather vague impression that they sound bad (ibid.). In this study, there were several participants who consistently refrained from marking the errors of the sentences they judged as ‘incorrect’, and there are also participants who have done this occasionally.25 In some cases this may have had to do with an

24 For sentences marked as ‘correct’, participants are assumed to have accepted every part of the sentence.
25 Altogether 11 participants have consistently not marked perceived errors in the sentences judged as ‘incorrect’.
inability to circle what they perceived as wrong with the sentences, but in most cases, I think, it has had more to do with laziness, or because participants did not remember the instructions given to them at the beginning of the test.

A possibly controversial assessment is that I decided to give one point to grammatical test sentences that were judged as ‘incorrect’ but where participants marked a perceived error other than the target (i.e. rWo). For example, several participants judged the grammatical test sentence 12b as ‘incorrect’, när möblerna han köpt till sin nya lägenhet anlände, förstod han att han borde köpt en större lägenhet ‘when the furniture he (had) bought for his new apartment arrived, he realized that he should (have) bought a bigger apartment’ (all test sentences are found in Appendix D). Several of them marked a perceived error other than the target structure in this example and most of them reacted to the fact that the auxiliary har/hade ‘have/had’ was left out before the non-finite verb in the sentence (see the underlined elements in the sentence). In Swedish, one has the option to leave out the auxiliary verb har/hade ‘have/had’ in subordinate clauses, and this is done especially often in less formal written text (SAG, 1999). There are also a few examples when participants have reacted to a word choice in an otherwise grammatical test sentence. My decision to give all rWo-judgments one point is based on the fact that the participants did not react to the target in these cases. They did not say that the subject-verb order displayed in these sentences was ‘incorrect’, and since subject-verb order is in focus here I have decided to give this the most weight when assessing the GJT-answers. Bolander (1987) encountered a similar problem when assessing the answers on a GJT by second language learners of Swedish, and she also opted to count answers of this type as being in line with Swedish norms for word order.

Another possibly controversial decision made was to give zero points to ungrammatical test sentences that were judged as ‘incorrect’ but where the participants marked a perceived error other than the target (i.e. wWo). In this case, I reasoned that since the participants did not indicate that they had reacted to or noticed the non-inversion displayed in these examples, they received zero points in relation to standard Swedish norms for word order.

There are nine instances when a participant has judged an ungrammatical test sentence as ‘correct’ at the same time as s/he has marked the target in the sentence, i.e. s/he has circled or underlined the example of non-inversion displayed in the sentence (i.e. wRt). There are two possible readings of such an example. Either the participant happened to mark the box ‘correct’ with a cross by mistake, since s/he obviously noticed the target structure as ‘deviant’ in some way judging by the marking of the target structure, or the participant wished to point out to the

---

26 There were altogether 53 examples of this type of answer, i.e. 1.3% of all the GJT answers (see table 5.1). Some test sentences received relatively many answers of this kind, for example test sentences 12b, 10b and 5b (see Appendix D).
27 There are 31 examples of this type of answer, i.e. 0.8% of all the GJT answers (see table 5.1).
28 Only 0.2% of all the test answers.
researcher that yes, s/he knows what is supposed to be ‘incorrect’ in the test sentence but still finds the sentence ok. Examples of this kind have received one point, since the participants have obviously noticed the non-inversion and reacted to it. None of the participants consistently answered ungrammatical test sentences like this. In fact, only one participant has given more than one answer of this type, which, I argue, speaks more for the accidental interpretation.

There are three examples when a participant has not marked either of the boxes ‘correct’ or ‘incorrect’ with a cross, at the same time as s/he has underlined or circled the target structure (i.e. w-t). These examples have received one point, since the missing cross is most likely due to negligence.

Finally, there are ten examples of missing values, where participants have not answered a sentence on the GJT, most likely by mistake. Nobody has more than one missing value. It is always either the first or the last of three sentences on a page that has been left unanswered.

Each participant received a total score based on the points given to their answers on the GJT, accordingly with what is described above. The maximum score was 32 points since there were 32 test sentences included in the part of the test that was selected for analysis in this thesis (see section 4.2.8 for details). The mean score for each participant was calculated. For participants with a missing value, the mean was calculated in relation to the total number of sentences they answered, i.e. since their maximum score was 31 points the mean was calculated in relation to this score.

5.4 Statistical analyses

After consulting with a statistician, I decided to mainly use non-parametric statistical methods since, for most part, one cannot be certain that the data in this study meet the stringent assumptions of parametric techniques (e.g., Pallant, 2001; Siegel & Castellan, 1988). One cannot presume that the distribution of the variables studied in the population selected is normal or that the variance is equal in different groups of participants. Non-parametric tests are less stringent than parametric ones and do not make assumptions about the underlying population distribution, which makes them suitable for the purposes of this study. The disadvantage, however, is that they are less sensitive and may fail to detect differences between groups that actually do exist, so-called type I errors (ibid.). This is the reason why I sometimes report the results of a parametric test equivalent in a footnote when it turned out that a comparison between the results for different groups of participants fails to reach significance on a non-parametric test but shows a statistical significance if a comparable parametric test is used. All statistical data were analysed using the statistical program SPSS 14.0.
Chapter Six

Results

The results are presented in this chapter. The chapter starts with an overview of the results of the analyses of the large sample (section 6.1) and continues with an overview of the results of the focus sample (6.2). Subsequently, the results of the analyses made of the impact of different demographic (section 6.3.1), linguistic (section 6.3.2) and socio-pragmatic (section 6.3.3) factors on the syntactic variation produced are presented. The chapter ends with an overview and discussion of the results of the grammaticality judgment test (section 6.4).

6.1 Large Sample

In this section, an overview of the results of the quantitative analyses made of the large sample is presented. Section 6.1.1 presents the distribution and relative frequency of different word order patterns produced in main declarative clauses, questions, and subordinate clauses. Thereafter, comparisons are made between the results from the spoken and the written material of the large sample (section 6.1.2). Finally, in section 6.1.3, the distribution of results among the studied participants is discussed.

6.1.1 Overview of production data

6.1.1.1 Word order in main declarative clauses

I have looked at the distribution and relative frequency of different word order patterns in all main declarative clauses produced in the large sample. The results of these analyses are summarized and presented in table 6.1. As explained in the previous chapter, X-clauses refer to all main clauses that provide contexts for inversion, i.e. all main clauses that begin with something other than a subject. As explained in chapter five, the X-clauses were categorized into five different word order patterns depending on the order of elements following the clause-initial non-subject; there are XVS-clauses, XSV-clauses, pXSV-clauses, ADV-V-clauses, and Others (see chapter 5 for more details and examples).

In table 6.1 the total number of X-clauses produced in the retellings and the written essays is presented, as well as the relative frequency expressed as a
Table 6.1. Distribution and relative frequency of different main clause word order patterns in the large sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X-clauses (m)</th>
<th>XVS</th>
<th>XSV</th>
<th>pXSV</th>
<th>Adv-v</th>
<th>Other (o)</th>
<th>Total*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>% (x/m)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>% (xsv/x)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>% (pXSV/x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retell.</td>
<td>17509</td>
<td>5082</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>4658</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writt. essays</td>
<td>5138</td>
<td>1829</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22647</td>
<td>6911</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>6434</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All X-clauses that diverge from XVS-order; this includes all main clauses that have been labelled as XSV, pXSV, adv-v or Other.

percentage (i.e. the proportion of X-clauses in relation to the total number of main declarative clauses analyzed). Table 6.1 also displays the proportion of XVS-, XSV-, pXSV-, ADV-V-, and Other-clauses in relation to the total number of X-clauses produced in each context. A total of 22647 main declarative clauses were analyzed in the large sample, and 6911 of these, or 30.5%, began with a clause-initial non-subject, i.e. provided contexts for inversion. Approximately 93% of the X-clauses were produced with standard subject-verb inversion (i.e. XVS) and only about 4% displayed clear XSV-order. The majority of the examples of non-inversion were produced in the retellings.

Looking at the contexts for inversion produced in the large sample, table 6.1 shows that the proportion of X-clauses produced in this study is lower than the 40% reported in earlier studies of native Swedish speakers, especially in the oral context (e.g., Jörgensen, 1976; Håkansson; 1988, Westman, 1974, see also section 2.1.1). In the retellings, only 29% of the declarative clauses began with a clause-initial non-subject, i.e. X-clauses provided contexts for inversion. Approximately 93% of the X-clauses were produced with standard subject-verb inversion (i.e. XVS) and only about 4% displayed clear XSV-order. The majority of the examples of non-inversion were produced in the retellings.

The overview shows that participants in this sample predominantly invert main clauses beginning with clause-initial non-subjects, at least in the situations chosen for investigation here. The proportion of X-clauses produced with (possible) non-inversion is relatively low, but it is still not insignificant. In the retellings, approximately 7.5% of the X-clauses are produced with (possible) non-inversion and a few individuals produced relatively many examples of (possible) non-inversion in their retellings, as is illustrated in figure 6.1 and as will be thoroughly discussed in section 6.1.3.
Figure 6.1. Boxplot. Overview of results in the large sample. Distribution of (possible) non-inversion in the retellings. The majority produce low proportions of (p)XSV-clauses, but there are a few exceptions.

6.1.1.2 Word order in questions

The word order of questions has also been analyzed. I chose to focus solely on question word questions (from now onwards referred to as *wh*-questions) since the same word order rules apply to *wh*-questions as to main declarative clauses in standard Swedish, i.e. whenever something other than the subject is in initial position of the clause, subject-verb inversion must follow (see also section 2.1). Hence, whenever a question-word occupies first position of a clause, subject-verb inversion occurs.29 In table 6.2 the results of the analyses of *wh*-questions in the large sample are presented.

As can be seen in table 6.2, a total of 693 *wh*-questions were analyzed; 437 in the retellings, and 256 in the written essays. This figure may seem low compared to how many main declarative clauses were analyzed, but neither of the two contexts studied were aimed at triggering questions. In the retelling task, it was mainly the researcher who asked questions and not the other way around, and questions were only occasionally produced in the written data. All but one *wh-*

29 Except when it is the subject that is questioned (see section 2.1.2, footnote 5). Question-word questions of this type are, therefore, excluded from the analysis here.
### Table 6.2. Word order in *wh*-questions, the large sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><em>Wh</em>-questions (N)</th>
<th>with subject-verb inversion (N)</th>
<th>with variable word order (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retellings</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written essays</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6.3. Word order in subordinate clauses, the large sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subordinate clauses</th>
<th>with SV-word order</th>
<th>with main clause word order</th>
<th>with “non-standard” main clause word order</th>
<th>Other*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retellings</td>
<td>6252</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>6162</td>
<td>98.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written essays</td>
<td>4701</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>4555</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10953</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>10717</td>
<td>97.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Subordinate clauses without an explicit subject.

question clause is produced with subject-verb inversion. Zora (E43) produced the single violation of the V2-rule in a *wh*-question in the large sample (example 6.1).

**Example 6.1. Non-inversion in a *wh*-question. [Zora (E43), retelling]**

Varför han skulle ti(ll)baks?
Q S V
‘Why was he going back?’

The results show that the word order of *wh*-questions presents no difficulties for the participants studied. They produce almost no word order variation in *wh*-questions. Because of this finding, I will not further discuss the case of syntactic variation in questions, apart from a brief overview of the *wh*-questions produced in the focus sample (see section 6.2.1.2).

### 6.1.1.3 Word order in subordinate clauses

The word order patterns produced in subordinate clauses were also investigated. Subordinate clauses in Swedish most commonly display canonical subject-verb word order. As was explained earlier, there are, however, certain contexts in which main clause word order may be used in subordinate clauses (see section 2.1.3 for more details). In table 6.3, the results of the analyses of word order variation in subordinate clauses are presented. The only variation studied here is the order between the subject and the finite verb.
A total of 10953 subordinate clauses were analyzed. The majority of these were produced with the canonical subject-verb word order typical for subordinate clauses (97.8%). A small number of subordinate clauses (1.7%) were produced with “standard” main clause word order with subject-verb inversion. The majority of these examples are either conditional subordinate clauses (example 6.2), which are often produced with subject-verb inversion in standard Swedish (see section 2.1), or instances where the beginning subordinator is directly followed by an adverbial and subsequently subject-verb inversion (example 6.3).

**Example 6.2.** Conditional subordinate clause with VS-order. [Mehmet (B09), retelling]

`såg man den där filmen senare så dog man`

`v s o topic placeholder V S`

‘if you saw that movie later you died’

**Example 6.3.** Subordinator-XVS-order. [Eliot (B15), retelling]

`de(t) ja(g) inte gillade va(r) att ibland blir den seg`

`main clause subord. adv v s`

‘what I didn’t like was that sometimes it feels slow’

There are also sixteen subordinate clauses (0.1%) that display a word order pattern that is not in line with the norms described for standard Swedish. These are predominantly subordinate interrogative clauses with subject-verb inversion (see example 6.4.), and as mentioned earlier (see section 2.1.3) indirect interrogative clauses are relatively often produced with subject-verb inversion typical of direct questions in spontaneous speech (e.g., Källström, 2000). Finally, a small number of subordinate clauses have been produced without an explicit subject, which are labelled ‘Other’ in table 6.3.

**Example 6.4.** Subordinate interrogative clause with VS-order. [Alisha (P31), retelling]

`å så ville hennes släkting liksom veta varför dog hon`

`main clause why v s`

‘and then her relative wanted to know why she died’

To conclude, this overview shows that the participants produced relatively little variation in their subject-verb placement in subordinate clauses. The variation produced is of a type that is common in spoken Swedish in general. For this reason, I have decided not to focus any further on syntactic variation produced in subordinate clauses in this thesis. Apart from a brief overview of the subordinate clauses produced in the focus sample (see section 6.2.1.3), I will concentrate solely on syntactic variation in main declarative clauses from now on.
Table 6.4. Comparison between oral and written data in the large sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retellings</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>XSV</th>
<th>pXSV</th>
<th>Tot*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written essays</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*pThe difference is statistically significant at the p < .01-level.
**The difference is statistically significant at the p < .001-level.
* All X-clauses that diverge from XVS-order.

6.1.2 Comparison between oral and written data

The two contexts studied in the large sample have been compared in terms of their proportion of X-clauses, XSV-clauses, pXSV-clauses and the total number of X-clauses that diverge from standard XVS-order in some sense. A summary of a statistical comparison of the two contexts is presented in table 6.4. First, it was explored whether the proportion of contexts for inversion was significantly lower in the retellings compared to the written context, as it appears from the figures presented in table 6.1, and a paired samples t-test confirms that the difference is statistically significant \[\text{Written: } M = 0.352, \text{SD} = 0.116; \text{Retellings: } M = 0.296, \text{SD} = 0.084; t(125) = 5.008, p < .0005, \eta \text{ squared} = .167\]. Participants, thus, produced proportionately fewer contexts for inversion in the retellings compared to the written essays.

A paired samples t-test also confirms that the proportion of XSV-clauses is significantly higher in the retellings compared to the written essays, i.e. participants produced more examples of clear non-inversion in the retellings than in their written essays \[\text{Retellings: } M = 0.040, \text{SD} = 0.074; \text{Written: } M = 0.019, \text{SD} = 0.043; t(125) = 2.628, p < .010, \eta \text{ squared} = .052\]. They also produced significantly more examples of possible non-inversion (i.e. pXSV) in the retellings compared to the written essays \[\text{Retellings: } M = 0.027, \text{SD} = 0.035; \text{Written: } M = 0.001, \text{SD} = 0.007; t(125) = 8.287, p < .0005, \eta \text{ squared} = .355\]. Consequently, the proportion of all X-clauses that diverge from standard XVS-order is also significantly higher in the retellings compared to the written essays \[\text{Retellings: } M = 0.075, \text{SD} = 0.093; \text{Written: } M = 0.028, \text{SD} = 0.053; t(125) = 4.791, p < .0005, \eta \text{ squared} = .155\]. The statistical comparisons taken together, thus, show that the oral context was more favorable for the production of non-inversion than the written essays.

Not only the statistically significant differences between the two situational contexts are interesting to consider. The type of variation produced in the two contexts also differs. For example, in the written context the majority of the examples produced with XSV-order begin with the adverb kanske ‘maybe’; 22 of the 35 XSV-clauses (i.e. 62.9%) are of this type. As mentioned in section 2.1, kanske is often followed by XSV-order in standard Swedish varieties, so it is unsurprising that we find these examples here as well. The majority of the
Table 6.5. Distribution of results: the number of (possible) non-inversions per participant in the written essays.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of XSV-clauses</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of subjects</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.6. Distribution of results: the number of (possible) non-inversions per participant in the retellings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of XSV-clauses</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2-4</th>
<th>5-53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pXSV-Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pXSV-Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pXSV-Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of non-inversion found in the oral data are not of a kind commonly described in descriptive grammars of Swedish.³⁰

Another important difference between the two contexts is that the majority of participants produced no examples of (possible) non-inversion in the written essays, whereas considerably more participants produced at least occasional examples of (possible) non-inversion in the retellings (see table 6.5 and 6.6 for the distribution of (possible) non-inversions in the written essays and the retellings).

As shown in table 6.5, altogether 100 of the 126 participants (i.e. 79%) completely followed the rules for subject-verb inversion after clause-initial non-subjects in the written essays. Twenty of the remaining participants produced one example of XSV-order and six participants produced between 2-4 examples of XSV-order in their essays. As already mentioned, most of these examples begin with the adverb kanske ‘maybe’. Only one example was coded as a possible non-inversion in the written data.

By contrast, in the retellings only 54 participants (43%) produced no examples of clear XSV-order, and even among these participants most of them produced one or a few examples of possible non-inversion (see table 6.6). The majority of the participants (66, or 52.4%) produced between 1-4 examples of clear XSV-order in the retellings, plus additional examples of possible non-inversion. Six participants produced between 5-53 examples of clear XSV-order in the retellings. Only 8 of the 236 XSV-clauses (i.e. 3.4%) produced in the retellings are kanske-SVO-clauses.

³⁰ Only 8 of the 236 XSV-clauses (i.e. 3.4%) produced in the retellings are kanske-SVO-clauses.
Table 6.7. Mean and range of results in the large sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X-clauses per participant</th>
<th>XSV per participant</th>
<th>pXSV per participant</th>
<th>Tot.* per participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retellings</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>10-146</td>
<td>11.8-51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written essays</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>0-38</td>
<td>0-65.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All X-clauses that diverge from XVS-order.

retellings, in addition to various examples of possible non-inversion.\(^{31}\) Taken together, the results demonstrate that much more variation was produced in the oral data compared to the written data in the large sample.

6.1.3 Distribution of results among participants

Although the majority of participants produced few examples of (possible) non-inversion in the large sample, there are a few exceptions. Certain individuals within the sample produced relatively many examples of (possible) non-inversion in the retellings. Table 6.7 presents the mean and range of X-clauses, XSV-clauses, pXSV-clauses and all X-clauses that diverge from standard XVS-order in the two contexts studied. As is apparent from this table, wide ranges of results were produced, and the range is wider in the retellings than in the written essays. Although participants on average produced only two examples, or 4%, of clear non-inversion (i.e. XSV) in the retellings, the range of results shows that participants produced anywhere between 0 and 53 examples of clear non-inversion. By contrast, no participant produced more than four examples of XSV-order in the written essays.

Two Stockholm participants, Bushra (K28) and Farhad (B02), distinguish themselves from the rest of the group since they produced many instances of non-inversion in their retellings compared to the other participants (see Appendix E for selected results from each participant included in the large sample). Bushra (K28) produced 53 examples of clear non-inversion in her retelling, 12 examples of possible non-inversion and an additional example that lacks an explicit subject (i.e. adv-v). This means that about 45% of all the X-clauses she produced in her retelling were non-inverted. Farhad (B02) produced 25 examples of clear non-inversion, 6 examples of possible non-inversion, and one example where he placed the subject after the non-finite verb (e.g., á nu vill göra dom, literally ‘and now want make they’), something which is not seen in standard Swedish. This means that about 75% of all his X-clauses were non-inverted. Bushra is, thus, the partici-

\(^{31}\) Roshan (B13) produced 5 XSV-clauses and 3 pXSV-clauses, Murad (B18) 7 XSV-clauses, Abel (K02) 7 XSV- and 7 pXSV-clauses, Kalifa (L26) 11 XSV- and 4 pXSV-clauses, Farhad (B02) 35 XSV- and 6 pXSV-clauses, and finally Bushra (K28) 53 XSV- and 12 pXSV-clauses.
Table 6.8. Comparison between the three cities: range of results. Retellings only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stockholm</th>
<th>Göteborg</th>
<th>Malmö</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XSV</td>
<td>pXSV</td>
<td>Total*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range in</td>
<td>0-53</td>
<td>0-12</td>
<td>0-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>numbers</td>
<td>0-64</td>
<td>0-17</td>
<td>0-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range in</td>
<td>0-64</td>
<td>0-17</td>
<td>0-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>percent (%)</td>
<td>0-7</td>
<td>0-12.5</td>
<td>0-25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All X-clauses that diverge from XVS-order.

pant with the highest number of non-inversions, but Farhad the participant with the largest proportion of non-inversion in the large sample. None of the other participants in the large sample even come close to these levels in their oral production. Stockholm participants Kalifa (L26) and Abel (K02) are the participants with the highest number of (possible) non-inversions after Bushra and Farhad, and they produced 15 (21.1%) and 14 (25.5%) examples of (possible) non-inversion. Needless to say, Bushra and Farhad are, thus, rather extreme cases in this sample, as was also illustrated in the boxplot graph presented at the beginning of this section (see figure 6.1).

It is interesting that there are no participants in Göteborg or Malmö who produced comparable amounts of non-inversion to Bushra (K28) and Farhad (B02), or even to Kalifa (L26) and Abel (K02), although the schools and classes in all three cities were selected in a similar manner (see chapter 4). None of the participants in Göteborg or Malmö produced more than four examples of clear non-inversion in the retellings (see table 6.8 for a comparison of the results from the three cities). With eighteen percent of his X-clauses displaying non-inversion, Omar (P10) was the participant with the highest proportion of XSV-clauses in the retellings from Göteborg, and in Malmö, participants Märta (E33) and Ket (D43) had the highest proportions of XSV-clauses, with 12.5% and 10% respectively. The other participants from Göteborg and Malmö produced even lower proportions of non-inversion in their retellings.

If we return to table 6.7 and focus on the written material, it is apparent that the number and proportion of X-clauses that vary from standard subject-verb inversion in this context is much lower than in the retellings, and the range of results is much narrower. With four XSV-clauses, Axel (S15) is the participant with the highest number of XSV-clauses in the written context, and three of his examples begin with the adverb _kanske_ ‘maybe’. Karim (P11) produced the largest proportion of X-clauses that diverge from standard XVS-order in some sense in the written context (27% of his X-clauses). In reality, however, we are speaking about only three examples of X-clauses that do not follow standard subject-verb inversion, and of these one lacks an explicit subject (i.e. adv-v) and two might be punctuation mistakes rather than examples of non-inversion.
6.1.4 Summary of the large sample

To conclude, relatively little variation was produced in the large sample if the whole sample is considered. Practically no variation was found in the production of *wh*-questions, and the variation produced in subordinate clauses is of a kind often described in accounts of Swedish language use. The most interesting variation to study is found in the production of main declarative clauses. Although the majority of participants predominantly produce standard Swedish subject-verb inversion in main declarative clauses beginning with a non-subject, there are a few individuals who produced relatively many examples of non-inversion in the oral context. There are also relatively many participants who produced sporadic examples of non-inversion in the retellings.

6.2 Focus sample

In this section, an overview of the results of the quantitative analyses made of the focus sample is presented. The focus sample is based on the results of the analyses made of 20 focus participants from Stockholm in five different situational contexts (see chapter 4 for more details). Data from self-recordings, group conversations, presentations, retellings, and written essays is analyzed. Firstly, an overview is given of the distribution and relative frequency of different word order patterns produced in main declarative clauses, questions, and subordinate clauses (see section 6.2.1). The following section, 6.2.2, presents the results of a statistical comparison of the different situational contexts. In order to shed further light on some of the findings, the results from each context are discussed separately in section 6.2.2.1-6.2.2.6. To conclude, the results of individual participants are discussed in section 6.2.3.

6.2.1 Overview of production data

6.2.1.1 Word order in main declarative clauses

The distribution and relative frequency of different word order patterns produced in each situational context of the focus sample is summarized and presented in table 6.9 (for a reminder of what the different abbreviations in the table stand for, return to chapter 5). In addition, the range of results, both in number and percentages, is displayed in table 6.10. Selected results for each individual of the focus sample are also given in Appendix F. In total, 11228 main declarative clauses were analyzed in the focus sample. Of these, 2304 clauses (20.5%) began with a non-subject, i.e. provided contexts for subject-verb inversion. Approximately 84% of these X-clauses were produced with standard subject-verb inversion (i.e. XVS), whereas 10.2% were produced with clear XSV-order, and an additional 4.6% with possible XSV-order (i.e. pXSV). Evident from the results presented in table 6.9 and 6.10, the results vary largely between the different situational contexts and between different participants.
### Table 6.9. Distribution and relative frequency of different main clause word order patterns in the focus sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Main clause (m)</th>
<th>X-clauses (x)</th>
<th>XVS-clauses</th>
<th>XSV-clauses</th>
<th>pXSV-clauses</th>
<th>Adv-v</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>% (x/m)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>% (xvs/x)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>% (pXSV/x)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>% (advV/x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-record. (13)</td>
<td>3068</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group conv. (19)</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retellings (19)</td>
<td>4238</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations (18)</td>
<td>1532</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written (20)</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11228</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All X-clauses that diverge from XVS-order.

### Table 6.10. Ranges of results, both in numbers and percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>X-clauses</th>
<th>XSV</th>
<th>pXSV</th>
<th>Total*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range (N)</td>
<td>Range (%)</td>
<td>Range (N)</td>
<td>Range (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-recordings</td>
<td>9-55</td>
<td>8-22</td>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>0-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group conversations</td>
<td>3-29</td>
<td>8-27</td>
<td>0-16</td>
<td>0-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retellings</td>
<td>22-146</td>
<td>15-37</td>
<td>0-53</td>
<td>0-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>6-54</td>
<td>13-47</td>
<td>0-29</td>
<td>0-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>0-26</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>0-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57-242</td>
<td>16-33</td>
<td>0-75</td>
<td>0-34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All X-clauses that diverge from XVS-order.
Figure 6.2. Boxplot. Overview of results in the focus sample. Distribution of (possible) non-inversions. The majority produce relatively low proportions of (p)XSV-clauses, but there are two exceptions.

Comparatively more examples of (possible) non-inversion were produced in the focus sample than in the large sample. This is relatively unsurprising considering that more undirected contexts where the adolescents had the opportunity to interact with peers were included in the focus sample.

If the whole focus sample is considered, only 20.5% of the total number of main declarative clauses produced provide contexts for inversion (i.e. X-clauses), although there are significant variations between the different contexts. This is lower than the figure found for the large sample (30.5%) and much lower than the suggested 40% found in earlier studies of native Swedish (e.g., Häkansson, 1988; Jørgensen, 1976, see also section 2.1 and 6.1.1.1). It is only in the written essays, in the presentations, and in some of the retellings that some of the focus participants produce proportions of X-clauses around 40% or higher. As mentioned earlier when discussing this finding in relation to the results of the large sample, it is difficult to know what to make of these differences, though, since the circumstances surrounding the earlier studies on word order in native Swedish and the present study are very different.

Similarly to the large sample, the overview of the focus sample shows that the majority of the main declarative clauses beginning with clause-initial non-subjects
are produced with subject-verb inversion. At the same time, interesting variation is found. In the focus sample, 14.8% of the X-clauses display (p)XSV-order, and if the whole sample is considered all focus participants produced at least one or a few examples of (possible) non-inversion. Certain individuals within the focus sample produced many examples of non-inversion. The distribution of results among the focus participants is illustrated in figure 6.2.

6.2.1.2 Word order in questions

The word order patterns found in all wh-questions produced in the focus sample were analyzed. The results are presented in table 6.11. A total of 1015 wh-questions were produced in the focus sample, and all of them (i.e. 100%) display subject-verb inversion. The focus participants, thus, employed no word order variation in their subject-verb placement in wh-questions in the situational contexts studied.

6.2.1.3 Word order in subordinate clauses

The different word order patterns produced in subordinate clauses in the focus sample were also analyzed. Table 6.12 presents the number of analyzed subordinate clauses in each situational context, and in table 6.13 the results of the analysis of subordinate clauses in the focus sample as a whole is presented. In total, 3973 subordinate clauses were produced in the focus sample, and a majority of these, 3907 or 98.3%, display canonical subject-verb order. A small number of subordinate clauses diverge from this pattern in different ways. For example, 45 (or 1.1%) subordinate clauses were produced with main clause word order. The majority of these begin with a subordinator followed immediately by an adverbial and subsequently subject-verb inversion (see example 6.3, section 6.1.1.3), and some are conditional subordinate clauses (see example 6.2). A small number of interrogative subordinate clauses (N=7) were produced with subject-verb inversion typical of direct questions (see example 6.4), which as mentioned earlier is relatively common in spoken language (e.g., Källström, 2000). As concluded for the large sample, little word order variation is found in the production of subordinate clauses in the focus sample, in terms of how participants place the subject in

32 As in the large sample, question word questions where the subject is questioned were excluded from the analysis.
Table 6.12. Number of subordinate clauses analyzed in the different contexts of the focus sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-recording</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Retelling</th>
<th>Presentation</th>
<th>Written</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>749</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>3973</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.13. Word order in subordinate clauses, the focus sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subordinate clauses (N)</th>
<th>with SV-word order</th>
<th>with main clause word order</th>
<th>with “non-standard” main clause word order</th>
<th>Other*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3973</td>
<td>3907 (98.3%)</td>
<td>45 (1.1%)</td>
<td>7 (0.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Subordinate clauses without an explicit subject.

relation to the finite verb, and the variation produced is of a kind commonly reported in Swedish in general.

6.2.2 Comparison between the different contexts

The results presented earlier in table 6.9 and 6.10, indicated that participants produced proportionately more contexts for inversion in the written essays, presentations and retellings than in the group conversations and self-recordings, at the same time as they produced more examples of (possible) non-inversion in the group conversations and self-recordings than in the other contexts. Statistical analyses were conducted, using paired-samples t-tests\(^{33}\), in order to explore whether these differences are statistically significant. The five data types included in the focus sample were compared in terms of the proportion of X-clauses produced in each context, XSV-clauses, pXSV-clauses and all clauses that diverge from standard XVS-order (labelled ‘tot’ in table 6.14). The results are summarized in table 6.14. A double star indicates a statistically significant difference between two contexts at the \(p < .01\)-level and a single star indicates a statistically significant difference at the \(p < .05\)-level. Since the statistical comparisons were made pair-wise, only participants from whom there was data from both contexts in a pair were included here.

The statistical analyses show that participants produced significantly more X-clauses in the written essays than in all other contexts except the retellings. The proportion of X-clauses in the self-recordings and group conversations is also significantly lower than in the retellings and presentations, but the differences between self-recordings and group conversations or between retellings and presentations are not statistically significant in this respect. Taken together, the results indicate that participants tend to produce fewer contexts for inversion in the less directed contexts where they interact with peers than in the more directed contexts.

\(^{33}\) Non-parametric Wilcoxon Signed Rank Tests give exactly the same result.
Table 6.14. Results of statistical analyses of comparisons between the different situations in terms of the production of X-clauses, XVS-clauses, XSV-clauses, pXSV-clauses, and all X-clauses that diverge from XVS-order (i.e. tot).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Self-recordings</th>
<th>Group convers.</th>
<th>Retellings</th>
<th>Presentations</th>
<th>Written essays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xsv</td>
<td>pxsv</td>
<td>tot</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-record.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retell.</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present.</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writt.</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ns = not significant  
*statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level  
**statistically significant at the $p < .01$ level

If we turn to look at the proportion of X-clauses that display XSV-order in the different contexts, the statistical analyses show that significantly higher proportions of XSV-clauses were produced in the self-recordings and group conversations than in the presentations and written essays. The difference between the self-recordings and the retellings also reaches statistical significance. These results point to a tendency for more non-inversions to be produced in the more informal situations where the adolescents interact mainly with their peers compared to more directed contexts. If we consider the production of non-inversion as a continuum from few non-inversions to relatively many non-inversions, data from the presentations and written essays would be found on one end of the continuum and the self-recordings and group conversations on the other, with data from the retellings falling somewhere in between these two poles, which is the order of presentation in table 6.14.

Regarding the proportion of possible non-inversion produced in the different situations, the only difference that reaches statistical significance is the difference between the retellings and the presentations. A significantly larger proportion of X-clauses were interpreted as possible non-inversions in the retellings compared to the presentations. Data from the written essays was not included in this analysis since there were no examples of possible non-inversion produced in this context in the focus sample.

As regards the proportion of all X-clauses that diverge from standard XVS-order in the different contexts, the results show that the self-recordings and group conversations differ significantly from the presentations and the written essays. The difference between the retellings and the written essays also reaches statistical significance in this respect, i.e. a larger proportion of X-clauses diverge from XVS-order in the retellings compared to the written essays.
6.2.2.1 Specifics of the situational contexts

The results presented so far give a fair picture of the general results found in the focus sample, but the figures may also hide some interesting circumstances surrounding each recording context that affected the turnout. In the following sections, each situational context will therefore be described separately in detail in order to disclose some of the reasons why the results may have turned out the way they did.

6.2.2.2 Self-recordings

Only thirteen of the twenty focus participants conducted self-recordings (see chapter 4 for more details). This is lower than for the other situational contexts studied.

On the whole, the self-recordings resulted in more examples of (possible) non-inversion than most of the other contexts studied. All but three of the thirteen participants who conducted self-recordings produced examples of non-inversion in this context. For several participants, the self-recording is the context in which they produced the largest proportion of non-inversion. Only three participants, Lisa (L29), Alfred (L11) and Olof (K01), produced no examples of non-inversion in this context (see Appendix F). One explanation for these three participants’ lack of non-inversions in the self-recordings might be that they normally do not produce non-inversions, irrespective of the situational context. This hypothesis is supported by the fact that the three of them produced no or very few examples of non-inversion in all contexts studied. However, there are other possible explanations as to why these three participants in contrast to the others did not produce any non-inversions in their self-recordings. For example, Lisa (L29) conducted her self-recording at a family dinner. Judging by the observation that the presence of adults seems to disfavor the use of non-inversion (see section 6.3.3.1), it cannot be excluded that the presence of Lisa’s parents may have inhibited her use of non-inversion in this context. Had Lisa conducted her self-recording together with friends perhaps the result would have been different. Semra (L43) produced only one non-inversion during her self-recording and similarly to Lisa, she conducted her recording at home with her brother and mother. Olof (K01) conducted his recording together with classmate Abel (K02), and the recording predominantly took place in the office of the school’s study and career counsellor, which may explain the lack of non-inversions in this recording. Interestingly, Abel (K02) produced a non-inversion after the boys left the career counsellor’s office, when they were standing alone in the school corridor speaking about mobile phones. To conclude my line of reasoning, it cannot be excluded that even more examples of non-inversion might have been produced in the self-recordings if all recordings had been conducted in company of friends only.
6.2.2.3 Group conversations

The group conversations also resulted in relatively many examples of non-inversion. Table 6.9 shows that approximately 20% of the X-clauses in the group conversations were produced with XSV-order. However, if the data is studied in more detail it turns out that the non-inversions are above all produced by two groups of male participants from Bullerbyn. The majority of participants produced no or few examples of non-inversion in this context. Consequently, although it appears as if the group conversations result in many examples of non-inversion on the surface, this is only true for certain participants within the sample.

One problem with the group conversations that complicates the interpretation of the results is that they were not conducted in exactly the same way in the different schools with the different groups of participants (see chapter 4). For example, while some groups were recorded while discussing the short story *Elixir* (Leiva Wenger, 2001), a topic picked by the research team, other groups were recorded while discussing topics picked by their respective teachers. Some of the groups could speak uninterruptedly among each other without any adult present whereas in other groups a teacher participated during parts of the conversation. These circumstances probably affected the outcome of these recordings.

6.2.2.4 Retellings

The retelling task resulted in the highest overall number of contexts for inversion (i.e. X-clauses) of all the situations studied\(^{34}\), most likely because it gave the participants the opportunity to speak uninterruptedly for longer stretches and because the narrative element of the task required them to use more varied information structures in order to move the retellings forward.

Most focus participants produced one or two examples of non-inversion in their retellings, but only four participants, Bushra (K28), Kalifa (L26), Abel (K02) and Roshan (B13), produced more than just occasional examples of non-inversion in this context. Bushra (K28) is exceptional with her 53 non-inversions and 12 possible non-inversions in the retelling (see also section 6.1.3). Since the participants were allowed to pick the movie they wanted to speak about, the content of the retellings was not kept constant, and there were big variations between the recordings in terms of how long they lasted, how much the researcher interacted with the participants, how relaxed the conversations were etc. There were a few occasions when participants conducted their retelling in the company of a friend, something which appears to have favored their use of non-inversion (see section 6.3.3.1).

\(^{34}\) Although participants produced proportionately more contexts for inversion in the written essays (see table 6.9).
6.2.2.5 Presentations

The proportion of non-inversion produced in the presentations appears relatively high (i.e. 10%) in table 6.9. It was, however, one participant alone (Ekmel, B05) who produced the majority of the (possible) non-inversions in this context. Ekmel produced 81% of the non-inversions and 47% of the possible non-inversions in the presentation context. None of the others produced more than one or two examples of non-inversion during their presentations, and the majority produced only subject-verb inversion after clause-initial non-subjects in this context. If Ekmel (B05) were excluded from the pair-wise statistical analyses made between the presentations and the other situational contexts (see 6.2.2), the proportion of X-clauses that diverge from standard XVS-order would be significantly higher in the retellings compared to the presentations (cf. table 6.14).

An interesting observation made is that all the participants who produced non-inversions in the presentations also produced non-inversions in at least one of the other contexts studied. All participants who produced examples of non-inversion in the presentation produced examples of non-inversion in their group conversation and/or self-recording, i.e. in the least directed contexts. No participant produced non-inversions only in her/his presentation but not in other contexts, which is an interesting implicational relationship.

6.2.2.6 Written essays

Only three participants, Lillian (B36), Alfred (L11) and Jemila (L36), produced examples of XSV-order in the written essays. There were no examples of possible non-inversion in this context. Both Jemila’s (L36) and Alfred’s (L11) examples of XSV-order begin with the clause-initial adverb kanske ‘maybe’ (see section 2.1). The only example of non-inversion that is not typically found in standard Swedish is, thus, Lillian’s (B36) example that begins with a clause-initial subordinate relative clause followed by SV-order (example 6.5).

Example 6.5. Non-inversion in the written essays. [Lillian (B36), written essay]

Men som det är tiden kan gå fort

X = sub. clause S V

‘but as it is time can pass quickly’

To sum up, the written context resulted in very few examples non-inversion in the focus sample.

6.2.3 Different patterns for different participants

As mentioned earlier, there is great variation between different participants in terms of how many (possible) non-inversions they produce in the different contexts. When studying the focus sample as a whole, I was able to distinguish three groups of participants depending on the number of clear non-inversions they
Results

produced in the contexts studied; there is one group of participants who produced relatively many examples of non-inversion in all or most contexts studied except the written, there is one group of participants who produced non-inversions only in the less directed contexts, and there is one group of participants who produced practically no variation at all irrespective of context. Because several of the participants were not recorded in all of the required contexts, due to different circumstances (see chapter 4), it was in some cases difficult to place the participants in one of the three distinguished groups. There is, therefore, also a group of participants who do not fit the other three groups.

6.2.3.1 Participants who produced relatively many non-inversions in all or most contexts except the written

Obvious candidates for the group of participants who produced many non-inversions in most contexts are Ekmel (B05) and Bushra (K28) (see Appendix F for selected results for each focus participant). Ekmel’s performance in the different contexts is presented in figure 6.3 to illustrate the pattern of this group. Ekmel and Bushra produced the highest numbers of non-inversion in the collected material as a whole. Bushra’s (K28) production of non-inversion is especially extreme in relation to the other participants in the retelling context, but she produced relatively many (possible) non-inversions in all of the spoken contexts in which she was recorded. However, in her written essay she produced no examples.
of non-inversion. Ekmel’s (B05) production of non-inversion is extreme in relation to the other participants primarily in the presentation context, but he produced many non-inversions in several spoken contexts. Similarly to Bushra, Ekmel produced no examples of (possible) non-inversion in the written essay. Unlike Bushra, he produced only one example of clear non-inversion in his retelling.

Only two other focus participants, Kalifa (L26) and Roshan (B13), display the same pattern in their use of non-inversion, although they produce far fewer examples of non-inversion than Bushra and Ekmel. Kalifa (L26) produced relatively many examples of non-inversion in her retelling and self-recording but no variation in her presentation or written essay, and there is no recording with her in a group conversation. Roshan (B13) produced a few examples of non-inversion in all oral contexts recorded with him, but none in his written essay.

6.2.3.2 Participants who produced non-inversions only in the less directed contexts

The majority of the focus participants fit into this group; Mehmet (B09), Ismail (B16), Riya (B29), Anton (B01), Rana (L39), Lillian (B36), Åsa (L37), Daniella (K29), and Abel (K02). They produced no or little word order variation in most of the contexts studied but something happened with their syntactic usage in the least directed contexts. In either the self-recordings or the group conversations they suddenly produced several examples of (possible) non-inversion. This pattern is illustrated with data from Rana (L39) and Anton (B01) in figure 6.4a and 6.4b. Rana (L39) produced no clear examples of non-inversion in the presentation, retelling, group conversation and written essay, but in her self-recording, which was conducted mainly in the company of one male friend during a school break, she produced six clear examples of non-inversion (17.6%) and two possible non-inversions (5.9%). Anton’s (B01) performance is similar. He produced no clear examples of non-inversion in the presentation, retelling, or written essay but five clear examples of non-inversion (23.8%) and two possible ones (9.5%) in the group conversation where he interacted with three male classmates. Since no self-recording was conducted by Anton we cannot tell what his syntactic pattern would have been like in this context.

Daniella (K29) was placed in this group of participants despite only producing two examples of non-inversion and three examples of possible non-inversion in her self-recording. This was done because even this low figure may be significant considering that Daniella produces no clear instances of non-inversion in any other context.

Abel (K02) was also placed in this group despite the fact that he actually produced his largest proportion of non-inversions during the retelling task. Abel produced no clear examples of non-inversion in his presentation, group conversation, or written essay, but one non-inversion in his self-recording and seven clear non-inversions and seven possible non-inversions during his retelling. Abel (K02)
was one of the participants who conducted his retelling in the company of two classmates, so it is possible that their presence made the context more informal and more similar to the self-recordings or group conversations (see section 6.3.3.1 for further discussion). Most of the non-inversions in the retelling also occurred.
when Abel had finished retelling the movie and was speaking about his interest in football and his future summer plans. As mentioned earlier, Abel’s self-recording was special since it mainly took place in the study counsellor’s office (see section 6.2.2.2), so it is unsurprising that he did not produce non-inversions in this context.

6.2.3.3. Participants who produced no or little variation irrespective of context

A few focus participants produced no or very few examples of (possible) non-inversion in all the contexts studied (see figure 6.5). This was the case with participants Lisa (L29) and Olof (K01), for example, who produced no clear instances of non-inversion in any context studied, although both of them produced a few possible non-inversions (see Appendix F). Alfred (L11), who also fits into this group, produced one example of XSV-order after a clause-initial *kanske* ‘maybe’ in his written essay and two possible non-inversions in his retelling. Jemila (L36) and Rachel (B25) also fit into this group of participants. Both of these girls produced two examples of non-inversion in their retellings, and Jemila (L36) produced two examples of *kanske*-svo in her written essay, but otherwise they both produced only subject-verb inversion after clause-initial non-subjects. However, neither of the girls conducted self-recordings and both of them talked little in their respective group conversations, so it cannot be excluded that the picture would have been different had these circumstances been different.
6.2.3.4 Participants who did not fit the other groups

There are two participants in particular, Semra (L43) and Jan (B10), who do not fit the other groups. Semra (L43) produced one or a few examples of clear non-inversion in all the contexts studied, except the written essay. In contrast to the second group, there is no apparent shift in her syntactic performance when she speaks in the less directed contexts compared to the more directed contexts. She produces as few (or many) non-inversions in her group conversation or self-recording as she does in the presentation and the retelling.

Because there is only data available with Jan (B10) from three of the five requested contexts, it is difficult to say anything about his use of non-inversion in different contexts. Jan was also the only participant who produced no contexts for inversion in his written essay. The group conversation in which Jan (B10) participated was also different from the other group conversations since the teacher of Swedish was present during parts of the conversation. As discussed later in section 6.3.3.1, the presence of the teacher appears to have inhibited the boys’ use of more informal language and possibly their use of non-inversion.

6.2.4. Summary of the focus sample

To summarize the findings of the focus sample, more examples of (possible) non-inversion were produced in the focus sample compared to the large sample, most likely as a result of including more spontaneous situational contexts where the adolescents could interact with their peers.

As in the large sample, the variation found in the production of wh-questions and subordinate clauses was only of limited interest. The results presented in this section therefore center on the variation found in main declarative clauses.

Although the majority of the X-clauses produced in this sample display subject-verb inversion, some of the participants produced more non-inversions than subject-verb inversions in certain contexts. Large variations were found both between different situational contexts and between different participants. All the focus participants produced at least one or a few examples of (possible) non-inversion if the whole sample is considered.

The five different situations resulted in varying amounts of contexts for inversion and varying degrees of word order variation. In section 6.2.2 it was argued that the production of X-clauses and the production of (possible) non-inversion could perhaps be seen as a continuum where the written essays and the presentations would be found on one end of the continuum and the self-recordings and group conversation on the other, with the retellings ending up somewhere in the middle. The presentations and written essays resulted in significantly more contexts for inversion and less word order variation than the contexts at the other end of the continuum. Most participants produced at least one or a few examples of (possible) non-inversion in the group conversations and/or self-recordings.
Some of the specific circumstances surrounding each situational context were discussed in section 6.2.2.1-6.2.2.6 since these may have affected the results in different ways.

Finally, the performances of individual participants were discussed and it was shown how most of the participants could be distinguished into four different groups depending on the number and proportion of non-inversions that they produced in the different contexts; participants who produced relatively many non-inversions in all or most contexts except the written, participants who produced non-inversions only in the less directed contexts, participants who produced no or very few non-inversions in all contexts studied, and participants who do not fit the other groups.

6.3 Factors influencing the syntactic variation

In order to try to explain the variation found, this chapter explores how different demographic, linguistic and socio-pragmatic factors systematically constrain the adolescents’ variable use of subject-verb inversion and non-inversion. Section 6.3.1 discusses the impact of location, gender and various factors related to the issue of nativeness, and the following section, 6.3.2 is dedicated to the influence of different linguistic factors, for example the importance of the type and nature of the clause-initial element, the subject and the finite verb. The influence of different socio-pragmatic factors is finally discussed in section 6.3.3, as a result of more qualitative analyses of the data.

6.3.1 Demographic factors

Various statistical analyses were conducted to explore the impact of different demographic factors on the syntactic variation produced. These analyses were conducted solely on the large sample, since similar analyses of the focus data would have been less reliable considering how few the focus participants are and how they were selected (see chapter 4 for more details). Among the demographic variables explored are location, i.e. what city the participants are from and which school they go to, participants’ sex and several factors related to the issue of nativeness, for example participants’ reported age of onset of Swedish acquisition (AO), length of residence in Sweden (LOR), birthplace, and linguistic background.

6.3.1.1 Location

Comparisons were made between the results for participants from the different cities and from the different schools in order to explore whether these variables could possibly explain any of the syntactic variation found. The results for the three cities are summarized in table 6.15. Statistical analyses were conducted to see if any of the differences between participants from the three cities in terms of their proportion of X-clauses, XSV-clauses, pXSV-clauses, and all X-clauses that diverge from XVS-order were significant (see chapter 5 for definitions of these
Table 6.15: Results for the three cities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X-clauses (%)</th>
<th>XSV-clauses (%)</th>
<th>pXSV-clauses (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)**</th>
<th>retellings written</th>
<th>retellings written</th>
<th>retellings written</th>
<th>retellings written</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Göteborg</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malmö</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*It is not interesting to look at the proportion of pXSV-clauses in the written material since there is only one example of this, produced by a Stockholm informant.

**All X-clauses that diverge from XVS-order.

abbreviations). As is evident from the results presented in table 6.15, the Stockholm participants produced somewhat fewer contexts for inversion than participants from the other two cities. Statistical analyses using non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis H Tests show, however, that the differences between the three cities in terms of their proportion of contexts for inversion are significant only in the written context \( H(2) = 6.098, p < .05 \). A post-hoc comparison using the Nemenyi test indicates that participants from Stockholm produced significantly fewer contexts for inversion in the written context than participants from Malmö, but the results for the participants from Göteborg do not differ significantly from the other two cities.

Judging by the results presented in table 6.15, participants from Stockholm appear to have produced more examples of XSV-order in the retellings than participants from Göteborg and Malmö, but none of these differences are statistically significant. The differences between the cities in terms of the proportion of non-inversion in the written context are also non-significant. There are also no statistically significant differences between the cities in terms of their proportion of all X-clauses that diverge from XVS-order. As the production of possible non-inversions is concerned, there is a statistically significant difference between the cities in the retellings \( H(2) = 9.326, p < .01 \), and a post-hoc comparison using the Nemenyi test shows that the Stockholm participants produced significantly more examples of possible non-inversion than participants from both Göteborg and Malmö. This means that a larger proportion of the X-clauses produced in Stockholm compared to the other two cities were interpreted as possible instances

35 All statistical analyses in section 6.3.1.1 were conducted using non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis H Tests.
36 However, when tested with the parametric equivalent, one-way between groups ANOVA-test, the difference between the cities also reaches statistical significance in the oral context \( F(2, 123) = 3.537, p = .03 \). The post-hoc test using Tukey HSD indicates that the Stockholm participants produce significantly fewer contexts for inversion than participants from Malmö, whereas the result for Göteborg does not differ significantly from the other two cities.
37 The Nemenyi test is a non-parametric post-hoc test analogous to the Tukey test, comparing ranks instead of means.
Syntactic Variation in the Swedish of Adolescents in Multilingual Urban Settings

Table 6.16. Results for the different schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X-clauses (%)</th>
<th>XSV-clauses (%)</th>
<th>pXSV-clauses (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)**</th>
<th>retellings written</th>
<th>retellings written</th>
<th>retellings written</th>
<th>retellings written*</th>
<th>retellings written</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bullerby-skolan</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>Körsbärs-skolan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lönneb-skolan</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Göteborg</td>
<td>Platon-skolan</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sokrates-skolan</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malmö</td>
<td>Cypres-skolan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dahlia-skolan</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ekskolan</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*It is not interesting to look at the proportion of pXSV-clauses in the written material since there is only one example of this, produced by a Stockholm informant.

**All X-clauses that diverge from XVS-order.

of non-inversion by the author. Possible explanations for this are discussed in section 7.8.

Although most of the comparisons made here between the three cities fail to reach statistical significance there is one difference that is important to bear in mind. As mentioned earlier there were no equivalents in the Göteborg and Malmö materials to the two Stockholm participants Farhad (B02) and Bushra (K28), who produced considerable amounts of non-inversion in their respective retellings. All six participants with more than four examples of non-inversion in the retellings are from Stockholm (see table 6.6).

Schools. Comparisons were also made between the results for the different schools in order to see whether it was of importance for the results whether participants were from a more or less multilingual school, as initially hypothesized (see chapter 1). The schools were compared in terms of their proportion of X-clauses, as well as their proportion of non-inversions, possible non-inversions, and all X-clauses that diverge from XVS-order. The results for the eight different schools are summarized and presented in table 6.16.

The results of the statistical analyses made of the differences between the schools show that there are no significant differences between the schools in terms

---

38 I have explored if any of the statistical results presented in section 6.3.1 change if these two rather exceptional participants are excluded from the analyses, and the answer is no. No significant changes in the overall results occur if Bushra (K28) and Farhad (B02) are excluded from the analyses of the large sample.
of the proportion of contexts for inversion, neither in the retellings nor in the written essays. There are, however, statistically significant differences between the schools as regards the proportion of possible non-inversions $[H(7) = 17.871, p < .01]$, and the proportion of all X-clauses that diverge from XVS-order $[H(7) = 14.846, p < .05]$. Post-hoc comparisons using the Nemenyi test show that participants from Bullerbyskolan produced a significantly larger proportion of possible non-inversions and a larger proportion of all X-clauses that diverge from XVS-order than participants from most of the other schools (the differences between Bullerbyskolan on the one hand and Körsbärsskolan and Platonskolan on the other did not reach statistical significance). Participants from Körsbärsskolan also produced a significantly larger proportion of possible non-inversions and a larger proportion of all X-clauses that diverge from XVS-order than participants from Lönnebergaskolan and Sokrateskolan.

Summarising the impact of city and school on the production of word order variation in this material, a tendency was found in the oral context for participants from Stockholm to produce fewer contexts for inversion and more word order variation than participants from the other two cities, but most of the differences fail to reach statistical significance. In the written context, the Stockholm participants produced a significantly lower proportion of contexts for inversion than participants from Malmö, but there were no other significant differences between the cities. Most of the differences between the schools failed to reach significance, but participants from Bullerbyskolan, and to a lesser degree also participants from Körsbärsskolan, were shown to have produced significantly larger proportions of possible non-inversions and all X-clauses that diverge from XVS-order than participants from several of the other schools. The sum of results indicate that the use of (possible) non-inversion in the contexts studied might be linked in particular to Stockholm, and possibly in particular to the more multilingual schools in the Stockholm sample, but the sum of findings evidently also shows that location exerts only a small effect on the results.

6.3.1.2 Sex

The impact of the participants’ sex was also explored. This was done in order to see whether female and male participants performed differently from each other in the contexts studied. The female and male participants were compared in terms of their proportion of contexts for inversion (X-clauses), non-inversion (XSV), possible non-inversion (pXSV) and all X-clauses that diverge from XVS-order. The results are summarised and presented in table 6.17.

The statistical analyses were made using non-parametric Mann-Whitney U Tests, and the results show that there is a statistically significant difference

---

39 The differences between the schools were analyzed using non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis H Tests.
between female and male participants in the retellings in terms of their proportion of contexts for inversion \([Z = -2.153, p < .05]\). The female participants produced significantly more contexts for inversion in the retellings than male participants, and although the tendency is the same in the written context it does not reach statistical significance \([Z = -1.608, p < .108]\). In the retellings, the direction of results is that girls produced somewhat lower proportions of word order variation than boys (see table 6.17) but none of the differences reach statistical significance. The pattern is the same in the written context, but the difference between female and male participants in terms of their proportion of XSV-order reaches statistical significance in this context \([Z = -2.039, p < .05]\), as does the difference in terms of the proportion of all X-clauses that diverge from XVS-order \([Z = -2.067, p < .05]\). It has to be pointed out, however, that the majority of the XSV-clauses that the males produced in the written essays begin with the adverb *kanske* ‘maybe’, which is commonly followed by non-inversion in standard Swedish (see section 2.1). The male participants did not produce more examples of non-inversion in their essays that are not commonly described in descriptive grammars of Swedish.

### 6.3.1.3 Different factors related to the issue of nativeness

As explained in section 3.2, the importance of age of onset has often been explored in second language studies interested in investigating age effects on different measures of second language proficiency. Since I initially hypothesized that the syntactic variation produced in this study might be related to the age the participants started learning Swedish, I wished to explore the results in relation to participants’ reported age of onset of Swedish acquisition (from now on referred to as AO) as well as several other variables often used to operationalize the issue of nativeness, such as participants’ length of residence in Sweden (from now on referred to as LOR), whether they were born in Sweden or not, and whether the participants are from a multilingual or a monolingual background (see section 3.3 for a discussion of the problematic usage of these terms, especially in multilingual contexts).

The results of the statistical analyses of the relationship between participants’ reported AO, and their LOR, and the word order variations they produced are
Table 6.18. Results of statistical analyses using Spearman’s rank order correlation; AO = age of onset, LOR = length of residence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>X-clauses</th>
<th>XSV-clauses</th>
<th>pXSV-clauses</th>
<th>Total (%)***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>retellings written</td>
<td>retellings written</td>
<td>retellings written</td>
<td>retellings written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>$r$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.245**</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOR</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>-.019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*statistically significant at the $p < .05$-level.
**statistically significant at the $p < .01$-level.
***All X-clauses that diverge from XVS-order.

Table 6.19. Results for participants born in Sweden and participants born abroad.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X-clauses (%)</th>
<th>XSV-clauses (%)</th>
<th>pXSV-clauses (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>retellings written</td>
<td>retellings written</td>
<td>retellings written</td>
<td>retellings written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abroad</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*It is not interesting to look at the proportion of pXSV-clauses in the written context since there is only one example.
**All X-clauses that diverge from XVS-order.

As is evident from the results presented in table 6.18, none of the correlations between the results and participants’ length of residence in Sweden reach statistical significance at the $p < .05$-level. Hence, information about how long a participant has lived in Sweden does not explain the proportion of X-clauses s/he produced or the word order variations s/he used. In terms of participants’ reported AO, there is no significant correlation between AO and participants’ proportion of contexts for inversion, but there is a small positive correlation between reported AO and the production of clear non-inversion in the retellings [$r = .245$, $p < .01$] and between AO and the production of all X-clauses that diverge from XVS-order [$r = .204$, $p < .05$]. A later reported age of onset is related to a larger proportion of non-inversion and a larger proportion of all X-clauses that diverge from XVS-order in the oral context. However, the calculation of the coefficients of determination show that only a small part of the variation produced is explained by participants’ AO. 40 No correlation was found between participants’ reported AO and the production of possible non-inversion.

Born in Sweden or abroad. The impact of birthplace on the production of word order variation was explored in order to see if participants born in Sweden and participants born abroad perform differently from each other. The two groups were compared in terms of their proportion of X-clauses, XSV-clauses, pXSV-clauses,

40 The studied variables only share about 6 per cent of their variance.
Table 6.20. Results for participants with a multilingual and a monolingual background.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X-clauses (%)</th>
<th>XSV-clauses (%)</th>
<th>pXSV-clauses (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>retellings written</td>
<td>retellings written</td>
<td>retellings written</td>
<td>retellings written</td>
<td>retellings written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilingual</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monolingual</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*It is not interesting to look at the proportion of pXSV-clauses in the written context since there is only one example.

**All X-clauses that diverge from XVS-order.

and all X-clauses that diverge from XVS-order, and the results are summarized and presented in table 6.19.

The observations made prior to data collection, in addition to the information received during background interviews, indicated that birthplace would not be a significant factor in explaining the variation found in this study. Despite this, I wished to explore the relationship statistically in order to strengthen my observations. Non-parametric Mann-Whitney U Tests were conducted to investigate whether there were any significant differences between the two groups and the results show that none of the differences reach statistical significance. Participants born in Sweden do not perform differently from participants born elsewhere in this study.

Multilingual or monolingual. Finally, it was explored whether participants’ multilingual or monolingual background impacted on their tendency to produce word order variation (turn to section 3.3 for a critical discussion of this terminology, and see how multi- and monolingual background has been defined in this study). The results for the multilingual and monolingual participants are summarized and presented in table 6.20.

Non-parametric Mann-Whitney U Tests were conducted to investigate if any of the differences between the two groups are statistically significant. The results presented in table 6.20 show a tendency for participants from a multilingual background to produce fewer contexts for inversion and slightly more examples of (possible) non-inversion than participants from a monolingual background in the oral context, but the differences between the groups fail to reach statistical significance.41 At the same time, all the six participants who produced more than four examples of non-inversion in the retellings (see table 6.6) are of multilingual background, which supports my impression that participants’ multi- or monolingual background may have an impact on the results, despite not reaching statistical

41 However, equivalent parametric tests (independent samples t-tests) of the differences between the two groups in terms of their proportion of X-clauses and XSV-clauses reach statistical significance at the $p < .05$-level. Also, if all kanske-SVO-clauses are excluded from the analysis of the XSV-clauses, since these types of clauses are often produced with SV-order in standard Swedish, the difference between the groups reaches statistical significance ($p < .03$) also with a non-parametric Mann-Whitney U Test. These results thus indicate that participants’ mono- or multilingual background is of at least some relevance for the results.
significance (see also footnote 41). The results of the grammaticality judgment test (GJT) also point in this direction (see section 6.4.3).

None of the differences between multilingual and monolingual participants in the written context reach statistical significance. Participants from a multilingual background did not produce fewer contexts for inversion nor more examples of word order variation than monolingual participants in their essays.\(^{42}\) If anything, the opposite tendency is seen.

When Tingsell (2007) investigated the use of anaphoric binding among the same participants followed in this thesis, she found that whether participants were from a multilingual or a monolingual background was of importance for her results. The multilingual participants were more likely to vary from standard Swedish norms for anaphoric binding than were monolingual participants, but variation was found in both groups (ibid.). Hence, we see a tendency in both our studies for the participants from a multilingual background to produce slightly more linguistic variation than the participants with a monolingual background, but at the same time, both our studies show that both multilingual and monolingual participants produce variation.

6.3.1.7 Summary of demographic factors

Most of the demographic factors explored in this section were shown to have a statistically insignificant impact on the word order variations produced, but there were a few significant findings. The results indicate that the production of contexts for inversion is influenced by participants’ location, gender, and to a certain extent also by their multilingual or monolingual background. Participants from Stockholm produced fewer contexts for inversion than participants from the other two cities, and although this tendency is found in both situations it is only the difference between Stockholm and Malmö in the written context that reaches statistical significance. The female participants produced significantly more contexts for inversion than male participants in the oral context (possible explanations are discussed in section 7.3). There is also a tendency for participants from a multilingual background to produce slightly fewer contexts for inversion than participants from a monolingual background in the oral context.

The only demographic factor that proved statistically significant for the production of non-inversion in the retellings was reported age of onset of Swedish acquisition. A small statistically significant positive correlation was found between a participant’s AO and her/his production of non-inversion. No such relationship is found in the written context. A related factor, participants’ multilingual or monolingual background, also appears to have some influence on the production of non-inversion in the oral context. The results also point to a tendency for female participants to produce lower proportions of non-inversion

\(^{42}\) This is true even if all the kanske-SVO-clauses are excluded from the analysis.
Table 6.21. The clause-initial element of the X-clauses produced in the large sample (126 participants); in retellings, written essays, and totals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause-initial element</th>
<th>Retellings</th>
<th>Written essays</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbial</td>
<td>3805</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>1140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate clause</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate clause + topic placeholder*</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicative</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitival clause</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fundament</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other**</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no of X-clauses</td>
<td>5082</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1829</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Subordinate clauses followed by a topic placeholder så/då in the fundament, see section 6.3.2.1.3 for details and examples.
**‘Other’ refers to instances when the clause-initial element was a finite or a non-finite verb, or when it was impossible to decipher the exact nature of the clause-initial element.

than male participants in both the oral and the written context, but the difference reaches statistical significance only in the written context.

The results are practically the same regarding the production of all X-clauses that diverge from XVS-order, with the exception that participants from Bullerby-skolan and Körsbärskolan were shown to produce significantly more examples of X-clauses that diverge from XVS-order than participants from most of the other schools.

The only factor to significantly influence the proportion of possible non-inversion is location. More X-clauses were interpreted as possible non-inversions in the Stockholm material, in particular in data from Bullerbyskolan and Körsbärskolan compared to the other schools. Possible explanations for this result are discussed in section 7.8.

Finally, the analyses show that participants’ birthplace and their length of residence in Sweden have no impact on the results. These two factors cannot explain any of the variation found in the large sample.

6.3.2 Linguistic factors
As reported in section 2.1, various linguistic factors have been shown to affect the production of subject-verb inversion by learners acquiring Swedish as a second language. For example, the type and nature of the clause-initial element, the subject, and the finite verb appear to influence whether or not learners produce subject-verb inversion. I wished to explore whether the same linguistic factors
### Table 6.22. The clause-initial element of the X-clauses produced in the focus sample; in self-recordings, group conversations, retellings, presentations, written essays, and totals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause-initial element</th>
<th>Self-record.</th>
<th>Group conv.</th>
<th>Retellings</th>
<th>Present.</th>
<th>Writt. essays</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbial</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate clause</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate clause +</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>topic placeholder</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitival clause</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fundament</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot. no. of X-clauses</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

would be important in explaining the variation between subject-verb inversion and non-inversion among the adolescents in this study, partly in order to further explore the relevance of factors related to nativeness and second language acquisition.

### 6.3.2.1 The clause-initial element

As mentioned in section 2.1.4.1, Bolander’s studies (e.g., 1988a, 1988b) of variable subject-verb order among relatively early second language learners of Swedish showed that the clause-initial element of an X-clause was one important factor influencing whether or not the learners produced inversion (see similar results for Norwegian as a second language in Hagen, 1992). Bolander (ibid.) found that the learners often had difficulties producing subject-verb inversion in clauses beginning with a short adverbial or a subordinate clause, whereas they were better at producing inversion after initial objects, or in so called tag structures.\(^{43}\)

Although most of the participants in this study are not obvious second language learners, I wished to explore the importance of the clause-initial element for the variation between inversion and non-inversion in this study. The distribution of different clause-initial elements in all the X-clauses produced by the participants is presented in table 6.21 (large sample) and 6.22 (focus sample). Subsequently, table 6.23 and 6.24 present the number and proportion of the X-clauses produced with (possible) non-inversion that began with the different clause-initial elements. In order to clarify the information given in table 6.23-6.24, the first cell of table 6.23 may serve as an illustrative example of how to read the tables. To begin, the

---

\(^{43}\) Tag structures refer to fragments of the kind **tyckte hon** ‘she thought, **sa han** ‘he said’, **trodde dom** ‘they thought’ etc. that are added as comments on a previous declarative clause.
Table 6.23. The number and proportion of the (p)XSV-clauses produced in the large sample that begin with different clause-initial elements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause Initial Element</th>
<th>Retellings</th>
<th>Written Essays</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbial</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.7 (332/3805)</td>
<td>2.9 (33/1140)</td>
<td>7.4 (365/4945)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate clause</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.5 (33/71)</td>
<td>1.2 (3/256)</td>
<td>11.0 (36/327)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate clause +</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>topic placeholder</td>
<td>2.8 (10/358)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7 (10/580)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.9 (3/331)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7 (3/435)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitival clause</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.1 (1/9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.8 (1/36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fundament</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column total</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to column figures:
- Count
- Proportion of the X-clauses that begin with the clause-initial element that displays (p)XSV-word order
- Column percentage

Information given in the cell tells us that 332 of the X-clauses that began with a clause-initial (non-clausal) adverbial were produced with following (possible) non-inversion. As revealed in the second row of the cell, this means that approximately 8.7% of all the X-clauses that began with a clause-initial adverbial were produced with (possible) non-inversion, since altogether 3805 main clauses were produced with an adverbial in clause-initial position in the retellings of the large sample (see table 6.21). This figure is the most interesting to focus on. Finally, the third row of the cell shows that out of all the (possible) non-inversions produced in the large sample, 87.6% began with an adverbial, since the column total is 379.

As is evident from the results presented in table 6.21 and 6.22, an adverbial was the most common clause-initial element beginning the X-clauses produced in the

---

44 Clause-initial subordinate clauses and infinitival clauses were analyzed separately from adverbials even when their function within the clause was adverbial.
Table 6.24. The number and proportion of the (p)XSV-clauses produced in the focus sample that begin with different clause-initial elements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adverbial</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.4 (58/285)</td>
<td>33.0 (60/182)</td>
<td>16.4 (128/779)</td>
<td>16.7 (42/251)</td>
<td>1.8 (3/164)</td>
<td>17.5 (291/166)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>85.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate clause</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84.6 (11/13)</td>
<td>80.0 (4/5)</td>
<td>60.0 (15/25)</td>
<td>34.8 (8/23)</td>
<td>2.9 (1/35)</td>
<td>38.6 (39/101)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate clause + topic placeholder</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.5 (2/16)</td>
<td>13.3 (2/15)</td>
<td>4.5 (3/67)</td>
<td>3.0 (1/33)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.9 (8/163)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.8 (2/53)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1 (2/180)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.0 (1/2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4 (1/31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitival clause</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25.0 (1/4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.0 (1/10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fundament</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to column figures:
Count: Proportion of the X-clauses that begin with the clause-initial element that displays (p)XSV-word order
Column percentage: samples studied, irrespective of context. In fact, if all contexts are considered together approximately 72% of the X-clauses were produced with a clause-initial adverbial. Other relatively common clause-initial elements were subordinate clauses, sometimes followed by topic placeholders (see section 6.3.2.1.3), objects, predicatives and infinitival clauses. Relatively many tag-structures (see footnote 43) or narrative inversions (e.g., Mörnsjö, 2002, see also section 2.1) with nothing in the fundament (thus labelled ‘no fundament’ in the tables above) were also produced.

Clause-initial adverbials were involved in the production of the highest number of (possible) non-inversions in the two samples (see table 6.23-6.24), but subordinate clauses were also followed by (possible) non-inversion relatively often.

---

45 For example:

för att vinna infintital clause V
fuskade hon S
‘in order to win she cheated’

The infinitival clauses lack an explicit subject.
Table 6.25. Distribution of the most common clause-initial adverbials in the large sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adv</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Adv</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>så</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sen</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>då</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>då</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>så</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>nu</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>till slut</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>sen/sedan</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>där</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>kanske</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nu</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>ibland</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>först</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>därför</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annars</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>idbland</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rest</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3805</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PP* stands for prepositional phrase. Included in this category are all clause-initial prepositional phrases that function as adverbials.

‘rest’ refers to all other clause-initial adverbials than the ones mentioned in the list.

‘Tot/total’ refers to the total number of X-clauses produced with a clause-initial adverbial.

especially if we consider the proportion of all the X-clauses that began with subordinate clauses that were produced with (possible) non-inversion, which is between 34.8-84.6% in the different oral contexts studied (see table 6.23-6.24). This is proportionately higher than for clause-initial adverbials, which were followed by (possible) non-inversion between 8.7-33.0% of the time in the oral contexts studied.46 Clause-initial subordinate clauses that were followed by a topic placeholder in the fundament were produced with non-inversion to a much lower degree than clause-initial subordinate clauses that were not followed by a topic placeholder (see section 6.3.2.1.3 for more details). 47 By contrast, clause-initial objects, predicatives and infinitival clauses were rarely followed by non-inversion in the studied material and tag-structures and narrative inversions were always produced with subject-verb inversion.

The results presented so far, thus, indicate that the clause-initial element is one important factor influencing the production of subject-verb inversion and non-

46 The difference between clause-initial adverbials and clause-initial subordinate clauses is statistically significant at the $p < .05$-level (Pearson Chi-Square test) in all the contexts studied. Clause-initial subordinate clauses were followed by (p)XSV-order proportionately more often than clause-initial adverbials.

47 The difference is statistically significant at the $p < .01$-level (Pearson Chi-Square test) in all oral contexts studied. Simple clause-initial subordinate clauses are followed by (p)XSV-order proportionately more often than clause-initial subordinate clauses that are immediately followed by a topic placeholder in the fundament.
Table 6.26: Distribution of the most common clause-initial adverbials in the focus sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-recordings</th>
<th>Group conv.</th>
<th>Retellings</th>
<th>Presentations</th>
<th>Written essays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>då</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>sen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>sen</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>då</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>så</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>så</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>nu</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>nu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>dag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>annars</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>där</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>hår</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>här</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>annars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>igår</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>ändå</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>rest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inversion in this study. Clause-initial subordinate clauses and adverbials were much more often followed by non-inversion than other clause-initial elements, and the presence of topic placeholders is also influential as is further discussed in section 6.3.2.1.2. The following section will focus solely on clause-initial adverbials and it will be explored whether different adverbials are more likely than others to influence the production of non-inversion in this study (section 6.3.2.1.1).

6.3.2.1.1 Clause-initial element: Adverbials

Clause-initial adverbials were followed by (possible) non-inversion the highest number of times among the different clause-initial elements studied and it is therefore relevant to investigate whether certain adverbials are more likely than others to favor or disfavor non-inversion. The distribution of the most common clause-initial adverbials in the large sample and the focus sample are presented in table 6.25 and table 6.26 (translations of the Swedish words displayed in the tables are found in Appendix G).

The three connective adverbs *sen/då/så,*48 all corresponding to English ‘then’, were among the most common clause-initial adverbials in all contexts studied. More specifically, the connective adverb *sen* ‘then’ was either the most common or the second most common clause-initial adverbial in all of the oral contexts studied. By contrast, *sen* only began a small proportion of the X-clauses produced

---

48 As explained in section 5.1 (see footnote 22) main clauses beginning with the consecutive *så* ‘so/then’ that does not require subject-verb inversion (see section 2.1, example 2.3b) were not included in the analysis. Otherwise the incidence of main clauses with clause-initial *så* would have appeared much higher, as would the incidence of non-inversion after *så.*
Table 6.27. The number and proportion of different clause-initial adverbials that were followed by (possible) non-inversion in the large sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverbial</th>
<th>Retellings</th>
<th>Written essays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sen</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.9 (184/925)</td>
<td>5.0 (2/40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>då</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6 (17/476)</td>
<td>0.9 (1/109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>så</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.8 (47/1656)</td>
<td>0 (0/50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.4 (26/209)</td>
<td>0.3 (1/370)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kanske</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88.9 (8/9)</td>
<td>59.5 (22/37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>till slut</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.8 (8/74)</td>
<td>0 (0/6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>egentligen</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.8 (5/24)</td>
<td>0 (0/10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>till exempel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.0 (2/5)</td>
<td>57.1 (4/7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>där</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.5 (4/73)</td>
<td>0 (0/18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rest</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column total</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to column figures:
Count (N)
Proportion of the X-clauses that begin with a certain clause-initial adverbial that displays (p)XSV-order
Column percentage

In the written context. In addition to these three connective adverbs, different kinds of prepositional phrases (PP) were found in clause-initial position relatively often, especially in the presentation context and in the written essays.

Regarding how often different clause-initial adverbials were followed by (possible) non-inversion, it was found that the connective adverb *sen* ‘then’ was involved in the highest number of non-inversions out of all the adverbials studied.
Table 6.28. The number and proportion of different clause-initial adverbials that were followed by (possible) non-inversion in the focus sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverbial</th>
<th>Self-recordings Group conv.</th>
<th>Retellings</th>
<th>Presentations</th>
<th>Written essays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sen</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.6 (17/64)</td>
<td>58.3 (35/60)</td>
<td>33.8 (90/266)</td>
<td>37.1 (13/35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>då</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.9 (13/77)</td>
<td>0 (0/34)</td>
<td>6.9 (7/101)</td>
<td>38.2 (13/34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>så</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 (0/37)</td>
<td>8.9 (2/23)</td>
<td>2.4 (6/251)</td>
<td>3.2 (1/31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.5 (5/13)</td>
<td>57.1 (4/7)</td>
<td>23.3 (10/43)</td>
<td>14.0 (8/57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rest</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to column figures:
Count (N)
Proportion of the X-clauses that begin with a certain clause-initial adverbial that displays (p)XSV-order
Column percentage

(see table 6.27 and 6.28 for the distribution of the clause-initial adverbials most commonly followed by (possible) non-inversion in the large sample and the focus sample). An example is given to clarify how table 6.27 and 6.28 should be read. The first line of each cell presents the total number of examples in which a particular clause-initial adverbial was followed by (possible) non-inversion, i.e. there were 184 examples of a clause-initial sen ‘then’ followed by (p)XSV-order in the retellings of the large sample (table 6.27), and this is 19.9% of all the X-clauses that began with a clause-initial sen since altogether 925 X-clauses with sen in initial position were produced in this context (see table 6.25). The last row of each cell refers to the proportion of all the examples of (possible) non-inversion produced after a clause-initial adverbial that began with a particular adverbial, i.e. in the retellings of the large sample 332 instances of (possible) non-inversion were produced after clause-initial adverbials and 55.4% of these began with the connective adverb sen ‘then’. Again, the most interesting figure to follow in the tables is found in the second row of each cell.

Many of the participants produced at least occasional X-clauses beginning with clause-initial sen ‘then’ followed by (possible) non-inversion in the contexts
studied\textsuperscript{49} and examples of sen-SV are found in all oral contexts. Some participants produced many examples of non-inversion following clause-initial sen. In certain contexts, there are even a few participants who produced more examples of (possible) non-inversion than subject-verb inversion following clause-initial sen. For individuals with relatively many examples of non-inversion, sen tends to be the most common clause-initial element followed by non-inversion.

Apart from sen, the only other clause-initial adverbials that were followed by (possible) non-inversion more than sporadically were the connective adverb då ‘then’ and different kinds of prepositional phrases (labelled PP in the tables above). Judging by the results presented in table 6.28 clause-initial då is followed by (possible) non-inversion relatively often in the self-recordings (16.9%), presentations (38.2%), and to a certain extent also in the retellings (6.9%). In the other contexts, då is practically never followed by non-inversion. Similarly to sen, clause-initial då thus seems to favor the production of non-inversion in certain contexts, but fewer of the participants produced examples of non-inversion after då than after sen\textsuperscript{50}. Complicating the finding is the fact that it was a few individuals within the sample who produced almost all of the non-inversions following clause-initial då. Ekmel (B05) alone produced all but two of the thirteen examples of non-inversion following a clause-initial då in the presentations (see table 6.28). In the self-recordings Ekmel also produced several of the examples of non-inversion after då. Interestingly, he produced only subject-verb inversion after då in the other contexts. Bushra (K28) produced some examples of non-inversion after clause-initial då in her self-recording and retelling, and Kalifa (L26) and Farhad (B02) also produced a few examples of non-inversion after då in some contexts. Apart from these four participants, however, none of the others produced more than one or two examples of (possible) non-inversion after clause-initial då. It appears as if clause-initial då, to a larger extent than clause-initial sen, favors the production of non-inversion only for some participants, and the use of non-inversion following då appears to be more strongly constrained by the situational context than sen.

Prepositional phrases (PP) were also relatively often followed by non-inversion in all the oral contexts studied. For example, in the group conversations four of the seven X-clauses produced with a clause-initial prepositional phrase were followed by non-inversion, i.e. 57.1\%, and in the self-recordings five of thirteen examples, i.e. 38.5\%. A similar pattern is seen in the retellings and presentations but the proportions are lower (see the second line of each cell in table 6.27 and 6.28). The proportion of (possible) non-inversion produced after a clause-initial prepositional phrase is almost the same or higher than the proportion of non-inversion produced after sen.

\textsuperscript{49} 63 of the total 127 participants (49.6\%) produced at least one example of (possible) non-inversion following a clause-initial sen if both samples are considered.

\textsuperscript{50} 16 participants (12.7\%) produced at least one example of (possible) non-inversion following a clause-initial då if both samples are considered (compare with sen in footnote 49).
after clause-initial *sen* in several contexts.\(^{51}\) However, as was the case for clause-initial *då*, clause-initial prepositional phrases seem to favor the production of non-inversion only for a few individuals. Interestingly, several of the same participants who produced non-inversions after clause-initial *då* produced examples of non-inversion after clause-initial prepositional phrases.\(^{52}\)

As mentioned earlier, the connective adverb *så* ‘then’ initiated many of the X-clauses produced in the contexts studied, but *så* is rarely followed by non-inversion in this study.\(^{53}\) None of the participants produced non-inversion more than once or twice after a clause-initial *så*.

The adverb *kanske* ‘maybe’ also deserves a special mention.\(^{54}\) The results for the large sample show that *kanske* is followed by non-inversion more often than by subject-verb inversion in both the retellings and the written essays (see table 6.27). This is in line with what is often described in descriptive grammars of Swedish (see section 2.1 for further details). By contrast, the possibility for non-inversion to occur after the other clause-initial adverbials discussed in this section is never mentioned as an option in descriptive grammars of Swedish.

The results from the written essays contrast sharply with the results from the oral data. First and foremost, far fewer examples of (possible) non-inversion are found in the written data. Secondly, the majority of the examples of non-inversion in the written essays occur after clause-initial *kanske* ‘maybe’, and several of the other examples of non-inversion are most likely the result of missing commas rather than “true” examples of non-inversion (this appears to be the case for example after clause-initial *till exempel* ‘for example’, see table 6.27).

Summarizing the results of the analyses of the importance of different adverbials for the production of non-inversion, it was shown that certain adverbials favor the use of non-inversion more than others. For example, the placement of the connective adverb *sen* ‘then’ in clause-initial position of an X-clause favors the production of non-inversion for many of the participants studied. Prepositional phrases and the connective adverb *då* ‘then’ in clause-initial position also favor the use of non-inversion to a certain extent, but in contrast to *sen* the influence appears to be more restricted to certain individuals and/or to certain contexts. Few non-

\(^{51}\) The difference between the proportion of (possible) non-inversion after clause-initial *sen* and after clause-initial PP is non-significant at the \(p < .05\)-level in all contexts except the presentations, where the proportion of (p)XSV-clauses following *sen* is significantly higher (Pearson Chi-Square test).

\(^{52}\) 19 participants produced at least one examples of (possible) non-inversion after a clause-initial prepositional phrase, which is almost as many as after clause-initial *då* (see footnote 50).

\(^{53}\) Main clauses beginning with the type of clause-initial *så* that does not require following subject-verb inversion (see section 2.1.1, example 2.4b) were not included here (see also section 5.1).

\(^{54}\) Both X-clauses with *kanske* in clause-initial position and X-clauses where *kanske* is located immediately to the right of the clause-initial element, thus occupying the second position of the clause, i.e. the place for the finite verb (see section 2.1.1, example 2.2f and 2.2g), have been counted as "*kanske*-clauses" in table 6.25-6.28.
inversions were produced in the written essays and most of the examples produced began with a clause-initial *kanske*.

### 6.3.2.1.2 Clause-initial element: Subordinate clauses

As mentioned earlier, clause-initial subordinate clauses were relatively often followed by non-inversion in the oral contexts studied (see table 6.23 and 6.24). The majority of the clause-initial subordinate clauses that were followed by non-inversion are either temporal subordinate clauses beginning with the subordinator *när* ‘when’ (see example 6.6) or conditional subordinate clauses (see example 6.7), and this tendency is seen in most of the contexts studied. Because of the limited total number of X-clauses beginning with clause-initial subordinate clauses in the data, this finding should, however, be viewed with some caution. This tendency might have disappeared if more examples of X-clauses beginning with different kinds of clause-initial subordinate clauses had been produced.

*Example 6.6.* Temporal subordinate clause-S-V. [Rachel (B25), retelling]

\[
\begin{aligned}
\text{och när mannen dog} & \text{ tjejen kom ut från tven} \\
X = \text{sub. clause} & \quad S \quad V \\
\end{aligned}
\]

‘and when the man died the girl came out from the TV’

*Example 6.7.* Conditional subordinate clause-S-V. [Shakira (P49), retelling]

\[
\begin{aligned}
\text{om du inte vill gifta dej} & \text{ vi bryr oss inte} \\
X = \text{sub. clause} & \quad S \quad V \\
\end{aligned}
\]

‘if you don’t want to get married we don’t care’

In relation to the finding that a participant’s multilingual background may influence whether s/he produces non-inversions (see section 6.3.1), it is interesting to note that most examples of (possible) non-inversion following a clause-initial subordinate clause were produced by participants with a multilingual background (70 of 75 examples, i.e. 93.3%), several with a relatively late age of onset of Swedish acquisition. Participants with a monolingual Swedish background produced only five examples of this kind.

### 6.3.2.1.3 Presence of topic placeholders

As is evident from the results presented in section 6.3.2.1, the presence of a topic placeholder in the fundament after a clause-initial subordinate clause favors the use of subject-verb inversion in this study (see example 6.8, and also table 6.23 and 6.24 above). A statistical analysis using the Pearson Chi-Square test shows that subject-verb inversion is produced significantly more often after subordinate clauses followed by a topic placeholder than after subordinate clauses that are not followed by a topic placeholder \([p < .01]\). This is true in all oral contexts studied.
Example 6.8. Subordinate clause-topic placeholder-V-S. [Rachel (B25), retelling]

\[X = \text{sub. clause} \quad \text{place holder} \quad \text{V} \quad \text{S}\]

‘but when you see it [topic place holder] it’s really scary’

The presence of topic placeholders after other clause-initial elements also favors subject-verb inversion in this study. For example, non-inversions are more rarely produced after clause-initial å sen så (example 6.9) than after simple å sen (example 6.10) in the data studied. In the retellings of the large sample 925 X-clauses were produced with a clause-initial sen ‘then’ or combinations with sen (see table 6.25). In approximately half of these examples (432 examples, or 46.7%) sen was followed immediately by a topic placeholder så/då in the fundament (see example 6.9). Whereas a simple å sen was produced with following (p)XSV-order 28.2% of the time (139/493, see example 6.12), å sen så/då was followed by (p)XSV-order only 10.4% of the time (45/432, see example 6.11). The difference is statistically significant at the \( p < .0005 \)-level (Pearson Chi-square test). It is also important to point out that most of the examples of non-inversion after clause-initial å sen så/då have been interpreted as possible non-inversions rather than clear examples of non-inversion, which is not the case for most of the examples of sen-S-V. The pattern is the same in all oral contexts studied.

Example 6.9. Adverbial-placeholder-V-S. [Daniella (K29), retelling]

\[X = \text{adv placeholder} \quad \text{V} \quad \text{S}\]

‘and then [topic placeholder] she stands on a bridge’

Example 6.10. Adverbial-V-S. [Anton (B01), retelling]

\[X = \text{adv} \quad \text{Vf} \quad \text{S} \quad \text{Vinf}\]

‘and then the audience gets to decide’

Example 6.11. Adverbial-placeholder-S-V [Hypothetical version of example 6.9]

\[X = \text{adv placeholder} \quad \text{S} \quad \text{V}\]

‘and then [topic placeholder] she stands on a bridge’

Example 6.12. Adverbial-S-V. [Hypothetical version of example 6.10]

\[X = \text{adv} \quad \text{S} \quad \text{Vf} \quad \text{Vinf}\]

‘and then the audience gets to decide’
Table 6.29: Distribution and relative frequency of type of subject in X-clauses and (p)XSV-clauses produced in the large sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Retellings</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>(p)XSV (N % %)</th>
<th>Written essays</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>(p)XSV (N % %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 pers pron (sg/pl)</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.4 (28/639) 7.4</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0 (5/484) 13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 pers pron (sg/pl)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.4 (9/55) 2.4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.1 (3/59) 8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 pers pron (sg/pl)</td>
<td>3679</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>6.8 (250/3679) 66.0</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.8 (23/820) 63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical NP</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10.0 (49/492) 12.9</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0 (4/399) 11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical NP + pronoun</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0 (27/27) 7.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>5082</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1829</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result is the same after clause-initial **då** versus **då så**. Whereas some examples of non-inversion are produced after clause-initial **då** (34 examples, or 7.1%) no examples of non-inversion are produced after a clause-initial **då så**.

All these observations indicate that the presence of topic placeholders after clause-initial adverbials or subordinate clauses favors subject-verb inversion and disfavors the use of non-inversion in this study.

6.3.2.1.4 Clause-initial element: The expression **å sen du vet** ‘and then you know’

Another construction that appears to influence the use of non-inversion in the data is a clause-initial **sen/då** ‘then’ directly followed by the expression **du vet** ‘you know’ (see examples 6.13 and 6.14).

**Example 6.13.** X (å sen du vet)-S-V. [Åsa (L37), self-recording]

å sen du vet han kommer in

X S V

‘and then you know he comes in’
Example 6.14. X (å sen du vet)-S-V. [Bushra (K28), retelling]

å sen du vet han vill inte va(ra) me(d)
X     S     V
‘and then you know he doesn’t want to participate’

Whenever this clause-initial construction is produced in the data it is followed by non-inversion. However, only fourteen examples of this type are found, both samples included. All the examples were produced by participants from Stockholm, and Bushra (K28), one of the participants with the highest number of non-inversions in her speech, produced half of the examples (see example 6.14). Interestingly, the examples that were produced with clause-initial å sen/då du vet followed by non-inversion were always accompanied by a marked intonational pattern.

6.3.2.2 Type and nature of the subject

As mentioned in section 2.1, there are various studies that have investigated whether certain types of subjects favor or disfavor the use of subject-verb inversion among learners of Swedish as a second language (e.g., Bolander 1987, 1988a, 1988b; Hyltenstam, 1978; Håkansson, 1994, 1997; see also Hagen, 1992, and Brautaset, 1996 for Norwegian). The results of these studies have been contradictory. While Hyltenstam (1978) found no evidence for the influence of the subject on learners’ production of subject-verb inversion, both Bolander (ibid.) and Hagen (1992) found tendencies for certain characteristics of the subject to influence the production of inversion among second language learners in their studies. Bolander (op. cit.) found that the subject of an X-clause being a noun or a noun phrase favored inversion more than the subject being a pronoun, and first person pronouns favored inversion more than second or third person pronouns. These findings indicate that it might be interesting to investigate the role of the type and nature of the subject in the production of subject-verb inversion and non-inversion in this study as well. The distribution and relative frequency of different types of subjects used in the X-clauses produced in the different contexts are presented in table 6.29 (large sample) and 6.30 (focus sample). The first column for each situational context presents a list of the different types of subjects that were found in the X-clauses produced. The second column presents the total number of X-clauses that contained each type of subject and the third column translates this number into a proportion of all X-clauses produced in the context, i.e. 639 X-clauses in the retellings of the large sample (table 6.29) contained a first person pronoun, which is 12.6% of all the 5082 X-clauses produced in the retellings. Finally, in column four, the number of all the X-clauses that were produced with (possible) non-inversion and contained a certain subject is specified as well as the proportion in relation to the total number of X-clauses containing the same type of subject. The third line of column four presents the proportion of all the (p)XSV-clauses produced in a context that contains a particular type of
Table 6.30. Distribution and relative frequency of type of subject in X-clauses and (p)XSV-clauses in the focus sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Self-recordings</th>
<th>Group conversations</th>
<th>Retellings</th>
<th>Presentations</th>
<th>Written essays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N % (p)XSV (N %)</td>
<td>N % (p)XSV (N %)</td>
<td>N % (p)XSV (N %)</td>
<td>N % (p)XSV (N %)</td>
<td>N % (p)XSV (N %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pers pron (sg/pl)</td>
<td>171 42.8 42</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>73 28.1 14</td>
<td>112 11.0 4</td>
<td>68 18.8 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 pers pron (sg/pl)</td>
<td>39 9.8 5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>16 6.2 2</td>
<td>21 2.1 8</td>
<td>17 4.7 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 pers pron (sg/pl)</td>
<td>164 41.0 23</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>142 54.6 39</td>
<td>737 72.3 100</td>
<td>197 54.6 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical NP</td>
<td>18 4.5 3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>20 7.7 6</td>
<td>105 10.3 20</td>
<td>73 20.2 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical NP + pronoun</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5 1.9 5</td>
<td>14 1.4 1</td>
<td>1 0.3 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8 2.0 1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>5 30 2.9 1</td>
<td>5 1.4 0</td>
<td>6 2.3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>400 100</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>260 100</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1019 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

subject. As an example, 28 of the 639 X-clauses that contained a first person pronoun in the retellings of the large sample were produced with (possible) non-inversion, i.e. 4.4%. This is 7.4% of all the 379 examples of (possible) non-inversion produced in this context.

In table 6.29 and 6.30 I have highlighted the type of subject(s) involved in the largest proportion of (possible) non-inversions in relation to the total number of X-clauses that contain the same subject. Counted this way, second person pronouns were the type of subjects involved in the largest proportion of non-inversions in the retellings, presentations and written essays (of the large sample).\(^{55}\) However, in the self-recordings, first person pronouns were involved in the largest proportion of non-inversions and in the group conversations third person pronouns and noun phrases were involved in proportionately more examples of non-inversion than other subjects.\(^{56}\) Hence, no consistent pattern is found for all the different contexts studied, and although second person pronouns appear to favor the use of non-inversion in several contexts it is difficult to say whether it really is

\(^{55}\) In these three contexts 2nd person pronouns were involved in a significantly larger proportion of X-clauses displaying (possible) non-inversion than 1st or 3rd person pronouns (\(p < .01\), Chi-square test).

\(^{56}\) The differences between different types of subjects are not statistically significant in these two contexts (Chi-square test).
the type of subject that favors the use of non-inversion in these contexts since almost all the examples of non-inversion with second person pronouns are produced in sentences that begin with one of the two connective adverbs sen 'then' or då ‘then’. It might, therefore, be the clause-initial element rather than the type of subject that favors the use of non-inversion in these examples, or both linguistic factors could simultaneously favor the use of non-inversion.

It was explored whether the subject being a pronoun or a noun phrase might influence the variation between subject-verb inversion and non-inversion, but no such observations could be made. Subject pronouns were not involved in more non-inversions than subject noun phrases or vice versa, except in the retellings in the large sample where significantly more examples of (possible) non-inversion contained a subject noun phrase than a subject pronoun.57

One type of subject, a sort of double subject containing a lexical noun phrase followed by a pronoun (see example 6.15) was found only in examples of non-inversion and never in examples produced with subject-verb inversion. A total of 33 examples of this kind were produced in the data. Interestingly, examples of non-inversion with this same kind of subject were found in Jörgensen’s (1976) study of spoken Swedish (see example 2.9b in section 2.1).

Example 6.15. XSV-word order with a double subject (NP + pronoun). [Bushra (K28), retelling]

å sen den här lilla flickan hon kom+ kutar in i huset
X S (NP + pronoun) V
‘and then this little girl she com+ runs into the house’

To conclude, not enough evidence is found for the influence of the type and nature of the subject on the production of subject-verb inversion or non-inversion in the present study. No consistent patterns can be discerned across the different contexts studied. Although second person pronouns appear to favor the use of non-inversion in certain contexts, this might rather be the result of the influence of the clause-initial element since most of the examples of (possible) non-inversion containing a second person pronoun began with either sen or då (see section 6.3.2.1.1). Regarding possible differences between first, second and third person pronouns or subject noun phrases vs. subject pronouns no consistent patterns were found.

6.3.2.3 Type and nature of the finite verb

The importance of the type of finite verb on the production of subject-verb inversion and non-inversion was also explored. Similarly to some studies of Swedish learner language, I wished to investigate whether the verb being a main

57 In the retellings of the large sample subject noun phrases were involved in proportionately more examples of non-inversion than subject pronouns (p < .01, Chi-square test).
Table 6.31. Distribution and relative frequency of different types of finite verbs in the X-clauses and (p)XSV-clauses in the large sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finite verb</th>
<th>Retellings</th>
<th>Written essays</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>(p)XSV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3101</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copula</td>
<td>1069</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column total</td>
<td>5082</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other refers to examples where double finite verbs have been produced, for example both a copula and an auxiliary, or both a copula and a main verb etc.

...
As is apparent from the results presented in table 6.31 and 6.32, the most common finite verbs in the X-clauses produced are main verbs. This is true for all contexts studied. Except in the written essays of the focus sample, the majority of the examples of (possible) non-inversion also contain main verbs as finite verbs. However, the most interesting figure to study in the tables above is how often a certain finite verb is involved in the production of (possible) non-inversion in relation to how often it is produced in the X-clauses altogether. In the tables above, I have highlighted the type of finite verb that is involved in the largest proportion of non-inversion in each context. Evidently, no consistent pattern is found across different situational contexts. In each context, most of the differences between the three types of finite verbs in terms of how often they are involved in the production of (possible) non-inversion do not reach statistical significance. No convincing evidence is, thus, found for the influence of the finite verb on the variation between subject-verb inversion and non-inversion in this study. Whether the finite verb is a main verb, an auxiliary or a copula verb does not appear to have a significant impact on the results.

In addition, I was unable to find evidence that certain verbs favor or disfavor the production of inversion in the present material. The large number of different verbs used in the X-clauses produced in each context makes it difficult to study how certain verbs might influence the use of non-inversion. In the focus sample...
there are between 80 and 150 different verbs used in the X-clauses produced in the various contexts, and in the large sample more than 350 different verbs are produced in the X-clauses of the retellings and more than 250 in the written essays. The copula verb *är/var* 'is/was' is the single most common verb used in the X-clauses of all contexts, and it is also the most common verb in the examples with (possible) non-inversion in most contexts. However, several other verbs are proportionately involved in more examples of (possible) non-inversion than the copula verb *är/var*. A difficulty in the analysis of the finite verbs is that several of the verbs were produced only once or twice in the sample and if one of these examples displays non-inversion, then the proportion of non-inversion involving these verbs appears very high. For example, in the group conversations two X-clauses were produced with the finite main verb *köpte* 'bought', one of which displayed non-inversion. It thus looks as if *köpte* was produced with non-inversion 50% of the time in this context. This is misleading since the proportion would most likely be lower if more X-clauses with this particular verb as the finite verb had been included in the analysis. To sum up my argument, the evidence found is not strong enough for the hypothesis that certain verbs might influence the production of non-inversion more than others in this study.

6.3.2.4 Summary of linguistic factors

The results taken together show that the clause-initial element of an X-clause is one important factor influencing the participants’ production of subject-verb inversion and non-inversion in this study. Clause-initial subordinate clauses or adverbials are more often produced with non-inversion than other clause-initial elements. This pattern is consistent across the different situational contexts. Among the different clause-initial adverbials, a clause-initial *sen* ‘then’ is most likely to be followed by non-inversion in the oral contexts. Clause-initial *då* and/or clause-initial prepositional phrases are also followed by non-inversion relatively often in relation to how often they begin the X-clauses produced, at least in certain contexts, and at least in the language production of certain individuals.

The results show that the presence of a topic placeholder favors subject-verb inversion among the participants studied. Subordinate clauses directly followed by topic placeholders are less likely to be followed by non-inversion than subordinate clauses that are not followed by a topic placeholder in the fundament. This pattern is consistent across the different contexts studied. The same pattern is also seen for clause-initial adverbials. A clause-initial *sen* ‘then’ immediately followed by a topic placeholder in the fundament, i.e. *å sen så/då*, is less likely to be followed by non-inversion than a simple clause-initial *å sen*. The clause-initial expression *å sen du vet* ‘and then you know’ was produced with following SV-order every time it occurred in the data, but since only a limited number of examples of this kind were produced, it is difficult to know if this finding can be generalized.

Insufficient evidence was found for the influence of the type of subject on the variation between subject-verb inversion and non-inversion in this study. No
consistent pattern was found across different situational contexts. The only type of subject that was consistently followed by non-inversion in the studied material was a double subject consisting of a lexical noun phrase followed by a pronoun (see example 6.15).

No convincing evidence was found for the influence of the finite verb on participants’ production of subject-verb inversion and non-inversion. No consistent pattern was found across different contexts. Whereas copula verbs were involved in the largest proportion of non-inversion in some contexts, main or auxiliary verbs were involved in the largest proportions of non-inversion in others.

To sum up, the results show that the clause-initial element of an X-clause influences participants’ variable subject-verb order in this study. Nevertheless, the influence of the clause-initial element cannot alone explain all the variation. Numerous questions remain, and factors beyond the linguistic have to be accounted for in order to better understand the variable use of XVS- and XSV-word order in this study. Only in combination with a range of other factors can the linguistic factors help explain the variation found.

6.3.3 Socio-pragmatic factors

Apart from the quantitative analyses already presented, I have looked at the collected material from a more qualitative angle. These analyses have been conducted in a bottom-up fashion. I have gone through the data looking for reoccurring patterns. Despite the fact that the majority of the participants studied follow standard Swedish norms for word order most of the time (see section 6.1 and 6.2), in this part of the thesis I focus above all on the participants who produced relatively many examples of (possible) non-inversion, since it is impossible to investigate and discuss factors that may influence variation in language production that displays no such variation. The emphasis is put on subject-verb order in main declarative clauses in these analyses.

In section 6.2, it was reported how participants varied their subject-verb order with the situational context. Whereas some situations, such as the self-recordings and the group conversations, elicited numerous examples of non-inversion, few examples were generally found in the presentations and the written essays. The aim of the qualitative analyses is to further explore what it is in each situation that favors or disfavors the use of non-inversion. As will unfold in this section, several interesting patterns have been found. Factors such as speech accommodation (6.3.3.1), topic of conversation (6.3.3.2), and gender (6.3.3.3) are all important for the production of word order variation in the present data, as are various pragmatic factors (6.3.3.4-6.3.3.6). The analyses also show that non-inversions in some cases are used as a means by some participants to express their identification with the multilingual suburb and the varieties of Swedish spoken there (6.3.3.7), show solidarity with peers (6.3.3.8), and/or to contest official school discourses (6.3.3.9). At the end of this section, it is also speculated about whether some participants’ abundant use of non-inversion in certain contexts may be part of an
attempt to stage a stereotypical image of speakers of multilingual youth language varieties (6.3.3.10).

6.3.3.1 Syntactic accommodation

An observation made early on was that the adolescents’ use of non-inversion appeared to be related to whom they interacted with. Many more examples of non-inversion were produced in contexts where participants spoke to peers than when they talked to a teacher or a researcher. As reported earlier, the largest proportions of non-inversion were generally produced either in the group conversations or the self-recordings, i.e. in contexts where the youths interacted with friends. In the retellings, where participants were asked to retell a movie to an adult researcher, most adolescents avoided using non-inversions. It is interesting that several of the few participants who produced relatively many non-inversions in their retellings made their recordings in the company of one or two peers (see chapter 4). This was the case for both Bushra (K29) and Abel (K02), for example. For these participants, the pressure, or ease, to continue speaking in accordance with how they usually speak with their friends was probably stronger and more important than the influence of the recording situation and/or the presence of the researcher (cf. Labov, 1972a, 1972b; Nordberg, 1982). Focus participant Bushra (K28), who produced the highest number of non-inversions in the retellings of all participants studied, did her recording in the company of two friends who were sitting with us at a table in the school cafeteria. By contrast, during the background interview conducted with Bushra by the same researcher without any of her friends around, Bushra produced only a few occasional examples of non-inversion.59

In the data, there are a few examples of how the presence of a teacher creates a change in the language and syntax used by the adolescents. During a group conversation between Ekmel (B05), Mehmet (B09) and Ismail (B16) in Bullerby-skolan, the boys used a lot of slang and many non-inversions. The use of non-inversion was, in fact, more common than subject-verb inversion in this particular conversation and it is, therefore, interesting to try to see in what contexts the boys used subject-verb inversion. At one point during the recording, the teacher of Swedish entered the classroom in which the group was sitting and there was an instant change in the boys’ syntactic usage where they went from using almost exclusively non-inversions to using only subject-verb inversions. Interestingly, as soon as the teacher left the classroom the boys reverted to producing non-inversions. These changes in subject-verb order are exemplified in excerpt 6.16.

59 The background interviews have not been analyzed in as much detail as the other contexts, but I have listened through Bushra’s (K28) interview several times, and although she produces a number of X-clauses, very few of them are produced with non-inversion. There is a notable difference between her language use in the background interview and the retelling.
Example 6.16. Presence of a teacher. [Ekmel (B05), Ismail (B16), Mehmet (B09); group conversation]

1. **B16**: ah å sen dom får det(=?) den brevet (=XSV). ‘yeah and then they get that letter’
2. **B05**: ah va(d) händer? ‘yeah what happens?’
3. **B09**: <[>] det(e) anonymt. ‘it’s anonymous’
4. **B16**: <[>] å sen va(d) het(r) re dom gär(r) va(d) het(r) re # öppnar breven då (= XSV) ’and then what was it they go what was it # open the letter then’
5. **B05**: XXX [= svensklärarens namn] vi hålle(r) på. ‘XXX [= name of teacher of Swedish] we’re on it’
6. **%com**: the teacher of Swedish has entered the classroom here and is addressed by B05.
7. **B16**: <[>] å sen # å sen så förs+/ (= XV) ’and then # and then unders+’
8. **B05**: <[>] vi spelar in # vi har frågorna här. ‘we’re recording # we have the questions here’
9. **BL1**: jaha ni spela(r) in. ‘ok you’re recording’
10. **B05**: <[>] ah xx. ‘yeah xx’
11. **B16**: <[>] å sen så förstå(r) rom [: dom] (=XVS) # att det(=) ‘and then they understand # that it’
12. **B16**: <[>] å sen så hitta(r) rom [: dom] en flaska där inne (=XVS) ’and then they find a bottle in there’
13. **BL1**: <[>] va(d) duktigt. ‘that’s good’
14. **B05**: <[>] tack XXX [= svensklärarens namn] ja(g) vet # xx. ‘thanks XXX [= name of teacher of Swedish] I know # xx’
15. **B09**: ah å det(=) dä(r) brevet det(=) måste ha vart från Sverige för frimärket va(r) från Sverige. ‘yeah and that letter it must have been from Sweden because the stamp was from Sweden’
16. **B16**: ah # å sen eh. ‘yeah # and then eh’
17. **B09**: så å det(=) va(r) en nån anonym. ‘so and it was a somebody anonymous’
18. **%com**: the teacher has left the classroom again.
19. **B16**: <[>] å sen det(=) finns såhär(=) nån läsk eller(=) nånting <du vet såhär(=)> (?) (=XSV) ’and then there is a sort of soda or something <you know sort of>’ one guy he starts drinking it [...]’

At the beginning of example 6.16 (line 1 and 4), Ismail (B16) tries to summarize the content of the short story *Elixir* (Leiva Wenger, 2001), during which he produces two examples of non-inversion. The teacher of Swedish then suddenly enters the classroom and Ekmel (B05) addresses him (line 5). While Ekmel speaks to the teacher, Ismail (B16) immediately changes from producing non-inversions
to producing subject-verb inversion in his speech (see line 7). Ismail’s following two utterances (lines 11 and 12) present two more examples of subject-verb inversion. The teacher was still in the classroom when these were uttered. However, as soon as the teacher leaves, Ismail starts producing non-inversions again (see line 19). This example thus appears to illustrate how syntactic usage may change when an adult enters a conversation between the youths, but the finding is complicated by the fact that Ismail uses the construction å sen så in the examples where he produces subject-verb inversion. As was noted in section 6.3.2.1.3, the presence of the topic placeholder så/då, immediately after the first element of an X-clause tends to favor the use of inversion. The question is, therefore, whether it is the topic placeholder or the presence of the teacher that triggers the use of inversion in this particular context, or whether both factors simultaneously influence the use of inversion.

Another example of a situation where the presence of a teacher may have influenced the syntactic patterns used in the group is a group conversation between Fred (B03), Jan (B10), Rafiq (B06) and Kostas (B17) in Bullerbyskolan. Like most of the other group conversations, the boys discussed the short story *Elixir* (op. cit., see chapter 4 for more details). After the boys started speaking, the teacher of Swedish entered the room and sat down with the group. The teacher then controlled most of the rest of the conversation and asked many questions. During the conversation, none of the boys produced any examples of non-inversion, despite the fact that Rafiq (B06) at least had been observed to sometimes produce non-inversions in other contexts at school. The presence of the teacher may, at least partly, explain why this group of boys, in contrast to other groups of boys recorded while discussing *Elixir* in the same school did not produce non-inversions.

In the recordings, there are various examples where participants accommodate each other’s use, or non-use, of non-inversions. For example, when one individual in a conversation produces several examples of non-inversion, her/his peers in the same conversation tend to produce several examples of non-inversion as well, though not necessarily to the same extent. The opposite pattern is also found. There are examples where a participant who is often observed using non-inversions participates in a conversation where the others do not use non-inversions, and consequently decreases her/his use of variation compared to how s/he performs in other similar contexts. The participants appear to first and foremost accommodate to the syntactic patterns used by the speaker/s who dominates a conversation, i.e. if the participant who dominates a conversation produces many non-inversions, then the other participants are more likely to

---

60 The example is left unfinished, but since the beginning of the verb förstår ‘understand’ follows immediately after the beginning element å sen så ‘and then’, I have taken this as evidence that Ismail (B16) is about to produce an example of subject-verb inversion.

61 This is based on casual observations made at school by the author.

62 ‘Dominating’ refers here to the speaker with the highest number of speech turns and who keeps the longest turns.
produce non-inversions than if the person who dominates the conversation does not produce any non-inversions.

One example of how the participants accommodate each other syntactically is a group conversation between the four boys Anton (B01), Diram (B07), Rahim (B11) and Roshan (B13) in Bullerbyskolan. The group discussed the short story *Elixir* (Leiva Wenger, 2001), but they also trailed off to other topics. Three of the boys, Anton, Diram and Roshan, produced examples of both inversion and non-inversion throughout the conversation, but they did so to different degrees (see table 6.33). Anton (B01) and Diram (B07) dominated the beginning of the recording. They were trying to retell the plot of the short story and during this part of the recording they both produced various examples of non-inversion. Nevertheless, Roshan (B13) was the one who spoke the most in the group if the conversation as a whole is considered. He was the one initiating most new topics and had longer turns than the others. Roshan produced several examples of both subject-verb inversion and non-inversion throughout the recording. Rahim (B11) spoke little during the conversation, only an occasional remark here and there, and he only produced one X-clause, with subject-verb inversion. In comparison with other contexts studied, there are some interesting differences. Anton (B01), for example, produced no non-inversions in the other contexts studied, but several in this group conversation where he interacted with classmates who produced several non-inversions. Roshan produced a few examples of non-inversion in the other contexts studied, but his proportion of non-inversion is higher in the group conversation than in the other contexts. Diram (B07) produced the highest proportion of non-inversion among the boys in the group (57%), although he produced relatively few X-clauses in total. By contrast, in the retelling to a researcher, which is the only other oral context studied with Diram, he produced only one non-inversion (4.8%).

Syntactic accommodation also occurs in the group conversation between Ekmel (B05), Mehmet (B09) and Ismail (B16), referred to above. During the conversation, all three boys produced more non-inversions than subject-verb inversions (see table 6.34). Ekmel (B05) produced the highest proportion of non-inversion in the group (89%). In some of the other oral contexts studied, Ekmel also produced

\[
\begin{array}{|c|ccccc|}
\hline
\text{Participant} & \text{X-clauses} & \text{XVS-clauses} & \text{XVS-clauses} & \text{XSV-} + \text{pXSV-} & \text{(p)XSV-clauses} \\
\hline
\text{(N)} & \text{(N)} & \text{(%)} & \text{clauses (N)} & \text{(%)} & \\
\hline
\text{Anton (B01)} & 21 & 14 & 66.7 & 7 & 33.3 \\
\text{Diram (B07)} & 7 & 3 & 42.9 & 4 & 57.1 \\
\text{Rahim (B11)} & 1 & 1 & 100.0 & 0 & 0 \\
\text{Roshan (B13)} & 14 & 9 & 64.3 & 5 & 35.7 \\
\text{The whole group} & 43 & 27 & 62.8 & 16 & 37.2 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]
Table 6.34: Group conversation between Ekmel (B05), Mehmet (B09) and Ismail (B16).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>X-clauses N</th>
<th>XVS-clauses (%)</th>
<th>XSV- + pXSV- (p)XSV-clauses N</th>
<th>XSV-clauses (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ekmel (B05)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehmet (B09)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ismail (B16)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The whole group</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

relatively many non-inversions, but never to the same extent as in this group conversation. By contrast, Mehmet (B09) and Ismail (B16) had relatively low proportions of non-inversion in all other contexts studied.

A different kind of example of how the adolescents accommodated each other syntactically was observed in the group conversation between Bushra (K28), Daniella (K29), Fawza (K27) and Leah (K33) in Körsbärrskolan. As mentioned earlier, Bushra (K28) produced relatively many examples of non-inversion in all the oral contexts studied. In the group conversation, however, her proportion of non-inversion is lower (24%) than in her self-recording and retelling. One possible explanation for this may be that the other girls in the group did not produce non-inversions. Daniella (K29), who was the one who spoke the most in the group and who seemed to take on a leading role in the conversation, produced only one example of a possible non-inversion throughout the whole conversation, and Leah (K33), and Fawza (K27) produced no examples of non-inversion. If one looks closer at Bushra’s examples of non-inversion in this context it is obvious that several of her non-inversions are direct quotes from the short story *Elixir* (Leiva Wenger, 2001). Without these, her proportion of non-inversion would be even lower, which strengthens the impression that her syntax was influenced by the other girls’ subject-verb order in this context.

In the self-recordings by Bushra (K28) and Ekmel (B05), there is also evidence of syntactic accommodation taking place. Both these participants produced relatively many non-inversions in their respective self-recording, and the other speakers participating in the recordings (speakers who were not part of the present project) also produced examples of non-inversion, although never to the same extent as Bushra and Ekmel.

The examples presented in this section can all be related to theories of speech-accommodation (e.g., Giles, Coupland, N. & Coupland, J., 1991; Giles & Powesland, 1975; Thakerar et al, 1982) and audience design (e.g., Bell, 1984) (see chapter 3 for a review of these theories). These examples typify how the adolescents’ syntactic usage is influenced by whom they interact with, whether a friend or a teacher/researcher, and also how they may accommodate each other syntactically by converging their use of non-inversion to match other participants in a conversation.
6.3.3.2 Topic of conversation

There are some observations that suggest that topic of conversation is another factor that influences the use of non-inversion in this study. For example, in the group conversations it was found that several of the groups that discussed the short story *Elixir* (Leiva Wenger, 2001) produced various examples of non-inversion, whereas none of the groups that talked about other topics produced any non-inversions (see chapter 4 for details about the group conversations). The finding is, however, complicated by the fact that only girls participated in the groups that discussed something other than *Elixir*. The difference could, therefore, have more to do with the influence of gender than the influence of topic.

Looking over the results again, it becomes apparent that there is yet another factor complicating the finding of the influence of topic on the production of syntactic variation in the group conversations. In fact, it was only male participants from Bullerbyskolan who produced high numbers of non-inversion when discussing *Elixir*. Apart from two female participants who produced a few non-inversions, none of the participants from Lönebergaskolan or Körsbärsskolan produced syntactic variation in the group conversation context. This indicates that there may be interesting differences between different schools in terms of what topics of conversation may trigger the use of non-inversion.

In order to find out more about the influence of topic of conversation, further investigations are needed where different factors are better controlled for than they have been in this study. In order to separate the influence of topic from gender we would need to record separate boy groups, girl groups and mixed groups when they discuss *Elixir* and when they discuss some other common topic. If the results then show that all groups produce more non-inversions when discussing *Elixir* than when they discuss the other topic, we would have better evidence for the influence of topic on syntactic variation. If this was repeated the same way in the different schools we would also be able to see whether the differences between the schools remain.

As reported in chapter 3, Bell’s Audience design (1984) claims that topics that are normally brought up in conversation with intimates may cause a speaker to produce the speech style normally used with these intimates even when s/he speaks to someone else. A possible example of this is found in a background interview with one of the focus participants. Ekmel (B05) produces a number of non-inversions during the background interview with one of the project researchers, which contrasts with the behavior of most other participants in this context. As already mentioned, apart from a few exceptions, participants did not produce non-inversions when they spoke to adults in this study. Many of Ekmel’s non-inversions during the interview occurred when he tried to describe his own language behavior in different contexts and in particular when he accounted for his use of a local variety of Swedish, which he referred to as *rinkebysvenska* ‘Rinkeby Swedish’. Apart from the non-inversions, Ekmel (B05) produced a number of other language features characteristic of informal youth language during the
interview (see section 6.3.3.4). It does not seem too farfetched to think that one reason why Ekmel (B05) used this youth language style despite speaking to an adult researcher may have been that speaking about how he normally speaks to his friends triggered the use of the style he was speaking about. This would be in line with Bell’s (ibid.) claims. Interestingly, in Haglund’s (2005) study, which was conducted in a multilingual suburb of Stockholm, some of her participants appear to have produced non-inversions particularly when they spoke about their use of local language varieties during an interview (see for example pages 132 and 142, where Marcela and Hawar exchange thoughts on how one speaks in Durby).63

To summarize, some findings point in the direction that topic may be a factor that influences the use of non-inversion among the participants studied, but further studies are needed to confirm this. In future research it would be useful to try to separate the influence of topic from other influencing factors such as gender and school.

6.3.3.3 Gender

Gender has often been reported to be an important factor influencing language variation (e.g., Cheshire, 2002). The results of the quantitative analyses of the large sample and the GJT (see section 6.3.1.2 and 6.4.3) present some interesting differences between girls and boys in this study. In the retellings, for example, female participants produced slightly lower proportions of (possible) non-inversion than male participants, although the difference did not reach statistical significance, and on the GJT female participants judged the test sentences more according to standard Swedish word order norms than the male participants. The quantitative results thus indicate that male participants tend to perform syntactically more variably than female participants in this study. Nonetheless, it is a girl, Bushra (K28), who produced the highest number of non-inversions in the study as a whole, and both girls and boys produced examples of XSV-order in all contexts studied.

The qualitative analyses of the focus sample point to some influence of gender on the variable use of subject-verb order. As mentioned above, gender is one factor, perhaps in combination with topic of conversation that influenced the use of non-inversion in the group conversations. It was predominantly male participants who produced the non-inversions found in the group conversations. In the self-recordings, there are also findings that support the influence of gender on the production of syntactic variation. For example, in Lillian’s (B36) self-recording, her use of non-inversion increases during passages of the recording when she speaks to a male classmate. The self-recording was conducted in Bullerbyskolan.

63Syntactic variation is by no means the focus of Haglund’s (2005) thesis. The observations presented here are based on “lighter” syntactic analyses that I have made of some of the examples presented in Haglund’s thesis. Since I have not heard or analyzed the original recordings nor looked at more than a few examples with the same participants, the similarities found here should be taken with a pinch of salt.
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117 during a lunch break, and during the first part of the recording Lillian and Riya (B29) were sitting in the lunch hall speaking to each other. Both girls produced only a few sporadic non-inversions during this part of the conversation. Later on in the recording, the girls were joined by two boys. Lillian spoke mostly to Eliot (B15), a boy from the same class, and during their conversation she produced various examples of non-inversion. Eliot (B15) also produced several non-inversions during the exchange. In total, Lillian (B36) produced ten examples of XSV-word order (30.3% of her X-clauses) during the course of the self-recording. Seven of these were produced while she spoke to Eliot (B15). Lillian did not produce this many non-inversions in any of the other contexts studied. It appears as if speaking to the boy Eliot (B15) somehow triggered Lillian’s use of non-inversion. We would, however, need to look at more interactions between Lillian and different boys and girls in order to say for certain whether her changes in syntax are related to the issue of gender. A similar observation can be made in Rana’s (L39) self-recording. During the recording, Rana predominantly spoke to a boy from another class and by contrast to other contexts where she interacted mainly with girls, she produced a number of non-inversions during this recording.

Despite discovering tendencies for gender to influence the use of non-inversion in both the quantitative and qualitative analyses of the two samples, the findings need to be further substantiated with empirical data. It would be interesting to do a follow-up study of syntactic variation where gender was better controlled for. This could be done, for example, if the same participants were studied when interacting with participants of the same gender and with participants of mixed genders in different situational contexts, and where other factors were kept as constant as possible.

6.3.3.4 High-involvement style

In the data, most examples of (p)XSV-word order occur in conversational contexts characterized by a number of language features typical of informal youth language (e.g., Nordberg, 1984), for example an increased use of slang words, an abundant use of epistemic markers such as *du vet* ‘you know’ (cf. Svensson, 2007; in prep.), many discourse extenders (cf. Norrby, 2003, Ekberg, 2006, 2007), fast speech rates, a lot of overlapping talk, fast turn-taking, as well as usage of expressive phonology and sometimes marked intonational patterns (cf. Bodén, 2004, 2005; Bodén & Svensson, 2004). The non-inversions also tend to occur when participants speak about something personally engaging to them, when they tell someone about something that has happened to them or somebody they know. These characteristics are all part of what Deborah Tannen (1984: 30-31) calls a high-involvement style. Hence, the non-inversions seem to be part of some participants’ high-involvement style. Example 6.17 with female participant Daniella (K29) illustrates the production of non-inversion as part of a high-involvement style in her self-recording. Overall, Daniella (K29) produced very few examples of non-inversion in the different contexts (see Appendix F for specific details on
Daniella’s production). In her self-recording, however, she produced a few examples of (possible) non-inversion, and these were produced particularly in a section of the recording where she narrated a personal story of something “embarrassing” that happened to her the day before (see line 1, 16 and 18 of example 6.17). During the narration, Daniella speaks very fast and she produces a number of filler words and expressions such as *ba* ‘just’, *såhär* ‘like’, *typ* ‘kind of’, *du vet* ‘you know’, *asså* ‘thus’. By quoting things that she and others said during the event, she also manages to make the story more vivid (cf. Eriksson, 1997). In the example, Daniella also uses a few slang words such as *smajla* ‘smiled’ and *drev* ‘joked’. Perhaps most importantly, she seems very involved in her story-telling and she told this same story to several people during the course of her self-recording. It was apparently an event that had an impact on her.

*Example 6.17. Non-inversions as part of a high involvement style. [Daniella (K29), self-recording]*

1. *K29: hallå ja(g) skäm+ igår ja(g) skämde ut mej [= XSV] # asså känner ni henne hon
den där # hon me(d) uppsatt hår ?
2. *KK1: xxx .
7. *K29: m ja(g) drev bara såhär du vet ja(g) ja(g) va(r) där ute å sjöng # så hon såhär
smajla(de) # hon ba(ra) .
8. *KK1: va ?
9. *K29: asså känner ni henne hon
10. *KK1: va ?
11. *K29: ho smajlade dåför ja(g) sjöng .
13. *K29: så ja(g) skämta(de) <typ> [?] me(d) XXX [= namn] å kolla varför ler hon för [=!
skrattar] ja(g) ba(ra) varför ler hon fõ(r) fast ja(g) sa inte det(t) högt .
15. *KK1: va ?
16. *K29: å sen du vet # hon vart såhår[%= XSV] hon ba(ra) gick därifrån såhär # så ja(g)
ba(ra) hur(r) kan hon hörö dom sa(t[t]) typ bakom dörren # å sen XXX [= namn]
17. *K29: m ja(g) drev bara såhär du vet ja(g) va(r) där ute å sjöng # så hon såhär
smajla(de) # hon ba(ra) .
19. *K29: m I was joking only like that you know I I was out there singing # so she smiled at
me # she just .

1. *K29: hey I emba+ yesterday I embarrassed myself [= XSV] # so do you know her that #
the one with her hair up ?
2. *KK1: xxx .
7. *K29: m I was joking only like that you know I I was out there singing # so she smiled at
me # she just .
9. *K29: she smiled because I was singing .
11. *K29: so I kind of joked <like> [?] with XXX [= name] oh check it out why’s she
In section 6.3.2, where the impact of different linguistic factors was discussed, I argued that there was no clear evidence for the influence of the type and nature of the subject on the production of non-inversion, or at least that the results were inconclusive. However, the results showed that second person pronouns were the type of subjects involved in the largest proportion of non-inversion in several contexts (see section 6.3.2.2). These findings are in line with what is discussed in this section, namely that the use of non-inversion may be part of some participants’ high-involvement style. Since the use of second person pronouns helps to make the interlocutor or listener feel more included in the story, and make her/him more engaged, it is only natural that the use of these pronouns would increase in passages of talk characterized by high-involvement. And since non-inversions tend to occur in these same contexts, it seems logical if the proportion of second person pronouns, and first person pronouns, were higher than other types of subjects in these contexts.

6.3.3.5 Longer stretches of talk and enumerations of events

The non-inversions in the data occur above all when participants produce longer stretches of talk without being interrupted. This pattern is seen in all the different situational contexts studied. The finding may seem somewhat contradictory to the fact that a high involvement style, as mentioned above, is often characterized by a lot of overlapping talk. However, when participants were allowed to speak continuously, without being interrupted right away, they generally produced more contexts for inversion (i.e. X-clauses), and consequently there were better chances for the production of non-inversion. Accordingly, non-inversions tend to be produced within passages of speech characterized on the whole by high-involvement style features, but specifically when participants are allowed more continuous talking space.

Many of the examples of non-inversion in the data also occur when participants start to enumerate a number of events or occurrences that have happened or are about to happen, and especially if the X-clauses produced for the enumeration begin with the clause-initial element (å) sen ‘(and) then’. This pattern is seen in particular in the group conversations, where participants retold a number of events taking place in the short story Elíxir (see example 6.16 above), and in the retellings, where they retold the events taking place in a movie (example 6.18), but
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Example 6.18. Non-inversions in enumerations of events. [Bushra (K28), retelling]

1. å sen dom va(r) tvungen å springa därför (= XSV) å sen de(t) blev dom två tydligen (= XSV)
2. å då du vet dom blir ju kära i varann (= varandra) (= XSV) de(t) e typiskt # å sen du vet dom
3. gär (= XSV) dom ska leta efter mat å sådär å sen dom kommer in i ett hus (= XSV) # dom ser
4. ett hus med eh julpyn av lyser såhär # dom ba de(t) måste va(r)a nån som lever där # så dom
5. går in i de(t) här huset å de(t) e såhär vagn s+ vagn du vet såhär # aftärsavgarn dom ligger
6. såhär i hög du vet å sen dom å sen du vet eh (= XSV) dom ba ah va(d) fän e de(t) här för nåt #
7. å sen den här tjejern å killen dom ser dom ser ett ett par andra killar (= XSV) du vet dom hära
8. s+ # galna dom börjar kuta efter å dom ba va(d) fän va(d) ska vi göra nu så dom kutar upp för
9. dom här spa+ vagarna # å sen så du vet dom kutar dom kutar å allting (= XSV) å sen dom
10. tittar ner (= XSV) å sen dom ser att dom e på våg upp dom hära # zombies eller va(d) dom är
11. (= XSV) # å sen eh # ah å sen de(t) e (= XSV) du vet hon kollar upp hon börjar skrika å
12. vet han kommer efter han ba vad # sen står de(t) en kille där me(d) såhär skydd å allting (= XSV) han står såhär # han å du vet hon blev rädd att han va(r) en av dom han ba ah men kom
13. kom # hon ba du vet såhär han ba knacka på första dörren # så han släppte för våg dom å så
14. stod han kvar (= XSV) så slog han på dom hår som kom (= XSV) # å sen don knackar (=XSV)
15. å sen de(t) e en liten flicka som öppnar den här rutaen (=XSV)
16. [1. and then they had to run from there (= XSV) and then they got together apparently (= XSV)
2. and then you know they fall in love (= XSV) it’s typical # and then you know they go (= XSV)
3. they’re going to look for food and that and then they enter a house (= XSV) they see a house eh
4. with shining Christmas decorations # they just somebody has to live there # so they walk into
5. this house and there’s like car+ a cart you know like # shopping carts they’re lying on top of
6. each other you know and then they and then you know eh (=XSV) they just what the fuck is
7. this # and then the girl and the guy they see they see a couple of other guys (=XSV) you know
8. these s+ # crazy ones they start running after them and they just what the fuck what are we
9. gonna do now so they run up on these spa+ shopping carts # and then you know they run they
10. run and everything (= XSV) and then they look down (= XSV) and then they see that they’re
11. on their way up these # zombies or whatever (= XSV) # and then eh # yeah and then there’s
12. (= XSV) you know she looks up she starts screaming and you know he comes after he’s just
13. like what # then there’s a guy there with protection and everything (=XSV) he stands there #
14. he and you know she got scared that he was one of those he just but come come # she just you
15. know he just knock on the first door # so he let them through and then he stayed there (=XSV)
16. and then he hit these that came (= XSV) # and then they knock (=XSV) and then
17. there’s a little girl who opens the window (=XSV) [...].

Example 6.19. Non-inversions in enumerations of events. [Rana (L39), self-recording]

1. *L39: [...] å sen ja(g) komme(r) ner (= XSV) ja(g) lovar ja(g) e nere kvart över [...] å sen
2. ja(g) sitte(r) me(d) dej (= XSV) å sen ja(g) ha(r) lunch (= XSV) lyssna # kolla mitt
3. schema # ja(g) skolka(r) där # å sen lunch # å sen gå(r) ja(g) ti(ll) samhälls-
4. kunskaperen (= XSV).
5. *XX1: men ja(g) har ingen lektion sen ja(g) ha(r) slutat .
6. *L39: åh nej # å sen ha(r) ja(g) lunch (= XSV) # ja(g) ja(g) skolka(r) den å sen ha(r) ja(g)
7. lunch (= XSV) # å sen ha(r) ja(g) historia tolv å förtifem # å de(t) e sista
8. lektionen men hon komme(r) runt typ # där nå(r) ja(g) slutar .

[1. *L39: [...] and then I come down (=XSV) I promise I’ll be down at a quarter past [...]
2. and then I sit with you (= XSV) and then I have lunch (=XSV) listen # check my
3. schedule # I cut a class there # and then lunch # and then I go to the social
4. sciences’ class (= XSV).]
5. *XX1: but I don’t have a class later I have finished.
6. *L39: oh no # and then I have lunch [= XVS] # I cut that one and then I have lunch
7. [= XVS] # and then I have history at twelve forty-five [= XVS] # and that’s the last class but she’ll be here around like # there when I finish.]

Example 6.20. Non-inversions in enumeration of events. [Lillian (B36), self-recording]

1. ja(g) jobba(de) # första året där ja(g) ja(g) jobbade du vet i lobbyn [= XSV] såhär torka(de) bord å såhära fö(r) ja(g) va(ra) bara liten såhära # å sen an+ i första året så jobbade ja(g) också då satt ja(g) i kassan [= XSV] å nu i år ja(g) jobbar såhär i lördagar bara (= XSV) men ti(ll) sommaren ska ja(g) jobba [= XSV].

[1. I worked # the first year there I worked you know in the lobby [= XSV] like wiped tables and that because I was only small like that # and then sec+ last year I also worked [= XVS] 3. then I worked the cashier [= XVS] and now this year I work like Saturdays only [= XSV] but 4. this summer I will work [= XVS]].

6.3.3.6 A non-inversion rarely comes alone

As is obvious from most of the examples presented in this section, an example of non-inversion rarely comes alone, at least for those participants who produce more than just occasional examples of non-inversion. A non-inversion is often followed by several others, either immediately after or in the close vicinity of the first example. Correspondingly, if a participant changes to inverse word order, several examples of subject-verb inversion tend to follow. Two examples that illustrate this pattern clearly are examples 6.18 and 6.19 presented above. In example 6.18 Bushra (K28) produces a number of non-inversions, the first two already in line 1. In line 12-13 in the example (line 13 in the English translation) she changes to subject-verb inversion, which is followed by two more inversions before she once again produces a non-inversion (line 15 (line 16 in the English translation)). In example 6.19, Rana produces a few examples of non-inversion at the beginning of the example, but ends her first turn with a subject-verb inversion (line 3-4). After a brief interruption from her interlocutor, Rana then produces several more subject-verb inversions (line 6-7).

6.3.3.7 Identification with the multilingual area and the language variety/ies spoken there

Bushra (K28) and Ekmel (B05), the two participants who produced the largest number of non-inversions among the participants studied, share certain personality characteristics. They were both very outgoing and talkative, and they were both eager to take part in the project, Ekmel even more so than Bushra. In their different recordings, they did not seem inhibited by the recording situation. Both participants tended to take up a lot of space in the conversations in which they participated. They also had it in common that they repeatedly expressed positive attitudes towards the language varieties spoken in their respective local areas. In the background interview conducted with Ekmel (B05) at the outset of the project,
for example, he said that so-called “Rinkeby Swedish” or slang was his everyday language and the variety he used when speaking to his friends (see example 6.21). He also exemplified the situations one should or should not speak like this. Interestingly, during the account of his usage of ‘Rinkeby Swedish’, he produced a number of non-inversions (see also section 6.3.3.2, topic of conversation, for a discussion of this).

Example 6.21. Identification with the multilingual area and the varieties spoken there. [Ekmel (B05), background interview]

1. *B05: men rinkebysvenska de(t) e liksom mitt vardagsspråk asså # inte hemma då # [=! skratt] asså me(d) föräldrarna då du kan inte säga 
2. tillmorsan [...] me(d) mina kompisar de(t) beror på vart den personen bor nånstans # om de(t) e en tjej från Östermalm tror ru [: du] ja(g) ska snacka rinkebysvenska ey len gitta shoå sådära
4. *INT: ah okej men kompisar du umgås mest me(d)
5. *B05: då de(t) bli(r) typ slang för re [: det] mest [=XSV] # du vet de(t) # de(t) bli(r)
6. såhär # man uttrycker sej bättre då och eh # man det känns såhär bättre på nät sätt att kommunicera [...]
they both reported that most of their friends were from the same multilingual area as they were, and most of their friends were from a multilingual background. Judging by their syntactic behavior in the different contexts studied, Bushra and Ekmel considered more contexts appropriate for the use of non-inversion than most of their classmates. At the same time, they both showed an awareness of when to use youth language, and non-inversions, and when not to. There are contexts with both of them when they produced no, or very few, examples of non-inversion. For example, neither of them produced non-inversions in their written essays, and on the grammaticality judgment test both of them judged the sentences mostly according to standard Swedish norms for word order (see section 6.4).

6.3.3.8 Solidarity

As touched upon when speaking about high-involvement style above, the non-inversions tend to occur in contexts where participants try to create a stronger intimacy with their interlocutors and when they try to engage the listeners in something they are speaking about. For some of the participants, the use of non-inversion appears to be part of a linguistic strategy used to manifest an allegiance with the interlocutor(s)/listener(s). An illustrative example of this is Ekmel’s (B05) presentation. During the presentation, Ekmel (B05) and the two classmates Mehmet (B09) and Ismail (B16) spoke about refugees and immigration. As mentioned previously, Ekmel (B05) produced a very high number of non-inversions during his presentation compared to other participants (see section 6.2.2.5), and it is interesting to study his variable use of inversion and non-inversion throughout the presentation. Whereas most of his subject-verb inversions occur in passages of the presentation where Ekmel presents facts and where he follows a traditional form of school presentation\textsuperscript{64}, his non-inversions occur when he starts to improvise, when he gets more involved in something he is explaining or when he directly addresses someone in the class in order to clarify something or answer a question. The non-inversions are part of a complete change of speech style that takes place when Ekmel starts to speak more relaxed and faster. He starts using a lot of slang words and many examples of the including ‘you know’ (see Svensson, 2007, in prep., for functional uses of ‘you know’). This change of style is also seen in his body language\textsuperscript{65}. Among other things, Ekmel gesticulates more and keeps better eye contact with the audience. Now and then he also jokes around and ridicules the act of the presentation. Through his change of speech style, of which the production of non-inversion is one part, Ekmel manages to create a feeling of solidarity with his classmates. His rhetorical strategy makes the facts in the presentation more comprehensible and tangible to his classmates. The strategy is, perhaps, one means for Ekmel to show an allegiance with his school friends.

\textsuperscript{64} Traditional in the sense that it is the presentation format that most of the other participants follow (see chapter 4 for more details).

\textsuperscript{65} Most of the presentations were both audio- and video-recorded, which is why I have been able to analyze both of these in Ekmel’s presentation.
Through the change of speech style he also manages to get better attention from his classmates. They listen more carefully and ask more questions. By contrast, the speech style he uses during the parts of the presentation that follow a more traditional format is a means for him to simultaneously show that he masters the official school discourse. He manifests that he is aware of and knows how to use a different rhetoric to convey meaning during a presentation. In the more “traditional” passages of the presentation, Ekmel presents prepared facts without adding many opinions or comments of his own, and he produces very few non-inversions. The presentation is, however, dominated by his more relaxed presentation style. His changes in style in general, and the syntactic changes in particular are illustrated in examples 6.22 and 6.23. Example 6.22 begins when Ekmel presents a few prepared facts during which he produces two examples of subject-verb inversion. In line 5, he starts to lose track of what he wants to say and is, therefore, interrupted by his co-presenter Ismail (B16). When Ekmel (B05) continues after the short interruption, he uses a different speech style (see line 7). He now speaks faster and more relaxed, he produces a non-inversion, he turns directly to the listener with expressions such as förstår du hur jag menar ’do you know what I’m saying’, and du vet ’you know’. He also uses the slang expression går runt å softar ’take it easy’.

Example 6.22. Solidarity with peers. [Ekmel (B05), presentation]

1. *B05: <[>][=! harklar sig] # eh från och med eh artonhundfemti # till eh tvåtusen eh dom
2. hä+ under dessa årtal asså i hundrafemti år så ha(r) de(t) # kommit två komma sju
3. miljoner eh invandrare ti(II) Sverige [= XVS] # och eh av dessa ha(r) de(t)
4. utvandrat [= XVS] asså kommit stannat å så fortsatt vidare är [=! harklar sej] två
5. komma fem miljoner # så liksom Sverige har varit en plats eh
7. *B05: <[>][=! clears his throat] # eh from eh eighteenhundfifty # to eh two thousand eh
8. these+ during these years well for hundred and fifty years two point seven million
9. eh immigrants have come to Sweden [= XVS] # and eh of these it has emigrated
10. inte val(d) går runt å softar å sen dom fortsätter till ett annat land [= XSV] # förstår
du hu(r) ja(g) menar till exempel sähär # du vet en båthamn stannar lastar av nästa
du vet samma sak
11. *B05: <[>] [=! clears his throat] # eh from eh eighteenhundfifty # to eh two thousand eh
12. these+ during these years well for hundred and fifty years two point seven million
13. eh immigrants have come to Sweden [= XVS] # and eh of these it has emigrated
14. [= XVS] well come stayed and then continued on is [=! clears his throat] two point
five million # so Sweden has kind of been a place eh
15. *B16: <[>] xxx emigrants like a place for emigrants .
16. *B05: <[>] yeah yeah right well they come they stay # eat some food I don’t know what
17. take it easy and then they continue on to another country [= XSV] # do you know
18. what I’m saying for example like # you know a harbor stays unloads next you
19. know the same thing]

Later on in the presentation (see example 6.23), Ekmel speaks about gastarbeiders, and exemplifies this with how many Turks ended up in Sweden in the seventies. As he points out in the first line of the example, this is something that he claims to know about from personal experience since he is of Turkish origin. During his
declaration, he uses a very casual speech style and he produces several examples of non-inversion, but not a single example of subject-verb inversion.

Example 6.23. Solidarity with peers. [Ekmel (B05), presentation]

1. eh bland annat på sjuttitalet # asså ja(g) pratar för min del eftersom ja(g) e turk # på sjuttitalet
2. de(t) strömmade mycket(t) turkar hit ti(ll) Sverige på grund av att dom ville [= harklar sej]
3. tjänar pengar [= XSV] å sen ti(t)baka ti(t) hemmalandet asså åka ti(t)baka # men eh det(t) blev
4. inte så # det(t) blev inte så # för att eh # ah fem turkar kommer hit å ah dom tjänar å ah det(t) e
5. mycket(t) pengar va(d) händer då (d)om ba(ra) ah vi ta(r) me(d) oss frun # efter tre fyra år f+ eh
6. ba+ frun kommer [= XSV] å sen barnen kommer [= XSV] å sen det(t) kommer barn fran [= =
7. XSV] # ni vet # bra pengar å sen man fixar bostad [= XSV] å du vet man har(re) re [ det] bra å
8. va(d) händer å liksom man utvecklar sej ä sen det(t) kommer mera turkar [= XSV] # ä sen eh
9. de(t) blir ännu mer turkar [= XSV] och man bosätter sej och nu i dagens samhälle ni ser
10. ungefär tiotusen turkar i Sverige överallt splittrade [= XSV].

[1. eh for example in the seventies # well I’m speaking on my account since I’m a Turk # in the
2. seventies there were many Turks coming here to Sweden because they wanted to [=! clears his
3. throat] earn money [= XSV] and then back to the home country well go back # but eh it didn’t
4. turn out that way # it didn’t turn out that way # because eh # yeah five Turks come here and
5. well they earn and well it’s a lot of money what happens then they just ah let’s bring the wife #
6. after three four years w+ eh ch+ the wife comes [= XSV] and then the children come [= XSV]
7. and there are children coming [= XSV] # you know # good money and then you fix a place to
8. live [= XSV] and you know you’re doing well and what happens and your sort of develop and
9. then there are more Turks coming [= XSV] # and then eh there are even more Turks [= XSV]
10. and you settle down and now in today’s society you see about ten thousand Turks in Sweden
11. everywhere spread out [= XSV].]

Ekmel’s two co-presenters follow a much more traditional presentation style throughout the presentation. The two boys produce very few examples of non-inversion. It is, however, interesting that Mehmet (B09) produces one of his two non-inversions specifically when he addresses the class directly, when he wants the class to pay full attention to what he is saying. He requests for them to behave well when he introduces a guest whom they have invited to the presentation for a brief interview, and he threatens his classmates with consequences if they do not obey (see example 6.24). The request is produced with an example of non-inversion.

Example 6.24. Solidarity with peers. [Mehmet (B09), presentation]

hör ja(g) nån som skrattar ni åker ut
X = conditional sub. clause S V
‘if I hear somebody laughing you’ll be thrown out’

These examples typify how adolescents may employ different speech styles, of which the use of non-inversion is one part, in order to express their different allegiances with classmates, teachers, the official school discourse etc. (cf. Haglund, 2005; Jonsson, 2007; Werndin, in prep., for similar thoughts and examples).
6.3.3.9 Contestation

In some recordings, there were instances when participants tried to provoke the listener (i.e. the researchers) and show their resistance to being recorded and researched. For instance, in the group conversation between Ekmel (B05), Mehmet (B09) and Ismail (B16), which I have referred to various times before, there were moments when the boys showed a high awareness of being recorded and expressed opposition towards the situation. During parts of the recording, they made provocative remarks directed at some of the researchers, whom they knew would listen to what they said at a later date (see for example the last line of example 6.25). What is especially interesting is that these comments are loaded with non-inversions and slang words among other youth-oriented language features (in example 6.25, I have underlined the non-inversions produced, as well as italicized the slang words used). I argue that their provocation towards us was as much demonstrated in what they said as by how they said it. In example 6.25, the boys speak about whether one of the project members is likely to have sex or not with any of them. Whereas Ekmel (B05) initially says that he does not think she will “give” them anything, another boy from the class who joins the group, Murad (B18), claims that she will (and later in the conversation he also claims to have evidence of this). During the exchange between the boys, both Mehmet and Ekmel produce examples of non-inversion (see line 1-2, and line 12).

Example 6.25. Non-inversions as part of an act of contestation. [Ekmel (B05), Mehmet (B09) and Ismail (B16), group conversation]

1. *B09: asså det om vi baxa(r) hennes nummer # å sen vi ringe(r) henne [= XSV] å sen vi
2. kanske g+ kan bazz henne [= XSV].
3. *B05: vem ?
4. *B09:  den här XXX [% namn på projektmedlem].
5. *B05: ja(g) tro(r) inte hon ger len .
7. *B09: jo tro mej xx +/.
[...]
8. *B05: <[>] ey ey ey grabbar grabbar grabbar han som ga+ # han som gav # han som gav
9. henne # han som gav henne han e här kolla # kom len .
10. %com: flera skrattar.
11. *B05: kom bre va(d) giorde ni # shuno berätta [...] 
12. *B05: asså # nå(r) hon hö(r) det(r) här hon komme(r) spräckish oss [= XSV].

[1. *B09: well if we [baxar] [steal] her number # and then we call her [= XSV] and then
9. maybe we can [bazz] [fuck] her [= XSV].
3. *B05: who ?
4. *B09: this XXX [% name of project member].
5. *B05: I don’t think she gives [% gives sex] [len] [man].
7. *B09: yes believe me xx +/-.
[...]
8. *B05: ey ey ey guys guys the one that ga+ # the one that gave [= gave sex] # that gave
9. her # the one that gave her he’s here check it out # come [len] [man].
10. %com: several people laugh .
A similar example of contestation and protest is found in Åsa’s (L37) self-recording which was conducted together with Radmila (L28). In total, the girls produced very few occurrences of non-inversion; Åsa (L37) produced 4 examples of non-inversion (13%) and Radmila (L28) only one. However, one of Åsa’s non-inversions is produced when the girls are complaining about us researchers “forcing” them to take part in the project (example 6.26, line 4), and Radmila’s only non-inversion occurs a bit later when the girls start speaking about stealing the recording equipment (example 6.27, line 1).


1. *L28: va(d) xxx # xxx fatta(r) dom [: dom] inte att man inte vill .
2. *L37: xxx # # xxx .
3. *L28: <[>] mm xxx .
6. *L37: <[>] [=! nynnar] .
4. *L37: do you understand now nobody can [terror] [terrorize] me anymore [= XSV] # xxx .
6. *L37: <[>] [=! sings] .
8. *L28: <but how can they care enough to follow us> [?]
10. *L28: xxx that they’re not ashamed to come forward xx # xxx .
11. *L37: this one’s probably not even on # rec toc [...]]

Example 6.27. Non-inversions as part of an act of contestation. [Radmila (L28), self-recording]

1. å va(d) ska dom göra vi säger(r) xx vi glömde den här # å sen vi kommer(r) tillbaka va(r) fan e
2. ren [: den] men va(r) e ren [: den] # men va(d) va(d) e re [: det] me(d) re [: dej] ja(g) gø(r)
3. de(t) # ja(g) svår ja(g) xxx Åsa [= L37] vet du hu(r) mycket(t) den kostar # fem sex tusen .
[1. and what are they gonna do we say xx we say that we forgot it here # and then we come back
2. [= XSV] where the hell is it but where is it # but what’s wrong with you I’ll do it I swear I
3. xxx Åsa [= L37] do you know how much it costs # five six thousand .]

A different kind of contestation takes place in Ekmel’s (B05) presentation (see above) since he resists following the official school discourse that is expected of him in a presentation context. Both his language use and his behavior during the presentation challenge the expectations put on him as a presenter of a school
assignment, while he sometimes demonstrates that he also knows how to follow the “rules”. That Ekmel’s presentation has been understood as some form of contestation by the teacher of social sciences is also confirmed by the teacher’s comments following the presentation. Ekmel asks his teacher whether the presentation was good or not, where upon the teacher comments that it was both good and bad, but that the presentation did not work rhetorically speaking (see example 6.28). The teacher also asks Ekmel if they never practice rhetoric in Swedish class, and ends his argument by saying that they have to learn much more about oral presentation.

Example 6.28. Teacher’s comments on Ekmel’s (B05) presentation.

1. *B05: va(r) rec [: det] bra eller dåligt ?
2. *TEA: jo de(t) b+ va(r) ju både och men de(t) e ju ret+ retoriskt så klara(de) ni inte riktigt
3. eh # redovisningen # men läser inte ni svenska xxx fär(r) ni inte lära er hos XXX [= svensklärarens namn] hu(r) man ska göra .
4. [...] 5. *TEA: ni måste lära er mycket(t) mer om att framföra muntligt saker # xxx .

What I wish to show with the examples presented in this section is that the production of non-inversion may be one means by which adolescents express contestation. Through the use of non-inversion, their act of contestation can be manifested even on a syntactic level.

6.3.3.10 Staging a stereotype

In relation to the previous section on contestation, there are also occasions when participants’ abundant use of non-inversions appears to be part of an attempt to stage some sort of linguistic stereotype of speakers of multilingual youth varieties. For example, in the background interview with Ekmel (B05), which was referred to earlier, he repeatedly returned to the subject Rimkeby Swedish, despite not being asked to do so directly. He seemed to think that this was of main interest for the project, despite the other questions asked. While he spoke to the researcher he used a lot of slang words and many examples of non-inversion. There is something about both how he speaks and what he says during the interview that gives the impression that he was trying to provoke the interviewing researcher. Apart from the abundant use of non-inversions and slang during the interview, there are also other indications that Ekmel might be playing around with stereotypical images of male youths from multilingual suburbs. For example, he repeatedly refers to

---

66 An impression that has also been confirmed by the interviewer.
people, places, and things that he likes as being G (i.e. gangster, taken from gangster rap music), see example 6.29. He also acts out a stereotype of a heterosexual speaker of multilingual youth varieties when he strongly reacts to a question asked by the interviewer about whether he has a girlfriend or a boyfriend, and claims that there are no gays who speak ‘Rinkeby Swedish’ (see example 6.30) (cf. Jonsson, 2007; Werndin, in prep.).

Example 6.29. Staging a stereotype. [Ekmel (B05), background interview]

å rinkebysvenska de e asså de e G [% eng] språk förstå ru asså de e viktigt asså [...] vi kanske inte har grammatik men vi ska utveckla strax grammatiken också [...] [and Rinkeby Swedish it is you know it is a G [% gangster] language you know what I’m saying it’s important you know [...] we may not have grammar but we’ll soon develop the grammar as well [...]]

Example 6.30. Staging a stereotype. [Ekmel (B05), background interview].

å ni intervjuar bögar faan asså värsta skammet i rinkebysvenska det finns inga bögar som snackar rinkebysvenska . [and you interview gays damn the worst shame in Rinkeby Swedish there are no gays who speak Rinkeby Swedish]

It is possible that since Ekmel seemed to suspect that the project was mainly interested in what he calls *rinkebysvenska* ‘Rinkeby Swedish’, he tried to portray his stereotype of a typical speaker of ‘Rinkeby Swedish’ during the interview, in order to give us what we wanted. On the other hand, since Ekmel speaks about personal topics maybe it is his involvement in the matter he speaks about that triggers the use of the variety he normally uses when speaking about these topics (see topic of conversation and also high-involvement above; cf. Bell, 1984).

As mentioned earlier, in the group conversations the research team asked the participants to read and discuss the short story *Elixir* (Leiva Wenger, 2001), a story characterized by a language that deviates from standard Swedish in many ways (see chapter 4 for more details). The story also presents a somewhat stereotypical image of young boys from a multilingual suburb. Some of the comments given during the group conversations expressed participants’ worries that we, the researchers, actually believed that they were like and spoke like the characters in the short story. One question that they were asked to discuss was, for example, ‘do you identify yourself with this story’ (*känner du igen dig i berättelsen*). It does, therefore, not seem completely farfetched to think that some of the groups may have reacted to these supposed expectations by acting out stereotypes that they believed us to have of how youths from multilingual suburbs speak. At least this could have triggered them to use a more exaggerated form of the variety than they otherwise would have. This is something that I have speculated about, especially when analysing the group conversation between Ekmel (B05), Mehmet (B09) and Ismail (B16), which has been referred to repeatedly above, since this group produced so many non-inversions, so much slang, and so many provocations
towards the research team during their conversation compared to the other groups studied.

6.3.3.11 Summary of socio-pragmatic factors

The results of the qualitative analyses show that several different socio-pragmatic factors influence the variation between subject-verb inversion and non-inversion in this study. For example, different recording situations resulted in the production of different syntactic patterns. Whereas most participants produced at least some examples of (possible) non-inversion in the least directed situations, far fewer participants produced non-inversions in the more directed and formal situations. The results also show that participants produced more examples of non-inversion when interacting with peers than with adults. Participants tended to accommodate to each other syntactically. For instance, if one participant produced many non-inversions in a conversation, the other participants in the same conversation tended to produce examples of non-inversion as well, and the reverse was also found.

Other factors shown to possibly influence the variation between inversion and non-inversion were topic of conversation and gender, although further research is needed to clarify their importance and work out the relationship between the two factors and how they relate to other influencing factors. The production of subject-verb inversion and non-inversion was also affected by various pragmatic factors. For example, non-inversions were produced mainly in contexts characterized by high-involvement, when speakers enumerated a number of events taking place and when they were allowed to speak without being immediately interrupted.

Finally, at least for some of the participants the use of non-inversion appears to be an active linguistic resource sometimes employed to convey different kinds of meaning, for example to express identification with the multilingual setting, show solidarity with friends, stage stereotypical images, or contest official school discourses or the act of being researched. As argued further in chapter seven, these observations would benefit from being further substantiated with data that focuses specifically on the different processes through which adolescents may create meaning using syntactic variation.

6.4 Grammaticality Judgment Test (GJT)

6.4.1 Overview of the results on the GJT

The grammaticality judgment test used in this study investigated participants’ judgment of subject-verb inversion and non-inversion in main clauses and subordinate clauses (see chapter 4 for more details). An overview of the results of the GJT is given in table 6.35. The highest possible score given on the GJT was 32 (see chapter 5 for details on how this score was counted), and altogether nine participants (i.e. 7.1%) judged all the thirty-two test sentences completely accord-
Table 6.35. Overview of the results on the grammaticality judgment test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum score</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum score</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of participants*</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean score</td>
<td>28 (87.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of participants who received top score, 32 points</td>
<td>9 (7.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of participants who scored below the mean</td>
<td>32 (25.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The total number of participants includes everyone in the large sample (126) + focus participant Åsa (L37), who was the only focus participant who was not included in the large sample.

ing to standard Swedish norms for word order. Thirty-two participants (i.e. 25.2%) scored below the mean on the GJT (i.e. below 28, or 87.5%) and the lowest score received by any participant was 16, or 50%. On average, participants gave four examples of sentence judgments that diverge from the standard norm.

6.4.2 Sentences that received the most variable judgments

The average score received on the GJT by the participants is high, which means that for the most part the participants judged the test sentences as expected by standard Swedish norms for word order. They judged grammatical test sentences as ‘correct’ and ungrammatical test sentences as ‘incorrect’. However, there is also evidence of variation, and it is interesting to look at which sentences received the most variable judgments by the participants. Twelve of the thirty-two test sentences received judgments that diverge from standard Swedish word order norms by at least ten participants. These sentences are shown in table 6.36, where the number and proportion of participants that judged each sentence variably is specified (for a full list of the test sentences included in the GJT, see Appendix D).

As is apparent from this list, sentences that received variable judgments from the highest number of participants were all sentences that violate standard Swedish word order norms in different ways. The most common pattern found is that participants have accepted ungrammatical test sentences as ‘correct’ in addition to the grammatical counterpart of a pair. The participants are, thus, more accepting of variable word order than standard Swedish norms would suggest. Most of the ungrammatical test sentences that have been accepted as ‘correct’ are examples of violations of the V2-rule in main clauses. These are the same kind of examples that were found in oral and written production. It is interesting to see that most of the sentences that received variable judgments began either with the short clause-initial connective adverb *sen/sedan* ‘then’, a subordinate clause, or a prepositional

---

67 As mentioned in chapter 5, the scores on the GJT were counted in relation to the word order norms described for standard Swedish (e.g., SAG, 1999).
Table 6.36. Test sentences on the GJT that received variable judgments by at least ten participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Variable judgments received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>7a. *Du får sommarjobb hos oss om du kan arbeta hela sommaren.</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>13a. *De såg en film på bio och sedan de gick på restaurang.</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>14a. *Vi kan ta en snabb fika men sedan jag måste gå hem.</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>4a. *När man bor på landet man kan njuta av naturen.</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>15a. *Man vill spela elitfotboll i några år och sedan man vill prova på något annat.</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>9a. *Hon har klarat sig riktigt väl med tanke på att missade hon introduktionen.</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>1c. *I elva år han satt inläst på Kumlaängelset dömd för dråp.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>10a. *Eftersom tåget de skulle fara med till Sälen var inställt. familjen fick tillbringa lovet hemma istället</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>5a. *Då det är påsklov i skolan många familjer åker till Åre</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>11a. Om keramikkursen de anmält sig till starter först till hösten. eleverna måste välja ett annat alternativ</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>1a. *Igår jag tränade fotboll på Körsbärsdalens IP</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>2a. *Genom fönstret han kunde se hur flygplanet exploderade</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>12a. *När dataspelet han nyligen köpt slutade fungera. han insåg att butiken sält honom ett måndagsexemplar</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

phrase. These are the same clause-initial elements that were earlier shown to influence the use of non-inversion in oral production data (see section 6.3.2.1). The results of the GJT, hence, match the production data relatively well in this respect.

In table 6.36, there are two examples of subordinate clauses that display subject-verb inversion (test sentence 7a and 9a) that were judged as ‘correct’ by many participants, the former by the majority of participants. This contrasts sharply with production data where very few examples of subordinate clauses of this kind were produced with subject-verb inversion (see section 6.1.1.3 and 6.2.1.3). I have no really good explanation for why so many participants judged these sentences as correct. Perhaps their judgment of sentence 7a, that displays a conditional subordinate clause that begins with the subordinator om ‘if’ and is “incorrectly” followed by subject-verb inversion, is influenced by the fact that interrogative subordinate clauses beginning with the subordinator om ‘if’ are sometimes produced with subject-verb inversion typical of direct questions in spoken Swedish (e.g., Källström, 2000; SAG 4, 1999). And perhaps their judgment of sentence 9a is influenced by the fact that att-clauses frequently display main clause word order, despite the fact that the subordinator med tanke på
att ‘considering’ displayed in example 9a is normally not (see section 2.1 for more details on att-clauses). It cannot be excluded that there is something about these two sentences that makes the reader more prone to reading them the way they “should” be in standard Swedish than other test sentences, i.e. that they are read with SV-word order instead of the VS-word order they display. Some comments that I have received from colleagues indicate that this is what happened when they read sentence 7a at least.

Not a single test sentence was judged the same by all 127 participants, but there are several sentences that most participants have agreed on. These sentences are all grammatical test sentences that follow standard Swedish norms for word order in main clauses and subordinate clauses. There are instances where grammatical test sentences have been judged as ‘incorrect’, but only five participants, Abel (K02), Farhad (B02), Diram (B07), Murad (B18) and Omar (P10), judged more than one grammatical sentence as ‘incorrect’. Unfortunately, in most cases where a grammatical test sentence was judged as ‘incorrect’ it is impossible to know if participants have really reacted to the target structure since they did not mark what they found incorrect in the sentence, despite being asked to do so.

In a few rare examples participants judged the grammatical sentence of a pair as ‘incorrect’ whereas the ungrammatical counterpart was accepted as ‘correct’. Only two participants, Farhad (B02) and Abel (K02), made this sort of switch more than once, however. Test sentences, 5a and 5b (see Appendix D), may also be interesting to mention in this respect since it was the only sentence-pair that received a reverse judgment by more than two participants, i.e. there were three participants who judged the grammatical test sentence (5b) as ‘incorrect’ and the ungrammatical counterpart (5a) as ‘correct’. Unfortunately, none of the participants who did this marked whether it was the target structure or something else that bothered them with test sentence (5b).

6.4.3 Comparison of results for different groups of participants

Comparisons were made between the results on the GJT by different groups of participants. This was done in order to investigate the impact on the GJT of the same demographic factors that were studied for production data. First, it was explored whether the results on the GJT were influenced by participants’ location, i.e. whether there were any significant differences between the mean scores for participants from different cities (see table 6.37 for summary of results for the three cities) or different schools (see table 6.38 for summary of results for the different schools). Statistical analyses, using the non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis H Test, showed that the differences between the results for the three cities were not statistically significant \( H(2) = 0.585, p < .746 \) and the differences in scores for the different schools also failed to reach statistical significance \( H(7) = 5.010, p < .659 \). These results match what was found for the influence of location on the production data.
Table 6.37. Mean GJT-score for participants from the different cities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Mean score on the GJT (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Göteborg</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malmö</td>
<td>89.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.38. Mean GJT-score for participants from the different schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Mean score on the GJT (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bullerbysskolan</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Körsbärssskolan</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lönnebergaskolan</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platonskolan</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sokratesskolan</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypressskolan</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahliaiskolan</td>
<td>86.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekskolan</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relationship between the results on the GJT and different factors related to nativeness were also explored. For example, the relationship between reported age of onset of Swedish acquisition (AO) and the result on the GJT was investigated using a non-parametric Spearman’s rank order correlation. The results show that there is no significant correlation between the two variables \( r = -0.084, n = 127, p = .347 \). There is also no significant relationship between participants’ length of residence in Sweden (LOR) and their result on the GJT \( r = .005, n = 127, p = .955 \). Further, no significant differences are found between the results for participants who were born in Sweden and those who were born abroad \( Z = -0.502, p < .616 \), nor between participants with a multilingual background (\( N = 78; M = 0.878 \)) or a monolingual background \( N = 49, M = 0.908, Z = -0.727, p < .467 \).68

To conclude, the results of the statistical analyses show that none of the factors related to nativeness are able to explain the variation in results on the GJT. These results also match what was found for production data relatively well (see section 6.3.1.1).

Finally, the impact of sex on the results of the GJT was also explored. A non-parametric Mann-Whitney U Test shows that the female participants (\( N = 79; M = 0.906 \)) scored significantly higher on the GJT than male participants (\( N = 48, M = 0.863 \)) \( Z = -2.354, p < .05 \). The female participants judged the GJT sentences more according to standard Swedish norms than the male participants, and the boys were more likely than the girls to accept examples of non-inversion as
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68 The analyses were conducted with non-parametric Mann-Whitney U Tests.
correct. As reported earlier, a similar pattern was found in oral and written production, where the boys tended to produce slightly more examples of syntactic variation than female participants (see section 6.3.1.3).

To conclude, when comparisons were made between the scores on the GJT for different groups of participants, it was found that participants’ sex influenced the scores significantly, but no evidence was found for the influence of participants’ location or any factors related to the issue of nativeness. On the whole, the results of the GJT match the results found for the production data relatively well.

6.4.4 Results for individual participants and their correspondence with production data

It is also interesting to look at the GJT performance of individual participants and see how their results on the GJT correspond with their oral and written production (see Appendix E). In the retellings of the large sample, there were six participants who distinguished themselves from the others because they produced relatively many examples of non-inversion (see section 6.1.3). Interestingly, four of these six participants, Abel (K02), Farhad (B02), Kalifa (L26), and Murad (B18), are also among the ten participants who produced the highest number of variable judgments on the GJT, i.e. among the participants who received the lowest scores on the GJT. Ket (D43), one of two participants from Malmö who produced the largest proportion of (possible) non-inversion in her retelling, is also among the ten participants with the lowest scores on the GJT, as is Omar (P10), the participant who produced the largest proportion of non-inversions in the retellings from Göteborg. Hence, for these participants, as well as for some of the other participants, there appears to be a correspondence between their results on the GJT and their performance in the oral and written tasks included in this study.

Among the nine participants who received the highest possible score on the GJT, there is also a relatively good correspondence with their performance in the oral and written production contexts. Three focus participants are among the participants who received the top score; Anton (B01), Ismail (B16), and Daniella (K29). As explained earlier (section 6.2.3), Anton and Daniella produced no examples of non-inversion in the more directed oral production contexts but they both produced a few non-inversions each in the more informal contexts with friends. Ismail produced a few non-inversions in most production contexts, but like the other two he gave no variable judgments of word order on the GJT. None of the other participants who received the top score on the GJT produced more than one or a few examples of non-inversion in oral production.

At the same time, for some participants no correspondence is found between their GJT performance and their oral production. For example, Bushra (K28) and Ekmel (B05), the two participants with the highest number of non-inversions in oral production, both scored high on the GJT. Bushra judged all but four test sentences on the GJT completely according to standard Swedish norms for word order, and Ekmel all but one test sentence. The ungrammatical test sentences that
they accepted as correct on the GJT were the same kind of sentences that they sometimes produced in speech, i.e. examples of non-inversion produced after clause-initial adverbials, subordinate clauses, or prepositional phrases.

There were also other participants whose performance on the GJT did not match their oral performance. For example, focus participants Olof (K01) and Lisa (L29) produced no examples of clear non-inversion in the oral or written contexts studied, but on the GJT they both judged a number of ungrammatical test sentences as ‘correct’. In total, Olof (K01) accepted eight ungrammatical test sentences as ‘correct’ and Lisa (L29) six. In addition, Lisa also judged one grammatical test sentence as ‘incorrect’. Among the focus participants, only Abel (K02) and Kalifa (L26) received scores on the GJT lower than Olof and Lisa. Like many of the other participants, Olof (K01) comes from a multilingual background. His family is of Syrian origin and he speaks both Swedish and Syrian at home, he reports. Inside and outside school, most of Olof’s friends are of a multilingual background. One explanation for Olof’s result on the GJT as opposed to his language production might be that because he hears examples of variable syntax in the environment where he lives and goes to school, he may be prone to accept a variety of sentence constructions as correct despite not producing them. This is, of course, not specific for Olof, but could be an explanation of the variable judgments on the test in general among the participants in this study. Another kind of explanation came to my mind when I thought about the variable judgments produced by Lisa (L29). In contrast to Olof, Lisa (L29) is a girl who is of a monolingual background and she attended one of the less multilingual schools in the sample. Both in school and at home Lisa reported that she mostly hangs out with friends who are also of a monolingual background. Judging by the background interview and the observations made during data collection, the impression that I got of Lisa is that she tended to see herself as an open-minded, liberal, and unprejudiced individual. This impression is based on comments that Lisa made, her personal style, her way of dressing, and how she interacted with other people in her class. If Lisa saw herself as an accepting person, perhaps this could be reflected in her performance on the GJT. Although she did not produce non-inversions herself in the oral contexts studied, nor seemed to interact particularly much with people who might produce non-inversions in their speech, maybe she wished to express to us that in her opinion it is okay to use non-inversions, nothing that she finds incorrect or ‘wrong’ (which was the label used in the test, see chapter 4). Perhaps her understanding of the GJT was that she should give a personal judgment of the sentences rather than base her judgment on the understanding of what is grammatically correct. Of course, this explanation might also apply to Olof’s performance on the GJT, and several of the other participants’. Alternatively, Olof and Lisa’s performances on the GJT could be viewed as an act of protest of some kind. Whatever the case, these examples illustrate the difficulty of knowing what exactly it is that a person judges on a GJT, and how s/he understands the purpose of the judgment task (see also discussion of this complex
of problems in chapter 4). In multilingual environments like these, it also becomes apparent that it is impossible to know in relation to what norm participants make their judgments.

In conclusion, the results show a correspondence between the results on the GJT and the production of variable word order for some individuals, but not for others.

6.4.5 Summary of the grammaticality judgment test

The results of the grammaticality judgment test show that the majority of participants scored high on the GJT, i.e. for most part they judged the test sentences according to standard Swedish norms for word order. At the same time, interesting variation was also produced. For example, whereas some test sentences received variable judgments by many participants, almost all participants judged other sentences the same. The sentences that received the most variable judgments were all ungrammatical test sentences, and the majority were examples of non-inverted declarative clauses beginning with a non-subject (i.e. X-clauses). On the whole, the results of the GJT show that the participants in this study tend to be more accepting of word order variation than standard Swedish norms for word order would suggest. Participants sometimes accept both the ungrammatical and the grammatical test sentences of a pair as ‘correct’.

When comparing the results on the GJT for different groups of participants, the only significant difference found is between the results for female and male participants. The results show that the female participants scored significantly higher on the GJT than male participants, i.e. the females judged the GJT-sentences more according to standard Swedish word order norms. No significant evidence was found for the impact of location or different factors related to nativeness on the results of the GJT. Participants from the different cities or the different schools did not perform significantly different from each other. The score on the GJT was not significantly correlated with participants’ ages of onset of Swedish acquisition or their length of residence in Sweden. Participants born in Sweden or abroad or participants from a multilingual or a monolingual background also did not perform differently from each other on the GJT. These results taken together correspond relatively well with what was found for oral and written production among the same participants.

Finally, individual participants’ performances on the GJT were also explored and it was investigated how well their performance on the GJT corresponded with their oral and written production. Some participants showed a relatively consistent performance across different types of data. Some of the same participants who produced relatively many examples of (possible) non-inversion in oral production were among the participants who received the lowest scores on the GJT. However, for other participants no such correspondence could be found. Some of the participants who produced almost no variation in speech gave relatively many examples of sentence judgments that diverge from standard Swedish norms, whereas some
of the participants who produced many non-inversions in oral production judged
the test sentences on the GJT almost exclusively according to standard Swedish
norms.

The overall results on the GJT in this study stress the difficulty of knowing
what exactly it is that a person judges on a GJT, how s/he understands the purpose
of the judgment task, as well as the difficulty of knowing in relation to what norm
participants base their judgments.
Chapter Seven

Discussion of Findings

The most important findings made in chapter 6 are further developed, discussed and problematized in this section of the thesis. Based on the various issues that are raised, the chapter ends with implications of the findings and suggestions for future research.

7.1 Relatively infrequent use of word order variation in oral and written production

In this study I have investigated the use of variable subject-verb order among adolescents in different multilingual settings in Stockholm, Göteborg and Malmö. Although the study has looked at the production of word order variation in different types of clauses, the main focus has been on variation in the placement of the subject in relation to the finite verb in main declarative clauses that begin with a non-subject. As reported earlier, practically no word order variation was found in the production of \( \textit{wh} \)-questions (section 6.1.1.2 and 6.2.1.2), and the variation produced in subordinate clauses (see section 6.1.1.3 and 6.2.1.3) was of a kind that is commonly described in accounts of spoken and written Swedish. By contrast, the type of variation between subject-verb inversion and non-inversion observed in the production of main declarative clauses in this study is practically never mentioned as an option in descriptive grammars of Swedish. Instead, Swedish is commonly described as a typical V2-language, i.e. whenever something other than a subject begins a main clause, subject-verb inversion has to follow. 69 At the same time, it is well known that the use of non-inversion is common in learner language, and some researchers have claimed that the use of non-inversion is also typical of varieties of Swedish spoken among adolescents in multilingual settings, even when the speakers are not typical second language learners (e.g., Kotsinas, 1994, 1998; cf. Quist, 2000a, 2000b for Denmark).

69 As explained in section 2.1, descriptive grammars of Swedish (e.g., SAG, 1999) mention that non-inversion is optional after the adverbs \textit{kanske}, \textit{kanhända}, \textit{måhända} ‘maybe’, and two sources that I have found briefly indicate that examples of non-inversion may also occur sporadically in native Swedish after other clause-initial non-subjects, for example after clause-initial \textit{sen} ‘then’ (Bohnacker, 2004, 2006; Jörgensen, 1976).
Some of my initial expectations were confirmed by the results. I hypothesized that the variation produced would be influenced by the situational context; that the less directed contexts where adolescents had the opportunity to interact with peers would result in more word order variation than the more directed contexts. This is what was found (see section 6.2.2). Several of the focus participants whom I expected would produce many examples of non-inversion, based on observations made in class, for example Ekmel (B05), Bushra (K28) and Lillian (B36), met my expectations to a certain extent. Nevertheless, considering that Kotsinas’ (ibid.) early descriptions of language use among adolescents in multilingual settings in Stockholm indicated that the production of non-inversion was very common (see section 2.2 for more details), and since my first impression was that the use of non-inversion was relatively common among the participants studied (see section 7.2), I was surprised to find that so little variation was, in fact, produced when the data was analyzed in detail. As described in section 6.1, in the large sample only 4.6% of the X-clauses produced in the oral context, and 1.9% in the written, were produced with clear non-inversion. Non-inversions were comparatively more common in the focus sample, where more spontaneous data was included, but the total proportion of clear non-inversion did not pass 10.2% (see section 6.2).

In the large sample, the general pattern found was that participants followed standard subject-verb inversion almost all the time, although many of them produced sporadic examples of non-inversion. This finding may in part be due to the circumstance that the situations included in the large sample were not favorable for the production of non-inversion. As argued in chapters 1 and 4, I expected non-inversions to be produced mainly in spontaneous contexts, and no such contexts were included in the large sample. A few participants diverged from the general pattern of the large sample and produced relatively many examples of non-inversion in their retellings, but even these participants produced more inversions than non-inversions70 (see section 6.1.3).

In the focus sample, where a few situational contexts were added where the adolescents could interact with peers, the incidence of variation increased compared to the large sample. All the studied focus participants produced at least one example of (possible) non-inversion in at least one context. Similarly to the large sample, all focus participants produced more subject-verb inversions than non-inversions if the whole sample is considered, but there were a few occasions when a focus participant produced more non-inversions than subject-verb inversions (see for example Ekmel (B05), Mehmet (B09), and Ismail’s (B16) group conversation, section 6.3.3.1, table 6.34).

70 The only exception being Farhad (B02) (see section 6.1.3).
studied. When I first visited Bullerbyskolan in Stockholm, I thought I heard lots of examples of non-inversion being produced. A first run-through listening of the pilot-recordings and some of the retellings also gave me the impression that non-inversions occurred fairly often, at least in Bullerbyskolan. However, when I systematically started studying the syntactic patterns in detail, I noticed that non-inversions were much less common than I had first assumed. As mentioned above, Kotsinas’ articles (e.g., 1994, 1998) indicated that the use of non-inversion was very common among the adolescents she followed in her studies of so-called ‘Rinkeby Swedish’ in the 1980’s, but as argued earlier (see section 2.2) Kotsinas did not substantiate these claims with quantitative data, so it is uncertain what she meant by “very frequent”. Despite the fact that this type of syntactic variation has never been studied in detail before, many people presume that non-inversions are typical of the language varieties used by adolescents in multilingual areas. This is not least obvious from media accounts of language use in multilingual suburbs, and in literary attempts to illustrate multiethnic youth language (see Källström, 2005, 2006, for a discussion of the portrayal of multiethnic youth language in media and literature). This has also been obvious from many of the comments I have received about my thesis work at conferences and seminars. The results, thus, reveal a discrepancy between what was expected to be found based on informal observation and anecdotal evidence and what was found when empirical data was systematically analyzed. These findings underline the risks of relying on impressionistic data. My first reaction to the collected data indicates that even occasional examples of non-inversion can give the impression that speakers use a lot of non-inversion. Presumably, the extensive use of non-inversion by some individuals may occasionally also be generalized to speakers who do not use many non-inversions. Interestingly, Hyltenstam and Lindberg (1983) found a similar discrepancy between what they expected and what they found when they investigated the production of initial consonant clusters among Finish learners of Swedish as a second language (see also Arvaniti & Joseph, 1999; Ayoun, 2005). Whereas Hyltenstam and Lindberg’s first impression was that the Finish learners often deviated from the target language norm when producing initial consonant clusters, a closer analysis of the results showed that the learners in fact had very few problems with initial consonant clusters. The authors argue that their first impression was influenced both by the general assumption that Finish learners have problems with initial consonant clusters, and by the condition that this type of deviation seems to be particularly “ear-catching”. These two arguments can account for what was found in this study as well. The use of non-inversion appears to stand out, to be especially salient (e.g., Kerswill & Williams, 2002) and noticeable to the listener, and something that s/he gets easily hung up on. This is one reason why the use of non-inversion, like the use of slang, might be an efficient means to mark group identity.
7.3 Possible clause-contexts for subject-verb inversion

It is worthwhile to briefly discuss the findings regarding the proportion of clause-contexts for subject-verb inversion in the present study, i.e. the proportion of X-clauses. Earlier studies of spoken and written (non-learner) Swedish (e.g., Jörgensen, 1976; Håkansson, 1988, 1994; Håkansson & Nettelbladt, 1996; Westman, 1974) have argued that about 60% of all main declarative clauses are produced with the subject in first position and about 40% with clause-initial non-subjects (i.e. X-clauses), both in child language and in adult language (see section 2.1 for more details). In this study, the participants did not produce these high proportions of X-clauses in any of the contexts studied if we look at the group means (see table 6.1 and 6.9). The statistical analyses showed that the proportion of X-clauses varied significantly with the situational context. Fewer contexts for inversion were produced in the least directed contexts compared to the more directed contexts. The highest proportion of X-clauses was found in the written context in both samples, which differs from Jörgensen’s (1976) observation that higher proportions of X-clauses are found in spoken compared to written language production. However, as argued earlier, it is difficult to compare the results of the present study with results from earlier studies, not least since none of the earlier studies focus on adolescent language use. A comparison thus has to be made between adult language on the one hand and adolescent language on the other. Some researchers have argued that the proportion of X-clauses is the same in child language as in adult language (e.g., Håkansson, 1988, 1994), but there are no studies that can tell us whether lower proportions of X-clauses may characterize adolescent language in general or whether this is specific for the adolescents followed in this study. Also, none of the earlier studies include data from situational contexts that are as undirected as the self-recordings or group conversations of the present study, and it is possible that fewer contexts for inversion are typical for more spontaneous language use. As discussed in section 6.3.3.5-6.3.3.6, the proportion of X-clauses appears to be related to how continuous a conversation is; when the participants spoke without much hesitation and were allowed to speak without being interrupted by others they generally produced more contexts for inversion. In the self-recordings and group conversations participants often interrupted each other and no room was given for longer stretches of continuous talk, and this might explain why participants produced fewer X-clauses in these situations.

Regarding learning Swedish as a second language, Håkansson (e.g., 1992) has argued that few contexts for inversion may indicate that a speaker tries to avoid using subject-verb inversion, and although this does not result in any errors per se it gives the impression of non-idiomaticity, she claims. Most of the participants in the present study are not obvious second language learners of Swedish, but it is interesting to ask if it is possible that the proportion of X-clauses that a participant produces tells us something about her/his level in Swedish. If Håkansson (ibid.) is right about the non-idiomaticity in producing low proportions of X-clauses, this
also raises a number of questions that would be interesting to pursue in future studies, for example whether there is a minimum proportion of X-clauses that a speaker has to produce in order to pass for an idiomatic speaker, at what point one goes from being non-idiomatic to idiomatic, and whether this limit may possibly vary with the situational context in such a way that a higher tolerance is shown for low proportions of X-clauses in spontaneous speech compared to more formal speech.

The results of the analyses showed that there is no significant correlation between contexts for inversion and the production of non-inversion. Participants who produced few clause-contexts for subject-verb inversion did not necessarily produce more examples of non-inversion or vice versa. Also, no statistically significant relationship was found between participants’ proportion of X-clauses and different factors related to the issue of nativeness, i.e. it was not significant whether the participants had an early or late age of onset of Swedish acquisition, whether they were born in Sweden or whether they were of a multilingual or a monolingual background (see section 6.3.1.3). Intriguingly, however, the results showed that there is a significant relationship between sex and the proportion of contexts for inversion in the retellings. Male participants produced significantly fewer contexts for inversion on average than female participants. It is difficult to see why such a relationship should exist, but if we tentatively see the proportion of X-clauses as an indication of how standard-near or standard-distant a speaker’s language is, perhaps the female participants’ higher proportion of contexts for inversion is a sign of a more standard-near language use, which would be in line with what has been found in many variation studies (e.g., Labov, 2001; Eckert, 1997, 2005; Ellis, 1994). Alternatively, since continuous and cohesive talk seems to favor the production of X-clauses more than hesitant and scattered talk (see section 6.3.3.4–6.3.3.6) it is possible that the reason for the female participants’ production of more clause-contexts for inversion has to do with the observation that they were less hesitant in their retellings and needed less encouragement from the researcher to move their retellings forward than some of the male participants.

7.4 Variation in grammaticality judgment

In order to supplement production data, a metalinguistic task in the form of a grammaticality judgment test was conducted. The test asked for participants’ judgments about subject-verb inversion and non-inversion in main declarative clauses and subordinate clauses. The intention was to compare the results of the GJT with production data.

In accordance with the original hypotheses about which factors would determine the production of non-inversion, I predicted that the results on the GJT would correlate with participants’ reported AO, i.e. that participants with an earlier AO would judge test sentences more according to standard Swedish norms than participants with a later AO. I also predicted that participants from the more
multilingual schools would possibly give more variable judgments on the GJT than participants from the less multilingual schools.

The results showed that the majority of the studied participants were well acquainted with standard Swedish norms for subject-verb order, irrespective of whether they produced non-inversions in oral production. There were only a few instances where participants accepted the ungrammatical test sentence of a pair as ‘correct’ and judged the grammatical counterpart as ‘incorrect’,

which was something that I originally expected to find more examples of, at least among participants with a later reported AO. There was no correlation found between the results on the GJT and AO, or other factors related to the issue of nativeness. In fact, several of the participants with the highest AOs judged all, or almost all, of the test sentences in accordance with standard Swedish word order norms. However, because the GJT in this study involved quite simple structures it is possible that the results suffer from ceiling effects that may have contributed to the lack of support for AO effects (e.g., Abrahamsson & Hyltenstam, in press; Hyltenstam & Abrahamsson, 2003a; Long, 2005). As some recent research suggests, the span of different AOs in the present study may also be too narrow to capture possible AO effects (e.g., Abrahamsson & Hyltenstam, in press). The results on the GJT showed no evidence of a significant difference between participants from the more multilingual schools compared to participants from the less multilingual schools, nor between participants categorized as having a multilingual or a monolingual background (see section 3.3 for definition of these terms).

Despite the generally very high scores on the GJT, the results showed that participants were more accepting of word order variation than descriptions of standard Swedish norms for word order would suggest, which is in line with my expectations. Many participants accepted at least a few examples of non-inversion in addition to examples displaying subject-verb inversion.

To a certain extent, it was possible to see a correspondence between the results on the GJT and oral and written production. For the most part, the same type of sentences that were produced with non-inversion in the oral contexts received variable judgments by relatively many participants. For some participants, it was possible to see a correspondence between how they judged test sentences on the GJT and whether or not they produced non-inversions in speech. At the same time, some of the participants who produced relatively many non-inversions did not accept word order variation on the GJT, whereas several participants who produced no variation in speech gave relatively many GJT-judgments that diverge from standard Swedish word order norms (for possible explanations see section 6.4.4).

The findings point to the importance of considering a number of different factors when analyzing the results of a GJT. In particular, one has to question the norm participants base their judgments on (cf. Sorace (1996) and Philipsson

71 Only two participants did this more than once.
(2007) for use of GJT among second language learners), and although this applies to GJT usage in general it is even more important in a multilingual context and among adolescents. One has to question how the variable input that participants meet influences how they judge variation on a GJT. In the present study, irrespective of the participants’ family and language background, all of them meet variable input to different degrees in everyday life. All of them may also have different ideas or understandings about the importance of correctness, and possibly different expectations or tolerances for variation depending on the context. Because of these circumstances, one cannot assume a simple correspondence between how the participants perform in oral and written production and how they perform on a grammaticality judgment test. The findings of the present study clearly show that there is no simple relationship between the participants’ background, the variation they meet, the variation they produce, and the judgments they make on the GJT.

Despite these reservations, I think it was of value to include a metalinguistic task in this study since it added an interesting dimension to the results. It is important to know that participants such as, for example Bushra (K28) and Ekmel (B05) who produced relatively many examples of non-inversion, answered the sentences on the GJT mostly according to standard Swedish norms for word order, while participants like Olof (K01) and Lisa (L29), who basically produced no word order variation in any context, gave relatively many examples of variable judgments on the GJT. The results of the GJT support my claim that the production (and judgment) of non-inversion does not necessarily say anything about a speaker’s level in Swedish, in terms of her/his command of Swedish word order rules, in these multilingual contexts.

7.5 Variation in relation to linguistic factors

The production of non-inversion in relation to different linguistic factors was explored in section 6.3.2. The linguistic factors chosen for investigation were the same that have been found to be important in explaining variation between inversion and non-inversion in learner language. These were chosen since I initially hypothesized that the variation found in this study would be related to factors of nativeness or learner language. Despite the fact that most of the participants in this study are not obvious second language speakers of Swedish, and despite not finding very strong evidence for the influence of different factors related to nativeness on the production of non-inversion (see section 6.3.1.3), some of the same linguistic factors that determine the variation produced in learner language are able to explain the variation found in this study. For example, evidence was found for the influence of the clause-initial element on the variation between subject-verb inversion and non-inversion in main declarative clauses. As in learner language, participants in this study produced non-inversions in particular after clause-initial subordinate clauses, or after short adverbs, especially after the connective adverb sen ‘then’ (cf. Bolander, 1988a, 1988b for Swedish learner language; see also Kotsinas’ findings for ‘Rinkeby Swedish’, e.g., 1998). Very
few non-inversions were produced after clause-initial objects or predicative, and so-called tag-structures or verb-initial clauses (i.e. narrative inversions) were always produced with subject-verb inversion, which is similar to the pattern found in learner language (i.e. Bolander, 1988a, 1988b).

A possible reason why the construction sen-S-V is used so abundantly by some adolescents in multilingual settings when they employ an informal speech style among friends might be that this particular construction is frequent enough in the learner language varieties they meet in their surroundings for them to have noticed it and to have picked it up to use it as a marker, for example, of their identity as multilingual youths (see also 7.2 and 7.6). Maybe this structure, more than others, is salient (e.g., Kerswill & Williams, 2002) enough for speakers to be aware of it and to be able to more or less consciously manipulate their use of it.

Another possible explanation why clause-initial (å) sen ‘(and) then’ is followed by non-inversion so often in relation to other adverbials in this study, why it is so common in learner Swedish, and also why it is sporadically produced with non-inversion in standard spoken Swedish (see section 2.1.4.2), might be that sen often functions more like a coordinating conjunction like och ‘and’ rather than a connective adverb that indicates temporal succession in language production (cf. Abrahamsson & Bergman, 2005: 40, Bohnacker, 2006: 453). Unlike clause-initial connective adverbs, coordinating conjunctions are followed by canonical word order in Swedish. Alternatively, perhaps the use of clause-initial sen is influenced by the characteristics of the polysemous connective adverb så ‘so/then’ that has many different functions in Swedish and that requires subject-verb inversion in some contexts but not in others (see section 2.1 for more details about så-constructions).

The results showed that clause-initial subordinate clauses appear to favor the production of non-inversion among the participants studied (see section 6.3.2.1.2). This is similar to what has been found in studies of learner language (e.g., Bolander, 1988; Hagen, 1992). Interestingly, in contrast to what was found for non-inversion after clause-initial sen, almost all non-inversions after clause-initial subordinate clauses were produced by participants with a multilingual background, and several were produced by participants with a relatively late age of onset of Swedish acquisition. It is, therefore, tempting to speculate that non-inversions of this kind may be the result of some of the participants still being in the process of acquiring Swedish as a second language. The non-inversions produced after sen were produced by many of the studied participants irrespective of their language background.

Furthermore, the results of the linguistic analyses showed that the production of subject-verb inversion or non-inversion was influenced by the presence of topic placeholders. Fewer non-inversions were produced in contexts where a topic placeholder så (or sometimes då) was inserted immediately after the clause-initial adverb or subordinate clause (see section 6.3.2.1.3). In his thesis on the role of så-constructions in Swedish, Ekerot (1988) argued that så as a topic placeholder has
the purpose, among other things, to clarify the hierarchical relationship between
the different elements of a clause, and facilitate the understanding of complex
sentence constructions. The results here indicate that så as a topic placeholder also
flags for inversion, i.e. more clearly marks the need for subject-verb inversion to
follow (see also Svensson, 1999).

As reported in section 6.3.2.1.1, the connective adverbs sen and då were the
most common clause-initial elements of the X-clauses produced in the contexts
studied, particularly in the least directed contexts, i.e. in the self-recordings and
group conversations. According to Viberg (2001), a strong reliance on the
connective adverbs sen/så/då ‘then’, at the expense of other possible non-subjects,
tends to be characteristic of Swedish child language. By contrast, adults normally
use a more varied set of clause-initial elements (ibid.). Perhaps, as the results
indicate, a strong reliance on the three connective adverbs sen/så/då is also
persistent in adolescent language, at least in more informal spoken contexts. On
the other hand, it has to be remembered that the choice of the clause-initial
element was often connected to the task at hand in the present study. For example,
when participants were asked to retell a movie, this task required a high use of the
connective adverbs sen/så/då in order to keep the retellings moving forward.

In addition to the influence of the clause-initial element, it was explored
whether participants’ subject-verb order was influenced by the nature of the
subject and the finite verb, since these factors have been shown to be significant in
some studies of learner language (e.g., Bolander, 1988; Hagen, 1992). However,
there was no convincing evidence of the influence of these two variables on the
production of non-inversion in this study. It is unsurprising that not all of the
linguistic factors that determine learner language can be seen to influence the
variation in this study, since this study only marginally deals with obvious second
language learners (see also the following section) and since the adolescents in this
study employ non-inversion for different purposes. Basically, they do not use it
because they do not master the V2-rule. Even if my suggestion is correct that the
adolescents have picked up the use of non-inversion from learner language input,
they are unlikely to have picked up exactly the same usage patterns that these
structures have in learner language.

7.6 Variation and factors related to the issue of nativeness

Because the occurrence of non-inversion is known to be characteristic of learner
language, it would have been easy to assume that the occurrence of non-inversion
in the present study has its origin in learner language. The link to learner language
is supported by some of the findings. For example, as discussed in the previous
section some of the same linguistic factors that are known to influence subject-
verb order in learner language were found to influence the variation between
inversion and non-inversion in the present data. In the large sample, a small
positive correlation was also found between the production of non-inversion and
participants’ reported ages of onset of Swedish acquisition, i.e. higher proportions
of non-inversion were related to an increased age of onset. The direction of results also indicates that whether participants are of a multilingual or a monolingual background might influence the likeliness for them to produce non-inversions. However, it is important to clearly point out that the overall results suggest that the production of non-inversion cannot be reduced to a learner phenomenon in the present study. To begin with, most of the studied participants are not obvious second language learners (see also section 3.3). All the participants produced subject-verb inversion in a number of different linguistic contexts and all but one participant produced more inversions than non-inversions if all results are taken together. Irrespective of their linguistic background, there were many participants who produced sporadic examples of non-inversion in their oral production. These occasional examples of non-inversion were produced in all three cities and in all the studied schools, by participants with both a monolingual and a multilingual background, and by participants with all different reported ages of onset of Swedish acquisition. Most of the participants with the highest reported ages of onset produced no or very few examples of non-inversion, despite some of them displaying other second-language features in their language. For example Zora (E43), the participant with the highest age of onset (10 years) in the large sample, produced no examples at all of non-inversion.

In the most spontaneous oral contexts, some of the participants with a monolingual Swedish background produced more than just sporadic examples of non-inversion (see for example Anton (B01), section 6.2.3.2). This finding, together with the ones mentioned earlier, indicate that factors related to nativeness are not decisive for the production of non-inversion in this sample. At the same time, participants with the highest proportions of non-inversion in all the contexts studied are participants with a multilingual background, i.e. they have grown up with more than one language at home (see also section 3.3). All of them also live in multilingual settings and report that most of their close friends have a multilingual background. Interestingly, the monolingual participants who were noted to produce more than just occasional examples of non-inversion always did this in conversation with multilingual peers. To conclude, the sum of results shows that although factors related to nativeness are not unimportant for the results, they are not able to fully explain the variation found in this study.

For a few of the studied participants, it is, of course, possible that the use of non-inversion is partly the result of them still being in the process of acquiring Swedish as a second language (see also 7.5). For example, Kalifa (L26) who produced relatively many examples of non-inversion in her retelling and self-recording had one of the highest AOs, 9.5 years, in this study. Kalifa was also one of the participants with the highest number of variable judgments on the GJT. In addition to non-inversions, Kalifa’s language production was characterized by a number of other features that are often taken as typical of Swedish L2-learning, e.g., she sometimes left out subjects (förr att tittar på henne, literally ‘because looks at her’) or articles (jag måste hitta svenskalärare, literally ‘I have to find
teacher of Swedish’) vacillated in her choice of prepositions (hon började gå i den där disco, literally ‘she started going in that disco’) and gender (often choosing utter over neuter gender, den där disco instead of det där discot, both corresponding to English ‘that disco’), produced examples of incongruence in noun phrases (den där arbete instead of det där arbetet, Eng. ‘that work’), produced non-idiomatic expressions (många i klassen ska skolka bort för att det är ont om tid, literally ‘many in the class will cut away (classes) because there is not enough time’) and overused certain expressions. Like non-inversions, many of these so-called typical L2-features have, however, also been claimed by some researchers to be more or less conventionalized characteristics of multiethnic youth language varieties (e.g., Kotsinas, 1994, 1998, see also section 2.2). Like many of the other participants, Kalifa (L26) lives in a multilingual suburb and both inside and outside school she reported that she mostly hangs out with friends who have a multilingual background. One difficulty, therefore, is to know whether her use of non-inversion, and the other features mentioned above, is the result of her still being in the process of learning Swedish or whether it is the result of her using features of the multiethnic youth language varieties spoken around her. It is possible that Kalifa’s use of non-inversion is sometimes the result of the former but sometimes the result of the latter. Speaking for the latter is the fact that Kalifa’s performance shows that she masters the V2 rule in many different linguistic contexts. She mostly produces subject-verb inversion after clause-initial adverbials, subordinate clauses, objects and predicative. As for many of the participants, her non-inversions tend to occur mostly after a clause-initial sen ‘then’ or other short adverbials (see section 6.3.2.1.1). Like other participants, Kalifa’s use of non-inversion is also related to type of situation. She consistently produced subject-verb inversion after clause-initial non-subjects in her presentation and written text.72 and the non-inversions only occurred in more spontaneous contexts, which is the pattern found in the material in general.

Although there appears to be no direct link between second language acquisition and word order variation in the present study, learner language may still indirectly be a source for the variation produced. It may serve as an inspiration (cf. Jaspers, 2007). Most of the participants studied meet variable input both inside and outside school on a daily basis, and have done so ever since they started learning Swedish. They are likely to have met a lot of people in their environment that are second language speakers of Swedish at different stages in their development and who produce non-inversions as a result of their learner status. As argued in section 6.3.3, the adolescents’ use of word order variation may, therefore, be one resource they employ to show solidarity with the varieties of Swedish spoken by friends, family and people around them, and a resource used to manifest their identifica-

72 I was not able to get hold of a copy of Kalifa’s written national test in Swedish, so the written text referred to in Kalifa’s case is a text written as an assignment for Tingsell’s (2007) doctoral thesis. This text is shorter and more informal in nature than the Swedish national test (see Tingsell, 2007, for more details; see also section 4.2.1, footnote 17).
syntactic variation with the multilingual setting (cf. Kotsinas 1989, 1996; Fraurud & Bijvoet, 2004). The adolescents may also use non-inversions to distance themselves from standard Swedish norms and everything that this may represent.

7.7 Variation and gender

In studies of multiethnic youth language varieties, it has often been observed that boys tend to use such varieties to a larger extent than girls (e.g., Doran, 2000; 2001; 2004; Kotsinas, 1988a; 1988b; Quist, 2000a; 2000b; see also section 2.2). Some of the results in this study also indicate that the use of non-inversion might be linked in particular to male language use. In the large sample, the results show that male participants produced slightly more examples of non-inversion on average than female participants, although the difference between the groups did not reach statistical significance. As mentioned above (section 7.3, see also section 6.3.1.2) there was a significant difference between male and female participants in terms of the proportion of contexts they produced for inversion. Female participants produced more contexts for inversion than male participants. The results on the GJT also pointed to differences between male and female participants. Male participants produced more variable judgments than female participants, and the difference was statistically significant. The boys were more likely than the girls to accept examples of non-inversion as ‘correct’. At the same time, it is important to remember that participants of both sexes accepted examples of non-inversion as ‘correct’ on the GJT, and participants of both sexes produced non-inversions in all the oral contexts studied. Beyond this, two female participants, Bushra (K28) and Kalifa (L26), were among the four participants who produced the highest number of non-inversions in this study.

The results of the qualitative analyses support the impression that the use of non-inversion might be linked in particular to male language use. For example, whereas several of the male participants produced numerous non-inversions in their group conversations, none of the female participants did so in this context (see section 6.3.3.3). In the self-recordings, some of the girls who produced many non-inversions did so mainly in interaction with boys and not when speaking to female friends (see for example Lillian (B36) and Rana (L39) in section 6.3.3.3). These findings indicate that female and male participants in this study may have somewhat different opinions about where, when and with whom to use non-inversions, and there is a tendency for male participants to employ a more extensive use of non-inversion in the contexts studied (cf. Cheshire, 1982, 2002).

7.8 Variation and location

In the large sample, the results showed that non-inversions were produced to more or less the same extent in all three cities and in all different schools. At the same time, the participants who produced the highest proportions of non-inversion were all from Stockholm, which indicates that the use of non-inversion might be linked
in particular to this city. There were no equivalents of Bushra (K28) and Farhad (B02) in the data from Göteborg and Malmö (see section 6.1.3).

Since the focus sample only included participants from Stockholm, no comparisons can really be made with the other cities. Nonetheless, after listening to some of the self-recordings and group conversations from Göteborg and Malmö my impression is that none of the Göteborg and Malmö participants produce proportions of non-inversion equivalent to the Stockholm participants with the highest number of non-inversions. Of course, more in-depth analyses of these recordings are needed to confirm this impression, and as the discussion above revealed (see section 7.2) impressionistic observations of the occurrence of non-inversion are fragile and very much under the influence of the expectations one might have.

I initially thought the production of non-inversion would possibly be related to whether the schools were more or less multilingual. The statistical results of the large sample did not confirm this hypothesis, although the results pointed in this direction. It is possible that more differences would have been found between the schools if more spontaneous data with participants from all the different schools had been included for comparison. Some of the findings in the focus sample point to this possibility. For example, whereas none of the participants from Körsbärsskolan and Lönnebergaskolan produced non-inversions in the group conversations, several of the boys from Bullerbyskolan produced many examples of non-inversion in this context (see chapter 4 for information about the different schools).

One intriguing result presented in section 6.3.1.1 is that the production of possible non-inversions varied significantly between the three cities and between several of the participant schools. A larger proportion of the X-clauses produced in the Stockholm material were interpreted as possible instances of non-inversion than in the other two cities. It is in particular in the data from Bullerbyskolan and Körsbärsskolan that more X-clauses have been interpreted as examples of possible non-inversion. There are at least two different explanations for this. It may be so that participants from these two Stockholm schools produced more X-clauses that appeared as examples of non-inversion but that for different reasons, for example because they were interrupted by a pause or accompanied by an intonational pattern that indicated a possible restart, were considered unsure examples of non-inversion. This being the case, these results would point towards slightly more variation being produced in the more multilingual schools compared to the less multilingual schools, at least in Stockholm. But there is also the risk that I, the researcher, was biased by my assumption that participants from the more multilingual schools would produce more variation and as a result interpreted more examples produced in these schools as possible cases of non-inversion. Perhaps the same types of examples produced by participants from the less multilingual schools were not even interpreted as X-clauses. As discussed above (section 7.2) my first impression of the production of X-clauses in, for example, Bullerbyskolan was colored by my expectation that I would find many examples of non-inversion.
However, it is important to point out that I have listened through all the recordings many times and most of the same examples remain unsure examples of non-inversion from one listening to another.

7.9 Variation and socio-pragmatic factors

As the results of the qualitative analyses showed, participants’ production of non-inversion was favored and disfavored by a number of socio-pragmatic factors. Participants produced most non-inversions in conversation with peers, when they were highly involved in what they spoke about and when they were allowed to speak continuously for a period of time. These observations indicate that the use of non-inversion is part of some participants’ more casual language repertoire in certain contexts (cf. Labov 1972a). The finding that the production of non-inversion is sensitive to the interlocutor(s) and other people present is in line with what is predicted by theories of speech-accommodation (e.g., Beebe & Giles, 1984; Giles & Powesland, 1975; Giles, Coupland, N. & Coupland, J., 1991; Thakerar et al., 1982) and audience design (Bell, 1984). More importantly, however, it was shown that the use of non-inversion is not merely a response to external changes in the context. Some of the adolescents studied employ non-inversions for communicative purposes, as an active linguistic resource to convey different kinds of meaning; for example to express their identification with the multilingual setting and the varieties of Swedish spoken there, to show solidarity with peers and family, to contest standard language norms or official school discourses, etc. In future studies of word order variation, I think this is where most research is needed. The observations made in this study about the influence of different sociolinguistic factors would benefit from being followed up by ethnographic observations. It would be interesting and fruitful to attempt to link these language practices to processes taking place on a macro level (cf. Haglund, 2005), i.e. attempt to tie the use of variation to a larger social context. It would also be interesting to try to explore the adolescents’ use of non-inversion in relation to their membership of different groups, depending on their interests, habits, style, etc., in a similar fashion to what has been done in some recent variation studies (e.g., Bucholtz, 1999; Eckert, 1989, 2000; Quist, 2005; Gunnarsdotter Grönberg, 2004). We would then be able to better understand the different meanings attached to the use of non-inversion among adolescents in multilingual settings in Sweden today.

7.10 Implications

The sum of results indicate that the use of non-inversion may not be as common among adolescents in contemporary multilingual settings as is often assumed, at least not in most situational contexts, and at least not among adolescents of this age. At the same time, the results show that non-inversions are part of some adolescents’ linguistic repertoires, and that they employ non-inversions to
different extents in different contexts in order to convey different kinds of meaning.

The influence of many different factors on the production of word order variation was explored in this study, and as demonstrated by both the quantitative and the qualitative analyses several of these variables were shown to have an effect on the variable production of subject-verb inversion and non-inversion in main declarative clauses. However, none of the factors studied can alone explain the variation found. The variation cannot be reduced to only one or a few influencing factors. Instead, a complex combination of demographic, linguistic, and socio-pragmatic factors co-vary in intricate ways to influence the variation produced (cf. Bayley, 1994, 2002; Schilling-Estes, 2002; Young, 1991). Although the results show that some factors related to the issue of nativeness might influence whether or not the participants produce non-inversions, I argue that the use of non-inversion does not say anything about a participants’ level in Swedish or her/his ability to use subject-verb inversion in this study. All the participants studied, irrespective of their language background, know how to use subject-verb inversion and everyone produces subject-verb inversion in a number of different linguistic and situational contexts. In the data, many participants produced sporadic examples of non-inversion but only a few participants produced many examples of non-inversion. The findings indicate that the adolescents have a conception of when, where and with whom it is appropriate to use non-inversions.

It is interesting that many of Tingsell’s (2007) results in relation to the influence of different demographic factors are similar to mine (see also section 6.3.1.3). She studied variation and anaphoric binding among the same adolescents that took part in this study and similarly to my results she found that variation was used relatively sparingly in the studied population, and only in specific linguistic contexts. Regarding the influence of location she saw the tendency for the variation in her study to be linked in particular to Stockholm. The Stockholm participants produced more variation than participants from the other two cities and more participants from this city produced various examples that diverged from the norm, which is the same tendency found in this study (see section 7.8). Tingsell’s results also indicate that adolescents’ with a multilingual background produced more variation than participants with a monolingual Swedish background73, although variation was found in both groups. In addition, Tingsell did not find strong evidence for the influence of the more or less multilingual nature of the schools on her participants’ production of variation, which is also in line with the results in this study. Finally, Tingsell’s results showed a tendency for the female participants to vary less from standard Swedish norms than male participants, which, as argued in section 7.7, is what is found here as well. In several ways, our results are, thus, parallel as regards the influence of different demographic factors on the variation produced. However, unlike the use of non-

---

73 Tingsell’s (2007) definition of multilingual and monolingual is more or less the same as my definition (see section 3.3).
inversion, the variation Tingsell (ibid.) studies is not “ear-catching” or stigmatised (cf. Boyd & Fraurud, forthc.) and her results indicate that the adolescents’ variation in the production of anaphoric binding does not seem to have any symbolic value for them (p. 189). Tingsell is also able to show that the variation produced quite possibly represents a linguistic change in progress, which is not something that is argued here with regard to non-inversion. Further, Tingsell only includes relatively directed data types, so we do not know how the adolescents would perform in more spontaneous contexts. Her results show that the adolescents produce slightly more variation in the written data compared to the spoken data, which is the opposite of the pattern found in this study.

This study has not been able to fully answer the question of whether or not non-inversions are a conventionalized characteristic of multiethnic youth language varieties in Sweden. For some participants, in certain contexts, this appears to be the case. However, at this point I have started to doubt the importance of answering this question at all. Had I formulated the aim of the thesis today, I think I would have moved the focus away from the discussion of multiethnic youth language varieties and concentrated only on the issue of syntactic variation among adolescents in different settings in general, and the different purposes syntactic variation may have for them. The aim of my thesis was formulated at the outset of the study and it was influenced by the naive assumption that many of us within the larger project Language and language use among adolescents in multilingual settings initially had, namely that we would somehow be able to go out and find multiethnic youth language varieties and be able to describe their different characteristics (Bijvoet et al., 2001). When faced with reality, we realized that this is an unattainable task and that our descriptions of the variety/ies could never be taken as direct reproductions of linguistic reality (cf. Bijvoet & Fraurud, forthc.; Jaspers, 2007).

7.11 Future research

As my discussion in relation to variation and socio-pragmatic factors indicates, in the future it would be interesting to be able to supplement the findings in this study with ethnographic research of how adolescents employ word order variation to convey different kinds of meanings, how they do this differently in different situations with different people, and how their use of variation may reflect the power relations and struggles that surround them and that they themselves are part of (cf. Haglund, 2005). These issues could be explored through participant observations of a smaller group of speakers, who are known to produce non-inversions in at least some contexts, and who are followed around for a longer period of time in a number of contexts both inside and outside school.

It would be valuable to be able to investigate how speakers’ use of word order variation may change over time, across their entire lifespan. Based on Kotsinas’ earlier findings (e.g., 1994; 1998), it seems possible that some of the participants in this study might have employed a more extensive use of non-inversion when
they were younger, before they entered upper secondary school. It would be interesting to find out what happens to the participants' language use as they enter adulthood. Will participants like Bushra (K28) and Ekmel (B05) continue to employ non-inversions extensively in certain contexts when they reach age thirty or forty? And how will their use of non-inversion in relation to different contextual variables change over time? Naturally, the use of non-inversion is non-static and the participants are not locked into fixed patterns of language use throughout their lives. Ideally, one should try to explore these transitional changes in language use from childhood to adolescence to adulthood in a longitudinal study of a group of individuals who live and grow up in a multilingual urban setting.

In addition, as the discussion in sections 6.3.3.2 and 6.3.3.3 indicates, it would be interesting to do more controlled studies of the use of word order variation in relation to certain variables, for example sex/gender and topic of conversation. These two variables appeared to play a part in the production of non-inversion in this study, but since the variables were confounded with other variables it was difficult to estimate their importance for the variation produced.

Throughout my thesis work it has become more and more apparent how little we know about the nature and extent of the Swedish input that was available to our participants at the time they started learning Swedish, especially for those who grew up in highly multilingual environments. We also have limited knowledge about the nature of Swedish input that the adolescents meet in different contexts of their current daily lives. In order to be able to speculate about the short term and long term effects that the variable input received might have, for example, on the development of their morphosyntactic system (e.g., Hudson Kam & Newport, 2005; Miller, 2007; Miller & Schmitt, 2006, submitted; Ross & Newport, 1996; Smith, Durham & Fortune, 2007; Vasilyeva, Huttenlocher & Waterfall, 2006), we first need to know more about these circumstances. Relatively few studies have examined the effect of inconsistent or variable vs. consistent input on language acquisition, so research within this field is relevant to pursue (e.g., Miller & Schmitt, 2006, submitted).

Finally, it would be of interest to find out more about how conscious the adolescents are about the word order variations they produce and to what extent they are able to consciously manipulate their use of these structures. The observations made in this study of the adolescents’ usage of non-inversion as an active resource indicate relatively high levels of consciousness, and this impression is also supported by the fact that many attempts by media to stylize multiethnic youth language, as well as literary attempts to illustrate the language use of multilingual youths often involve the use of non-inversion (e.g., Källström, 2005, 2006), but much more research is needed to investigate this issue. Relevant in this line of research is Bijvoet and Fraurud’s (personal communication) ongoing research project “Sociolinguistic awareness and language attitudes in multilingual contexts” that investigates how different groups of people perceive, understand and react to different varieties of Swedish.
Sammanfattning på svenska


Den aktuella avhandlingenens syfte är att undersöka hur vanlig denna variation mellan rak respektive omvänd ordföljd är bland ungdor i några flerspråkiga områden i Stockholm, Göteborg och Malmö. Fokus ligger på den variation som produceras i deklarativa huvudsatser, men undersökningen redogör också kortfattat för ordföljden mellan subjektet och det finita verbet i frågesatser och i underordnade satser. I studien jämförs olika grupper av talare för att bland annat ta reda på om det finns några skillnader/likheter i variationen mellan skilda städer och skolor eller mellan manliga och kvinnliga deltagare. I studien undersöks också om det finns något samband mellan ungdornas användning av rak ordföljd och i vilken ålder de påbörjat inlärningen av svenska. Om användningen av rak ordföljd hänger samman med att man har svenska som andraspråk skulle man kunna anta att de ungdor som lärt sig svenska i högre åldrar producerar mer variation än de som lärt sig svenska i lägre åldrar. Utöver detta görs också en analys av om huruvida och i så fall på vilket sätt olika språkinterna och sociopragmatiska faktorer kan tänkas påverka användningen av rak respektive omvänd ordföljd bland de studerade ungdorna. Avhandlingen försöker alltså att redogöra för hur olika demografiska, lingvistiska och sociopragmatiska variabler samtidigt kan tänkas påverka användningen av rak och omvänd ordföljd i olika kontexter.
Den aktuella studien ingår som en del i ett större forskningsprojekt *Språk och språkbruk bland ungdomar i flerspråkiga storstadsmiljöer* (Bijvoet et al., 2001), med syftet att beskriva, analysera och förklara olika varieteter av svenska som talas av ungdomar i flerspråkiga storstadsområden i Sverige.


Eftersom rak ordföljd är vanligt förekommande i svenska som andraspråk var det lätt att tro att undersökningen skulle visa ett tydligt samband mellan bruket av rak ordföljd och det faktum att relativt många av deltagarna hade svenska som sitt andraspråk. Resultaten visar dock att användningen av rak ordföljd i den aktuella studien långt ifrån kan reduceras till ett andraspråkssfenomen. Det finns ett svagt
statistiskt signifikant samband mellan användningen av rak ordföljd och deltagarnas ålder för påbörjad inlärning av svenska, det vill säga deras "startålder". Samtidigt är det flera av dem som lärt sig svenska i relativt sen ålder (efter sex års ålder) som inte producerar några raka ordföljder alls medan vissa av dem som lärt sig svenska tidigt producerar relativt många exempel på rak ordföljd. En statistisk analys av betydelsen av deltagarnas bakgrund som en- eller flerspråkiga visar att sambandet mellan ungdomarnas språkliga bakgrund och deras produktion av raka ordföljder är icke-signifikant, även om riktningen på resultaten är som förväntat, det vill säga att något fler raka ordföljder produceras av deltagare med en flerspråkig bakgrund jämfört med deltagare med en enspråkig bakgrund (se avsnitt 3.3 för en diskussion av hur begreppen en- och flerspråkig används i den aktuella studien). Flera deltagare med en enspråkig bakgrund producerar exempel på rak ordföljd, men den kvalitativa analysen av fokussamlingen tyder på att de enspråkiga deltagarna framförallt använder rak ordföljd när de samtalar med flerspråkiga vänner.

Resultaten från både de kvantitativa och de kvalitativa analyserna visar att raka ordföljder produceras både av kvinnliga och av manliga deltagare i studien. Det finns dock en viss antydning om att killarna använder rak ordföljd i större utsträckning än tjejer och eventuellt även i en vidare bemärkelse. Samtidigt är det viktigt att påpeka att två av deltagarna med flest exempel på rak ordföljd i studien är tjejer.

Analysen visar att den lingvistiska kontexten inverkar på bruket av rak respektive omvänd ordföljd. En viktig faktor visar sig vara typen av satsinledande element. Rak ordföljd är vanligare efter en inledande bisats eller efter ett inledande adverbial, särskilt om det rör sig om de konnektiva adverbena sen eller då, än till exempel efter ett inledande objekt eller predikativ. Resultaten visar dock att varken typen av subjekt eller finit verb i satsen i någon högre grad tycks påverka användningen av rak och omvänd ordföljd bland de studerade ungdomarna.


Trots att de sammantagna resultaten visar på en relativt begränsad användning av rak ordföljd finns det vissa undantag. Det finns några deltagare som är flitiga
användande av rak ordföljd, åtminstone i vissa situationer. Den kvalitativa analysen av materialet visar att användningen av rak ordföljd verkar fungera som en aktiv språklig resurs som vissa av ungdomarna använder sig av för att bland annat uttrycka sin identifikation med det flerspråkiga området och de olika sätt att tala svenska som karakteriserar det. I vissa fall verkar bruket av rak ordföljd också vara förknippat med att ungdomarna vill visa solidaritet med sina klasskamrater, uttrycka ett motstånd mot något i klassrumssituationen eller mot att bli ”forskad” på. Det kan ibland också tolkas som att de leker med olika stereotypier om hur ungdomar i flerspråkiga miljöer pratar och är.

Resultaten visar att ungdomarna i samtal ackommoderar varandra syntaktiskt. Om en talare använder sig av många raka ordföljder så tenderar detta med andra ord att påverka övriga deltagare till att också använda sig av rak ordföljd och vice versa. Fler kontexter för inversion och fler exempel på rak ordföljd produceras när talaren är starkt involverad i det hon/han talar om och samtidigt tillåts prata en längre stund utan att bli avbruten. Särskilt många raka ordföljder produceras i kontexter där talare räknar upp en rad olika händelser, ofta inledda med ett satss-

sen

initialt sen eller då.

I slutdiskussionen summeras resultaten och sätts in i ett större sammanhang. Möjliga förklaringar till att resultaten ser ut som de gör lyfts fram och diskuteras. Bland annat påpekas det att användningen av rak ordföljd verkar vara en del av vissa talares mer spontana språkbruk i vissa situationer, det vill säga det som i traditionell variationsforskning ofta kallas talaras ”vernacular language” (Labov, 1972a). Resultaten visar emellertid att detta inte räcker för att förklara användningen av rak ordföljd bland de studerade ungdomarna. För vissa av dem fungerar ordföljdsvariationen som en aktiv språklig resurs som de använder sig av för att uttrycka olika typer av betydelser. Avhandlingen avslutas med att de delar av studien som skulle vara intressanta att följa upp med fortsatt forskning lyfts fram. Där framhålls särskilt att det vore intressant att i en framtida studie lägga tonvikten på hur ungdomarna i olika sammanhang använder ordföljdsvariation för att skapa betydelse samt att försöka sätta in användningen av denna i en större social kontext.
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### Appendix A

**Overview of the large sample. Selected information about each participant based on the background interviews and the data types included in the large sample.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>AO</th>
<th>LOR</th>
<th>Born in Sweden?</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Retelling</th>
<th>Written</th>
<th>GIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B01</td>
<td>Anton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B02</td>
<td>Farhad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sw, Bal, Eng, Per</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B05</td>
<td>Ekmel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sw, Tur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B07</td>
<td>Diram</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sw, Arm, Per</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B09</td>
<td>Mehmet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sw, Kur, Tur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sw, Teg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13</td>
<td>Roshan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sw, Fin, Per</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14</td>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Eliot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sw, Arm, Ara</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B16</td>
<td>Ismail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sw, Tur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B17</td>
<td>Kostas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sw, Gre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B18</td>
<td>Murad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sw, Ara</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B25</td>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sw, Teg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B27</td>
<td>Moa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B29</td>
<td>Riya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sw, Hin, Urd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B30</td>
<td>Dinha</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sw, Teg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B33</td>
<td>Dorota</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sw, Pol</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B32</td>
<td>Klara</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B33</td>
<td>Aisha</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sw, Ara</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B34</td>
<td>Alicia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sw, Spa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B35</td>
<td>Anette</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sw, Spa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B36</td>
<td>Lillian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sw, Syr, Ara</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K01</td>
<td>Olof</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sw, Syr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K02</td>
<td>Abel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sw, Syr, Ara, Tur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K03</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sw, Ara, Syr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K08</td>
<td>Ashur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sw, Syr, Ara</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K27</td>
<td>Fawza</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sw, Ara</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K28</td>
<td>Bushra</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sw, Ara</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K29</td>
<td>Daniella</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sw, Eng, Per, Tag</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K33</td>
<td>Leah</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sw, Syr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K35</td>
<td>Zada</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sw, Syr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K36</td>
<td>Parwin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sw, Urd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L01</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L02</td>
<td>Mats</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L03</td>
<td>Hampus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L08</td>
<td>Åke</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10</td>
<td>Malte</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L11</td>
<td>Alfred</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L25</td>
<td>Malin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L26</td>
<td>Kalifa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sw, Som</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Language(s)</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Additional Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L27</td>
<td>Fanny</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L28</td>
<td>Radmila</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sw, Ser</td>
<td>Sw, Ser</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L29</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L31</td>
<td>Gelareh</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Sw, Per</td>
<td>Sw, Per</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L32</td>
<td>Freja</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L33</td>
<td>Helena</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sw (Gre)</td>
<td>Sw (Gre)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L34</td>
<td>Doris</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L35</td>
<td>Elsa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L36</td>
<td>Jemila</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sw, Som</td>
<td>Sw, Som</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L38</td>
<td>Jonas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L39</td>
<td>Rana</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sw, Per</td>
<td>Sw, Per</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L40</td>
<td>Natasha</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sw, Ser</td>
<td>Sw, Ser</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L41</td>
<td>Agnes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L42</td>
<td>Lucia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sw, Por</td>
<td>Sw, Por</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L43</td>
<td>Semra</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sw, Tur</td>
<td>Sw, Tur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L44</td>
<td>Eva</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L45</td>
<td>Samna</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>Omar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sw, Syr</td>
<td>Sw, Syr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td>Karim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sw, Ara, Kur, Per</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P19</td>
<td>Izhbar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sw, Arm, Per</td>
<td>Sw, Arm, Per</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P26</td>
<td>Ida</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sw, Cro</td>
<td>Sw, Cro</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P28</td>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P29</td>
<td>Nadira</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sw, Per</td>
<td>Sw, Per</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P31</td>
<td>Alisha</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sw, Ara</td>
<td>Sw, Ara</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P47</td>
<td>Cornelia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P49</td>
<td>Shakira</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sw, Ara, Syr</td>
<td>Sw, Ara, Syr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S08</td>
<td>Tommy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sw (Tag)</td>
<td>Sw (Tag)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>Jakob</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>Axel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S18</td>
<td>Jonas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S23</td>
<td>Azad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sw, Kur, Per</td>
<td>Sw, Kur, Per</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S29</td>
<td>Ebba</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S30</td>
<td>Tara</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sw, Syr</td>
<td>Sw, Syr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S32</td>
<td>Alva</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S37</td>
<td>Siri</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S40</td>
<td>Alexandra</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sw, Bos</td>
<td>Sw, Bos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S41</td>
<td>Saga</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sw, Nor</td>
<td>Sw, Nor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S47</td>
<td>Olivia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S49</td>
<td>Tea</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sw, Syr</td>
<td>Sw, Syr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C01</td>
<td>Zafer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sw, Ara</td>
<td>Sw, Ara</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C04</td>
<td>Evert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C06</td>
<td>Thorleif</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sw, Dan</td>
<td>Sw, Dan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C08</td>
<td>Otto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>Carlos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sw, Spa</td>
<td>Sw, Spa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C18</td>
<td>Algott</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C28</td>
<td>Gorda</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sw, Bos</td>
<td>Sw, Bos</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C29</td>
<td>Safa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sw, Ara</td>
<td>Sw, Ara</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C31</td>
<td>Pannie</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sw, Per</td>
<td>Sw, Per</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C35</td>
<td>Nour</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sw, Per</td>
<td>Sw, Per</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D01</td>
<td>Lars</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D02</td>
<td>Valdemar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D07</td>
<td>Hans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D09</td>
<td>Aron</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sw, Eng</td>
<td>Sw, Eng</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D26</td>
<td>Marre</td>
<td>2 6 12 2</td>
<td>Sw, Pas, Urd</td>
<td>3 7 + + +</td>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>Bullerbyskolan</td>
<td>Retellings, Written essays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D31</td>
<td>Titzia</td>
<td>2 1 18 1</td>
<td>Sw, Alb, Tur</td>
<td>3 7 + + +</td>
<td>Göteborg</td>
<td>Körsbärsskolan</td>
<td>Grammaticality judgment test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D32</td>
<td>Kristina</td>
<td>2 0 18 1</td>
<td>Sw, Rys</td>
<td>3 7 + + +</td>
<td>Malmö</td>
<td>Lönnebergaskolan</td>
<td>Self-recordings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D35</td>
<td>Nelija</td>
<td>2 3 19 1</td>
<td>Sw, Ser</td>
<td>3 7 + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D37</td>
<td>Ragnhild</td>
<td>2 0 18 1</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>3 7 + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D38</td>
<td>Kathinka</td>
<td>2 2.5 18 1</td>
<td>Sw, Pol</td>
<td>3 7 + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D43</td>
<td>Ket</td>
<td>2 3 18 1</td>
<td>Sw, Can</td>
<td>3 7 + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D44</td>
<td>Ulla</td>
<td>2 3 15 2</td>
<td>Sw, Dan</td>
<td>3 7 + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D47</td>
<td>Seida</td>
<td>2 7 11 2</td>
<td>Sw, Bos</td>
<td>3 7 + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E01</td>
<td>Linus</td>
<td>2 0 19 1</td>
<td>Sw, Spa</td>
<td>3 8 + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E02</td>
<td>Nenadi</td>
<td>1 9 9 2</td>
<td>Sw, Bos</td>
<td>3 8 + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E03</td>
<td>Edvin</td>
<td>1 0 18 1</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>3 8 + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E05</td>
<td>Tashak</td>
<td>1 3 19 1</td>
<td>Sw, Alb, Tur</td>
<td>3 8 + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E06</td>
<td>Maske</td>
<td>1 6.5 11.5 2</td>
<td>Sw, Ara</td>
<td>3 8 + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E07</td>
<td>Moner</td>
<td>1 5.5 14 2</td>
<td>Sw, Som</td>
<td>3 8 + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11</td>
<td>Jamal</td>
<td>1 4 14 2</td>
<td>Sw, Som</td>
<td>3 8 + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E26</td>
<td>Chorvey</td>
<td>2 4.5 18 1</td>
<td>Sw, Tur, Syr</td>
<td>3 8 + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E27</td>
<td>Livija</td>
<td>2 4.5 14.5 2</td>
<td>Sw, Mac</td>
<td>3 8 + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E29</td>
<td>Bodil</td>
<td>2 0 18 1</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>3 8 + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E31</td>
<td>Torborg</td>
<td>2 0 18 1</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>3 8 + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E32</td>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>2 0 18 1</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>3 8 + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E33</td>
<td>Märtta</td>
<td>2 0 18 1</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>3 8 + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E35</td>
<td>Anita</td>
<td>2 0 18 1</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>3 8 + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E36</td>
<td>Medhina</td>
<td>2 6 18 1</td>
<td>Sw, Ser</td>
<td>3 8 + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E37</td>
<td>Runa</td>
<td>2 0 18 1</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>3 8 + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E38</td>
<td>Ajana</td>
<td>2 7 11.5 2</td>
<td>Sw, Alb</td>
<td>3 8 + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E39</td>
<td>Gertrud</td>
<td>2 0 18 1</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>3 8 + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E40</td>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>2 0 18 1</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>3 8 + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E41</td>
<td>Katryna</td>
<td>2 3 18 1</td>
<td>Sw, Pol</td>
<td>3 8 + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E43</td>
<td>Zora</td>
<td>2 10 8 2</td>
<td>Sw, Ser, Slo</td>
<td>3 8 + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E46</td>
<td>Tang</td>
<td>2 5.5 17 2</td>
<td>Sw, Can</td>
<td>3 8 + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E49</td>
<td>Ellinor</td>
<td>2 0 18 1</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>3 8 + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B

*Overview of focus participants. Selected information about each focus participant based on the background interviews and the data types in which they participated.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B01</td>
<td>Anton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B05</td>
<td>Ekmel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sw, Tur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B09</td>
<td>Mehmet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sw, Kur, Tur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13</td>
<td>Roshan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sw, Per, Fin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B16</td>
<td>Ismail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sw, Tur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B25</td>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sw, Tig</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B29</td>
<td>Rihanna</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sw, Eng, Hin, Urd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B36</td>
<td>Lillian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sw, Ara, Syr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K01</td>
<td>Olof</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sw, Syr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K02</td>
<td>Abel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sw, Syr, Ara, Tur</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K28</td>
<td>Bushra</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sw, Ara</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K29</td>
<td>Daniella</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sw, Eng, Per, Tag</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L11</td>
<td>Alfred</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L26</td>
<td>Kalifa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>Sw, Som</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L29</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L36</td>
<td>Jemila</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sw, Som, Swa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L37</td>
<td>Åsa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L39</td>
<td>Rana</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>Sw, Per</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L43</td>
<td>Semra</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sw, Tur</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sex: 1-Male, 2-Female
AO: age of onset of Swedish acquisition
LOR: length of residence in Sweden
Born in Sweden?: 1-Yes, 2-No
Languages: Ara-Arabic, Eng-English, Fin-Finnish, Hin-Hindi, Kur-Kurdish, Per-Persian, Som-Somali, Swa-Swahili, Sw-Swedish, Syr-Syrian/Assyrian, Tag-Tagalog, Tig-Tigrinja, Tur-Turkish, Urd-Urdu (obs! “school languages” are not included in the table)
School: 1-Bullerbyskolan, 2-Körsbärskolan, 3-Lönnebergaskolan
Contexts: Retellings, Written essays, Grammaticality judgment test, Self-recordings, Group conversations, Presentations*
Appendix C

*Written instruction to the grammaticality judgment test (GJT)*

- Testet består av ett antal meningar som du ska bedöma som antingen ”rätt” eller ”fel”.
- Läs igenom en mening i taget och bestäm om du tycker att meningen är ”rätt” eller ”fel”.
- Det är viktigt att du svarar på alla frågor och att du endast sätter ett kryss per fråga.
- Om du markerar att en mening är fel, visa då vad i meningen det är som du tycker är fel genom att stryka under eller rita en cirkel kring detta.
- När du besvarat en fråga – lämna den och gå snabbt vidare till nästa.
- Gå inte tillbaka och ändra dina tidigare svar.

_Tack för din medverkan!_

*English translation of the test instruction*

- The test consists of a number of sentences that you should judge as either ”right” or ”wrong”
- Read one sentence at a time and decide if you think the sentence is “right” or “wrong”
- It is important that you answer all the questions and that you only mark one answer per question
- If you mark a sentence as wrong, please show what it is in the sentence that you find wrong by underlining or circling this.
- When you have answered a question – leave it and move quickly on to the next
- Do not go back and forth between the sentences or change any of your earlier answers

_Thank you for your participation!_
Appendix D

Grammaticality Judgment Test-sentences

Sentences marked with an asterisk (*) violate standard Swedish word order norms. Each sentence is followed by an (in some cases semi-literal) English translation.

Subject-verb order in main declarative clauses (part 1)
(*Adv S V, Adv V S – main clauses beginning with different types of time adverbials)

1a. *Igår jag tränade fotboll på Körsbärsdalens IP.
   ‘Yesterday I trained football at Körsbärsdalen’s sports field’

1b. *På kvällarna man festar med kompisarna och har roligt
   ‘In the evenings you party with your friends and have fun’

1c. *I elva år han satt inlåst på Kumlafängelset dömd för dråp.
   ‘For eleven years he was locked up for manslaughter in the Kumla prison’

1d. I många år pendlade han mellan Uppsala och Stockholm.
   ‘For many years he commuted between Uppsala and Stockholm’

 (*PP S V(aux), PP V(aux) S – main clauses beginning with different types of prepositional phrases)

2a. *Genom fönstret han kunde se hur flygplanet exploderade.
   ‘Through the window he was able to see how the plane exploded’

2b. På avstånd kunde hon se hur ett gäng misshandlade en äldre man.
   ‘From a distance she could see how a gang assaulted an older man’

3a. *I födelsedagspresent den lilla flickan fick ett par nya skor.
   ‘For her birthday the little girl got a new pair of shoes.’

3b. För sin veckopeng köpte den lilla pojken en ny leksaksbil.
   ‘For his weekly allowance the little boy bought a new toy car’

 (*Sub clause S V(aux), Sub clause V(aux) S – main clauses beginning with different types of subordinate clauses)

4a. *När man bor på landet man kan njuta av naturen
   ‘When you live on the countryside you’re able to enjoy the nature’

4b. När man är i Stockholm kan man besöka Moderna Museet.
   ‘When you are in Stockholm you can visit the Modern Museum of Art’

5a. *Då det är påsklov i skolan många familjer åker till Åre.
   ‘When it is Easter break in school, many families go to Åre’

5b. Då det ringde in efter rasten stannade många elever kvar ute på skolgården.
   ‘When the bell rang after the break many students stayed in the yard’

   ‘As soon as the last customer had left the store he locked the door and went home’

6b. Så fort Lina kom hem från universitetet satte hon på tv:n och tittade på nyheterna.
   ‘As soon as Lina came home from the university she turned on the TV and watched the news’
**Subject-word order in subordinate clauses**

Subordinate clauses with canonical subject-verb order versus inverted subject-verb order (i.e. violating Swedish word order norms)

(*subordinator V(aux) S, subordinator S V*)

7a. *Du får sommarjobb hos oss om kan du arbeta hela sommaren.*
   ‘You get a summer job here if you can work the whole summer’

7b. Du får åka med till Alperna i vinter om du kan betala resan själv.
   ‘You get to go to the Alps this winter if you can pay for the trip yourself’

8a. *Pojken började gråta hysteriskt när lämnade mamman honom på dagis.*
   ‘The boy started crying hysterically when the mom left him at the daycare’

8b. Den lilla flickan hoppade högt av rädsla när spöket ropade bu.
   ‘The little girl jumped from fear when the ghost yelled boo’

9a. *Hon har klarat sig riktigt väl med tanke på att missade hon introduktionen.*
   ‘She has managed really well considering that she missed the introduction’

9b. Vi har kämpat riktigt bra med tanke på att vi förlorade den första etappen.
   ‘We have fought really well considering that we lost the first stage’

**Subject-verb order in main declarative clauses (part 2)**

(*Rel-clause S V(aux), Rel-clause V(aux) S – main declarative clauses that begin with a clause-initial element containing a relative clause*)

10a. *Eftersom tåget de skulle fara med till Sälen var inställt, familjen fick tillbringa lovet hemma istället.*
   ‘Since the train they were supposed to go with to Sälen was cancelled, the family had to spend the break at home instead’

10b. Eftersom planet de skulle åka med till Malmö var försenat, fick tjejerna ställa in den planerade konserten.
   ‘Since the plane they were to go with to Malmö was delayed, the girls had to cancel the scheduled concert’

11a. *Om keramikkursen de anmält sig till startar först till hösten, eleverna måste välja ett annat alternativ.*
   ‘If the ceramics course they have registered for doesn’t start until the fall, the students have to choose another alternative’

11b. Om pengarna de sparat till semestern inte räcker, måste bröderna be föräldrarna om resebidrag.
   ‘If the money they have saved for vacation is not enough, the brothers have to ask their parents for a contribution’

12a. *När dataseplet han nyligen köpt slutade fungera, han insåg att butiken sålt honom ett måndagsexemplar.*
   ‘When the computer game he had recently bought stopped working, he realized that the store had sold him a bad copy’

12b. När möblerna han köpt till sin nya lägenhet anlände, förstod han att han borde köpt en större lägenhet.
   ‘When the furniture he had ordered for his new apartment arrived, he understood that he should have bought a bigger apartment’
(*and/but then S V(aux), and/but then V(aux) S – main declarative clauses beginning with the connective adverb (å/men) sedan ‘(and/but) then’)  

13a.  *De såg en film på bio och sedan de gick på restaurang.  
‘They watched a movie and then they went to a restaurant’  
13b.  De hyrde filmen och sedan gick de hem och tittade på den.  
‘They rented the movie and then they went home to watch it’  
14a.  *Vi kan ta en snabb fika men sedan jag måste gå hem  
‘We can take a quick coffee break but then I have to go home’  
14b.  Ni kan ta ett snabbt dopp men sedan måste vi åka hem  
‘You can have a quick dip but then we have to go home’  
15a.  *Man vill spela elitfotboll i några år och sedan man vill prova på något annat.  
‘You want to play elite soccer for a couple of years and they you want to try something else’  
15b.  Man vill skaffa körkort så fort som möjligt och sedan vill man köpa en fin bil.  
‘You want to get the driver’s license as soon as possible and then you want to buy a nice car’  

Total: 32 test sentences
Appendix E

Selected results for the participants of the large sample. Relative frequency of different main clause word order patterns in the retellings and the written essays, plus the scores on the GJT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Retellings</th>
<th>Written essays</th>
<th>GJT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XSV</td>
<td>pXSV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B01</td>
<td>Anton</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B02</td>
<td>Farhad</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B05</td>
<td>Ekmel</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B07</td>
<td>Diram</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B09</td>
<td>Mehmet</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13</td>
<td>Roshan</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14</td>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Eliot</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B16</td>
<td>Ismail</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B17</td>
<td>Kostas</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B18</td>
<td>Murad</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B25</td>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B27</td>
<td>Moa</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B31</td>
<td>Riya</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B32</td>
<td>Dinha</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B33</td>
<td>Dorota</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B32</td>
<td>Klara</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B33</td>
<td>Aisha</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B34</td>
<td>Alicia</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B35</td>
<td>Anette</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B36</td>
<td>Lillian</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K01</td>
<td>Olof</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K02</td>
<td>Abel</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K03</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K08</td>
<td>Ashur</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K27</td>
<td>Fawza</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K28</td>
<td>Bushra</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K29</td>
<td>Daniella</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K33</td>
<td>Leah</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K35</td>
<td>Zada</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K36</td>
<td>Parwin</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L01</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L02</td>
<td>Mats</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L03</td>
<td>Hampus</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L08</td>
<td>Åke</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10</td>
<td>Malte</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L11</td>
<td>Alfred</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L25</td>
<td>Malin</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L26</td>
<td>Kalifa</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L27</td>
<td>Fanny</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L28</td>
<td>Radmila</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L29</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L31</td>
<td>Gelareh</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L32</td>
<td>Freja</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L33</td>
<td>Helena</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L34</td>
<td>Doris</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L35</td>
<td>Elsa</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L36</td>
<td>Jemila</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L37**</td>
<td>Åsa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L38</td>
<td>Petra</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L39</td>
<td>Rana</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L40</td>
<td>Natasha</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L41</td>
<td>Agnes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L42</td>
<td>Lucia</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L43</td>
<td>Semra</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L44</td>
<td>Eva</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L45</td>
<td>Sanna</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>Omar</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td>Karim</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P19</td>
<td>Izhar</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P26</td>
<td>Ida</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P28</td>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P29</td>
<td>Nadira</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P31</td>
<td>Atisha</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P47</td>
<td>Cornelia</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P49</td>
<td>Shakira</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S08</td>
<td>Tommy</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>Jakob</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>Axel</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S18</td>
<td>Jonas</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S23</td>
<td>Azad</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S29</td>
<td>Ebba</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S30</td>
<td>Tara</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S32</td>
<td>Alva</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S37</td>
<td>Siri</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S40</td>
<td>Alexandra</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S41</td>
<td>Saga</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S47</td>
<td>Olivia</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S49</td>
<td>Tea</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C01</td>
<td>Zafer</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C04</td>
<td>Evert</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C06</td>
<td>Thorleif</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C08</td>
<td>Otto</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>Carlos</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C18</td>
<td>Algol</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C28</td>
<td>Gorda</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C29</td>
<td>Pannie</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C31</td>
<td>Pannie</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C35</td>
<td>Nour</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D01</td>
<td>Lars</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D02</td>
<td>Valdemar</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D07</td>
<td>Hans</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D09</td>
<td>Aron</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D26</td>
<td>Marre</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D31</td>
<td>Tizio</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D32</td>
<td>Kristina</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D35</td>
<td>Nelija</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D37</td>
<td>Ragnhild</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D38</td>
<td>Kathinka</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D43</td>
<td>Ket</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D44</td>
<td>Ulla</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D47</td>
<td>Seida</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E01</td>
<td>Linus</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E02</td>
<td>Nenad</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E03</td>
<td>Edvin</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E05</td>
<td>Tashak</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E06</td>
<td>Maske</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E07</td>
<td>Moner</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11</td>
<td>Jamal</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E26</td>
<td>Chorvey</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E27</td>
<td>Livija</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E29</td>
<td>Bodil</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E31</td>
<td>Torborg</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E32</td>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E33</td>
<td>Märt</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E35</td>
<td>Anita</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E36</td>
<td>Medhina</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E37</td>
<td>Runa</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E38 Ajana</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E39 Gertrud</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E40 Aurora</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E41 Katzyna</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E43 Zora</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E46 Tang</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E49 Ellinor</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Participants B13, B14, K08, L31, S08, P29, C28, E41, E43, and E49 all had one missing value. The percentage here is, thus, counted in relation to their total score (i.e. 31).

**L37 Åsa is the only focus participant who was not included in the large sample. Her results on the written essay and the GJT are presented here, anyhow.
### Appendix F

**Selected results for the focus participants. Relative frequency of different main clause word order patterns.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Self-recordings</th>
<th>Group conversations</th>
<th>Retellings</th>
<th>Presentations</th>
<th>Written essays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XSV</td>
<td>pXSV</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XSV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B01</td>
<td>Anton</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B05</td>
<td>Ekmel</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B09</td>
<td>Mehmet</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13</td>
<td>Roshan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B16</td>
<td>Ismail</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B25</td>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B29</td>
<td>Riya</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B36</td>
<td>Lillian</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K01</td>
<td>Olof</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K02</td>
<td>Abel</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K28</td>
<td>Bushra</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K29</td>
<td>Daniella</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L11</td>
<td>Alfred</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L26</td>
<td>Kalifa</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L29</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L36</td>
<td>Jemila</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L37</td>
<td>Ása</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L39</td>
<td>Rana</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L43</td>
<td>Semra</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>400</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix G

*Translations of Swedish words used in section 6.3.2.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>English translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>annars</td>
<td>otherwise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dag x</td>
<td>day x (refers to <em>idag</em> ‘today’ <em>den dagen</em> ‘that day’ <em>häromdagen</em> ‘the other day’ <em>varje dag</em> ‘every day’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>då</td>
<td>then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>där</td>
<td>there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>därför</td>
<td>because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>egentligen</td>
<td>really</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>först</td>
<td>first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>här</td>
<td>here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ibland</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idag</td>
<td>today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>igår</td>
<td>yesterday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kanske</td>
<td>maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nu</td>
<td>now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sen</td>
<td>then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>som x</td>
<td>as x (refers to for example <em>samt sagt</em> ‘as said’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>så</td>
<td>then/ so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tid</td>
<td>time (refers to specific time references, for example <em>klockan åtta</em> ‘eight o’clock’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>till exempel</td>
<td>for example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>till slut</td>
<td>in the end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ändå</td>
<td>yet, still, nevertheless</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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