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Abstract

This thesis investigates the grammatical constructions of *be*-and *get*-passives and their usage by Swedes writing in English. The investigation is based on findings from four different corpora, two of which were compiled for the purpose of this study. The first one, SWENC (the Swedish English Newspaper Corpus), contains texts from online newspapers and a corporate newsletter written by Swedes in English. The second, BESC (Blogs in English by Swedes Corpus), contains material collected from blogs written in English by Swedes. The results from these corpora are compared with results from the press sub-corpora of the native English Frown (American English) and F-LOB corpora (British English). The results show that Swedes writing in English use passive constructions to a similar extent as native English speakers do within the news genre. Furthermore, Swedes writing in English use significantly more *be*-passive constructions within the news genre than the more informal blog genre. Lastly, the study shows that Swedes writing in English use *get*-passives, and that they are considerably more common in the informal language used in blogs than the more formal language used in online newspapers.
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1 Introduction

This paper investigates the grammatical constructions *be*-passive and *get*-passive and their usage by Swedes writing in English. The following are examples of a *be*-passive and a *get*-passive alongside their corresponding active forms:

(1) Mary built a house today.  
(2) Today, a house *was* built by Mary.  
(3) Jake stole my watch.  
(4) My watch *got* stolen by Jake.

As these illustrations show, the structure of the passive sentences differs drastically from the active sentences. For instance, when comparing (3) and (4) it can be noted that the subject, *Jake*, has been moved from the beginning to the very end, while the object, *my watch*, has taken its place.

Very briefly, the passive consists of a form of *be* or *get* followed by a main verb in past participle form and an optional prepositional phrase beginning with *by* (Quirk et al, 1985: 159f). This syntactic structure is, however, not conclusive enough to exclude structures which may look like passives but do not function like them. Some constructions which follow the definition above can be read in two different ways - as *dynamic* or *statal* (cf. Quirk et al, 1985: 169f), as in:

(5) His face *was bruised* and torn and his ribs fractured. (F-LOB, A13)

The superficial structure of (5) suggests that it is a passive. However, in this case the past participle describes the person’s face as being ‘in a state of being bruised’ and is therefore what Quirk et al (1985: 170) refer to as a ‘statal passive’ where *was* functions as a copula rather than an auxiliary.

One particularly important function of passives in English is that they allow one piece of information which is required in the active to be left out, namely, the main clause subject (the agent in the passive) (Huddleston and Pullum, 2005: 243). In other words, the *by*-phrases included in (2) and (4) which express the agents are not necessary for the syntactical structure of the sentence, but can be left out if desired. A passive which expresses the agent is called a long passive and a passive which does not is called a short passive (Biber et al, 1999: 935 and Huddleston and Pullum, 2005: 243).
With regard to the get-passive, Leech et al (2009: 156f) note that they can be both adversative and non-adversative. The former is used to describe get-passives with negative connotations and the latter those which indicate something neutral or positive (ibid).

The present study compares how the English language is used within the expanding circle, i.e. where English is learned as a foreign language because it is useful to know, with how it is used within the inner circle, i.e. amongst people whose first language is English (cf. Svartvik and Leech, 2006: 3f). This type of research is needed because most studies within the field of English linguistics concern only the inner circle.

Using empirical data from a newly created corpus, the aim of this thesis is to investigate the extent to which Swedes writing in English utilize be-passive constructions compared to get-passive constructions. The results will be analyzed with regard to two qualitative patterns concerning passives, namely, long passives and short passives as well as whether the get-passives used are adversative or non-adversative. These terms are discussed further in the next section. Furthermore, the results will be put in a broader perspective by comparing them with results from three other corpora – two native English corpora and one corpus containing texts from a different linguistic genre written by Swedes. In order to achieve this, the following research questions will be addressed:

- In terms of frequency, how do Swedes writing in English use be-passives and get-passives when compared with the data found in native English corpora?
- In terms of frequency, how do Swedes writing in English use short passives and long passives when compared with the data found in native English corpora?
- In terms of semantics, how do Swedes writing in English use get-passives when compared with the data found in native English corpora?

This essay begins with a presentation of previous studies regarding passive voice, the be-passive and the get-passive. Subsequently, the material used for this study and the research process are explained. Then, the results are presented and discussed and, finally, relevant conclusions based on the investigation are drawn.
2 Theoretical background

2.1 Passive voice

According to Quirk et al (1985: 159), the term *voice* is used to distinguish between two different ways of looking at the action of a sentence without a change in meaning, namely, the *active* and the *passive* voice.

(6) The butler *murdered* the detective.  (7) The detective *was murdered* by the butler.

(Quirk et al, 1985: 159)

Here, the active voice is realized in (6) and the passive in (7). Quirk et al (1985: 159) note that the two voices differ both at the phrase and the clause level. At the phrase level, a form of the auxiliary *be* (*was* in (7)) followed by the past participle of the main verb (*murdered* in (7)) changes the sentence into the passive voice (ibid). Meanwhile, at the clause level, three adjustments occur when changing from the active to the passive. First, the subject becomes the *agent*. Secondly, the object becomes the subject and, thirdly, the preposition *by* is placed in front of the *agent*. The *agent* by-phrase is, however, generally optional and can often be omitted (ibid). Rather than talk about *by*-phrases, Biber et al (1999: 935) and Huddleston and Pullum (2005: 243) distinguish between *long passives* and *short passives*. The former expresses the agent in a *by*-phrase and the latter does not.

As mentioned earlier, the *be*-passive and *get*-passive can be broadly defined as *be* or *get* followed by a main verb in past participial form and sometimes also a prepositional phrase beginning with *by* (Quirk et al, 1985: 159f). However, as noted by Quirk et al (1985: 167) this definition would also include various constructions which are not considered to be passive. In addition to the broad definition, they talk about the passive in terms of a sliding scale, *the passive gradient*, which ranges from constructions which clearly function as passives to those which may appear to be passives at first glance but are in fact not regarded as such (ibid: 167-171). The scale is divided into three groups; *central passives*, *semi-passives* and *pseudo-passives* (ibid).

Central passives are passive constructions which have clear relationships with an active correspondent where the agent *by*-phrase can be both expressed and left out:

(8) This violin *was* made by my father.

(9) My father *made* this violin.
(10) This difficulty can be avoided in several ways.
(11) [They] can avoid this difficulty in several ways.

(Quirk et al, 1985: 167)

Semi-passives have both verbal and adjectival properties (Quirk et al, 1985: 168). They have active correspondents like verbal passives do, but they can be modified by, for example, very and they allow for be to be replaced by a copular verb, like seem (ibid.). Furthermore, they can coordinate the participle with an adjective, such as keen (ibid).

(12) Leonard was interested in linguistics
(13) Leonard seemed very interested in and keen on linguistics.

(Quirk et al, 1985: 168)

The last group on the scale of the passive gradient, the pseudo-passives, do not have active correspondents nor can they have an agent by-phrase (Quirk et al (1985: 169). Structurally, they look like passives (ibid), as is the case with for example:

(14) In 1972, the Democrats were defeated

(Quirk et al, 1985: 170)

(14) can be read in two ways, via a dynamic reading or a statal reading (Quirk et al, 1985: 170). In the former, it is considered a passive (Someone defeated the Democrats) and in the latter it is a copular verb denoting a state (The Democrats were in a state of having been defeated).

2.2 The be-passive

Leech et al. (2009: 144-158) use primarily the ‘Brown family of corpora’ when investigating variation in the be-and get-passive. This includes ‘the Standard Corpus of Present-Day Edited American English’ (Brown), ‘the Freiburg-Brown Corpus of American English’ (Frown), ‘the Lancaster-Oslo/Bergen Corpus’ (LOB) and ‘the Freiburg-LOB Corpus of British English’ (F-LOB) (cf. Varieng, 2013). The first two contain American English and the last two British English. Furthermore, Brown and LOB contain texts from the 1960s while the texts in Frown and F-LOB are from the 1990s. All of them contain around one million words of text from various genres each, such as academic texts and fiction (ibid).

In their corpus queries, Leech et al (2009: 145) look for forms of be followed by a verbal past participle and allow for additional elements to be placed in-between. Even though
Leech et al (2009: 149f) use POS (parts-of-speech) tagged corpora and try to limit the search results to non-progressive finite be-passives with the help of search strings, some undesired data is still collected. For instance, fixed phrases, such as *as far as x is concerned*, have to be excluded manually. Furthermore, the search results include some adjectival participles (ibid: 149). In order to be able to make an approximation of the reliability of their *be* + verbal participle strings, they analyzed every fortieth occurrence and gathered that the precision of the search strings was over 80% (ibid: 150). Thus, they argue that the results can be seen as indicative of the general development (ibid).

Figure 1. *Finite non-progressive be-passives: frequencies per 100,000 words*¹

(Leech et al, 2009: 149)

Leech et al (2009: 149) find that there is an overall decline in the usage of non-progressive finite be-passives in both AmE and BrE. Figure 1 above indicates that American English appears to be leading this change. More precisely, their comparison of the Brown corpus and the Frown corpus indicates a decline by 28.2% in AmE and their comparison of the LOB corpus and the F-LOB corpus indicates a decline by 14% in BrE (ibid: 148). In terms of frequency, as shown in Figure 1 above, they found a total of 1028 instances in the Brown corpus and 738 instances in the Frown corpus (ibid: 149). Furthermore, in the LOB corpus, they found a total of 1166 instances and in the F-LOB corpus 1006 instances (ibid). However, more relevant for this essay is the data connected with newspaper language. Particular attention will therefore be given to the results from the data in the press genre.

¹ All figures in this study have been normalized to 100,000 words. In section 2, this was done by dividing the figures provided by Leech et al. (2009) in *per million words* by 10 and subsequently rounding the results to the nearest whole number.
Figure 2. Finite non-progressive be-passives within the press sub-corpora: frequencies per 100,000 words

(Leech et al, 2009: 297)

Figure 2 above shows that within the press genre of the Brown corpus, Leech et al (2009: 297) found 977 instances of finite non-progressive be-passives and in the Frown corpus 727 instances, which signals a decline by 25.6%. In the press genre of the LOB corpus, 1130 instances were found and in the F-LOB corpus 965 instances, which indicates a decline by 14.6% (ibid).

Leech et al (2009: 150ff) suggest a number of possible reasons for the decline in the usage of be-passives. For instance, they claim that it is a result of a persistent attack “in usage manuals on the passive as a clumsy and awkward construction” (ibid: 151). This is supported by Svartvik and Leech (2006: 208) who argue that passives are portrayed in usage manuals as an obstacle hindering comprehensible communication.

The decline of the be-passive is related to a process called colloquialization, which Leech (2004: 75) defines as “a tendency for features of the conversational spoken language to infiltrate and spread in the written language”. Svartvik and Leech (2006: 208) and Leech (2004: 73) talk about the decline of passive constructions as a “negative aspect” or “negative manifestation” of colloquialization. More specifically, Svartvik and Leech (2004: 208) argue that passive constructions, which are typical of written language, are giving in to constructions that are more typical of spoken language, which includes active sentences with generic subjects, such as you or they.
Returning to the short passives (agent omitted) and long passives (agent expressed) mentioned above, Huddleston and Pullum (2005: 243) and Estling Vannestål (2007: 155) argue that the short passives are much more frequent than the long passives. This is partly supported by Leech et al (2009: 150). As shown in Figure 3 above, they find that the usage of long passives declined from 18.6% in the Brown corpus to 14.7% in the Frown corpus (ibid: 150). However, when the LOB corpus is compared with the F-LOB corpus long passives increased from 11.8% to 13.4% (ibid). In other words, when looked at in a broader context, while the usage of be-passives declined in both AmE and BrE the long passives declined in AmE but increased in BrE (ibid). Leech et al (2009: 151) argue that these somewhat counter-intuitive results can be explained by the fact that there are no competing structures that the by-phrases in long passives could be changed into, and thus the frequency of long passives in BrE increased.

2.3 The get-passive

Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 1442) note four main points on which get-passives differ from be-passives. Firstly, they are often avoided in formal registers and, secondly, they are used exclusively with dynamic verbs (ibid). The third difference is that get-passives tend to be used over be-passives when the subject-referent is seen as being, to some degree, responsible for the situation at hand (ibid). The following example is given:

(15) Jill deliberately got arrested
(16) Jill was/got arrested

(Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 1442)

In (15), Jill plays a more active role than in (16) with regard to the arrest and the get-passive is therefore more likely to be used (ibid).
The fourth main difference between the *get*-passive and the *be*-passive, as described by Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 1442), is that *get*-passives are typically used with situations that have a positive or negative effect on someone, as in:

(17) My letter *got* published  
(18) Kim *got* sacked  

(Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 1442)

According to Leech et al (2009: 154) the *get*-passive is a fairly recent innovation, yet it is fully grammaticalized. In other words, it has received grammatical functions and keeps developing new ones (Leech, 2004: 75). Svartvik and Leech (2006: 206) describe *grammaticalization* as a process whereby “items of vocabulary are gradually getting subsumed into grammatical forms”.

Huddleston and Pullum (2005: 245) note that *get*, unlike *be*, is not an auxiliary verb. Therefore, *get*-passives must be preceded by the dummy auxiliary *do* when in the interrogative or negative form (ibid), as is demonstrated by the following examples:

(19) They *weren’t* charged until later.  
(20) They didn’t *get* charged until later.  

(Huddleston and Pullum, 2005: 245)

(21) Was she killed?  
(22) *Got she killed?*

(Reed, 2011: 44)

Huddleston and Pullum (2005: 245) argue further that, while the *be*-passive is neutral in style, the *get*-passive marks an informal style.

Leech et al (2009: 154) point out that *get* followed by a past participle is not always a *get*-passive. As was the case with the *be*-passive, the participle sometimes functions as an adjective rather than a verb. The following example could be read in two different ways:

(23) The channel *got* blocked.

(Leech et al, 2009: 154)

Firstly, (23) could be understood with *blocked* as a lexical verb in which case it is a passive (ibid). Secondly, it could be understood with *got* as a copular verb (as in *became*) where *blocked* is an adjectival past participle in which case it is not a passive (ibid).

Meanwhile, Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 1441) show that verbal and adjectival ambiguity is less frequent with *get* than with *be*. They provide the following example:

---

^2 The asterisk indicates that the sentence is ungrammatical.
While (25) can only be read with a verbal interpretation, (24) can be either verbal or adjectival (ibid.).

Using the ‘Brown family of corpora’, Leech et al (2009: 156) searched for get-passives. The results, as seen in Figure 4 below, indicate that the get-passive is used very rarely, about 400 times less than the be-passive (ibid). However, the results also show that the get-passive is used more in the Frown and F-LOB corpora than in the Brown and LOB corpora (ibid). The increase in the usage of get-passives is most noticeable in AmE, where the frequency has doubled from the 1960s to the 1990s (ibid).

![Figure 4. Get-passives: frequencies per 100,000 words](Leech et al, 2009: 298)

Figure 5 above displays the results for the press sections of the corpora. It can be noted that the frequency of get-passives more than doubled from the 1960s to the 1990s in both AmE and BrE (Leech et al, 2009: 298).

![Figure 5. Get-passives within the press sub-corpora: frequencies per 100,000 words](Leech et al, 2009: 298)
In terms of the semantics of get-passives, Leech et al (2009: 156) argue that they have not shifted toward a more neutral meaning. In other words, most get-passives are still adversative, i.e. express opposition (ibid). In fact, they are moving in the other direction - the frequency of adversative get-passives has increased from 60.3% to 66.3% from the 1960s to the 1990s (ibid: 156-157). Examples (26) and (27) below illustrate get-passives which do not express opposition and are therefore called non-adversative.

(26) … if people are to learn to live together and get trained to do things well, …
(27) […] those who deserve rewards get rewarded appropriately

(Leech et al, 2009: 157)

As was hinted above, Leech et al (2009: 157) note that get-passives can be both neutral (as in (26) above) and positive (as in (27) above), but that these are not contributing enough toward the neutralization of the get-passive. Furthermore, they predict that the get-passive is not likely to replace the be-passive in the near future because of its non-neutral semantics (ibid).

This section has discussed previous research regarding be- and get-passives. The next section will explain the material and methods used for the study carried out in this thesis.

3 Material and methods

3.1 Material

In 2013, a small group of students at Linnaeus University made an effort to investigate contemporary usage of English by Swedes. However, no pre-existing corpora were suitable for such investigations. Therefore, they gathered articles written in English by Swedes from three online newspapers and one corporate newsletter and assembled them into a corpus. The articles were to fulfill two criteria. Firstly, the author had to have Swedish as his or her first language and, secondly, the material had to be relatively new. All of the texts included in the corpus were written between 2010 and 2013. The choice to use material within the news genre was motivated by the fact that journalistic prose is quick to adopt new ways of using language and is therefore a genre within which one can find innovative language (Hundt and Mair, 1999). The corpus, the Swedish English Newspaper Corpus (SWENC), contains 165,525 words. The three online newspapers from which the material for the corpus was extracted are: Stockholm News, The Local and The Swedish Wire. The articles taken from a corporate newsletter are from Svenskt Näringsliv.

The material collected from Stockholm News is dated from 2010 to 2012 and includes articles from a wide range of sections, such as politics, economy and culture. The articles
were written by five Swedish journalists, one female and four male. The articles collected from *The Local* were written in 2012 and 2013 by two Swedish journalists, one female and one male. The articles written by the female journalist are from the news section while the articles written by the male journalist are debate articles. The articles taken from *The Swedish Wire* were found, primarily, in the economy, the politics and the companies sections. However, a small number of articles were taken from the art and leisure and the global news sections. All of the articles were published in 2012 and 2013 and were written by one Swedish male journalist. Some articles on *The Swedish Wire* are proofread by native English speakers prior to publishing and such articles were thus excluded from the material. *Svenskt Näringsliv* is not a newspaper. Rather, it is a corporate website on which employees publish articles. Nevertheless, the language used and the topics concerned were deemed similar to that in the online newspapers, which is why it was included in the corpus. The articles taken from *Svenskt Näringsliv* were all written by Swedes, two females and eight males.

Lindquist (2009: 201) argues that the language used in blogs can be informal and conflict with standard language. Therefore, a second corpus was used in this essay, with the aim of presenting a broader understanding of how *be*-passives and *get*-passives are used in English by Swedes in different text genres. *Blogs in English by Swedes Corpus* (BESC) contains blog entries from fifteen blogs written in English by Swedes. The subject matters of the blogs include politics, fashion and gaming. BESC contains approximately 100,000 words which makes for quite a small body of data. However, not many Swedes blog in English and this is therefore the best material available. Even so, the corpus contains almost as many contributors as the SWENC corpus.

Finally, in order to understand the results from SWENC and BESC in a larger context, they were compared with results from an American English corpus (the Frown corpus) and a British English corpus (the F-LOB corpus). Only the press sub-corpora (sections A, B and C) were looked at in the Frown and F-LOB corpora since that material is the most similar in style to that in the SWENC corpus. The press sections of Frown and F-LOB both contain approximately 176,000 words each and consist of texts from the 1990s. They are thus quite similar in size to the SWENC corpus, which suggests that SWENC is large enough to be suitable for this type of investigation.
3.2 Methods

The investigation carried out in this thesis includes both a quantitative and a qualitative element. The former involved using corpora to find instances of *be*-passives and *get*-passives, counting them, inserting them into figures and tables and analyzing their frequencies. The qualitative part took a closer look at the constructions by analyzing them with regard to two qualitative features. Firstly, the passives were defined as either long passives or short passives. Secondly, the *get*-passives were analyzed with regard to their semantic connotations, whether they were positive, neutral or negative.

In this study, the definition of passives followed the terminology presented by Quirk et al (1985: 167-171), which was outlined in the previous section. More specifically, only central passives were regarded as passives. Consequently, semi-passives and pseudo-passives were not considered passives in this study. Contrary to the investigation carried out by Leech et al (2009: 144-158) progressive passives were included in the results. Furthermore, in instances, such as the following, where the sentence contains several passives in a row but only the first one is directly connected with *be* or *get*, only the first one was included in the results:

(28) A spokeswoman for the chain declined to say how many oxes *had been imported*, sold or recalled. (SWENC, The Swedish Wire)

The process of gathering the data for the corpus began with the search for suitable online newspapers. The students then searched through the chosen newspapers and extracted articles that fulfilled the criteria. The most fundamental prerequisite for the data to be considered satisfactory was that it was a text of at least fifty words written in English by a Swede. Therefore, collaboratively written articles where one of the writers was not Swedish were discarded. The same was the case for articles where either the identity of the author was not explicitly expressed or the identity of the author could not be satisfactorily verified.

Articles that were deemed suitable were copied into a word processing program, such as Microsoft Word. The text was then converted into plain text by stripping it of unwanted stylistic features, such as italics, underlines and hyperlinks. Subsequently, all of the articles were gathered into one .txt-file and the data was thus ready for analysis. This was done in the concordance program AntConc which is freely available on the Internet. AntConc makes it possible to analyze large sets of data. With the use of search terms, specific grammatical
constructions or lexical items can easily be singled out and, by clicking on the token, the whole context can be examined.

Figure 6. AntConc concordance tool

In this investigation, a total of 31 different searches were carried out in all four corpora with the purpose of extracting as many be- and get-passives as possible from the material. The different search terms used can be found in Tables 10 to 13 in the Appendix. As Figure 6 above indicates, there are multiple ways in which one can affect how the results are presented. Furthermore, there are several tabs which can be used depending on what type of investigation is being carried out. For this study, however, all of the searches were done with the default settings and, for the most part, the ‘concordance’ tab was used. Sometimes, when the full context of the token was needed to determine whether or not it was a passive, the ‘file view’ tab was used. The desired search term was typed into the ‘search term’ field and then the query was initiated by clicking ‘start’. When all of the instances of the search term were found the ‘sort’ button was clicked. This rearranged the results so that the first words to the right of the search terms were ordered alphabetically. This was done for efficiency so that, for example, the indefinite articles a and an could be scrolled past straight away. Passive tokens, as well as whether they were long passives or short passives, were tallied on a piece of paper.
and several examples were copied and pasted into a Word document to be used when presenting the results. All of the get-passives were copied and pasted into a Word document so that they could be analyzed further at a later stage. When the data had been gathered, the raw frequencies were normalized to 100,000 words. This was done so that data from corpora of different sizes could be compared properly. The results were normalized by dividing the raw frequencies by the size of the corpus from which they were extracted and then multiplying the result by 100,000. Finally, the normalized frequencies were rounded to the nearest whole number.

### 3.3 Problems and limitations

The methods and material used in this study presented a number of problems. Firstly, while the press sub-corpora of Frown and F-LOB are quite similar in size compared to SWENC, BESC is significantly smaller. Secondly, the fact that no other corpora containing texts written in English by Swedes were available severely limited the scope of the study. As a result, no observations could be made on whether or not the results found in this study represented an increase or decrease in the usage of passives. Thirdly, since most of the work in this study was done manually, the human factor played a large role. It is therefore possible that mistakes have been made in both the gathering and the analysis of the data. This possibility is not mitigated by the fact that no parts-of-speech tagged corpora were available and thus the search terms used to extract passives had to be very broad. This resulted in a large amount of tokens which had to be sorted through manually and analyzed.

### 4 Results and discussion

The results of the present corpus study are presented and discussed in the sub-sections below.

#### 4.1 An overview of the results

Figure 7 below illustrates the frequencies for be-passives and get-passives in the corpora used in this study. As was expected, the be-passive is considerably more common than the get-passive in all four. The be-passives stand for 98.9% of all the passives in Frown and 99.3% of all the passives in F-LOB. In SWENC, that figure is also 99.3% but in BESC only 94.8%. In other words, get-passives appear to be more prevalent within the blog genre, which tends to include more informal language (cf. Lindquist, 2009: 201) than the newspaper genre. With regard to be-passives, they are clearly the least common in BESC with 348 tokens and the
most common in F-LOB with 914. In-between the two extremes are SWENC and Frown, which contain similar amounts of *be*-passives. Meanwhile, SWENC contains significantly less *get*-passives than Frown.

![Bar chart showing frequencies of *be*-passives and *get*-passives in different corpora]

**Figure 7. Be-passives and get-passives in the Frown and F-LOB press sub-corpora and the SWENC and BESC corpora: frequencies per 100,000 words**

The figures extracted from the Frown and F-LOB corpora in this study differ from those presented by Leech et al (2009: 297). There are several possible reasons for this discrepancy. First, this study limits the constructions accepted as passives to only central passives. Thus, *semi-passives*, which can be both *adjectival* and *verbal*, were not included. Secondly, as was discussed earlier, Leech et al (2009: 149f) noted that some instances of passives which function as adjectives were intercepted by the search string they used to obtain their results. Thirdly, while Leech et al (2009: 144-158) did not include progressive passives in their results, the study carried out in this thesis did. The last possible reason which may have affected the results is human interference, which was mentioned earlier. In this study, the quantitative analysis of the corpus content was done almost entirely manually, whereas in Leech et al (2009: 144-158) much of it was done by means of a search string. The latter method allows for more consistency than the former which is more prone to mistakes.

Nevertheless, the proportion of passives in Frown to passives in F-LOB in this investigation is largely the same as in the study carried out by Leech et al (2009: 144-158). According to the present study, F-LOB contains 13.4% more passives than Frown and in their
study that figure is 13.8%. In the next section, the results found in the press sub-corpora of Frown and F-LOB are presented and discussed.

4.2 The results of the Frown and F-LOB corpora
As Table 1 below shows, passive constructions are strikingly more frequent in the press sub-corpora of F-LOB than in Frown.

Table 1. Be-passives and get-passives in the Frown and F-LOB press sub-corpora:
frequencies per 100,000 words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frown</th>
<th>F-LOB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be-passives</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get-passives</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>704</strong></td>
<td><strong>920</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below are a few examples of passives which were extracted from the corpora:

(29) Most new jobs in the U.S., Asia, and Europe are created by smaller companies. (Frown, B10)
(30) In another attack, Robert Whiting, 24, was beaten with a chair by two English timeshare touts. (F-LOB, A12)
(31) Not surprisingly, as Nikki notes, the dancers "get propositioned all the time." (Frown, A29)

The passives above all have direct active correspondents and are therefore considered central passives. For instance, (30) would be realized in the active as such:

(32) In another attack, two English timeshare touts beat Robert Whiting, 24, with a chair.

The search terms used in AntConc also retrieved constructions which may look like passives but are not considered as such, as in the following examples:

(33) The schedule is jammed with family sitcoms and dramas, but […] (Frown, A40)
(34) Mr Cook said Labour is committed to structural reforms of the health authorities […] (F-LOB, A01)
While both (33) and (34) follow the definition of *be* followed by a verb in past participle form it is clear that the participles in question do not function as verbs. Rather, they function as adjectives. (33) describes one of the properties of a television schedule and (34) denotes the mindset of the people within the Labour Party. This reasoning can be tested by carrying out a test similar to that outlined by Quirk et al (1985: 168). For instance, when *completely* is placed before *jammed* in (33) the sentence still makes sense and the same is true for (34) when *very* is placed before *committed*. Consequently, it is clear that both function as adjectives.

Table 2 below shows the frequencies of short and long passives in the press sub-corpora of Frown and F-LOB.

Table 2. *Short and long passives in the Frown and F-LOB press sub-corpora: frequencies per 100,000 words*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frown</th>
<th>F-LOB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Be-*passives</td>
<td>*Get-*passives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short passives</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long passives</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several observations can be made. For instance, the proportion of long *be*-passives to short *be*-passives is quite similar in the two corpora. In Frown, 13.9% of all *be*-passives are long passives and in F-LOB that figure is 13.5%. With regard to *get*-passives, it can be observed that only one long *get*-passive (shown in (32)) was found in Frown and none in F-LOB.

(35) But when someone's child is taken by the other parent […] (Frown, A23)
(36) Senior school staff involved in the holiday had been questioned by education department officers […] (F-LOB, A36)
(37) The WIC (Women, Infants and Children) program that provides vital nutrition to poor pregnant women and their babies would get zapped by Bush. (Frown, B19)
The examples above are long passives found in Frown and F-LOB. (35) and (36) are long be-passives while (37) is the long get-passive found in Frown.

As discussed earlier, Leech et al (2009: 156f) found that most get-passives are adversative, i.e. express opposition. Table 3 below indicates that the same trend was discovered in this study.

**Table 3. Adversative and non-adversative get-passives in the Frown and F-LOB press sub-corpora: frequencies per 100,000 words**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frown</th>
<th></th>
<th>F-LOB</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adversative</td>
<td>Non-adversative</td>
<td>Adversative</td>
<td>Non-adversative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the press sub-corpora of both Frown and F-LOB most get-passives are adversative. Furthermore, both contain get-passives with positive connotations and Frown also contains one with neutral connotations. Below are a few adversative and non-adversative get-passives found in the corpora:

(38) To which most of them replied in effect "before it gets shut down". (F-LOB, B07)
(39) This is what gets overlooked. (Frown, B14)
(40) Right now I just want to get elected. (F-LOB, A10)
(41) Calamari gets grilled and served with beans, garlic and tomatoes. (Frown, C15)

In the examples above, (38) and (39) have negative connotations. In (40) the person expresses a desire to get elected which means that, here, it is used in a positive sense. (41), on the other hand, differs from the previous examples in that it describes an event without expressing subjective values. It is therefore a neutral get-passive. In the next section, the results of the SWENC corpus are presented and discussed.

**4.3 The results of the SWENC corpus**

As Table 4 below shows, 735 be-passives and 5 get-passives were found in SWENC. When compared with the press sub-corpora of Frown and F-LOB it can be observed that SWENC contains slightly more be-passives than the former and considerably fewer be-passives than the latter. Thus, it is possible to argue that Swedes writing in English seem to follow the American style more so than the British with regard to the usage of passives. On the other
hand, the number of get-passives in SWENC is more similar to the results for F-LOB than Frown. Since no previous corpus studies have been carried out with respect to how Swedes use passives in English it is not possible to say whether the figures in Table 4 represent an increase or decrease in usage.

Table 4. Be-passives and get-passives in the SWENC corpus: frequencies per 100,000 words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tokens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be-passives</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get-passives</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>740</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following are some examples of passives in SWENC:

(42) It was bought by Microsoft in 2011 for $8.5 billion. (The Swedish Wire)
(43) Raising these wages even more could lead to these jobs getting outsourced or going into the black markets […] (Svenskt Näringsliv)
(44) They were sentenced to 11 years on prison in December. (Stockholm News)

Of the passives above, (44) is a short be-passives while (42) is a long be-passive. (43), however, is a short get-passive. As was the case with Frown and F-LOB, constructions which are not passives yet look like ones were also found in SWENC, for example:

(45) The film Extremely Loud and Incredibly Close is also nominated as best film. (Stockholm News)
(46) In Mexico, I think people still get excited to get an email. (The Local)

In (46), get can be substituted for the copular verb become which indicates that it is a pseudo-passive (cf. Quirk et al, 1985: 170) and is therefore not counted as a passive in this study. (45) describes a state as a result of an action, as in ‘The film is in a state of being nominated as best film’, and is thus also a pseudo-passive.
As was mentioned earlier, Huddleston and Pullum (2005: 243) and Estling Vannestål (2007: 155) argue that the short passive is significantly more frequent than the long passive. This is supported by the figures from SWENC, presented in Table 5 below.

**Table 5. Short and long passives in the SWENC corpus: frequencies per 100,000 words**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Be-passives</th>
<th>Get-passives</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short passives</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long passives</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More specifically, only 11.8% of the *be*-passives in SWENC are long passives. Furthermore, no long *get*-passives were found. When compared with the results from the press sub-corpora of Frown and F-LOB, it can be noted that the proportion of long *be*-passives to short *be*-passives is smaller in SWENC. The following are examples of long *be*-passives found in SWENC:

(47) But the demand *has not been received* with open arms by the mobile industry.
(Stockholm News)

(48) The event *was hosted by MEP, Jürgen Creutzmann.* (Svenskt Näringsliv)

Table 6 below shows the frequencies for adversative and non-adversative *get*-passives found in SWENC.

**Table 6. Adversative and non-adversative get-passives in the SWENC corpus: frequencies per 100,000 words**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adversative</td>
<td>Non-adversative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unsurprisingly, there were more adversative than non-adversative *get*-passives in SWENC. Moreover, contrary to the results from Frown, no *get*-passives with neutral connotations were found. Thus, a possible argument could be that Swedes do not yet use neutral *get*-passives. However, it is important to point out that only one token was found in Frown and to keep in mind that SWENC is a slightly smaller corpus that contains a limited number of contributors.
Consequently, it would be difficult to justify such an argument. Here follow two examples of adversative and non-adversative get-passives in SWENC:

(49) The positive aspect here is that Saab gets paid for their cars in advance. (Stockholm News)

(50) I felt being shot and bleeding and saw the others get shot. (The Local)

While the get-passive in (49) is clearly positive, that in (50) is negative because it describes a traumatic and sad experience. In the following section, the results of the BESC corpus are presented and discussed.

4.4 The results of the BESC corpus

As was noted earlier, Lindquist (2009: 201) writes that the language used in blogs can be different in that it often follows a more informal and non-standard style. Additionally, according to Huddleston and Pullum (2005: 245), the get-passive marks an informal style. With that in mind, it is understandable that the get-passive is more frequent in BESC which consists of texts from blogs, than in SWENC which consists of online newspaper articles and newsletters. Thus, the figures presented in Table 7 below can be argued to follow the general trend with regard to the usage of passives. Nevertheless, the difference between the number of passives in BESC and SWENC is significant. BESC contains considerably more get-passives than SWENC and nearly half as many be-passives.

Table 7. Be-passives and get-passives in the BESC corpus: frequencies per 100,000 words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tokens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be-passives</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get-passives</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>367</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following are a few of the passives found in BESC:

(51) That's - in my opinion - the way the language is normally used.

(52) And new comments are still being added every second as I blog this.

(53) When we went out from the apartment on the Thursday we were greeted by some cute cats who wished us good luck!
(54) The K-pop video was uploaded on July 15 and quickly reached an international mass audience.

(55) He actually got banned from being used by my team since it leaves a tray which show here it goes […]

(51), (52) and (54) are short be-passives and (53) is a long be-passive. (55) on the other hand is not as easy to label. It is clearly a get-passive, however, there is a degree of ambiguity regarding the by-phrase which follows. In other words, it cannot be determined whether by my team is connected with got banned or from being used. In this study, such cases were counted as short passives.

As with the other corpora, the search terms used also picked up constructions which may look like passives but do not function as such. Here follows a semi-passive found in BESC:

(56) I was disappointed and had a feeling they did not want to listen.

The fact that (56) is a semi-passive can be made clear by placing extremely before the past participle disappointed and noting that the sentence still works. It is thus apparent that the participle functions as an adjective and is therefore not counted as a passive in this study.

Table 8 below shows the frequencies for long and short passives in BESC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Be-passives</th>
<th>Get-passives</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short passives</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long passives</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>348</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be observed that five long get-passives were found in BESC, compared to none in SWENC. Furthermore, the trend that long passives are significantly less frequent is true also for BESC, as was the case in the other corpora. In fact, the proportion of long be-passives to short be-passives is smaller in BESC than in SWENC, with 10.3% and 11.8% respectively. The following are three long passives collected from BESC:

(57) The latest escalation was undoubtedly initiated by Hezbollah with its border ambush that kidnapped two soldiers.
(58) The hard work of collecting this massive dataset is not payed for by OECD directly.

(59) i just got beat by a girl..

(57) and (58) are both long be-passives and (59) is a long get-passive.

Table 9 below presents the frequencies for adversative and non-adversative get-passives in BESC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adversative</th>
<th>Non-adversative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar to the get-passives found in SWENC, most get-passives in BESC are adversative. Half of the non-adversative get-passives found in BESC were neutral. Meanwhile, as was noted earlier, no neutral get-passives were found in SWENC and F-LOB and only one in Frown. Perhaps, the more frequent usage of neutral get-passives in a more informal genre can be seen as a result of the grammaticalization of the get-passive which was discussed briefly earlier (cf. Leech, 2004: 75 and Leech et al, 2009: 154). The following are three examples of adversative and non-adversative get-passives found in BESC:

(60) We did get raped vs liquid the other day...

(61) So I will wait and see if I will get accepted...

(62) Just got dropped off at the hotel and as soon as the restaurant opens I am going to […]

(60) is a negative get-passive and (61) is a positive one. (62), on the other hand, describes an event objectively and is thus a neutral get-passive.

5 Conclusion

The aim of this study was to investigate the usage of be-passives and get-passives by Swedes writing in English. Three research questions were posed to help fulfill that aim. The first question was designed to establish an overview of how passives are used by Swedes writing in English compared with data found in native English corpora. The other two questions sought to dig deeper and shed light on how two qualitative features of be-passives and get-
passives are used. In order to answer these question, two corpora containing texts written by Swedes, one containing more formal and the other more informal language, were used. Additionally, the press sub-corpora of two native English corpora were investigated. This allowed for comparisons to be made across linguistic genres as well as between Swedish speakers of English and native speakers.

The results show that both be-passives and get-passives are used by Swedes writing in English, both in online newspapers and in blogs. It was observed that be-passives are nearly twice as frequent in SWENC as in BESC. Meanwhile, get-passives are almost four times more frequent in BESC than in SWENC. This supports the argument presented by Huddleston and Pullum (2005: 245) that get-passives mark an informal style while the be-passive is neutral in style. These results were then compared with the results from the Frown and F-LOB corpora. It was noted that the results for the frequency of be-passives in SWENC more closely resembles those for Frown, which contains American English, than those for F-LOB, which contains British English. However, the number of get-passives in SWENC is more similar to that in F-LOB than in Frown.

Furthermore, the results showed that long passives make up a smaller part of the be-passives in BESC than in SWENC. The long be-passives in Frown and F-LOB, however, make up a larger part of the be-passives when compared with SWENC.

The qualitative analysis of the get-passives found in the corpora showed that there are no neutral get-passives in SWENC but four in BESC. It was suggested that this could be a sign of the ongoing grammaticalization of the get-passive, whereby it takes on new grammatical functions (cf. Leech, 2004: 75). Within the press sub-corpora of Frown and F-LOB, only one neutral get-passive was found in the former and none in the latter.

As discussed earlier, there are a few problems regarding the methods and material used in this study. To begin with, BESC is considerably smaller than the other corpora and, thus, the personal preferences of the authors may have had an effect on the results. Furthermore, the human factor plays a large role in the methods used for this study since most of the work was done manually. Because parts-of-speech tagged corpora were not available, the search terms used had to be very broad which resulted in a large number of tokens which then had to be analyzed. Additionally, because of the fact that no previous corpora containing texts written by Swedes in English within the newspaper or blog genre exist, no observations could be made regarding a possible increase or decrease in the usage of passives. Thus, it is not possible to discuss the process of colloquialization related to the be-passive described by Svartvik and Leech (2006: 208) and Leech (2004: 73). Nevertheless, it is possible to argue
that SWENC is ahead of F-LOB when it comes to the loss of the be-passive, but not as advanced as Frown.

In the end, it should be noted that the three research questions posed for this study have been answered and a few definite conclusions can be drawn from the results. The first question asked how Swedes writing in English use passives when compared with data found in native English corpora. This study has shown that Swedes writing in English use passive constructions to similar degrees as native English speakers do within the news genre.

Furthermore, it can be concluded that Swedes writing in English use significantly more be-passive constructions within the news genre than the more informal blog genre. Moreover, the study showed that Swedes writing in English do use get-passives and that they are considerably more common in the informal language used in blogs than the more formal language used in online newspapers.

The second question asked how Swedes writing in English use long and short passives when compared with data found in native English corpora. The investigation showed that the proportion of long passives to short passives is slightly smaller among Swedes writing in English. An exception is get-passives within the blog genre where the proportion of long to short get-passives is considerably larger than within the news genre.

Lastly, the third question asked how Swedes writing in English use get-passives with regard to semantics when compared with data found in native English corpora. This study has shown that the trend found in the native English corpora, i.e. that adversative get-passives are more common than non-adversative, is true also for Swedes writing in English.

The study carried out in this essay leaves much room for further research. For example, it would be interesting to carry out a similar investigation in one or two decades to be able to make observations concerning how the usage of passives by Swedes writing in English has changed over a number of years. Moreover, a similar study could be carried out with data from other linguistic genres, such as academic texts or transcripts of spoken language. This essay has investigated one linguistic feature of the English language. However, in order to fully understand how the language is used by Swedes, significantly more research must be done and with respect to many other linguistic features.
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Table 10. Search terms used to extract *be-passives*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense and number</th>
<th>Search term</th>
<th>Passive structures sought</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present singular*</td>
<td>is</td>
<td>is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present plural†</td>
<td>are</td>
<td>are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past singular‡</td>
<td>was</td>
<td>was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past plural§</td>
<td>were</td>
<td>were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present modal singular and plural⁷ (positive)</td>
<td>may be</td>
<td>may be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present modal singular and plural⁸ (negative)</td>
<td>may not be</td>
<td>may not be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect singular⁹ (positive)</td>
<td>has been</td>
<td>has been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect singular¹⁰ (negative)</td>
<td>has not been</td>
<td>has not been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect plural¹¹ (positive)</td>
<td>have been</td>
<td>have been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect plural¹² (negative)</td>
<td>have not been</td>
<td>have not been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past perfect singular and plural¹³ (positive)</td>
<td>had been</td>
<td>had been</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*This search also yields present progressive singular tokens (*is being*)
† This search also yields present progressive plural tokens (*are being*)
‡ This search also yields past progressive singular tokens (*was being*)
§ This search also yields past progressive plural tokens (*were being*)
⁷ This search also yields positive modal progressive singular and plural tokens (*may be being*)
⁸ This search also yields negative modal progressive singular and plural tokens (*may not be being*)
⁹ This search also yields positive perfect progressive singular tokens (*has been being*)
¹⁰ This search also yields negative perfect progressive singular tokens (*has not been being*)
¹¹ This search also yields positive perfect progressive plural tokens (*have been being*), positive modal perfect and singular plural tokens (*may have been*) and positive modal perfect progressive singular and plural tokens (*may have been being*)
¹² This search also yields negative perfect progressive plural tokens (*have not been being*)
¹³ This search also yields positive past perfect progressive singular and plural tokens (*had been being*)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense and number</th>
<th>Search term</th>
<th>Passive structures sought</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present/present perfect/ present progressive singular</td>
<td>*'s\textsuperscript{18}</td>
<td>‘s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present/progressive plural</td>
<td>*'re</td>
<td>‘re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future singular and plural (positive)</td>
<td>*‘ll be</td>
<td>‘ll be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future singular and plural (negative)</td>
<td>*‘ll not be</td>
<td>‘ll not be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future perfect singular and plural (positive)</td>
<td>*‘ll have been</td>
<td>‘ll have been</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{14} This search also yields negative past perfect progressive singular and plural tokens (had not been being)

\textsuperscript{15} This search also yields negative modal perfect progressive singular and plural tokens (may not have been being)

\textsuperscript{16} This search also yields positive future progressive singular and plural tokens (will be being)

\textsuperscript{17} This search also yields negative future progressive singular and plural tokens (will not be being)

\textsuperscript{18} The asterisk is a wildcard which allows for characters to precede the rest of the search term
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future perfect</th>
<th>*’ll not have been</th>
<th>‘ll not have been + past participle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>singular and plural (negative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past perfect (positive)</th>
<th>*’d been</th>
<th>‘d been</th>
<th>‘d been</th>
<th>‘d been being</th>
<th>+ past participle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past perfect (negative)</th>
<th>*’d not been</th>
<th>‘d not been</th>
<th>‘d not been</th>
<th>‘d not being</th>
<th>+ past participle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modal perfective/modal perfective progressive</th>
<th>may’ve been</th>
<th>may’ve been</th>
<th>may’ve been</th>
<th>may’ve been being</th>
<th>+ past participle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 12. Search terms used to extract get-passives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense and number</th>
<th>Search term</th>
<th>Passive structures sought</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present singular</td>
<td>gets</td>
<td>gets + past participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present plural19</td>
<td>get</td>
<td>get + past participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past singular and plural</td>
<td>got</td>
<td>got + past participle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progressive</th>
<th>getting</th>
<th>getting + past participle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 13. Search term used to extract contracted get-passives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense and number</th>
<th>Search term</th>
<th>Passive structures sought</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>‘ll get</td>
<td>‘ll get + past participle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19 This search also yields future singular and plural tokens (will get)