Is verb raising influenced by information structure?
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Finiteness in L2 Dutch and German

• Learners have to acquire
  – verbal morphology (tense & agreement)
  – verb raising to V2

• Many studies* have used negation as a measure for verb raising

• Development from no raising to raising:

  Jan niet slapen  $\rightarrow$ Jan slaapt niet

*Becker 2005; Meisel 1997; Schimke 2009; Vainikka & Young-Scholten, 1996; Verhagen 2009
**Initial observation**

- Additive particles (*ook/auch and weer/wieder*) occur in same positions as negation in target languages
- but they behave differently in learner languages: less verb raising with additive particles

*Herr Grün* auch springt

Herr Grün springt nicht

*Herr Rot* auch springt nicht  (Herr Rot springt auch nicht)

*Schimke, Verhagen & Dimroth (2008)*
Potential explanations

• Lexical differences: only negation reverts truth value

  Jan was niet hier – Jan was hier
  Jan was ook hier – Jan was hier
  Jan was weer hier – Jan was hier

• Typically different information structures and scope domains
Differences in typical scope domain

• Negation and *ook/auch* typically affect different information units
• This is due to differences in their *typical* discourse integration:

OOM/AUCH:   Peter slapen/slaapt. [Hans] *ook* slapen/slaapt.  
            [topic] *ook* predicate

NEGATION:   Hans dansen/danst. Hans *niet* [slapen/slaapt].  
            topic *niet* [predicate]
If scope influences verb raising...

...one should see the difference within one particle by comparing typical and atypical scope patterns:

Peter slaapt. [Hans] niet slaapt.

more verb raising


less verb raising
Does verb raising depend on scope domain?

1. **Negation**: typically scope over predicate.  
   → Less verb raising when scope over topic?

2. **Ook/auch**: typically scope over topic.  
   → More verb raising when scope over predicate?

3. **Weer/wieder**: no clear typical pattern.  
   → Verb raising dependent on scope domain?
### Previous findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scope over Topic</th>
<th>Scope over Predicate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negation</td>
<td></td>
<td>more raising &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ook/auch</td>
<td>less raising &gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weer/wieder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Predictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scope over Topic</th>
<th>Scope over Predicate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negation</td>
<td>less raising</td>
<td>more raising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ook/auch</td>
<td>less raising</td>
<td>more raising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weer/wieder</td>
<td>less raising</td>
<td>more raising</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Method

• Elicited production data based on picture stories and video clips

• Context integration systematically varied

• Participants: adult L2 immersion learners
  – L2 Dutch (N=100), L1s = Turkish / Moroccan Arabic
  – L2 German (N=98), L1s = Turkish / Russian / others
Results for negation

Scope over Predicate  Scope over Topic

N=229  N=33
Results for ook/auch

Scope over Predicate
Scope over Topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Raising</th>
<th>No raising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scope over Predicate</td>
<td>N=39</td>
<td>N=341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope over Topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*
Results for weer/wieder

![Bar chart showing the distribution of raising and no raising for scope over predicate and scope over topic.](chart)

- **Scope over Predicate**
  - Raising: 70%
  - No raising: 30%

- **Scope over Topic**
  - Raising: 30%
  - No raising: 70%

- Sample sizes:
  - N=19 for scope over predicate
  - N=124 for scope over topic

*Significant difference (*)
# Predictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scope over Topic</th>
<th>Scope over Predicate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negation</td>
<td>less raising</td>
<td>more raising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ook/auch</td>
<td>less raising</td>
<td>more raising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weer/wieder</td>
<td>less raising</td>
<td>more raising</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scope over Topic</th>
<th>Scope over Predicate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negation</td>
<td>less raising X</td>
<td>more raising ➔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ook/auch</td>
<td>less raising ➔</td>
<td>more raising ➔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weer/wieder</td>
<td>less raising ➔</td>
<td>more raising ➔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evidence for influence of different scope domains?

- **YES**
  Results for additive particles support this

- **NO**
  Results for negation show equal amount of verb raising for both scope domains

.... why?
## Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scope over Topic</th>
<th>Scope over Predicate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negation</td>
<td>less raising</td>
<td>more raising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ook/auch</td>
<td>less raising</td>
<td>more raising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weer/wieder</td>
<td>less raising</td>
<td>more raising</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why is verb raising with additive particles more difficult in [topic] case?

• Verb raising leads to non-adjacency:
  Scope over topic: [Peter] slaapt ook.
  Scope over predicate: Peter [drinkt] ook.

• Learners might perceive [topic] + particle as a unit: even auxiliaries sometimes do not raise
  [Er] auch hat Bier getrunken.
  [Sie] auch ist eingeschlafen.
# Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scope over Topic</th>
<th>Scope over Predicate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negation</td>
<td>less raising X</td>
<td>more raising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ook/auch</td>
<td>less raising ➤</td>
<td>more raising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weer/wieder</td>
<td>less raising ➤</td>
<td>more raising</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scope over Topic</th>
<th>Scope over Predicate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negation</td>
<td>less raising 🔴</td>
<td>more raising ➤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ook/auch</td>
<td>less raising ➤</td>
<td>more raising ➤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weer/wieder</td>
<td>less raising ➤</td>
<td>more raising ➤</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why is [topic] case no problem for verb raising with negation?

- Additive particles more sensitive to information structure
  - they only mark discourse integration

- Negation reverts truth value independently of scope domain
  - it expresses that comment does not apply to topic
  - comment matters even in the [topic] case
  - the unit [topic] + negation is less strong
  - adjacency is given up earlier in favor of verb raising
Conclusions

• Acquisition of verb raising is influenced by information structure:
  – When particles have scope over the topic, learners keep them next to their scope domain and produce less verb raising
• Due to its meaning this relation is less strong for negation

Question: Are the different findings for negation and auch/ook due to lexical differences or differences in information structure?

Answer: Both are of influence.
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Morphological finiteness in non-raised utterances

Negation:
No difference

Ook/auch:
More finite verbs when scope over the predicate...
Morphological finiteness in non-raised utterances

Weer/wieder:
More finite verbs when scope over the topic

![Bar chart showing the comparison between finite and non-finite verbs with scope over predicate and topic.](chart.png)

- Scope over Predicate: Finite - N=6, Non-finite - N=74
- Scope over Topic: Finite - N=6, Non-finite - N=74