

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>General introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1	Finiteness .....	2
1.2	Finiteness in Dutch .....	4
1.3	Finiteness in a second language .....	8
1.4	Aims of the dissertation .....	12
1.5	Participants and methodology .....	13
1.6	Organization of the dissertation .....	15
1.7	Outline .....	17
<b>2</b>	<b>Finiteness in the source and target languages</b> .....	<b>19</b>
2.1	Word order and finiteness .....	19
2.1.1	Dutch .....	19
2.1.2	Moroccan Arabic .....	20
2.1.3	Turkish .....	21
2.2	Negation .....	22
2.2.1	Dutch .....	22
2.2.2	Moroccan Arabic .....	23
2.2.3	Turkish .....	24
2.3	Subject-verb agreement .....	25
2.3.1	Dutch .....	26
2.3.2	Moroccan Arabic .....	27
2.3.3	Turkish .....	27
2.4	Light verbs .....	28
2.4.1	Dutch .....	29
2.4.2	Moroccan Arabic .....	30
2.4.3	Turkish .....	31
2.5	Summary .....	33
<b>3</b>	<b>Light verbs and lexical verbs in negated sentences: On the crucial role of the auxiliary 'hebben'</b> .....	<b>35</b>
3.1	Background .....	36
3.1.1	Form-oriented studies .....	36
3.1.2	Function-oriented studies .....	39

3.2	The role of auxiliaries in L2 German .....	43
3.3	Research questions .....	47
3.4	The study .....	48
	3.4.1 Participants .....	48
	3.4.2 Tasks .....	49
	3.4.3 Coding and scoring .....	51
3.5	Results .....	52
	3.5.1 Acquiring Dutch light verbs .....	52
	3.5.1.1 A fixed order .....	52
	3.5.1.2 'Is-lexical verb' .....	58
	3.5.2 Light verbs and lexical verbs in negated sentences .....	63
	3.5.2.1 Data for the -AUX group .....	63
	3.5.2.2 Data for the +AUX group .....	66
	3.5.3 Summary .....	68
3.6	The role of auxiliaries .....	69
	3.6.1 A closer look at learners' use of auxiliaries ..	69
	3.6.2 Do auxiliaries lead to finiteness? .....	72
3.7	Conclusion and discussion .....	74
<b>4</b>	<b>Further support for the role of 'hebben': Evidence from production, imitation and processing .....</b>	<b>79</b>
4.1	Background .....	80
	4.1.1 Production studies .....	80
	4.1.2 Processing studies .....	82
4.2	Research questions .....	85
4.3	The study .....	87
	4.3.1 Participants .....	87
	4.3.2 Tasks: What they measure and how .....	88
	4.3.3 Production tasks .....	89
	4.3.4 Elicited-imitation task .....	89
	4.3.5 Sentence-matching task .....	91
4.4	Results for production .....	94
4.5	Results for elicited imitation .....	96
	4.5.1 Coding and scoring .....	96

4.5.2	Results .....	96
4.5.3	Summary .....	102
4.6	Results for sentence-matching .....	103
4.6.1	Analyses .....	103
4.6.2	Results for the native speakers .....	104
4.6.3	Results for the +AUX group .....	105
4.6.4	Results for the -AUX group .....	106
4.6.5	Summary .....	106
4.7	Discussion .....	107

## **5 Is there a relation between verb morphology and verb placement? Evidence from production and imitation .....**

		<b>113</b>
5.1	Finiteness and verb-raising .....	115
5.2	Functional categories in L2 acquisition .....	117
5.3	Aim of the study .....	120
5.4	Study I: Finiteness and verb-raising in production .....	123
5.4.1	Participants and data .....	123
5.4.2	Results .....	123
	5.4.2.1 Finiteness in negated utterances .....	124
	5.4.2.2 The role of proficiency: Two learner groups .....	130
5.4.3	Summary .....	132
5.5	Study II: Finiteness and verb-raising in imitation .....	133
5.5.1	Participants .....	133
5.5.2	Materials .....	134
5.5.3	Coding and analyses .....	135
5.5.4	Results .....	137
	5.5.4.1 Changes from finite to non-finite verbs and vice versa .....	137
	5.5.4.2 Changes from raised to non-raised verbs and vice versa .....	139
5.5.5	Summary .....	141
5.6	Discussion .....	142

<b>6</b>	<b>On the role of scope marking: Comparing negated sentences and sentences with adverbials .....</b>	<b>147</b>
6.1	Adverbials in natural language .....	151
6.1.1	Different types of temporal adverbials and scope marking .....	151
6.1.2	Adverbials in the source and target languages .....	153
6.2	Research questions .....	154
6.3	The study .....	155
6.3.1	Participants .....	155
6.3.2	Tasks .....	156
6.3.3	Coding and scoring .....	157
6.4	Results .....	158
6.4.1	Adverbial versus negation placement .....	158
6.4.2	Different types of adverbials .....	159
6.5	The different behavior of TAPs and TACs .....	161
6.5.1	Background: Finiteness in L2 Dutch .....	161
6.5.2	Different functions of TAPs and TACs .....	164
6.5.3	Double adverbial constructions .....	165
6.5.4	Fronted adverbials .....	166
6.5.5	Interaction with finiteness marking .....	167
6.6	Conclusion and discussion .....	170
<b>7</b>	<b>Further investigating the influence of semantic scope marking: Evidence from production and processing .....</b>	<b>175</b>
7.1	Verb placement in L2 acquisition .....	178
7.2	Verb placement in negated sentences: Recap of Chapter 4 .....	182
7.3	Research questions .....	184
7.4	The study .....	186
7.4.1	Participants .....	186
7.4.2	Production tasks .....	187
7.4.3	Sentence-matching task .....	187
7.4.4	Coding and scoring .....	189

7.5	Results .....	190
7.5.1	Results for production .....	190
7.5.2	Results for processing .....	194
7.5.2.1	Analyses .....	194
7.5.2.2	Results for all adverbials .....	194
7.5.2.3	Adverbials of position versus adverbials of frequency .....	197
7.5.3	Summary .....	199
7.5.4	Adverbials in sentence-initial position .....	199
7.6	Discussion .....	205
<b>8</b>	<b>Summary of the results and implications .....</b>	<b>209</b>
8.1	Summary of the main findings .....	209
8.2	From a non-finite to a finite system in L2 Dutch .....	212
8.3	General contributions to L2 research on finiteness ...	220
8.4	Limitations .....	222
8.5	Open issues .....	223
	<b>References .....</b>	<b>225</b>
	<b>Appendices .....</b>	<b>237</b>
A	Abbreviations used in the examples .....	237
B	Biographical information about the learners .....	238
C	Picture stories .....	248
D	Items .....	252
	<b>Samenvatting .....</b>	<b>261</b>