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Abstract

It is generally assumed that all refugees form one and the same group of low(er) educated people, without taking their previous experiences and certificates into consideration, which might cause problems in the integration and language learning process. Second language learning experiences of highly educated adult refugees in particular are largely absent from recent academic literature. For that reason, this explorative study investigates the second language proficiency in Dutch of highly educated adult refugees’ in the Netherlands by examining their written narrative production in Dutch. It is supposed that highly educated adult refugees are more proficient in Dutch as a second language than lower educated adult refugees, but less proficient compared to natives, measured in terms of written narrative production. Analyses examine written ”frog-story” narratives produced by two highly educated adult refugee groups on a different second language level, compared with the written narratives of one group of lower educated adult refugees and one group of native speakers. Categories of interest are narrative length, narrative structure and the inclusion of different evaluative devices. The results show that the written narratives of highly educated refugees are considerably shorter than the written narratives of native speakers of Dutch, whereas they are considerably longer compared to the written narratives of lower educated refugees. Moreover, highly educated refugees’ inclusion of structural elements and evaluative devices seems to be more constrained compared to native speakers, but not compared to lower educated refugees. This suggests that second language learners, and highly educated adult refugees in particular, possess a smaller repertoire of discourse and emotional functions than native speakers of Dutch, but when proficiency increases, this repertoire also appears to increase and people might be more likely to use a variety of linguistic resources to provide context to the story.
Samenvatting

In het algemeen wordt aangenomen dat alle vluchtelingen één en dezelfde groep van lager opgeleide personen vormen, zonder hun eerdere ervaringen en diploma’s te betrachten, wat problemen zou kunnen veroorzaken in hun integratie- en taalleerproces. De ervaringen van, in het bijzonder, hoogopgeleide vluchtelingen met betrekking tot het leren van een tweede taal worden grotendeels niet besproken in recent wetenschappelijk onderzoek. Deze exploratieve studie onderzoekt om deze reden de taalvaardigheid in het Nederlands als tweede taal van hoog opgeleide volwassen vluchtelingen in Nederland. Dit wordt gedaan door middel van geschreven verhaalproductie. De verwachting is dat hoogopgeleide volwassen vluchtelingen taalvaardiger zijn in het Nederlands als tweede taal dan lager opgeleide volwassen vluchtelingen, maar minder taalvaardig dan moedertaalsprekers, gemeten in termen van geschreven verhaalproductie. Dit onderzoek verschaft een analyse op basis van ”frog-story” verhalen, waarin de geschreven verhaalproductie in het Nederlands van twee groepen hoger opgeleide volwassen vluchtelingen op verschillende tweede taal niveaus wordt vergeleken met de geschreven verhaalproductie van een groep lager opgeleide vluchtelingen en een groep moedertaalsprekers. Analysecategorieën zijn lengte van het verhaal, structuur van het verhaal en het gebruik van verschillende evaluatieve elementen. De resultaten laten zien dat de geschreven verhalen van hoog opgeleide vluchtelingen aanzienlijk korte zijn dan de verhalen van moedertaalsprekers, maar ze zijn aanzienlijk langer dan de verhalen die geschreven zijn door laag opgeleide vluchtelingen. Bovendien lijken hoogopgeleide vluchtelinge meer beperkt te zijn in het gebruik van structurele elementen en evaluatieve elementen dan moedertaalsprekers, maar minder beperkt dan laag opgeleide vluchtelingen. Dit suggereert dat tweede taalleerders, en in het bijzonder hoogopgeleide volwassen vluchtelingen, een kleiner repertoire aan verhaal- en emotionele functies bezitten dan moedertaalsprekers van het Nederlands. Dit repertoire lijkt echter toe te nemen naarmate taalvaardigheid toeneemt en mensen lijken meer geneigd om een verscheidenheid aan taalkundige middelen toe te passen om context te creëren.
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1. Introduction

Refugee and immigrant migration is not a new phenomenon nowadays and people have been moving from place to place since the very beginning of mankind. In recent years, however, the rates of migration have increased worldwide due to globalization, growing aspirations for a better life, improved access to international travel, frequent devastation from natural disasters, and advanced technology (Bemak & Chung, 2015). Asylum migration is one of the most important forms of migration, next to family- and labor migration, and never before there were so many people fleeing violence and war. Globally, the number of people who are forcefully displaced as a result of persecution, violence, conflict or human right violations is about 65 million (end of 2015) – 5.3 million people more than the year before (US Committee for Refugees and Immigrants, 2016; VluchtelingenWerk Nederland, 2016). This increase in the number of asylum migrants has also become visible in the Netherlands, where the amount of refugees firmly increased from 73 thousand in 2012 to 88 thousand by the end of 2015 (VluchtelingenWerk Nederland, 2016).

Within the group of newcomers, refugees and asylum seekers appear to be a distinct category. They often suffer from mental health problems through traumatic experiences, making the integration process problematic (Mattheijer, 2000). Besides, it is generally assumed that refugees and asylum seekers are low educated (Bosher & Rowekamp, 1992; Bemak & Chung, 2015), but it is actually shown that many of them have high educational qualities and skills (Psoinos, 2007; Bemak & Chung, 2015). The most urgent priority for those refugees is satisfaction of basic human needs as shelter, income and protection, but once these needs are met, other priorities will emerge, like a demand for education and paid employment (Hannah, 1999). Those second order demands involve the attainment of proficiency in the host country’s language (Mesch, 2003), since language plays a key role in the integration process and the position of immigrants in the labor market (Van Tubergen, 2010). Following Brown, Miller and Mitchell (2006), refugees constitute an extremely high risk group facing great challenges concerning language learning, adaptation to the host country’s school system and the eventual academic success. Even when the literacy levels of the refugees are sufficient enough and when they have had enough formal schooling, many of them still experience problems with the mainstream curriculum and its language demands. Moreover, the education and skills acquired in the home country cannot always be transferred directly into relevant skills for the host country (Bijwaard, 2008), forcing people to go through the study process again in their new
country. Once in their new country, refugees are mostly financially supported to follow language courses, but the level of those courses, however, is often too low for the group of highly educated refugees, causing insufficient language proficiency of refugees to study at a high level (UAF, 2014). Therefore, language remains a barrier in the process of integration into the host country’s society (De Gruijter, 2005).

Most of the current research in the field of second language learning and language proficiency is concerned with all persons coming from countries in which the host country’s language is not the people’s first language, without making a distinction between different kinds of groups (McBrien, 2005; Van Tubergen, 2010; Yao & Van Ours, 2015). Research that is merely based on immigrant people is mainly focused on classic immigrant countries such as Australia, the United States and Canada. However, much less is known about the language learning process of immigrants in the Netherlands and other European countries (Van Tubergen & Kalmijn, 2009). Furthermore, experiences of highly educated refugees are largely absent from recent academic literature and most attention has been paid to refugee children and young adults in primary and secondary education and to international students in college or university settings (Bosher & Roweckamp, 1992). More research on refugee students as a distinct group is necessary, in which attention is paid to individual differences. This explorative research will therefore focus on the second language skills of refugee students, and more specifically on highly educated adult refugee students, by looking at their written narrative production. The examination of larger units of language (i.e. narratives) is a useful tool in identifying the strengths of highly educated adult refugees in acquiring a second language, but it can also detect problems they encounter during the learning process (Kang, 2006).

This study starts with an overview of literature on migration, both historical and temporary, including a conceptualization of refugees, asylum seekers, and highly educated refugees. This is followed by a literature section about integration and the second language learning process. Next, narratives as a research method are outlined. The theoretical part is ended with a presentation of the research question and hypotheses. Thereafter, in section three, the method for the execution of this study is outlined whereupon the results of this study are presented. Finally, a discussion of the results is presented followed by a conclusion of the study.
2. Theoretical framework

This chapter overviews current literature about migration, refugees and second language learning. First, European migration and more specifically Dutch migration are placed in a historical context. Thereafter, the second section discusses one of the key concepts of this study, namely the difference between immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers. In the third section, the focus is on refugees in the Netherlands, and the fourth section is about highly educated refugees as a distinct group. Section five discusses different factors affecting the integration process in general, followed by an outline of the second language learning process in particular. Finally, the seventh section deals with narratives as a research method for studying second language proficiency. This chapter ends with the development of a research question and hypotheses.

2.1 Migration history

This paragraph contains a brief description of the main forces of migration in Europe and more specifically in the Netherlands, which is the focus-country of this study.

2.1.1 European migration history

Patterns of migration, toward, from and within Europe were subject to many changes in the past sixty years. In the period after the Second World War (until about 1974), the North-Western parts of Europe were economically booming and therefore an interesting area for workers from all over Europe. At that time, local employees were reluctant to take up poorly paid work in sectors as agriculture, cleaning and mining. As a consequence, the governments in North-Western Europe started to recruit employees from poor(er) European regions were there was insufficient employment. Initially, migration was considered to be something positive in this period, both from the receiving as well as from the sending countries. By the end of this period, the immigrant population of North-Western countries firmly increased and at the same time, migration from (former) European colonies took place. However, due to the Oil Crisis, the demand for labor sharply reduced in the years 1973 and 1974, resulting in a migration stop. This stop, however, appeared to be ineffective, and the number of residents kept rising and people started settling permanently. As a result, migrants started to bring their families to their new country (Van Mol & De Valk, 2016).

The collapse of the Iron Curtain in the 1980s and the opening of the European borders induced new migration flows across Europe and the end of the Cold War led to a new flow of
asylum seekers to Western Europe. By the end of the 1990s, asylum applications decreased, but from 2006 onwards, the applications again grew due to raising conflicts in Afghanistan, Syria and Iraq (Van Mol & De Valk, 2016). The period of the past 25 years is mainly concerned with integration issues as a central policy concern. Many European countries aimed at attracting highly skilled or educated migrants for a global competition for talent. Until the 1990s, migration motives were mainly marked by family reunification, labor migration and asylum migration. Since the 1990s, however, those motives for migration have become increasingly diversified (Van Mol & De Valk, 2016). War and (political) oppression are nowadays seen as the main reasons for migration. New crises arose in the Middle East and African countries, reinforced by unresolved conflicts in the Democratic Republic of Congo, Somalia and Afghanistan. Moreover, the crises in Syria, Iraq and Ukraine are still ongoing, which is a major cause for the global increase of refugees (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2015). Furthermore, a growing number of young people nowadays migrate to attend higher education (Van Mol & De Valk, 2016).

2.1.2 Dutch migration history
The Netherlands has witnessed several immigration waves during the previous century (Bijwaard, 2008; Jennissen, 2009; Stupar, 2015; Van Mol & De Valk, 2016) and the country has changed from an emigration country to an immigration country (Bijwaard, 2008). Since the end of the Second World War, six major immigration waves can be distinguished (Bijwaard, 2008; Jennissen, 2009; VluchtelingenWerk Nederland, 2016). The first one started in the mid-1950s and consisted of migrants from former Dutch colonies, like Surinam, Indonesia and the Netherlands Antilles. The second wave took place in the 1960s when labor migrants from Turkey, Morocco and Southern Europe came to the Netherlands to conduct low skilled labor. Just as mentioned in section 2.1.1, the recruitment policy for labor migrants stopped during the Oil Crisis in the 1970s, which was also the case in the Netherlands. However, immigration continued and the families of Turkish and Moroccan guest workers (as the people coming to the Netherlands during the second wave were called) were reunited. In this same period, the independence of Surinam caused a third large immigration flow to the Netherlands. The fourth wave started in the 1980s and comprised of asylum seekers and (political) refugees from a bunch of countries, such as Afghanistan, Iraq, former Yugoslavia, Somalia and Iran. A major underlying cause for this migration wave was the political instability in Eastern Europe, caused by the downfall of communism. Family formation (with partners from other countries) and
reunification still continued in this phase. During the first half of the 1990s, the war in former Yugoslavia caused a lot of migration. The fifth wave was caused by labor migrants from Eastern European countries, such as Poland and Bulgaria (Bijwaard, 2008; Jennissen, 2009). Within the last couple of years, ongoing chaos due to civil war in Syria caused the most recent immigration flow to the Netherlands (VluchtelingenWerk 2015, 2016).

In the Netherlands, refugees have been settling since a long time. The number of refugees and the countries of origin, however, vary in time. Nowadays, asylum migration is seen as one of the most important forms of migration in the Netherlands. Reasons for those applications are mostly related to unsafe living conditions in the home country, to war and to oppression. The eighties typically comprised of a wave of asylum seekers and this is also the time-span in which the amount of asylum seekers started to increase, and in which the countries of origin became diversified. In 1988, the number of applications slightly decreased, but firmly increased a year later, due to the fall of the Iron Curtain. From that moment on, a lot of asylum seekers fled from Eastern Europe. In 1992, people from the region that was known as Yugoslavia found their way to the Netherlands. Due to the major increase of asylum seekers in the nineties and in order to regulate applications in a better way, the Immigration and Naturalization service was established. In the last couple of years and due to a new war, most asylum seekers are coming from Somalia and Iraq (Wijkhuijs, Kromhout, Wubs & Jennissen, 2009).

2.2 The difference between immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers
In current literature, various terms are used to define people who are coming to a foreign country in order to settle. Examples of terms are immigrant, refugee and asylum seeker. These terms are often confused and used in the same sense, but they do not strictly cover the same concept. According to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (in short the UNHCR), an immigrant is someone who voluntarily moves to another country in order to improve the future prospects of themselves and those of their families. This movement is mostly tied to economic reasons (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2016) and many of the immigrants are highly educated (Rong & Preissle, 1998, as cited in McBrien, 2005), had enough time to consider their decision to move (Cowart & Cowart, 2002, as cited in McBrien, 2005) and had sufficient financial means to do so (McBrien, 2005). Unlike most immigrants, refugees do not leave their home country voluntarily. The UNHCR describes a refugee as someone who ’owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion,
nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality, and is unable to, or owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country". Refugees are forced to move in order to save their lives or to preserve their freedom and they have no protection from their own state (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2016). It is assumed that refugees experience more pre-migratory problems than many other immigrants when it comes to acculturation, integration and language learning. Those problems are mostly caused by the living conditions in their home country. One of these factors causing problems is the disrupted education migrants might have got in the home country (Bonfiglio, 2010, as cited in Borrell, 2010), but also trauma, violence, loss of loved ones, lack of food, and political and economic oppression contribute to this (Steel, Silove, Phan & Bauman, 2002, as cited in Borrell, 2010). The term refugee can be used in two different senses: it can include all displaced persons who have applied for asylum, regardless of the outcome of their application, or it can include people who have been granted refugee status (Psinos, 2007). An asylum seeker, at last, is someone "who says he or she is a refugee, but whose claim has not yet been definitely evaluated" (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2016). He or she recently applied for asylum in which protection from another country is asked, but is still waiting for a decision on that by the host country. Once the application is approved, the asylum seeker becomes a refugee (VluchtelingenWerk Nederland, 2015). It is evident that there is a clear difference between immigrants and refugees/asylum seekers, in a way that refugees/asylum seekers often have traumatic experiences due to their ethnicity, religion, political opinion or nationality.

As of January 2015, the total population of concern to UNHCR stood at more than 59.5 million persons, 8.3 million persons more compared to the year before. This number includes persons who are forcibly displaced (i.e. refugees, asylum seekers and internally displaced persons), persons who have found a durable solution (i.e. returnees), and stateless persons. Of those 59.5 million forcibly displaced persons, 19.5 million are refugees. Most of them resided in Europe, followed by South West Asia and the Middle East. Of those refugees, 1.7 million individuals submitted an application for asylum. Most of those claims are submitted in the Russian Federation, followed by Germany, the United States and Turkey (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2016). The Netherlands takes the ninth position (OECD, 2015, Table 1.5, p. 28). The total number of asylum seekers in the same year is about 1.8 million. Most of them, just like the refugees, resided in Europe. Nevertheless, still a significant number of asylum seekers resided in Southern Africa. The remaining persons comprise internally displaced persons. For the first time, Turkey became the largest refugee hosting country
worldwide, hosting 1.59 million persons. Turkey is followed by Pakistan (1.51 million persons), Lebanon (1.15 million persons), Iran (982.000 persons), Ethiopia (695.500 persons) and Jordan (654.100 persons). Over the course of 2014, almost 127.000 people returned to their countries of origin. More than half of the refugees worldwide are from only three countries, namely Syria, Afghanistan and Somalia. Together, these three countries are responsible for 53 percent of all refugees under UNHCR’s responsibility. These days, Europe hosts around 3.1 million refugees, which is 22 percent of the global total (UNHCR, 2016).

2.3 Immigrants and refugees in the Netherlands

People who resettle in the Netherlands can roughly be grouped into two groups: the ones who migrate for protection (i.e. refugees and asylum seekers) and the ones who migrate for study or work (i.e. immigrants). The total number of immigrants and refugees in the Netherlands cannot be determined exactly, since this group is not properly registered in folk statistics (due to the fact that most refugees have arrived illegally in the host country, without a visa or documented proof of nationality). Therefore, absolute numbers are derived from estimations based on approved asylum applications and on the nationality of foreign people in the Netherlands (Klaver & Odé, 2003; De Gruijter, 2005; Van Mol & De Valk, 2016). In addition, the government uses language analyses to pinpoint nationality, which are based on the assumption that the way a person speaks contains clues about their origin. However, none of these methods are very reliable to generate numbers about amounts and nationality and concerns point to the direction of overgeneralizations and the process of making erroneous assumptions (Eades, 2005).

By 2014, the Netherlands hosts around 3.6 million registered residents who were of non-native background, half of them were born abroad and half of them were born in the Netherlands with at least one foreign-born parent. Together those immigrants comprise 21 percent of the total population. The largest group is from Turkish background (396.400), followed by Moroccans (375.000), Indonesians (372.200), Germans (368.500) and people from Surinamese background (348.300). 77 percent of the non-natives in the Netherlands has a Dutch citizenship (OECD 2015, p. 230). In the same year, the Netherlands counts almost 83 thousand refugees, almost ten thousand more than by the end of 2012. The number of asylum seekers (i.e. persons who have applied for asylum and are awaiting a decision on their application) is approximately seven thousand. Most of the refugees come from Iraq (54.159), Afghanistan (43.183), Somalia (37.432) and Iran (36.561; VluchtelingenWerk Nederland, 2015). One year later, in 2015, the
numbers slightly increased. A major increase, however, is visible in the number of asylum seekers from Syria. The number of Syrian immigrants increased from 13,744 in 2014 to 22,568 in 2015 (VluchtelingenWerk Nederland, 2016). In 2014, 24,500 asylum applications were filled, with Syrians, Eritreans and stateless persons comprising the main groups (OECD, 2015, p. 230).

2.4 Highly educated refugees
Little is known about refugee students in higher education and relevant research on this topic has almost exclusively focused on international students (Bosher & Rowekamp, 1992). It is generally assumed that refugees have few skills and are low educated, but this is actually a myth since statistics show different results (Bosher & Rowekamp, 1992; Bemak & Chung, 2015). A large portion of the total refugee population has high educational qualities and skills (i.e. college or university educated in the home country; Psinos, 2007; Bemak & Chung, 2015), but exact numbers are missing since most of the time, those numbers are not recorded in the folk statistics of receiving countries (see also section 2.3; Klaver & Odé, 2003; De Gruijter, 2005). Of the population of adult refugees (i.e. those who are sixteen years or older) in the Netherlands, only eleven percent was uneducated in the year 2000 and eighteen percent completed primary education. On the other hand, a quarter of the refugee population followed professional or academic education in their home country. Nineteen percent of them completed their study and six percent started education, but failed to complete (Warmerdam & Van den Tillaart, 2002, as cited in Klaver & Odé, 2003). However, it is important to mention that other studies found different numbers (Mattheijer, 2000), indicating that research is highly dependent on the chosen method. Based on those different studies, it can be stated that between 20 and 30 percent of the asylum seekers and refugees in the Netherlands are highly educated (Klaver & Odé, 2003).

There are, however, large differences between ethnic groups in terms of education (Mattheijer, 2000; Klaver & Odé, 2003). Among people from Iraq (Hulshof, De Ridder, & Krooneman, 1992, as cited in Mattheijer, 2000) and Iran (Van Tubergen, 2010), relatively many people are highly educated, while the portion of highly educated people among refugees from Somalia, Ethiopia and Eritrea is relatively low (Hulshof et al., 1992, as cited in Mattheijer, 2000). Nevertheless, highly educated people from African countries have fled to the Netherlands in the past fifteen years (De Gruijter, 2005). People from European countries such as former Yugoslavia (Desian & Hello, 2006) and Romania appear to be low educated (Doornhein & Dijkhoff, 1995, as cited in Mattheijer, 2000).
There are also gender differences in refugees’ level of education, but results of different studies point in different directions. Brink, Pasariboe and Hollands (1996, as cited in Mattheijer, 2000), for example, found that women where better educated than men, while Hulshof, De Ridder and Krooneman (1992, as cited in Mattheijer, 2000) concluded that women relatively more frequently had only some basic education. Moreover, it is claimed that the level of education rises with age. This might explain the findings that people from Iran are generally higher educated than people from Somalia: Iranians are often older than Somalian refugees at the time of fleeing (Brink et al., 1996, as cited in Mattheijer, 2000; Van Tubergen, 2010).

Refugees with professional qualifications trained outside the host country can encounter barriers in the host country’s labor force and are often unable to work in their area of professional qualification (Basran & Zong, 1998). It immediately starts with their arrival in the new country: refugees are often unable to present official documents confirming their previous educational qualifications and experiences (Hannah, 1999). Another factor that causes problems is that the studies refugees did in their home country are in most cases lower valued in the Netherlands than in their home country (Hulshof et al., 1992, as cited in Mattheijer, 2000). Furthermore, the skills someone has acquired cannot always directly be transferred into relevant skills for the host country (Bijwaard, 2008). In such cases, refugees have two options, namely continuing or discontinuing their careers in their new country (Glasta & Vedder, 2010). When students choose to continue their career, they follow the same academic subjects in the host country as they did in their home country, irrespective of the loss of possible status (i.e. lower educational level). Another form of continuation could be a transformation, in which informal and often repressed intellectual interests and activities are transformed into a formal educational career in the host country. When discontinuity occurs, refugees change the subject of their study in the host country. This could be due to the unavailability of certain subjects in their home country, the fact that they were unable to choose from this array of subjects or the lack of employment opportunities in the host country. An example of this discontinuity could be a refugee who now decides to follow a law study. In the home country, however, he or she has studied something different because a law study is not very valuable in their home country, since social institutions, including the juridical system, were seen as corrupt. At last, crystallization can occur, but this is not particularly interesting for foreign educated refugees. In the crystallization pattern, young students who finished secondary education in the host country are for the first time in their lives presented to higher education (Glasta & Vedder, 2010).
A frequently cited reason for the barriers that highly educated refugees experience in the host country is that countries lack appropriate and adequate mechanisms to evaluate refugees’ credentials (Basran & Zong, 1998). Basran and Zong (1998) describe the barriers of highly educated refugees in two different ways: as individual barriers and as institutional barriers. Individual barriers constitute a lack of host country specific experiences, the inability to meet occupational entry requirements and inadequate command of the host country’s language. In order to overcome those barriers, refugees have to acquire the equivalence in terms of the host country’s standard, i.e. they have to study again. Institutional barriers, also called structural barriers, can be the non-recognition of foreign work or study experiences or a devaluation of foreign credentials. This may cause systematic exclusion of professional refugees in the work force. Research performed by Boyd (1985, as cited in Basran & Zong, 1998), for instance, shows that natives receive a greater return for their education compared to non-natives due to differences in skills and difficulties between the transfer of educational skills across boundaries.

Sometimes it might be difficult to separate individual barriers from structural barriers, especially for foreign-trained people who may perceive racial discrimination. For instance, lacking host country experience may be categorized as an individual barrier, but it is also related to employers refusing to recognize the foreign credentials of refugees. Refugees themselves indicate that they perceive to be discriminated based on their skin color, ethnic origin or second language proficiency (Basran & Zong, 1998). Because of those barriers, many of the highly educated students are not succeeding academically at the post-secondary level and are dropping out (Bosher & Rowekamp, 1992).

2.5 Language and integration outcomes

When immigrants resettle in a new country, adaptation to a new country and a new life is often complicated by the necessity to acquire a new language (Borrell, 2010; Bemak & Chung, 2015). The inability to communicate often induces feelings of helplessness and frustration, and such language barriers impede the adjustment to the new country (Fletcher, 1999). Both sociolinguists and economists have studied immigrants’ language proficiency, and language use patterns of immigrants are often considered as being able to give information about their integration into the host society (Van Tubergen & Kalmijn, 2009). Moreover, language also plays an important role in their position in the labor market, i.e. their economical position, but also in their social position (Chiswick & Miller, 2001; Van Tubergen, 2010; Yao & Van Ours,
Immigrant people who are more proficient in the language of the host country, i.e. their second language, are more likely to find a job in the host country and are more likely to have higher earnings (Chiswick & Miller, 2002; Shields & Price, 2002; Van Tubergen & Kalmijn, 2009). Furthermore, immigrants are more likely to establish contacts with native speakers if they have more knowledge of the foreign language (Martinovic, Van Tubergen & Maas, 2009).

Nowadays, entire journals are dedicated to the topic of second language acquisition. Most of those journals, however, cover topics that apply to all persons from countries in which the host country’s language is not the people’s mother tongue, without making a distinction between different kinds of groups and different cultural backgrounds and ethnicities. In general, those studies show that immigrants with better language skills will integrate more easily in the host country than the ones with less developed skills. Unfortunately, little is known about the language acquisition process of particularly refugee groups in Western countries (McBrien, 2005; Van Tubergen, 2010; Yao & Van Ours, 2015), which is the target group of this study. Therefore the question remains whether the patterns are similar among refugees, because refugees differ from migrants in terms of migration motives and integration trajectories (Van Tubergen, 2010). Previous research has found that refugees are less proficient in the second language than immigrants, even when certain factors are controlled (Chiswick & Miller, 2001; Van Tubergen & Kalmijn, 2005).

In the following three paragraphs, different factors affecting the second language acquisition process are outlined. First, personal and demographic characteristics affecting the process are described, followed by the factors already present before migration. Finally, post-migration factors are discussed.

### 2.5.1 Personal and demographic characteristics

Age at immigration is argued to be an important factor in determining the success in the second language learning process. Despite a few exceptions, the literature suggests that the younger someone is at the time of migration, the better someone will perform regarding language learning (Dustmann & Fabbrini, 2003). A possible explanation is that younger people have a biological advantage in the learning process. In much of the literature regarding age and language learning, there is advocated for a so-called critical period for (second) language learning. Such a critical period is often defined as a sharp decline in learning outcomes with age. This indicates that language learning is easier for those below the critical period and that those people are more likely to gain native-like proficiency in a language. For them, language
acquisition can occur simply through exposure rather than through tutoring. The ones who learn a language after the critical period are assumed to have more difficulties learning a language (Chiswick & Miller, 2008). However, differences between a critical period for first language acquisition and second language acquisition (Bialystok, 1997) and the critical age for language learning are highly dependent on the way in which research is done. It is even argued that there might be different critical periods for different aspects of language (Chiswick & Miller, 2008). The critical period is, however, not of interest for this study, since this study focuses on recently migrated adults (excluding people who migrated during their childhood).

Another factor determining the success of language learning are the motivations of people, both for migration and for integration into the host country. Migration motives as unfavorable conditions in the home country might lead immigrants to perceive themselves only as temporary residents of the new country and therefore they are highly motivated to maintain their own culture and language. People who migrated because of the positive aspects of the host country, on the other hand, will show more interest in the new country and are therefore more likely to invest in its language and culture (Mattheijer, 2000; Mesch, 2003), possibly leading to a higher language proficiency. Younger people, for example, are likely to be more motivated to integrate and therefore more likely to invest in learning the language of the host country, since they have to invest in the future they are going to have in their new country. They will need the language in order to be able to participate in conversations with others. Compared with their older counterparts, younger immigrants can expect to enjoy a longer period of payback for their investments in language learning and integration (Dustmann & Fabbri, 2003).

In addition, there is found to be a gender difference regarding the process of acquiring a second language. A large amount of literature has demonstrated an advantage for women in verbal tasks (Tittle, 1986, as cited in Hou & Breiser, 2006), leading to the prediction that female immigrants might find it easier to learn the language of their host country than their male counterparts (Hou & Breiser, 2006). According to some other literature, however, it is found that immigrant men perform better in second language learning than women. An explanation for this finding might be that men are more oriented to the labor market and have higher employment rates and therefore they are more exposed to the non-native language (Dustmann & Fabbri, 2003).

Finally, second language proficiency is argued to be dependent on someone’s learning efficiency. This refers to the ability to convert exposure into language learning (Chiswick & Miller, 2008). Some people learn fast, for example due to an innate ability, whereas others learn more slowly. People who already have had some experience with learning a foreign language
are likely to have an advantage in learning another foreign language. This is because they have already grasped many of the concepts and can easily fit a new foreign term into those concepts (Van Tubergen, 2010).

2.5.2 Pre-migration factors

Formal education and literacy prior to migration are important determinants of second language acquisition. The more educated someone is, the more efficient someone is in learning in general (and therefore also in learning languages) and the more knowledge someone has of languages (Chiswick & Miller, 2001; Dustmann & Fabbri, 2003; Vermeer, 2010). Besides, highly educated persons have learned to read and write, so they can use written language in their learning process. For example, they can use the visual input as memory aid or for using a dictionary. This is even the case when people are not literate in the script of the new language (Vermeer, 2010). Furthermore, skilled people have acquired metalinguistic skills, resulting in knowledge on how to use different learning strategies (Beenstock, 1996, as cited in Mattheijer, 2000; Vermeer, 2010). Lower educated people often lack a lot of these capabilities. In addition, they are often uncertain about their capabilities since they are convinced that learning a new language is a hard task for them. This leads to early drop-outs and a negative self-image (Vermeer, 2010). High education is also associated with higher incentives for investing in the second language (Van Tubergen, 2010). Moreover, immigrants who are exposed to the new language before their migration, for example when it is one of their mother tongues or when they heard the language in daily communications, have some advantage in the language learning process in the host country (Chiswick & Miller, 2008; Van Tubergen, 2010).

The language learning success of refugees could also be influenced by the frequency of contact with native speakers (thereby also the exposure to the foreign language), which can in turn be determined by a refugees’ place of living in the host country. Western countries such as the Netherlands are highly urbanized – much more than the home countries of the refugees. People who lived in a city before their migration are possibly more adapted to the urban culture and might therefore be more individualistically oriented than those who lived in rural areas. The Netherlands is more characterized by an urban culture, and therefore the ones who migrated from an urban culture might be more likely to establish contacts with natives – due to their home country habits – in turn increasing their language exposure (Van Tubergen, 2010).

A final pre-migration determinant of second language acquisition could be the health status of refugees. Many refugees have experienced traumatic events and extreme stress in their
home country, due to war, oppression, loss of family members and friends and poverty (Marsella, Bornemann, Ekblad & Orley, 1994, as cited in Van Tubergen, 2010). In the new country, this could lead to depression and health problems. However, little is known about its impact on second language acquisition, but it is likely that traumas continue to play a role in the receiving country, likely to be due to living conditions in asylum centers and uncertainties about the future (Van Tubergen, 2010). Such health problems and depressive feelings can hamper the learning process (Chiswick & Miller, 2001; Van Tubergen & Kalmijn, 2005).

2.5.3 Post-migration factors

Research on the post-migration factors influencing second language acquisition suggests that there are two factors that affect the learning process, namely the level of personal investment in resettlement of immigrants and the opportunities and incentives provided to immigrants (Beenstock, 1996, as cited in Mattheijer, 2000). Commitment to remaining in the host country reinforces the willingness to invest in language training (Mesch, 2003; Van Tubergen, 2010), since people need to acquire the language in order to be able to communicate. This aspect is therefore closely related to someone’s intrinsic motivation, as mentioned in paragraph 2.5.1. Additionally, the length of stay in the host country influences the language proficiency of immigrants as well. The longer someone has already resided in the host country, the more someone has been exposed to the new language, resulting in better second language skills (Dustmann & Fabbri, 2003; Mesch, 2003; Van Tubergen, 2010). Lastly, incentives are of influence as well, since learning a new language is often difficult and it is a time consuming process. Therefore, there are costs on learning a language, such as tuition fees and course materials. It is argued that higher educated immigrants have higher incentives for investing in the second language, since most of the better paid employment (in contrast to lower skilled manual work) requires good second language knowledge (Van Tubergen, 2010).

Another post-migratory factor influencing the language learning process is the way in which the ethnicity of refugees is perceived in their new country. If refugees feel that they are inferior to the majority group, it can harm their language learning due to the social distance between them and the majority group (Schuman, 1986, as cited in Borrell, 2010). Moreover, contact with native speakers accelerates the learning process. A lack of contact with natives diminishes the desire to identify with the host country and in turn the motivation to learn the host country’s language and the need to speak the language (Elmeroth, 2003). In the Netherlands, refugees are facing this problem of having minimal contact with natives. Possible
contexts in which refugees could establish some contact with natives are organizations such as sport clubs and socio-cultural associations. Espinosa and Massey (1997, as cited in Van Tubergen, 2010), for example, found that immigrants who were a member of a sport club or social club had better second language skills than those who were not a member of a club (Van Tubergen, 2010). Acculturation factors such as changing family roles and barriers to mental health care also interact with the language learning process (Borrell, 2010).

The next factor that may influence the second language acquisition of refugees is the duration of the stay in reception centers. Once people flee to another country and apply to the government of another country for protection, they get the status of asylum seeker. Not all asylum seekers get this status immediately, and while awaiting a decision on their refugee status and residence permits, asylum seekers can spend months or sometimes even years in asylum- and reception centers. The length of stay in a reception center can have important consequences for the language learning process. While staying in an asylum center, the opportunity to come in contact with native speakers diminishes, thereby leading to less exposure to the host country’s language compared to when they would live outside the asylum center. Moreover, while awaiting the decision about permanent residence, refugees are uncertain about their stay, making the investment in language learning less attractive. Since refugees are not allowed to work during their asylum procedure, their incentives to invest in language learning are reduced (Van Tubergen, 2010).

After refugees receive permanent residency, they receive some special rights, such as access to the labor market, enabling them to establish a new life. In order to qualify for those rights, immigrants are required to learn the Dutch language and to learn about the Dutch society. Within three years after their arrival date, immigrants have to pass a naturalization exam (Rengers, Geerlings & Corrooms, 2015). If asylum seekers receive permanent residency and acquire the status of refugee, the Dutch government offers them the opportunity to participate in a so-called "integration course". In this course, refugees receive training in the Dutch language and they will be taught about the Dutch culture, values, norms and the justice system. It is expected that this course will have a positive effect on the language learning process (Van Tubergen, 2010). Earlier studies on labor and family migrants (see for example Beenstock, 1996, as cited in Van Tubergen, 2010), for example, have found a positive effect of following such courses. Hou and Breiser (2006), however, found no effect of participating in language and integration courses.
2.6 Mastering a new language

Many immigrants in the Netherlands have poor Dutch language skills and are found to have problems with reading and speaking Dutch (Yao & Van Ours, 2015). But as mentioned before, language proficiency is found to be a decisive factor in determining integration success (Dustmann & Fabbri, 2003). Immigrants typically enter a foreign country with skills which are only of limited use in the host economy, resulting in disadvantages regarding their success (Chiswick, 1978). After their immigration, people transfer skills specific to their home country to general skills or host country specific skills and acquire additional skills which are specific to the host country. The intensity and speed in which immigrants succeed this process determine their assimilation. Language proficiency is an important component of this process (Dustmann & Fabbri, 2003).

Cummins (1979) has articulated the need to distinguish between two different kinds of language skills, namely basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) and more cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP) skills. BICS refers to the kind of language that is used for interpersonal communication in everyday situations and involves the context embedded and cognitively undemanding aspects of language. CALP refers to the type of language that is required to communicate in more academic settings and relates to the context-reduced and cognitively demanding language tasks of formal schooling. Someone’s academic language proficiency develops gradually through social interaction, but becomes differentiated from someone’s basic interpersonal skills after the early stages of formal education. It is generally assumed that it takes two to three years to acquire the basic interpersonal skills of a language and five to seven years to acquire the cognitive and more academic skills (Cummins, 1981). Cummins (1983) concludes that the acquisition of second language formal skills is partially a function of the level of formal skills in the first language. In other words, well-developed CALP skills in someone’s native language determine the development of those academic skills in the second language. Besides, it is also assumed that IQ is related to the development of academic skills in the second language. Finally, analyses suggest that older second language learners acquire second language morphology, literacy skills and syntax more rapidly compared to their younger counterparts due to their more advanced cognitive skills (Cummins, 1981).

For refugees with interrupted education in their home country, it is found that they lack topic-specific vocabularies of academic subjects, understanding of register and genre, cultural background and learning strategies to process content. Students lack significant literacy in their first language on a regular basis as well, hampering the acquisition of a foreign language.
A study by Brown, Miller and Mitchell (2006) on the language and literacy experiences of African refugee students with interrupted education shows that especially grammar, spelling and vocabulary were difficult parts. Even when the students had some prior knowledge of a specific area, language difficulties still come up as a major barrier to success. People also indicated that they were concerned about their ability to demonstrate already existing knowledge in their mother tongue in a foreign language. People had the feeling that they were seen as being less competent than they actually felt themselves to be. This indicates that refugees had the feeling that they were incompetent in demonstrating already existing knowledge in a foreign language, while they do not have the same feeling when they can freely demonstrate that knowledge in their mother tongue.

Hou and Breiser (2006) performed a longitudinal study on the acquisition of English as a second language among South-East Asian refugees in Canada. The results of the study show that the mastery of the host society’s language increases with the duration of residence, but that the main gains in language acquisition occur during the early years of resettlement (i.e. seventeen percent spoke English well, 67 percent had a moderate command of the second language and sixteen percent spoke no English). In this stage of the process, especially personal and demographic characteristics and pre-migration achievement such as formal education played a major role. Over time, post-migration opportunities and incentives became more important. After ten years of residence, 32 percent had a good command of English, sixty percent had moderate skills and eight percent still spoke no English at all. Van Tubergen (2010), who performed a study on the integration and language learning process of refugees in the Netherlands, found similar results.

In an interview study of Elmeroth (2003) about the factors affecting adult refugees’ acquisition of a second language (in this case Swedish), it was found that refugees spoke the host country’s language very rarely. Interviewees indicated that they only spoke Swedish with their teacher(s) and sometimes with the social welfare officer. Conversations with friends took place in broken Swedish and could hardly be interpreted as comprehensible input. The interviewees indicated that they would like to have more contact with natives in the school. A striking result coming from the interviews was that one participant indicated that he or she did not even need Swedish in shops, since just looking at stuff is enough to get the attention from the cashier. This indicates that refugees do not even feel the necessity to talk Swedish in order to participate in society.

From a study by Van Tubergen (2010), it became clear that higher qualifications before migration led to significantly better reading and writing skills in Dutch as a second language.
In his study, Van Tubergen found that this effect was even stronger for reading skills than for speaking skills. An argument given for this discrepancy could be that reading skills require more formal education, where people become literate and learn to write. From those results, it can be assumed that the higher someone is educated, the better his or her language skills will be, especially someone’s reading skills. Moreover, in the same study, it was found that the ones who migrated from a major city performed significantly better in speaking and writing in Dutch (Van Tubergen, 2010).

2.7 Narratives as a research method for language proficiency

For refugees – and other non-natives – to become a competent speaker of the host country’s language, it involves more than just learning all the words and internalizing its grammar. It requires the ability to produce longer stretches of language and discourse, which is specific to the target language and which reflects the host country’s culture. However, there are large differences between cultures and languages in how meanings are conveyed and therefore refugees – and all second language learners in general – face difficulty in creating discourse that meets the expectations of native speakers. Second language learners, even advanced ones, encounter more difficulties in constructing longer stretches of text and discourse than in constructing single sentences (Kang, 2003). This is, however, not something unexpected, since a good command of discourse is a late acquired skill. For adult and adolescent second language learners, it is nevertheless expected that they already possess the cognitive capacities of creating discourse (Nistov, 2001).

Since narratives are found to be a good indicator of overall language proficiency (Fiestas & Peña, 2004) literature on narrative research will be outlined in this section. First, a definition of a narrative is given, followed by arguments for using narrative as a research method. Then, different models for structuring narratives are discussed, followed by some examples of research based on narratives.

2.7.1 Definition of narrative

In linguistics, narratives have been one of the first discourse genres analyzed. Nowadays it is still intensively studied to see what people do with talk (Johnstone, 2001). Narratives can be defined as ”representations of unique past adventures that preserve the chronology of the component events discussed” (Peterson, 1990 p. 434), or as a ”method of recapitulating past experience by matching a verbal sequence of clauses to the sequence of events which (it is
inferred) actually occurred” (Labov, 1972 pp. 359-360). Narrative is language use that requires the learner to convey a coherent message with little support available from the context, and in which all the information needed to comprehend the message should be included in the words used to tell the story (Lindberg, 1995, as cited in Nistov, 2001). A narrative is a specific type of discourse, distinguished from other kinds of discourse in that they relate events distributed over time (Peterson & McCabe, 1983). The skeleton of narratives consist of a series of temporally ordered clauses, called a narrative clause. By definition, a narrative includes at least two of these narrative clauses. Narrative clauses are characteristically ordered in a temporal sequence. This means that if narrative clauses are reversed, the inferred temporal sequence of the original semantic interpretation of the narrative is altered in some way. For example, ”I punched this boy / and he punched me” implies a different sequence of events than ”this boy punched me / and I punched him”. This example is regarded as a ”minimal narrative”: it is more than a sentence, although it is not an elaborate narrative. Most narratives are more complex, consisting of more narrative clauses as well as ”free” clauses that serve other functions (Labov, 1972). Furthermore, narratives are found to be universal in human cultures. It is not an account of what happened, but accounts of events from a human point of view (Peterson & McCabe, 1983).

2.7.2 Importance of studying second language learners’ narratives

The examination of larger units (what narratives consist of), instead of sentences, is a useful tool in identifying the strengths or problems second language learners may encounter during the process of fully acquiring a second language (Kang, 2006). Most research on narratives, however, is limited to the study of monolingual children’s narratives and narrative production by monolingual children and adults with disorders (Kemper, Rash, Kynette & Norman, 1990), such as specific language impairment, aphasia or deafness. Much less is investigated about the production of narratives by second language learners (Liskin-Gasparro, 1996). Cross-linguistic studies are able to offer important insights into the similarities and differences in discourse style among different speech communities, but since those studies are focused on a single language produced by native speakers, they do not offer insights into the problems second language learners may encounter in telling stories. Moreover, a lot of research on narrative production and development is focused on monolingual and bilingual children. Not all of the narrative components of children are relevant for adult second language learners (Pavlenko, 2006), since both groups differ in the cognitive capacities they possess (Nistov, 2001). Comparative studies
of bilingual children and adults have shown that the process of narrative production is qualitatively different, since children are still in the process of acquiring cognitive and linguistic skills necessary for competent storytelling, whereas adults have already acquired those skills (Berman, 1999, as cited in Pavlenko, 2006). Consequently, studying the narrative development of adult learners requires a focus on different elements (Pavlenko, 2006). Besides, most studies on narratives have focused on settings where the second language was the socially dominant language and where writers may not have developed writing skills in their first language. This may have an effect on the problems people encounter when producing narratives (Kang, 2006). Since this study will focus on highly educated adult people – and refugees in particular – it is expected that they already developed writing skills in their mother tongue.

To study the communicative competence of foreign language learners, narrative discourses are particularly interesting, since this is one of the first discourse forms acquired in all cultures (McCabe & Peterson, 1991, as cited in Kang, 2003) and they form a basic type of discourse that is realized differently in different cultures. The examination of larger units of discourse is useful in identifying what problems second language learners experience in the full acquisition of the target language. Narratives are a universal phenomenon, but vary in the shape they take within different cultures.

Both written and oral narratives are a useful and valid tool that indexes people’s competence in the host country’s language and culture (Botting, 2002; Kang, 2006), but most studies on narrative and discourse competence have been limited to oral narratives. Written narratives have received relatively little attention, although writing is suggested to be the first literacy task language learners encounter. Writing, instead of speaking, requires the language learner to integrate skills from different domains, possibly making it a better research tool than oral narratives. However, storytelling may be a more natural genre for oral discourse of adult second language learners, rather than written discourse. Nevertheless, since written narratives ask for careful editing and planning, written narratives may be a more accurate indicator of adults’ discourse skills and linguistic knowledge in the second language than oral narratives (Kang, 2006).

Furthermore, narratives provide insights on the learners’ knowledge of socio-cultural norms and their preferred discourse style in the host country’s language and culture (Kang, 2003). Next to composing a story, narratives give information about different linguistic skills, such as phonology, grammar and vocabulary (Tullener & Bree, 2014). Research has also shown that narrative skills are related to other language skills like reading comprehension (Kang, 2003). People who are worse in comprehending texts, tend to produce texts and stories that lack
coherence and cohesion (Cain, 2003, as cited in Kang, 2006). Narrative skills are therefore considered to be a relevant form of extended discourse (Verhoeven & Strömqvist, 2001).

2.7.3 Narrative structure
Narratives consist of various different elements, ranging from cohesive elements, evaluative elements, structural elements, to syntactic elements, linguistic functions and aspects. Botvin and Sutton-Smith (1977, as cited in Kemper et al., 1990), structurally analyzed narratives based on a hierarchical structure. In this analysis, each narrative is first segmented into episodes and events, and then the interrelationships among these episodes and events are determined. Their analyses distinguish eight different levels, ranging from least specific and least hierarchical to most specific and most hierarchical. Labov and Waletzky (1967) and Labov (1972) also structurally analyzed narratives, but in a different way than Botvin and Sutton-Smith (1977, as cited in Kemper et al., 1990) did. In this analysis, a ”good” narrative consists of six different structures, which will be outlined below. Kemper et al. (1989, as cited in Kemper et al., 1990) analyzed narratives based on syntax. In their analyses, narratives are first segmented into utterances and then each utterance is coded as a sentence fragment or as a complete sentence. Thereafter, each utterance is coded as being a main clause, a left-branching subordinate clause, an embedded clause or a right-branching subordinate clause. Analyses on the cohesive elements of narratives are done by for example Halliday and Hassan (1976, as cited in Kemper et al., 1990). They developed a system for classifying the linguistic devices that are used to link parts of a text to each other. Five different types of cohesion are distinguished: reference, ellipsis, lexical repetition, substitution and conjunction (Kemper et al., 1990). Current literature states that the different functions of narratives (be it structural, syntactic or cohesive) are content-free, in that they are independent of any particular type of story or character. So, it is said that functions serve stable and constant elements, independent of the way they are fulfilled and by whom they are fulfilled (Propp, 1986, as cited in Peterson & McCabe, 1983). For the purpose of this study, not all elements will be used in the research method and therefore not all analytical methods will be elaborated on. What is to follow is related to the research method of this study.

In general, narratives possess two functions, as suggested by William Labov and Joshua Waletzky (1967): a reference function and an evaluative function. The referential function of narrative clauses is used to orient the listener to whom the narrative is about and where and when the action takes place – it is a well differentiated description of what happened. The evaluative function of narrative clauses conveys emotional information, such as reasons for
telling the narrative, what the narrative means to the speaker and the meaning of the narrative (Peterson & McCabe, 1983; Peterson, 1990). Next to those two functions, narratives can be divided in two sections: the foreground or sequence of completed events defining the plot or the narrative line, and the background comprising the remainder of the narrative, introducing some elements of the plot, supplementing elements of the plot or concluding the plot (Hopper, 1997, as cited in Verhoeven & Strömqvist, 2001). The use of progressives is seen as a grounding technique, whereas tense forms (i.e. simple present/past) are foregrounding techniques, advancing the plot. A competent language user – in the sense of telling stories – will interweave both foreground and background information (Lanza, 2001). The foreground can be seen as the reason for telling the story (Hopper, 1997, as cited in Verhoeven & Strömqvist, 2001), and does therefore relate to the evaluative element of narratives. Among different dimensions composing narrative discourse, the evaluative function seems to differ the most across cultures. In the first sense, narratives convey the speaker’s emotional assessment and his or her attitude towards events (Labov & Waletzky, 1967).

Previous studies have identified a couple of structural components of completely developed, ”good” narratives. Following some of the earliest and most influential papers on narratives in linguistics, written by Labov and Waletzky (1967) and Labov (1972), the overall structure of narratives consists of the following six functions:

1. Abstract: one or two clauses that summarize the whole story.
2. Orientation: clauses that serve to orient the listener in respect to person, place, time, and behavioral situation. It describes the setting of the story.
3. Complication: clauses that serve the main body of the narrative, comprising a series of events.
4. Evaluation: that part of the narrative that reveals the attitude and point of view of the narrator towards the narrative by emphasizing the relative importance of some narrative units compared to others.
5. Resolution/result: clauses that release the tension of the story and tell what finally happened, mostly following the evaluation.
6. Coda: clauses that announce that the story has come to an end, mostly following the resolution/result.

Those six functions are mainly based on reference in narratives (i.e. the referential function, as described before). The abstract usually comes at the beginning of the story and summarizes the story that is to follow. For example, a person might begin with ”I walked a man out of – Old Doc Simon I talked him out of pulling the trigger” as response to the question ”were you ever
in a situation where you thought you were in serious danger of being killed?’’ (Labov, 1972). Besides, the abstract has the function to announce that the narrator has a story to tell and it makes a claim to the right to tell it (i.e. that it will be a good story worth listening to; Johnstone, 2001). In the orientation phase, the actions of the story are set, both spatially and temporally (Labov, 1972). It is a structural feature of narrative structure (Labov & Waletzky, 1967), mostly having some interesting syntactic properties; it is quite common to find many past progressive clauses in this section (Labov, 1972). However, not all narratives have a clear orientation section at the beginning of the story – it may be interjected at other points – and if a narrative has an orientation section, it does not necessarily include persons, and place, and time, and a behavioral situation. An example of an orientation clause could be ’’it was on a Sunday’’. It is found that orientation sections are typically lacking in narratives produced by children and less proficient adults. The complication (also called the ‘complicated action’) of a narrative contains clauses that tell what happened (Labov & Waletzky, 1967). Complicating action clauses usually recapitulate a sequence of events, resulting in a climax. These clauses then refer to events in the world of the story and they create tension in the narrative, keeping auditors listening (Johnstone, 2001). This section is usually terminated by a result or resolution (Labov & Waletzky, 1967; Labov, 1972; Johnstone, 2001), in which the tension is released and the narrator finally tells what happened (Johnstone, 2001). A narrative without an orientation, complication and result is not seen as a complete narrative. It may carry the referential function of the story perfectly, but it may still be hard to understand. By adding an evaluation, a narrative will become easier to understand (Labov & Waletzky, 1967). This is perhaps the most important element of the narrative, since this is used by the narrator to indicate the point of the narrative (Labov, 1972). The evaluation states what is interesting or unusual about the story, and why the audience should keep listening. An example of such an evaluative clause is ’’and it was the strangest feeling’’ (Johnstone, 2001). In many narratives, the evaluation section is fused with the result. This means that a single narrative clause both emphasizes the importance of the result, while at the same time stating the result. Evaluations may be defined semantically, formally and culturally (Labov & Waletzky, 1967). The story normally ends with a coda, the functional device for closing the sequence of complicating actions and indicating that none of the events that were to follow were important to the narrative. In this section, the story is linked to the real world (Labov, 1972). Moreover, it is used to return the verbal perspective to the present moment. This can, for example, be done with the use of deixis. Deixis is a linguistic category that points to a referent instead of explicitly naming it, as in ’’that was it’’, where ‘that’ refers to something (Labov & Waletzky, 1967). The coda is used to signal that the narrative is
finished. Narrators do this, for example, by uttering "and that was that". In addition, codas may contain general observations or clauses that show the effects of the events on the narrator (Labov, 1972). Each of these six elements serves a double purpose. First, it makes reference to the events, characters, feelings and so on that are understood to have happened or to have existed outside of the ongoing interaction. Second, and at the same time, they structure the interaction in which the story is being told by guiding the teller and the audience through the related events by making sure that everything told is comprehensible and worth listening to (Johnstone, 2001).

Peterson and McCabe (1983) identified a couple of evaluative functions of narratives. Those functions usually convey the narrator’s emotional assessment and his or her attitude towards the events (Labov & Waletzky, 1967). This attitude is expressed by showing the narrator’s thoughts and feelings towards the events and the participants through various linguistic strategies. Moreover, it establishes the meaning of the narrative (Kang, 2003, 2006). Peterson and McCabe’s categories include the following features:

1. Intensifiers (i.e. "he was very angry")
2. Repetitions (i.e. "he looked again and again")
3. Hedges (i.e. "he was kind of curious")
4. Adverbs (i.e. "searching frantically for his frog")
5. Onomatopoeia (i.e. "the frog says quaak")
6. Expressives (i.e. "oh, my god!")
7. Character delineation (i.e. "the little boy")
8. Expressions of emotions (i.e. "the boy is angry")
9. Direct reported speech (i.e. "where are you, frog?")
10. Indirect reported speech (i.e. "he asked the ground hog if he saw the frog")
11. Expressions of defeat of expectation/negatives (i.e. "but there was no answer")
12. Mental state of the characters (i.e. "the child thought that…")
13. Words that contain high evaluative content (i.e. "crash")
14. Elongation (i.e. "we had to stay a loooong time")
15. Exclamation (i.e. "oh boy!")
16. Attention getters (i.e. "listen" or "do you know what?")

It is found that the kind of the story does not change with increasing proficiency, while the degree of including different functions does increase with increasing proficiency. The more proficient someone is, the more detailed his or her story will be. Evaluation is considered to be the most important part of a narrative (see Labov, 1972), but also the part that differs the most
across cultures (Kang, 2003). Less proficient users of the second language are found to use far less evaluative devices than proficient second language users (see Liskin-Gasparro, 1996).

2.7.4 Studies on narratives

Studies on second language narrative discourse have found that producing a native-like narrative poses challenges on second language learners. Second language learners seem to approach the discourse task with the same underlying expectations they have in their mother tongue, but limitations show up due to their imperfect knowledge of the second language. It is found that second language learners rely more on their metalinguistic skills to overcome such problems. Moreover, second language learners often possess a smaller repertoire of discourse and emotional functions than native speakers (Liskin-Gasparro, 1996). When proficiency increases, the repertoire will also increase and people are more likely to use a variety of linguistic resources to provide context to the story (see Liskin-Gasparro, 1996). Second language learners also often transfer first language discourse structures in foreign language narratives (Lanza, 2001; Kang, 2003). It is found that the narratives told in the second language are likely to be shorter than stories told in the first language (Lanza, 2001; Kang, 2003, 2006), which may be due to the preference people have for their first language (Lanza, 2001). When people become more proficient in their second language, the stories are likely to become longer (see Liskin-Gasparro, 1996). Longer stories, in turn, are likely to be more complex. Better educated adults with greater vocabularies are also likely to produce longer sentences and more complex narratives (Kemper et al., 1990). A study by Lanza (2001), for example, found that bilingual adults produced more clauses in their first language, Norwegian, than in their second language, English. The same results are found by Kang (2003, 2006), who found that Koreans produced less clauses in their second language than in their first language, both in oral and written narratives.

Jennifer Kang (2003 and 2006) did extensive research on written and oral narratives of Korean learners of English as a second language. In her 2003 study, twelve Korean second language learners and twelve native American speakers produced an oral version of the frog-story. The frog-story is a wordless picture book designed by Mercer Mayer in 1969 (Mayer, 1969). The Koreans had to produce a narrative in both their first and second language and the Americans only had to produce the narrative in their mother tongue, English. The Korean people also had to produce a story in their native language in order to control for cultural differences between the two languages and to be able to explain the possible differences. The
results of Kang’s study show that Koreans produce shorter narratives in general, both in their first language and in their second language. The fact that the Koreans produced shorter narratives in their second language could therefore not directly be the reason of their less developed second language skills, since it also occurs in their first language. Therefore, it could be the case that there is cultural interference of the mother tongue (or conventions of the first language) on producing narratives in the second language. While comparing the Koreans’ English narratives and the American English narratives on the narrative structure, Kang found that the Koreans used significantly less clauses that outline the setting of the story (i.e. place and time) and introduce the characters of the story. The same holds for events and character actions that advance the plot of the story, as well as for clauses that describe the point of view of the narrator. There were no differences found between Koreans’ English narratives and native narratives in the inclusion of clauses that served to mark the beginning or conclusion of the narratives. In terms of evaluation, Kang found that the Koreans used significantly less hedges and character delineations in their English narratives, compared to native speakers of English.

In her 2006 study, Kang almost replicated her 2003 study on oral narratives, but this time 42 Koreans and 28 Americans produced a written narrative. The frog-story prompt was replaced by another prompt, in which participants were asked to tell about an experience they considered frightening. The results of this study again showed that the Korean participants produced shorter narratives in English than native Americans in English, but longer narratives in their second language than in Korean (their mother tongue). The written English narratives produced by the Koreans and the natives were found to be similar in many aspects of narrative structure. The same amount of events (i.e. events and character actions that advance the plot of the story), and codas (i.e. clauses that serve to mark the coda and which convey the moral of the narrative) were produced by both groups. The amount of clauses that provide any descriptive information, however, differed between the two groups: this structure was used more frequently by native English speakers than by Korean English learners. Concerning the evaluation, there were a lot of differences between the natives and the learners. The Koreans, for example, included more expressions of emotion in their narratives, used more direct reported speech, onomatopoeia and repetitions than the Americans. The natives, on the other hand, included more clauses of embedded speech (i.e. no direct and indirect speech), character delineations, evaluative words and adverbs than the learners. However, character delineation and evaluative words were also uncommon in Koreans’ mother tongue narratives, suggesting that those two aspects may be specific to the American culture and that they are devices that
Koreans have not yet acquired. Moreover, Koreans used even more adverbs and indirect speech in their native speech. This may indicate that they struggle to incorporate those items in foreign discourse, but use them freely in native discourse. Comparing the Koreans’ native and English narratives, it was found that they use slightly different structures in the two languages. Producing evaluative devices in the second language, however, still remains challenging. Kang (2006) concludes that the Koreans still experience limitations on the production of narratives in their second language. There appears to be both cultural transfer – by using similar kinds of discourse in the native language and the foreign language – as well as developmental issues of the second language, put forward by the reliance of linguistic features that are less challenging.

2.8 Research question and hypotheses
The goal of this research is highly explorative, since it examines the second language proficiency in Dutch of highly educated adult refugees, and investigates in what ways it differs from low(er) educated adult refugees’ second language proficiency in Dutch. It is generally assumed that all refugees form one group of low(er) educated people, without valuing their previous experiences and certificates. This could lead to an overgeneralization, causing problems in the integration and language learning process. A sociolinguistic perspective will be taken, in which different groups of language speakers are compared. To investigate the second language proficiency in Dutch of highly educated adult refugees, and to see in what ways it deviates from low(er) educated adult refugees’ second language proficiency in Dutch, an explorative method of a written narrative production task will be set up. In this experiment, highly educated adult refugees, low(er) educated adult refugees and Dutch natives have to produce a written narrative in Dutch based on the wordless picture book *Frog, where are you?* by Mercer Mayer (1969). To examine the language proficiency in Dutch as a second language of highly educated adult refugees’, a comparison is made with the second language proficiency of low(er) educated refugees’. The narratives of native Dutch speakers are used as a baseline for ”perfect” proficiency. Next to this experiment, a small survey is conducted to gain insights into the background and demographics of the participants.

Based on the preceding, the research question of this study is:

**RQ:** How do highly educated adult refugees’ written narratives in Dutch as a second language differ from lower educated refugees’ written narratives in Dutch as a second language and native Dutch speakers’ narratives in Dutch?
Based on the literature outlined in the previous sections, the following main hypothesis is formulated:

H1: Highly educated adult refugees are more proficient in Dutch as a second language than lower educated adult refugees, but less proficient than natives, measured in terms of written narrative production.

The additional hypotheses that are about to follow are based on the acceptance of hypothesis one and are designed to specify the first hypothesis. In order to prevent the hypotheses from becoming too complicated, they are divided into three categories: narrative length, narrative structure and evaluative devices. This distinction will also be used throughout the following sections.

Hypothesis concerning narrative length

H2: The Dutch written narratives of the natives contain more clauses compared to the narratives of the highly educated adult refugees and lower educated adult refugees, and the narratives of the highly educated adult refugees contain more clauses compared to the narratives of the lower educated adult refugees.

Hypotheses concerning narrative structure

H3: The Dutch written narratives of the natives contain more different types of structural elements compared to the narratives of the highly educated adult refugees and lower educated adult refugees, and the narratives of the highly educated adult refugees contain more different types of structural elements compared to the narratives of the lower educated adult refugees.

H4: The Dutch written narratives of the natives contain more clauses in the orientation section compared to the narratives of the highly educated adult refugees and the lower educated adult refugees, and the narratives of the highly educated adult refugees contain more clauses in the orientation section compared to the narratives of the lower educated adult refugees.

H5: The Dutch written narratives of the natives contain more clauses in the evaluation section compared to the narratives of the highly educated adult refugees and the
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1 Elements comprising language proficiency measured in terms of written narrative production are dealt with in the other hypotheses.
lower educated adult refugees, and the narratives of the highly educated adult refugees contain more clauses in the evaluation section compared to the narratives of the lower educated adult refugees.

H6: The Dutch written narratives of the natives contain more clauses in the complication section compared to the narratives of the highly educated adult refugees and the lower educated adult refugees, and the narratives of the highly educated adult refugees contain more clauses in the complication section compared to the narratives of the lower educated adult refugees.

H7: The amount of clauses in the coda section is the same for each of the four experimental groups.

Nothing explicitly was stated in the literature about the amount of clauses included in the resolution/result element, so therefore no specific hypotheses are made about that topic. Statistical analysis will, however, explore this variable to investigate whether there appear to be differences or not.

Hypotheses concerning evaluative devices

H8: The Dutch written narratives of the natives contain more different types of evaluative devices compared to the narratives of the highly educated adult refugees and lower educated adult refugees, and the narratives of the highly educated adult refugees contain more different types of evaluative devices compared to the narratives of the lower educated adult refugees.

H9: The Dutch written narratives of the lower educated adult refugees contain more instances of expressions of emotions, direct reported speech, onomatopoeia, and repetitions compared to the narratives of the highly educated adult refugees and the natives, and the narratives of the highly educated adult refugees contain more instances of expressions of emotions, direct reported speech, onomatopoeia, and repetitions compared to the narratives of the natives.

H10: The Dutch written narratives of the natives contain more instances of indirect reported speech and character delineations compared to the narratives of the highly educated adult refugees and the lower educated adult refugees, and the narratives of the highly educated adult refugees contain more instances of indirect reported speech
and character delineations compared to the narratives of the lower educated adult refugees.

Since no previous research delved into details about intensifiers, expressives, defeat of expectation/negatives, elongation and exclamations, no hypotheses are formulated for these variables. Statistical analyses will therefore investigate whether there are significant differences in the inclusion of these evaluative devices among the experimental groups.

Lastly, a hypothesis is set up, taking some reinforcing factors of language proficiency into account.

**H11:** Reinforcing factors of refugees’ language proficiency\(^2\) in Dutch are high motivation to stay in the Netherlands, longer residence in the Netherlands, shorter stay in reception centers after migration, and participation in integration courses.

Some variables were initially included in the hypotheses, while they turned out to be irrelevant for the results of the analyses (i.e. they would not make any distinction in the analyses). Therefore, these variables are excluded from the analyses. Since all refugee participants lived in urbanized areas before migration, the degree of urbanization of the former residential living area was excluded from the analyses as a variable. Next, since none of the refugee participants were exposed to the Dutch language before migration, this variable was excluded from the analyses as well. Moreover, some instances were initially included in the coding scheme, but appeared to be non-existent in the narratives (see Section 3.5.1.3). These variables were therefore also excluded from the analyses.

\(^2\) Measured in terms of written language production, see footnote 1.
3. Method

This chapter outlines the methodology implemented in this study. First, the design of the study is outlined. Next, the subjects of interest are presented, followed by a discussion of the used materials. Thereafter, the procedure of how the narratives are elicited is outlined. Finally, the method of analysis is explained, ended by a short discussion about the reliability of the coding.

3.1 Design

To investigate the Dutch language proficiency of (highly educated) adult refugees, a story telling research in the form of written narrative production was set up. Most studies on narrative and discourse competence of second language learners have been limited to oral narratives, and written narratives have received little attention in second language research. In order to get more insight into second language written skills, a written narrative task is used instead of an oral narrative task. Writing stories may be the first literacy task that most people will encounter during the language learning process and therefore may reflect someone’s language skills very well. However, it is argued that narratives, i.e. telling stories, are a more natural genre for adult oral discourse, but because of its rehearsed nature which allows participants time for editing and planning, written narratives may be a better indicator of language skills than spontaneous oral discourse.

3.2 Participants

In this study, a sample of 31 written frog-story narratives based on the wordless picture book *Frog, where are you?* (Mayer, 1969) is analyzed, produced by different people. Participants in this study are divided into four groups: (1) ten lower educated adult refugees on an A1/A2 Dutch as a second language level (men = 8, women = 2, mean age = 31.9, SD = 8.0), (2) seven highly educated adult refugees on A1/A2 level (men = 6, women = 1, mean age = 26.9, SD = 6.1), (3) five highly educated adult refugees on B1/B2 level (men = 3, women = 2, mean age = 25.6, SD = 5.8), and (4) nine adult native speakers of Dutch (men = 4, women = 5, mean age = 23.2, SD = 1.9). With the exception of two persons, all participants in the three refugee groups were of Syrian origin and spoke Arabic as a first language. One person of the highly educated A1/A2 refugee group was of Iraqi origin and one person of the highly educated B1/B2 refugee group was of Saudi Arabian origin, but both spoke Arabic as a first language. Two persons of the lower educated A1/A2 group where stateless at the time of testing, but nevertheless spoke Arabic as their first language as well. Except for one person, all participants have lived the
longest part of their lives in Syria. The one person who did not live the longest part of his life in Syria is the same participant as the one who is from Iraqi origin. He resided in Iraq and Turkey for the longest part of his life.

By controlling the first language background, possible effects due to cultural differences and differences in language background, could be eliminated. However, it could still be the case that the three refugee groups differ from the Dutch natives, but if that turns out to be the case, it is likely that this is specifically caused by differences between the Dutch and Arabic/Syrian culture. The participants in the lower educated refugee group followed a course ‘Dutch as a second language’ on an A1/A2 level at the ROC Nijmegen at the time of testing. The participants in the two highly educated refugee groups also followed a course ‘Dutch as a second language’ at the time of testing, either on an A1/A2 level or on a B1/B2 level, at Radboud in’to Languages Nijmegen. The native group consisted of a random selection of native speakers of Dutch (either lower or highly educated).

At first, the intention was to include only two refugee groups in the study: one lower educated group and one highly educated group, both on a high second language level (i.e. B1/B2) in order to make valid comparisons on Dutch language proficiency between the refugees and the natives. During the selection process, however, it turned out that there are almost no lower educated refugees on such a high level as B1/B2. Therefore, a lower educational level was taken into account as well in order to make the two groups comparable. Since the people at A1/A2 levels recently started to learn Dutch (they mostly only followed the previous course on A0/A1 level), they are likely to be restricted in their language production, influencing the outcome of this study. If A1/A2 participants indeed produce insufficient language, analyzing the data and making comparisons between the natives and refugees becomes complicated. Therefore, a group of highly educated refugees at a higher level, namely B1/B2, is included in this study. This group consisted of persons who are almost ready to start studying or working in the Netherlands and their language proficiency is good enough to follow a study in Dutch. By including this group, more insights can be gained in the progress highly educated refugees make and in which ways they differ from natives. It is assumed that all participants are literate and could write in either their first language as well as in Dutch.

3.3 Materials

The wordless picture book *Frog, where are you?* by Mercer Mayer (1969), consisting of 24 different pictures, was used to elicit written narratives from all 31 participants in this study.
This picture book was chosen because it allows a reliable comparison of the ways in which the participants perform the same task. The skills that are tapped from using this book as a prompt can highlight implications for their relation to other literacy skills as reading comprehension, since using a picture book allows for the use of the written register. This prompt was preferred over other prompts, like the one used by Labov (1972) and Kang (2006), in which participants were asked about a frightening situation, since this would elicit different stories which would impede valid comparisons. Moreover, such a prompt could create painful situations for the participants. By using the wordless picture book, participants have to produce a story based on given information instead of personal experience. This may be more difficult than producing a story based on personal experience, since people have to look carefully at the pictures instead of retrieving something from their memory. Moreover, since subjects were allowed to write the narrative from their own perspective, one might have expected considerable variability in narrative production. However, by analyzing the narratives, it turned out that there was not that much variability in the content of the written narratives, in a sense that no completely different narratives about different topics had been produced.

The participants in the three refugee groups were also asked to fill in a survey about demographics, education, and knowledge of languages. The Dutch participants were not presented a survey, since they only acted as a reference group. Questions in the survey were presented in both Dutch and English and participants had the choice to fill in the survey in either language. The fact that questions were also presented in English and participants had the choice to answer in English did not cause any problems for this research, because the questionnaire did not investigate language proficiency in itself. Since the task of producing a narrative is already hard enough, some effort of participation could be relieved by presenting questions in English and giving participants the opportunity to answer questions in a language they are more proficient in. The survey questions can be found in Appendix A.

3.4 Procedure

All participants were asked to compose a narrative essay in Dutch. Before they started the actual experiment, subjects received an information document listing the aim of the study, the confidentiality of the research data (i.e. that the data can be used for articles and presentations and that these data will be made and remain completely anonymous) and the voluntariness of participation. Participants also had to sign a consent form for their participation. Next, each subject was given an A4 printed booklet version with photocopied pictures from the original
Frog, where are you? book and the subject was asked to browse through their picture booklet. Then participants were asked to write down what is going on in the pictures, as they were allowed to page through the booklet on their own pace. Subjects had to write down their stories on paper or on a pc, depending on the group. The A1/A2 lower educated refugee participants completed the task with pen and paper, since they were not familiar with working on a pc. All other groups used the notepad function of Windows to write their story, to prevent bias due to the immediate and digital control of the autocorrecting function. Analyzing digital stories typed on a computer was easier, since (unintelligible) handwriting was not an issue. Participants were not given a time limit for the task, so they were able to write the best story they could. The original raw stories can be found in Appendix B. After the writing task, the refugee participants were asked to fill in the survey about demographics, education, and knowledge of languages.

The data for the two refugee groups on a low Dutch as a second language level (A1/A2) were collected at once (i.e. there was one specific moment in which all participants were together in one room). For the refugees on an intermediate second language level (B1/B2), two different moments of data collection were arranged. The native speakers of Dutch were approached individually.

3.5 Data analysis

3.5.1 Categories of analysis

3.5.1.1 Clauses

The written narratives were first divided into clauses, following Labov (1972), Peterson and McCabe (1983) and Berman and Slobin (1994). These researchers defined a clause as "any unit that contains a unified predicate" (Berman & Slobin, 1994, p. 657). By unified is meant "a predicate that expresses a single situation (activity, event or state). Predicates include finite and nonfinite verbs as well as predicate adjectives" (Berman & Slobin, 1994, p. 657). For these analyses, a combination of words was coded as a clause when it contained a subject and a verb. For example, the sentence "Het hert staakt zijn vlucht abrupt als hij aankomt bij een afgrond" ("The deer stops his fleeing abruptly as he arrives at a precipice") consists of two clauses, namely "Het hert staakt zijn vlucht abrupt" ("The deer stops his fleeing abruptly") and "als hij aankomt bij een afgrond" ("as he arrives at a precipice"). In the first clause, ‘het hert’ (‘the deer’) is the subject and ‘staakt’ (‘stops’) is the verb. In the second clause, ‘hij’ (‘he’,
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3 The original narrative sentences are loosely translated from Dutch to English.
referring to the deer) is the subject and ‘aankomt’ (‘arrives’) is the verb. However, there are also combined sentences, like the one above, where the subject in the second clause is omitted. An example of such a sentence is ”De hond kijkt ook door het open raam naar buiten, maar verliest haar evenwicht en valt buiten op de grond’’ (”The dog looks outside through the open window, but loses her balance and falls outside on the ground’’). Here, the second and third clause after the comma lack the subject ‘ze’ (‘she’), as in ”De hond kijkt ook door het open raam naar buiten, maar ze verliest haar evenwicht en ze valt buiten op de grond’’ (”The dog looks outside through the open window, but she loses her balance and she falls outside on the ground’’). Although the subject is omitted in the second part of the sentence, this whole sentence is coded as consisting of three clauses. The main reason for coding this sentence as consisting of three clauses is that the original clause is a combined clause, were it is generally accepted to not repeat the subject. Especially in the narratives of refugees, the subject or the verb is often omitted. In sentences as ”dus zij bigenden opzoeken over hem in de kamer maar niets zij keken van raam maar ook niets’’ (”so they started searching over him in the room but nothing they looked from window but also nothing’’), ”maar ook niets’’ (”but also nothing’’) is also coded as a clause, since it means ”maar ook daar vonden ze niets’’ (”but also there they found nothing’’). Sentences as ”En ja hoor’’ (”and yes’’) and ”kikker, kikker, kikker’’ (”frog, frog, frog’’) were not coded as clauses, since a clear subject or verb is missing. Such sentences were coupled with the subsequent clause to form one clause.

In the narratives of the Dutch language learners, it is often visible that the verb is omitted, as in ”de jongen bang en vallen van de boom’’ (”the boy scared and falling from the tree’’). Here, the complete sentence would be ”de jongen is bang en (hij) vallen van de boom’’ (”the boy is scared and (he) falling from the tree’’). In such cases, where it is clear that the verb is missing, clauses are still coded as a single clause. As can be seen in this sentence, the subject of the second clause is also omitted, as described in the previous paragraph. Thus, this sentence is coded as consisting of two clauses, namely ”de jongen is bang’’ (”the boy is scared’’) and ”en (hij) vallen van de boom’’ (”and (he) falling from the three’’).

3.5.1.2 Length and structure

Once each narrative was coded at the clause level (i.e. divided into clauses), it was analyzed for its length and its structure. The narrative length was coded as the total number of clauses of a narrative. For the narrative structure, the six elements proposed by Labov and Waletzky (1967), Labov (1972) and Peterson and McCabe (1983), as described in section 2.7.3, are used and
adapted in this study. Those elements are: abstract, orientation, complication, evaluation, resolution/result and coda. Within each structure, the amount of clauses is counted. The abstract is usually composed of one or two clauses that summarize the whole story. It is the introductory part of the narrative and often consists of a brief summary of the narrative events. The function of the abstract is to attract the listener’s interest. Orientation clauses are clauses that set the setting (place and time) of the narrative and introduce the characters/participants. For a narrative to be valid and understandable for the reader, this element is essential. The utterance ”Voor het slapen gaan” (’’Before bedtime’) is an example of an orientation clause. The clause ”Er was eens een jongen genaamd Bas en zijn hondje Sammie” (’’Once upon a time there was a boy named Bas and his dog Sammie’’) is also an example of an orientation clause. The complicated action refers to the actual events of the narrative. Exactly these clauses serve the main body of the narrative, comprising a series of events. The evaluation of a narrative is that part of the narrative that reveals the attitude and point of view of the narrator towards the narrative by emphasizing the relative importance of some narrative units compared to others. All clauses that do not clearly give an introduction to a story or that not clearly close a story are coded as evaluative clauses. The resolution/result is the conclusion of the narrative and is the part of the narrative that usually follows the evaluation. Here, the narrator clearly indicates that the story has come to an end and that a final action has occurred. It could also be the case that problems told in the story are solved in this part of the narrative. The complicated action is resolved in some sense, clearing the stage or capping off the experience (Peterson & McCabe, 1983). Lastly, the coda consists of the additional elements of the narrative, usually following the resolution/result. Here, the narrator points out the relevance of the story by connecting it to other events or actions (for example in everyday life). This part of the narrative mostly consists of more clauses.

After each individual structural element was coded, a frequency score for the inclusion of different types of structural elements was calculated. This resulted in a type frequency score, with possible values ranging from 1 to 6 (since there are six different structural elements). In this score, only the occurrence of the structural element was counted. For example, if a participant included orientation clauses, evaluation clauses and coda clauses, but not abstract clauses, complication clauses and resolution/result clauses, then the type frequency score for this participant is 3, since three different structural element occur in the narrative.
3.5.1.3 Evaluative devices

After each narrative clause was classified as accomplishing one of the above narrative functions, the evaluation component was further subdivided into different categories, using categories from Peterson and McCabe (1983) and adaptations of these categories based on Kang (2003). Those categories reflect any evaluative device contained in any part of the clauses with other narrative functions than the evaluative function as well. So, these evaluative functions can occur in clauses that are coded as evaluation, as well as in all the other elements (i.e. abstract, orientation, complication, resolution/result and coda). The categories included in the evaluation tier include:

- **Intensifiers**: an element was coded as an intensifier when it was used to emphasize other adverbs and adjectives. For example, in the clause ''Hij roept weer heel hard’’ (”He was again screaming very loudly’’), ”heel” (”very”’) is coded as an intensifier since it tells something about the adverb ”hard” (”loudly”).

- **Repetitions**: a repetition was (a part of) a clause which was repeated, as in ”darna hij schreeuwt kikker kikker kikker” (”Then he screams frog frog frog’’). This is only a repetition for the sake of emphasis and not for the sake of adding any new information to the narrative.

- **Onomatopoeia**: an element was coded as onomatopoeic when it reflected the imitation of a sound, as in ”kwaak”, the sound a frog makes. Sometimes participants used onomatopoeia as a proper name, as in ”Woef” (i.e. the sound a dog makes, but in one of the narratives used as the name of the dog). In those cases, the word was not coded as onomatopoeia. Words like ”ssst” and ”mmm” were not coded as onomatopoeic as well, since they do refer to a specific action that goes along with a sound, but not to a specific sound that is the action in itself.

- **Expressives**: something was coded as an expressive if it expresses some emotion in only one or two words. In contrast to expressions of emotions, it does not say anything about what emotions characters experience. Examples of expressives are ”Pff”, ”Aaah!” and ”Au”.
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4 Other evaluative devices, such as adverbs, hedges and words that contain high evaluative content were initially coded. However, since hedges do not seem to occur in the narratives, this device was excluded from the analysis. Adverbs turned out to be a very specific category, which could be subdivided into a lot of subcategories. Since the interesting subcategories (as intensifiers, for example), derived from the category of adverbs, are already part of the analyses, adverbs (in the broadest sense of the word) are excluded from the analyses. The category of words that contain high evaluative content was also excluded from the analysis, because this device turned out to be more subjective than all other devices.
- **Character delineations**: a character delineation was coded when a participant wrote down something specific of a character, as in "een bijzonder huisdier" ("a particular pet"). If two character delineations occurred in one clause, as in "Het was een leuke dag geweest voor Barry, zijn teckel Kees en zijn kikker Kikker die hij die middag buiten gevonden had" ("It had been a nice day for Barry, his dog Kees and his frog Frog which he had found outside that afternoon"), each instance was coded individually.

- **Expressions of emotions**: expressions of emotions were for example "De uil was chagrijnig" ("The owl was grumpy") or more complex sentences as "De kikker vond het helemaal niet leuk in the pot" ("The frog didn’t enjoy being in the jar") or "Hier was Bas niet zo blij mee" ("Bas was not so happy with this"). This category was taken quite broad and everything that has to do with feelings and emotions was coded as expression of emotion. An example of a more broad clause that expresses emotion is "Tot zijn schrik" ("To his fear").

- **Direct reported speech**: a part of an utterance was coded as direct reported speech if participants literally wrote down what one of the characters was saying, as for example in "Job roept uit zijn raam: ‘Kwak, Kwak waar ben je?’" ("Job was screaming from his window: ‘Kwak, Kwak where are you?’"). In most of the cases, participants put these sentences between quotation marks. However, not every clause that ended with a question mark was meant and coded as direct reported speech. For example, the clause "Waar is Frog?" ("Where is Frog?"), from one of the narratives produced by a native Dutch speaker, was not coded as direct reported speech due to its surrounding context. From its context, it can be deduced that this clause is not part of what the participants are saying in the story, but it is more like what the narrator is thinking at that time. Therefore, such a clause was not coded as direct reported speech. In most of the cases, such sentences are not put between quotation marks. Only the thing actually said was coded as direct reported speech, and not clauses as "Job roept uit zijn raam" ("Job is screaming from his window") and "zegt Tummy" ("says Tummy").

- **Indirect reported speech**: a part of an utterance was coded as indirect reported speech if participants wrote down what characters are thinking or saying, as in "Anas een zijn hond roeppen kekker" ("Anas and his dog are calling frog"). Here, the narrator wrote down indirectly what the participants are doing, instead of directly writing (as in "Kekker!", for example).

- **Expressions of defeat of expectation/negatives**: a part of an utterance that tells something contrastive or something that was unexpected, as "maar ze vonden hem niet" ("but
they didn’t found him’'). Negatives, as ’’de kikker was niet op de kamer’’ (’’the frog was not in the room’’) were also coded under this tag. For this function, only the defeat of expectation or negative is coded, not the previous clause. For example, as in ’’Als de nacht voorbij is, komen Jantje en Woef tot de ontdekking dat Frog verdwenen is.’’ (’’When the night has ended, Jantje and Woef discovered that Frog had disappeared’’), the first part of the sentence (’’Als de nacht voorbij is’’/’’When the night has ended’’) is not coded as a defeat of expectation.

- **Elongation:** elongation is a way of emphasizing particular words by lengthening certain vowels or consonants, as in ’’kikeeeeeeerr schreeuwdt de jongen’’ (’’froooooooog screams the boy’’). Words like ’’ssst’’ and ’’mmm’’ were not coded as elongation, because the addition of certain vowels or consonants is not done because of emphasis.

- **Exclamation:** the use of exclamation marks to stress certain aspects of the narrative. A double exclamation mark is not counted as two exclamations.

The evaluative functions are also described in section 2.7.3, including some examples. If an evaluative function occurred in different clauses, then the function was coded for each clause, as in ’’Max was bang en Loony ook!’’ (’’Max was afraid and Loony too’’). Moreover, in cases where words have multiple functions, all functions are categorized (as for example could be the case for intensifiers and adverbs).

After each individual evaluative device was coded, a frequency score for the inclusion of different types of evaluative devices was calculated. This resulted in a type frequency score, with possible values ranging from 0 to 11 (since there are eleven different evaluative devices). In this score, the amount of token frequencies of evaluative devices was not counted, but only the occurrence of the evaluative devices (i.e. type frequency). For example, if a participant included five instances of direct reported speech, two repetitions and one expression of emotion, then the type frequency score for this participant is 3, since three different evaluative devices occur in the narrative.

### 3.6 Statistical analysis

The dataset consisting of narrative length, frequency scores of different types of narrative structure, the five structural elements, frequency scores of different types of evaluative devices, and the eleven evaluative devices was entered into IBM SPSS Statistics version 23 and tested statistically. With the use of univariate analyses of variance (ANOVA’s) and multivariate
analyses of variance (MANOVA’s), the four groups (lower educated refugees on A1/A2 level, highly educated refugees on A1/A2 level, highly educated refugees on B1/B2 level and native speakers of Dutch) were compared with each other on their written narrative production, more specifically the length of their narratives, the inclusion of structural elements in their narratives (both type and token), and the occurrence of evaluative devices (also both type and token). Sometimes it was necessary to do some adaptations on the statistical tests (i.e. a Welch correction was executed), since about half of the variables were not normally distributed and variances between the independent and dependent variables were unequal. Besides, there is tried to use a type IV adaptation to the tests because some cells were empty, but it turned out that SPSS was not capable of doing that. Result that include empty cells should therefore be interpreted with care.

Next, the reinforcing factors like motivation to stay in the Netherlands, time of residence in the Netherlands, time of stay in reception centers in the Netherlands and participation in integration courses in the Netherlands were added to the analyses as covariates. Out of almost 70 possible combinations between the dependent variables and the covariates, only one turned out to be significant, namely the one between the covariate ‘integration course’ and the evaluative device ‘repetitions’. The fact that there were almost no significant differences between the dependent variables and the covariates indicates that controlling for possible effects of the covariates is useless, since they are likely to have no effect. This could be a consequence of the small sample sizes. The only significant result found is therefore ascribed to be coincidental. Results of these tests are not included in the result section. A couple of weeks were spent on the statistical analysis and narrative analysis (i.e. narrative length, structure and evaluative devices).

3.6.1 Reliability of the coding

After the first-hand analyses were performed, a second researcher has analyzed the narratives following the same set of criteria. This was done because the method of analysis is based on human judgements and is therefore quite subjective. The second rater was a researcher of the research group Grammar and Cognition at Radboud University Nijmegen. This researcher was informed about the method of analysis for the narratives. Besides, the original paper in which this method of analysis was used was handed to the second rater in case something was unclear. To measure the inter-annotator agreement between the two ratings, the intraclass correlation
coefficient (ICC) of each individual dependent variable is calculated. The ICC’s of each variable can be found in Table 1.

Although there is a very low interrater reliability between scores on the orientation variable and the coda variable (both are part of the narrative structure analysis), no variables are removed from the analysis. More about this decision is outlined in the discussion section.

Table 1.
ICC’s per variable and the mean ICC’s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>ICC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narrative length</td>
<td>.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type narrative structure</td>
<td>.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Token narrative structure (mean)</td>
<td>.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complication</td>
<td>.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution/result</td>
<td>.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type evaluative devices</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Token evaluative devices (mean)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensifiers</td>
<td>.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetitions</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onomatopoea</td>
<td>.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressives</td>
<td>.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character delineation</td>
<td>.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression of emotions</td>
<td>.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct reported speech</td>
<td>.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect reported speech</td>
<td>.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressions of defeat of expectation/negatives</td>
<td>.954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elongation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclamation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean ICC</strong></td>
<td>.901</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Results

In this chapter, the results of the narrative research on the Dutch second language proficiency of adult refugees are discussed. First, some demographic information of the refugee participants is given. Thereafter, there is delved into the assumptions of the different statistical tests used for this data. Afterwards, the three specific elements of the analyses (narrative length, narrative structure and evaluative devices) are discussed separately. In most of the tables, the following abbreviations are used for the three refugee groups: LE A1/A2 for the lower educated group on a low second language level, HE A1/A2 for the highly educated group on a low second language level, and HE B1/B2 for the highly educated group on an intermediate second language level.

4.1 Demographics participants

This chapter outlines some demographic information of the refugee participants, which is deduced from the questionnaire subjects had to complete after they wrote a narrative. The chapter is subdivided into three paragraphs: one for each refugee group. The native group is not discussed, since they were not presented with a survey and such demographic information is superfluous.

4.1.1 Lower educated A1/A2 group

Ten subjects participated in the group of lower educated adult refugees on a low level of Dutch (A1/A2) as a second language. Seven of them had the Syrian nationality, one of them was Palestinian and two were stateless. All were born in Syria and lived the longest part of their lives in Syria, mostly in a big city like Damascus or Deir es-Zor. The average length of stay in the Netherlands at the time of testing was 22 months ($SD = 6.89$, $min = 9$, $max = 34$). Nine out of ten participants in this group have lived in a reception center in the Netherlands. The average length of their stay in reception centers was 7.11 months ($SD = 3.26$, $min = 1$, $max = 11$). All subjects are motivated to stay in the Netherlands: five indicated that they ‘absolutely’ ($= 5^5$) wanted to stay in the Netherlands and four indicated that they wanted to stay in the Netherlands ‘very much’ ($= 4$). The data of one person on the motivation to stay in the Netherlands is missing. Nine persons indicated that they found it important to learn Dutch. Seven of them indicated it as ‘important’ ($= 4$) and two indicated learning Dutch as ‘very important’ ($= 5$). The

---

$^5$ This is the corresponding number on the scale, ranging from 1 to 5. See appendix A for a complete overview of the survey questions.
data of one person is missing. Of the ten participants, nine followed an integration course in the Netherlands. Of one person, data on this topic is missing.

4.1.2 Highly educated A1/A2 group

Seven subjects participated in the group of highly educated adult refugees on a low level of Dutch (A1/A2) as a second language. Six of them had the Syrian nationality and one of them had an Iraqi nationality. Except one, all were born in Syria and lived the longest part of their lives in Syria, mostly in a big city like Aleppo or Damascus. One participant was born in Iraq (the same person as the one with the Iraqi nationality), but lived the longest part of his life in Syria. The average length of stay in the Netherlands at time of testing was eleven months (SD = 5.42, min = 7, max = 21). Six out of seven participants in this group have lived in a reception center in the Netherlands. The average length of their stay in reception centers was eight months (SD = 7.52, min = 2, max = 21). Of one person, however, the data of the length of the stay in a reception center was missing. All subjects are motivated to stay in the Netherlands: six indicated that they ‘absolutely’ (= 5) wanted to stay in the Netherlands and one indicated that he/she wanted to stay in the Netherlands ‘very much’ (= 4). The data of one person on the motivation to stay in the Netherlands is missing. All persons indicated that, in their opinion, it is important to learn Dutch as a second language. Six of them indicated it as ‘very important’ (= 5) and one indicated learning Dutch as ‘important’ (= 4). Of the seven participants, six followed an integration course in the Netherlands.

4.1.3 Highly educated B1/B2 group

Five subjects participated in the group of highly educated adult refugees on an intermediate to high level of Dutch (B1/B2) as a second language. Three of them had the Syrian nationality and two of them had a Palestinian nationality. Except one, all were born in Syria and lived the longest part of their lives in Syria, all in a big city like Homs or Damascus. One person was born in Saudi-Arabia, but lived the longest part of his live in a big city in Syria. The average length of stay in the Netherlands at the time of testing was 25 months (SD = 13.45, min = 16, max = 48). All participants have lived in a reception center in the Netherlands. The average length of their stay in reception centers was 7.60 months (SD = 1.52, min = 6, max = 10). All subjects are motivated to stay in the Netherlands: four indicated that they wanted to stay in the Netherlands ‘very much’ (= 4) and one indicated that he/she ‘absolutely’ wanted to stay in the Netherlands (= 5). All persons indicated that, in their opinion, it is important to learn Dutch as a second language. Four of them indicated it as ‘very important’ (= 5) and one indicated learning
Dutch as ‘important’ (= 4). Of the five participants, one followed an integration course in the Netherlands.

4.2 Assumptions

Parametric tests as ANOVA and MANOVA are tied to some assumptions on the data. Since the dataset consisted of a small amount of observations and since the experimental groups differed in size, not all assumptions were completely met. Moreover, some cells were empty, meaning that in some groups, none of the participants used that specific element. Because of these factors, the statistical testing part of this study was somewhat problematic. In this chapter, the assumptions for statistical testing and its shortcomings are discussed.

4.2.1 Outliers

The assumption of no outliers within the dataset was not completely met. However, this was not a problematic event for this study considering the relatively low number of observations, leading to the occurrence of outliers quite easily. Inspection of the graphs suggested that most of the variables that violate the assumption of outliers had only one outlier (mostly based on less than five data points) or only two or three data points in total (making the occurrence of outliers quite straightforward).

4.2.2 Normality

The fact that there was a relatively small number of observations within the dataset and that a lot of variables only had a few data points, led to a violation of normality for some of the variables. Histograms showed that most of the variables were not normally distributed. Skewness and Kurtosis were also quite divergent. The Shapiro-Wilk test, a normality test for small samples, showed a significant result for all the variables, except for type frequency of the evaluative devices. This indicated that for all variables, except type frequency of evaluative devices, distributions were not normal.

4.2.3 Homogeneity of variance

Levene’s test was used to test for homogeneity of variance. Results can be found in Table 2. A significant result indicates that the variances are unequal. No score could be calculated for the resolution/result variable (narrative structure) and for onomatopoeia (an evaluative device), since only the native group included these elements in their narratives.
Table 2.

Results of Levene’s test per variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Levene’s test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narrative length</td>
<td>$F(3, 27) = 1.55, p = .223$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural elements type frequency</td>
<td>$F(3, 27) = 4.12, p = .016$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation element</td>
<td>$F(3, 27) = 3.93, p = .019$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complication element</td>
<td>$F(3, 27) = 2.81, p = .059$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation element</td>
<td>$F(3, 27) = 4.27, p = .014$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution/result element</td>
<td>$F(3, 27) = 17.03, p &lt; .001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda element</td>
<td>$F(3, 27) = 2.27, p = .10$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative devices type frequency</td>
<td>$F(3, 27) = 1.64, p = .203$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensifiers</td>
<td>$F(3, 27) = 5.76, p = .004$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetitions</td>
<td>$F(3, 27) = 11.59, p &lt; .001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onomatopoeia</td>
<td>$F(3, 27) = 51.10, p &lt; .001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressives</td>
<td>$F(3, 27) = 2.64, p = .070$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character delineation</td>
<td>$F(3, 27) = 13.81, p &lt; .001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressions of emotion</td>
<td>$F(3, 27) = 2.22, p = .109$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct reported speech</td>
<td>$F(3, 27) = 11.10, p &lt; .001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect reported speech</td>
<td>$F(3, 27) = 2.40, p = .090$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressions of defeat of expectation/negatives</td>
<td>$F(3, 27) = 2.43, p = .087$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elongation</td>
<td>$F(3, 27) = 5.71, p = .004$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclamation</td>
<td>$F(3, 27) = 4.94, p = .007$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Narrative length

Inspection of the narratives of the lower educated adult refugees suggested that not all narratives were complete, in other words, that they were not ‘formally’ ended. Some narratives ended with a random clause or an interrupted clause, like ‘Omer zoekt in de’. This might indicate that participants were not able to complete their narrative for some reason. Two narratives of the highly educated B1/B2 refugee participants also suggest that they are incomplete.

Table 3 lists the means and standard deviations of the number of clauses used in the narratives produced by the lower educated A1/A2 group, the highly educated A1/A2 group, the highly educated B1/B2 group and the natives.
Table 3.

Means, standard deviations and F-value for narrative length

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount of clauses</td>
<td>29.20 (11.98)</td>
<td>39.43 (12.15)</td>
<td>51.40 (13.16)</td>
<td>77.11 (27.59)</td>
<td>11.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lower educated adult refugees on a low Dutch as a second language level (i.e. A1/A2) included, on average, 29.20 clauses in their written narratives, which is ten clauses less than highly educated adult refugees with the same second language level, who included on average 39.43 clauses in their narratives. The highly educated adult refugees on an intermediate level (B1/B2) included, on average, 51.40 clauses in their written narratives, almost twelve clauses more than the highly educated A1/A2 participants. Compared to the lower educated adult refugees, the highly educated adult refugees on B1/B2 level included 22 clauses extra in their narratives. The natives produced, on average, 77.11 written narrative clauses. This is almost 48 more than the lower educated refugee group, 38 more than the highly educated A1/A2 group, and 26 more than the highly educated adult refugees on an intermediate second language level.

The standard deviations of the means suggest that there was some variance between the participants in the amount of clauses used in the narratives. For the lower educated group, the minimum number of clauses used in the written narratives was thirteen, with a maximum of 51. Therefore, the mean is closer to the lowest amount of clauses used than to the highest amount of clauses used. For the highly educated adult refugees on a low Dutch as a second language level, the minimum amount of clauses produced was 26, with a maximum of 59. Here, the mean is also closer to the lowest amount of clauses used than to the highest amount of clauses used. The minimum amount of clauses produced by the highly educated adult refugees on an intermediate second language level was 35, with the maximum of 69. The mean is slightly closer to the minimum score. The maximum amount of clauses of the natives was quite large, namely 138. The minimum score for this group was 48. The range for this group was thus quite large, indicating that there was a lot of variance within this group. The mean is way closer to the minimum score. The individual scores confirm this result, because there were two participants who included more than 100 clauses in their written narratives (whereas the third highest score is 80). The standard deviation of almost 26 also confirms this result.
To statistically test whether there are differences between the groups in terms of the amount of clauses produced, the length of the narratives was compared for the four experimental groups with the use of a univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA). A one-way ANOVA for the number of clauses included in the narratives showed a statistically significant result, $F(3, 27) = 11.76$, $p < .001$, $\omega^2 = .51$. Post-hoc comparisons using Gabriel’s test indicated that the lower educated A1/A2 group (M = 29.20, SD = 11.98, $p < .001$) and the highly educated A1/A2 group (M = 39.43, SD = 12.15, $p = .002$) included significantly less clauses in their narratives compared to the natives (M = 77.11, SD = 27.59). The highly educated B1/B2 group (M = 51.40, SD = 12.15, $p = .091$) did not include significantly less clauses in their narratives than the natives. All the other groups did also not differ significantly from each other.

4.4 Narrative structure

Initially, six structural elements were coded for the structural analyses. However, one of the elements, namely abstract, did not occur in any of the narratives (neither coded by the rater nor by the inter-rater), so this element was therefore deleted from statistical analyses. The current analyses are therefore based on the following five elements: orientation, complication, evaluation, resolution/result, and coda.

4.4.1 Type structural elements

Table 4 displays the means and standard deviations of the type frequencies of structural elements used in the narratives produced by the lower educated A1/A2 group, the highly educated A1/A2 group, the highly educated B1/B2 group and the natives.

Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type frequency</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.30 (0.48)</td>
<td>3.29 (0.76)</td>
<td>3.20 (1.10)</td>
<td>4.44 (0.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lower educated adult refugees included, on average, 2.30 out of five different types of structural elements in their narratives. This was also the lowest number of the four groups. Second came the highly educated B1/B2 participant group, who included on average 3.20
different types of structural elements in their written narratives. This is almost one type more than the lower educated group. The highly educated A1/A2 participants scored a little better than the highly educated B1/B2 participants. They used, on average, 3.29 different types of structural elements. The difference, however, is only 0.09, which is almost negligible. Most different types of structural elements were used by the natives, who included on average 4.44 out of five different structural types in their written narratives. The natives used more than two different types of structural elements than the lower educated adult refugees. Compared to the highly educated adult participants, they included more than one different type of structural element in their written narratives.

The relatively small standard deviations indicate that the groups were quite homogeneous in their use of different types of structural elements. Only for the highly educated B1/B2 participants, the standard deviation was a little higher compared to the others. All participants in the three refugee groups used at least two different types of structural elements. These two types were orientation and complication. The maximum amount of different structural elements used was three for the lower educated adult refugees and four for the highly educated adult refugees on an A1/A2 and a B1/B2 language level. The natives used at least three different types, which were orientation, complication and coda. At its maximum, they used five out of five different types.

A univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to statistically compare the four experimental groups on the inclusion of different structural elements. A Welch correction on the one-way ANOVA for the different types of structural elements included in the narratives showed a statistically significant result, \( F(3, 11.42) = 17.23, p < .001, \omega^2 = 0.75 \). Post-hoc comparisons using the Games-Howell test indicated that the lower educated refugee group (\( M = 2.30, SD = 0.48, p < .001 \)), and the highly educated A1/A2 group (\( M = 3.29, SD = 0.76, p = .038 \)) included significantly less different types of structural elements in their narratives compared to the natives (\( M = 4.44, SD = 0.73 \)). The difference between the lower educated adult refugees (\( M = 2.30, SD = 0.48 \)) and the highly educated A1/A2 participants (\( M = 3.29, SD = 0.76 \)) was just above the cut-off point of significance (\( p = .054 \)). All the other groups did not differ from each other.

### 4.4.2 Token structural elements

Table 5 displays the means and standard deviations for the token frequencies of the five measures of use of narrative structural elements produced by the lower educated A1/A2 group,
the highly educated A1/A2 group, the highly educated B1/B2 group and the natives. As can be
derived from the table, some cells are empty, indicating that this type of structural element does
not occur in the narratives of that specific group. Statistical testing, therefore, becomes
problematic for groups with empty cells on some variables.

Table 5.

*Means, standard deviations and F-value for the five different structural elements (token
frequency)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>2.40 (0.97)</td>
<td>2.00 (1.41)</td>
<td>3.80 (1.30)</td>
<td>4.67 (2.50)</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complication</td>
<td>25.20 (10.78)</td>
<td>32.86 (8.69)</td>
<td>44.20 (11.21)</td>
<td>62.67 (27.79)</td>
<td>7.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>0.20 (0.42)</td>
<td>1.29 (2.22)</td>
<td>1.80 (1.79)</td>
<td>4.56 (2.60)</td>
<td>8.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution/result</td>
<td>0.00 (0.00)</td>
<td>0.00 (0.00)</td>
<td>0.00 (0.00)</td>
<td>1.89 (2.09)</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>0.40 (1.27)</td>
<td>2.00 (1.29)</td>
<td>1.60 (1.67)</td>
<td>3.33 (2.44)</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All groups produced the most clauses in the complication section, with the lower
educated adult refugees producing, on average, 25.20 clauses, the highly educated refugees on
a low second language level producing 32.86 clauses, the highly educated adult refugees on an
intermediate level producing 44.20 clauses, and the natives producing 62.67 clauses. All
participants in all groups produced clauses in this section. The natives produced more than 37
complication clauses more than the lower educated participants, almost thirty more than the
highly educated A1/A2 refugees, and eighteen more than the highly educated B1/B2
participants. Examples of complication clauses written by the lower educated adult refugees are⁶,
for example, ‘’In de avond de kekker gin weg van zijn pot. Anas slaapt nog een de hond
ook.’’ (’’In the evening the frog went away from his jar. Anas is still sleeping and the dog too’’),
’’In de avond de kikker gin weg zijn pot maar Omer weker worden wil kijk de kikker de kikker
is weg zĳn denk hoe kan de kikker weg gan.’’ (’’In the evening the frog went away his jar but
Omer wakes up want look the frog the frog is gone she thinks how can frog go away.’’), and
’’De kind is slapen en de kikker naar kamer. De kikker is afwiseg en de kind is boss.’’ (’’The
child is sleeping and the frog to room. The frog is absent and the child is angry’’). Examples

---

⁶This, and all other examples, are just a random selection of clauses from different narratives.
of complication clauses written by the highly educated A1/A2 participants are "daarna de jongen en hond ging naar de bed en slapen en in deze momentje de kikker ontsnapping." ("Afterwards the boy and dog went to bed and sleeping and in this moment the frog escaped"), and "op middavond wanneer jams slaapt de kikker gaat uit. Jams sta op in morgen maar hij zien geen kikker en hij begant op de kikker zoken." ("In the evening when Jams sleeps the frog goes out. Jams wakes up in morning but he does not see frog and he begins searching frog"). The highly educated B1/B2 participants wrote, for example, "In een nacht, klimt de kikker van zijn pottje. En loopt weg. De jonge en zijn hond waren aan het slapen." ("In the night, frog climbs from his jar. And walks away. The boy and his dog were sleeping."). An example of complication clauses written by a native speaker is "De volgende dag na het slapen was de kikker opeens verdwenen! Duke en Robbie zochten overal. 'Kikker waar ben je?' schreeuwde Duke." ("The next day after sleeping the frog suddenly disappeared. Duke and Robbie searched for him everywhere. 'Frog, where are you?' was Duke screaming."). As can be seen from these example sentences, not many differences occurred in the content (i.e. the meaning) of these sentences. It was the amount of clauses that differed between the groups, meaning that some groups used more detailed information to tell their story than other groups.

In general, the least clauses were produced in the resolution/result section, where none of the refugee groups included clauses in this element. Only five of the nine natives included clauses in the section, on average 1.89 clauses. Examples of such clauses are "en zo is het eind goed, al goed." ("and so the end is good, all is good"), and "Jantje zal nooit meer vergeten om zijn raam dicht te doen als hij gaat slapen." ("Jantje will never forget to close his window when he is about to sleep.").

In the orientation section, not that many differences were visible between the four groups on the amount of clauses included. Again, the natives included the most clauses (4.67 on average). The highly educated B1/B2 participants used less clauses compared to the natives, namely 3.80 on average. The highly educated A1/A2 participants included the least clauses of all the groups, namely two on average. The lower educated refugees produced on average 2.40 clauses in this section. Minimum and maximum scores showed that all participants included at least one clause in this section, with nine clauses as a maximum, included by one of the native participants. Examples of orientation clauses written by the lower educated adult refugees are "Omar heeft slaapkamer en hij heeft een houtje een zijn kamer heel mooie." ("Omar has bedroom and he has a small dog and his room very beautiful."), and "De mooie weer en de zoon spelt met de hond en kikkers kijk." ("The nice weather and the son plays with the dog and the frogs watch"). Not all narratives of participants in this group had a clear orientation
section at the beginning of the narrative. Some orientation clauses were interjected at other points in the narrative. Moreover, they did not all include a person, and a place, and a time, and a behavioral situation. However, all narratives included a person and a behavioral situation in the orientation section. Place and time were sometimes missing. There was one subject who included all of the elements. An example of clauses written by the highly educated A1/A2 group is "‘In een nacht de jongen heb gespeled met hem hond en kikker in salpkamer.’ (‘At one night the boy played with him dog and frog in bedroom’). In this group, all orientation clauses occurred at the beginning of the narratives. Except the clause ‘er was eens’ (‘once upon a time’), all included a person. In addition, some narratives included a place, a time, and/or a behavioral situation in this section. There were two narratives which included all elements in this section. Examples of orientation clauses the highly educated B1/B2 group wrote are ‘Lang geleden, was er een jonge en zijn kleine hond. Er was ook een Kikker die in een glaze pot zit.’ (‘Long time ago, there was a boy and a small dog. There was also a frog who was sitting in a jar’). All of the orientation clauses written by this group occurred at the beginning of the narratives and all included a person, a behavioral situation and time. However, not all included a place. The natives wrote, for example, ‘Er was eens een klein jongetje die rustig lag te slapen in zijn bed. Op een ochtend werd hij wakker en kwam hij erachter dat zijn lievelingshuisdier ‘de kikker’ uit zijn slaapkamer was geslopen.’ (‘Once upon a time there was a little boy who was sleeping peacefully in his bed. One morning he woke up and found out that his favorite pet ‘the frog’ slipped out of his bedroom.’). All of the orientation clauses of the natives occurred at the beginning of the narratives and all included a person. Except one, all also included time or a behavioral situation. Out of the nine participants, five included all elements in this section (person, place, time, and behavioral situation).

The evaluation and the coda element are both elements in which the lower educated adult refugees included not many clauses, only 0.20 and 0.40 respectively. In the evaluation element, only two participants included a clause. These two clauses are ‘O jamar de kikker gaat weg.’ (‘It is a pity, the frog is leaving.’), and ‘Oh! Dat is problem.’ (‘Oh, that is problem.’). In the coda element, there was only one participant who included four clauses. That participant used the following clauses ‘Hij pak zijn kekker en hij zwijt de famili van en gin terug naar tuis met drie naar een lang en moe dag en Anas is heel blij.’ (‘He grabs his frog and he waves the family from and went back home with three after a long and exhausting day and Anas is very happy.’). All the other groups included on average at least one clause in each of these elements, with the natives scoring highest on both elements. Looking at the individual scores on the evaluation element, however, it can be seen that only three of the highly educated
A1/A2 participants and three of the highly educated B1/B2 participants included clauses in this section. Of the native group, there was one participant who did not include clauses in this section. An example of an evaluation clause produced by the highly educated A1/A2 participants is "maar helaas het was een andere dier." ("but unfortunately it was another animal."). For the highly educated B1/B2 participants, an example evaluation clause is "Helaas kon het kind het kikkertje niet vinden," ("Unfortunately the boy could not find the little frog."). An example clause of the natives is "maar gelukkig kon hij Duke niet pakken." ("Lukily he could not grab Duke."). Most of the evaluation clauses consisted of an evaluative device, such as 'helaas' (unfortunately), 'gelukkig' (luckily), or 'oh' (oh). Looking at the coda section, six out of seven participants in the highly educated A1/A2 group produced clauses in this section. Example clauses are "De jongen voelt gelukkig en hij neemt een kikkerje met hem en hij terug naar huis met hem hond." ("The boy feels happy and takes a little frog with him and he back home with his dog."). Of the intermediate group, three participants included clauses in this section. Examples are "En toen nam hij zijn kiker mee en zei voor de andere doei." ("And then he took his frog and said for the other one bye."). All of the natives included clauses in the coda section, such as "Ze nemen de kikker mee terug naar huis" ("They take the frog back home"), and "Wally, Joris en de nieuwe kikker zwaaiden totdat Jaap helemaal uit het zicht was verdwenen." ("Wally, Joris and the new frog were waving until Jaap completely disappeared."). The lower educated refugees and the highly educated A1/A2 refugees both produced the second lowest amount of clauses (after the resolution/result element) in the evaluation section, whereas the highly educated B1/B2 participants and the natives produced the second lowest amount of clauses in the coda section.

To statistically test whether there were differences between the four experimental groups on this domain of narrative production, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted. Using Wilks lambda, the MANOVA showed that there was a statistically significant difference between the four experimental groups in the inclusion of structural elements in written narratives, $F(15, 63.89) = 3.35, p < .001$, Wilks $\lambda = 0.20$, partial $\eta^2 = .41$. Results of the univariate tests showed that the orientation element, $F(3, 12.55) = 4.39, p = .012$, $\eta^2 = .33$, the complication element, $F(3, 2412.08) = 7.96, p = .001$, $\eta^2 = .47$, the evaluation element, $F(3, 31.64), 8.71, p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .49$, and the resolution/result element, $F(3, 7.60) = 5.88, p = .003$, $\eta^2 = .40$, differed significantly between the groups. The coda element, $F(3, 13.75) = 2.70, p = .066$, $\eta^2 = .23$, did not differ significantly between the groups.

Although the univariate test showed that there was a statistically significant difference between the four groups on the amount of clauses included in the orientation element, post-hoc
comparisons using the Games-Howell test indicated no significant differences. The difference that came closest to significance was the one between the highly educated A1/A2 participants (M = 2.00, SD = 1.41) and the natives (M = 4.67, SD = 2.50, p = .077), although the significance level was not achieved. The fact that the univariate analysis and post-hoc test were inconsistent was very likely due to the small sample sizes.

For the complication element, post-hoc comparisons using Gabriel’s test indicated that the lower educated A1/A2 group (M= 25.20, SD = 10.78, p < .001) and the highly educated A1/A2 group (M = 32.86, SD = 8.69, p = .012) included significantly less complication clauses in their narratives compared to the natives (M = 62.76, SD = 27.79). All the other groups did not differ significantly from each other in the inclusion of complication elements in their narratives.

For the evaluation element, post-hoc comparisons using the Games-Howell test indicated that the lower educated A1/A2 group (M = 0.20, SD = 0.42, p = .004) included significantly less evaluation clauses in their narratives compared to the natives (M = 4.56, SD = 2.60). All the other groups did not differ significantly from each other in the inclusion of evaluation elements in their narratives.

For the resolution/result element, post-hoc comparisons using the Games-Howell test indicated that all three refugee groups differed significantly from the natives with regard to the inclusion of resolution/result clauses, since none of the participants in the refugee groups included such clauses in their narratives. The natives included on average 1.89 (SD = 2.09) resolution/result clauses in their narratives. The three refugee groups, however, did not differ significantly between each other. Since the cells of the three refugee groups are empty, this significant difference, however, only means that the natives differed significantly from zero.

There were no significant differences between the four experimental groups on the inclusion of coda clauses in their narratives. All groups included roughly the same amount of such clauses in their narratives.

4.5 Evaluative devices

4.5.1 Type evaluative devices

Table 6 displays the means and standard deviations of the type frequencies of evaluative devices produced by the lower educated A1/A2 group, the highly educated A1/A2 group, the highly educated B1/B2 group and the natives.
Table 6.
Means, standard deviations and F-value for the type frequency of evaluative devices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>2.60 (1.71)</td>
<td>4.71 (2.14)</td>
<td>5.80 (2.68)</td>
<td>7.22 (1.56)</td>
<td>9.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a clear order of precedence of the production of different types of evaluative devices: the lower educated refugees used the least different types of evaluative devices, followed by the highly educated A1/A2 refugees, then the highly educated B1/B2 participants, and the natives producing the most different types of evaluative devices. Out of eleven different evaluative devices, the lower educated participants used on average only 2.60 different types. The highly educated A1/A2 refugees used almost five different types in their written narratives, with the highly educated participants on an intermediate level using on average one type extra compared to the highly educated A1/A2 group. The natives used on average 7.22 different types, indicating that even highly proficient language users do not use all eleven different evaluative devices in their written narratives. However, it is twice as much as the lower educated refugees.

Among the lower educated adult refugees, there was one participant who included none of the eleven evaluative devices coded for this study. There were two participants who included five different evaluative devices, which turned out to be the maximum as well. The minimum score for the highly educated A1/A2 participants and the highly educated B1/B2 participants was two, with a maximum of seven for the A1/A2 group and a maximum of eight for the B1/B2 group. For the natives, the minimum amount of different evaluative devices used was four. The maximum amount of different evaluative devices included by this group was nine.

A univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to statistically compare the four experimental groups on the inclusion of different evaluative devices. The one-way ANOVA for the different types of evaluative devices included in the narratives showed a statistically significant result, $F(3, 27) = 9.31$, $p < .001$, $\omega^2 = 0.49$. Post-hoc comparisons using Gabriel’s test indicated that the lower educated group (M = 2.60, SD = 1.71) included significantly less different types of evaluative devices in their narratives compared to the highly educated B1/B2 group (M = 5.80, SD = 2.68, $p = .030$) and the natives (M = 7.22, SD = 1.56, $p < .001$). All the other groups did not differ significantly from each other.
### 4.5.2 Token evaluative devices

Table 7 shows the means and standard deviations for the token frequencies of the eleven different types of narrative evaluative devices produced by the lower educated A1/A2 group, the highly educated A1/A2 group, the highly educated B1/B2 group and the natives. As can be derived from the table, some cells are empty, indicating that this evaluative device did not occur in the narratives of that specific group. Statistical testing, therefore, became problematic for these groups on variables with empty cells.

Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intensifiers</strong></td>
<td>0.40 (0.52)</td>
<td>0.71 (0.76)</td>
<td>1.00 (1.00)</td>
<td>2.89 (2.13)</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Repetitions</strong></td>
<td>0.00 (0.00)</td>
<td>0.29 (0.49)</td>
<td>0.00 (0.00)</td>
<td>0.44 (0.88)</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Onomatopoeia</strong></td>
<td>0.00 (0.00)</td>
<td>0.00 (0.00)</td>
<td>0.00 (0.00)</td>
<td>0.67 (0.50)</td>
<td>12.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expressives</strong></td>
<td>0.20 (0.42)</td>
<td>0.71 (1.25)</td>
<td>1.00 (1.23)</td>
<td>0.78 (1.09)</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Character delineation</strong></td>
<td>0.10 (0.32)</td>
<td>0.29 (0.49)</td>
<td>3.40 (3.05)</td>
<td>3.11 (2.85)</td>
<td>6.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expressions of emotion</strong></td>
<td>2.00 (1.63)</td>
<td>1.86 (1.07)</td>
<td>2.60 (2.30)</td>
<td>5.00 (2.55)</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct reported speech</strong></td>
<td>0.50 (0.85)</td>
<td>4.43 (6.29)</td>
<td>2.80 (4.09)</td>
<td>6.89 (8.22)</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect reported speech</strong></td>
<td>0.40 (0.84)</td>
<td>0.14 (0.38)</td>
<td>0.80 (0.84)</td>
<td>1.67 (2.87)</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expressions of defeat of expectation/negatives</strong></td>
<td>0.60 (0.70)</td>
<td>2.71 (1.38)</td>
<td>3.20 (1.79)</td>
<td>6.22 (2.59)</td>
<td>16.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elongation</strong></td>
<td>0.00 (0.00)</td>
<td>0.57 (1.13)</td>
<td>0.00 (0.00)</td>
<td>0.22 (0.67)</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exclamation</strong></td>
<td>0.10 (0.32)</td>
<td>2.00 (3.83)</td>
<td>3.40 (5.98)</td>
<td>3.78 (2.91)</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not all eleven evaluative devices were used equally often by the participants. Repetitions and elongations, for example, are not even used once by the lower educated refugees and the highly educated B1/B2 participants. The highly educated A1/A2 participants used repetitions two times, distributed over two participants. The repetitions used by this group are ”’hij zokt meer en meer’” (”he is searching more and more”), and ”’darna hij schreeuwt kikker kikker kikker’” (”Afterwards he is screaming frog frog frog”). The natives used repetitions four times, twice by two participants. The forms that were used are ”’Kikker, kikker
waar ben je?’ riep Duke weer.’”, (”’Frog, frog where are you?’ was Duke screaming again.”), ’Het hert rende en rende en moest opeens stoppen want de grond was daar afgebrokkeld.’” (”The deer was running and running and had to stop because the ground was demolished.”), and ”Kwak, Kwak waar ben je?” (”’Kwak, Kwak where are you?’”; used twice in the same form). Elongations are used four times by the highly educated adult refugees on an A1/A2 level, of which one participant used it once and one participants used it three times. The elongations used by this group are ”’kikkeeeeeeongeenteen schreeuwddd de jongen” (”froooooooog, was the boy screaming”), two times ”’oooh” (”’oooh”) and once ”jaal” (”’yess”). Only one native participant used elongation, which she did two times. The elongations she used were ”’FROOOOG WAAR BEN JE?” (”’FROOOOG WHERE ARE YOU?”), and ”maar hoort nergens ‘quaak’ terug.” (”’but does not hear ‘quaak’ back.”). Onomatopoeia are only used by the natives and not by any of the refugees. Natives, however, did only use is occasionally (on average less than once per narrative). In total, six onomatopoeia are used by six different participants. All of these onomatopoeia had to do with the sound a frog makes, like ”’Achter die boomstam hoor ik gekwaak.” (”’Behind that three trunk I hear quaak.”), and ”Alex roept Frog maar hoort nergens ‘quaak’ terug.” (”’Alex calls Frog but does not hear ‘quaak’ back.”), or with the sound an object or a person makes when falling into the water, like ”’Plons, ze vallen samen in het water” (”’Splash, together they fall into the water”), and ”’Met een plons belandde Joris in een vijver onder het ravijn.” (”’With a splash Joris ended in a pond under a ravine.”).

Of the eleven evaluative devices counted in this study, the lower educated adult refugees on an A1/A2 level most often used expressions of emotions in their written narratives. They used it, on average, two times per narrative. There were two of the ten participants who did not use any expressions of emotion in their written narratives. The use of expressions of emotions is also the only element the lower educated adult refugees used at least once per narrative, on average. All the other elements were used less than once per narrative. Examples of expressions of emotions used by the lower educated adult refugees are ”’Anas is bang’” (i.e. Anas is bang/Anas is afraid), ”’De uil is boos’” (”’The owl in angry’”), and ”’Zij zijn blij’” (”’They are happy’”). Eight of the twenty expressions of emotions are ‘bang’ (afraid), six are ‘boos’ (angry), five are ‘blij’ (happy), and one is ‘geschrokken’ (startled). Of all the different elements, the standard deviations of the means were also low, indicating that the use of the different evaluative devices was normally distributed among the participants in this group. There was not one person who used it way more often compared to the others.
The highly educated A1/A2 refugee participants used, on average, more evaluative devices than the lower educated group. Of the eleven different devices, they used direct reported speech most, namely 4.43 times per narrative. One participant used it fifteen times, one used it twelve times, one used it twice, one used it once and two did not use it at all. Examples of direct reported speech used by the highly educated A1/A2 group are ‘’’mijn kikkertje! Waar ben je! Ik mis je!’’, (’’’my little frog! Where are you! I miss you!’’), and ‘’’wij moeten naar de kikker zeken’’ (’’’we have to search for frog’’’’). The standard deviation was quite high, which explains the individual variance between the subjects. Expressions of defeat of expectation/negatives, exclamation, and expressions of emotion were also used relatively often compared to the other devices, respectively 2.71, 2.00, and 1.86 times per written narrative. Expressions of defeat of expectation/negatives, for example, were used by all seven highly educated A1/A2 participants. An example of such an expression is ‘’maar niks gebeurd’’ (’’’but nothing happened’’’’). Expressions of emotion were used by six out of seven participants. Seven different emotions were used: blij (happy; four times), boos (angry; three times), bang (afraid; two times), verdrietig (sad; once), verwonderd (astonished; once), gelukkig (happy\(^7\); once), and tevreden (satisfied; once). Compared to the lower educated participants, three emotions overlap, whereas four different expressions of emotion were used. Exclamation is actually only used by two of the seven participants, one of whom used it ten times and one used it four times. The other five participants did not use it at all. All the other elements were used less than once per narrative, with onomatopoeia not even used at all. For this group, the standard deviations were also quite in line with the means, suggesting that it is likely that the participants within this group were normally distributed on each device.

The highly educated adult refugees on an intermediate level of Dutch as a second language used eight out of the eleven different elements, which was less than the highly educated A1/A2 participants, who used ten different elements. Repetitions, onomatopoeia, and elongation were not used by this group. Of all the different elements, exclamation and character delineations were used most, followed by expressions of defeat of expectation and negatives. The high mean of exclamation might, however, give a distorted picture, since exclamation is fourteen times used by one single participant and not used by two of the participants. Character delineations, on the other hand, were used by all five participants in this group, with occurrences of eight (once), five (once), two (once) and one (twice). Examples of used character delineations are ‘’nieuwe vriend’’ (’’new friend’’), ‘’kleine kikkertjes’’ (’’little frogs’’), and ‘’grote uil’’

\(^7\) In Dutch, ‘blij’ and ‘gelukkig’ have two different meanings, whereas in English they are both translated to ‘happy’.
Expressions of defeat of expectation are used by all participants in this group. Of all the other used elements, indirect reported speech was the only element that was, on average, used less than once per narrative. Expressions of emotions were, on average, used 2.60 times per narrative. One participant did not use any expression of emotion. The emotions ‘bang’ (afraid) and ‘boos’ (angry) both occurred five times. ‘Blij’ (happy) occurred two times. This were the same emotions as were used by the other two refugee groups. Another emotional expression that was used by the highly educated B1/B2 participants was ‘verbaasd’ (astonished). Except for exclamation and direct reported speech, standard deviations were in line with the means. For exclamation and direct reported speech, standard deviations were quite high, suggesting that there might be variance between the participants in their use of these elements.

The natives used all of the eleven different evaluative devices in their narratives, of which direct reported speech was used most (6.89 times per written narrative). This device was, however, only used by five of the nine native speakers. One participant used it 22 times, one used it fifteen times, one thirteen times, one nine times and one three times. Next to direct reported speech, expressions of defeat of expectation and negatives, and expressions of emotions are used most. Expressions of defeat of expectation/negatives were used by all nine participants, with a maximum use of twelve and a minimum use of four. Expressions of emotions were also used by all of the participants. Compared to the refugee groups, a lot more variation was visible in the use of emotional expressions. ‘Bang’ (afraid) and ‘boos’ (angry) were again often used, but also equivalents of these words were used, such as ‘woest’ (ferocious). Where the refugee groups often used ‘blij’ (happy), the natives often used the negative formula of these words, like ‘niet blij’ (not happy). Another emotional expression that was often used is ‘schrikken’ (to scare), or conjugations of this word. At least one instance of intensifiers, as ‘heel voorzichtig’ (very carefully), and ‘de hele slaapkamer’ (the whole bedroom), was used by all of the participants. Elongation, repetitions, onomatopoeia, and expressives were, on average, used less than once per narrative. Elongation, for example, was only used twice by one participant. Repetitions were used twice by two participants, and expressives (as ‘aaaah’ and ‘haha’) were used by four participants (either once, twice or three times). Onomatopoeia were used once by six participants. Again, standard deviations for most of the means were quite low. Only for direct reported speech, the standard deviation was somewhat higher, suggesting that some participants might have used it more often than others.

There were devices that were more often used by participants with a lower language level than by participants with a high(er) language level. The highly educated adult refugees on
a B1/B2 level, for example, used expressives and character delineations more often than the natives did. The highly educated A1/A2 participants used elongation more often than the natives. Besides, they used repetitions, direct reported speech, and elongation more often than the highly educated B1/B2 participants. Lastly, the lower educated adult refugees used expressions of emotion and indirect reported speech slightly more often than the highly educated A1/A2 group.

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to statistically compare the four experimental groups on this domain of narrative production. Using Wilks lambda, the MANOVA showed that there was a statistically significant difference between the four experimental groups in the inclusion of evaluative devices in narratives, $F(33, 50.79) = 3.03, p < .0005$, Wilks $\lambda = 0.041$, partial $\eta^2 = .66$. Results of the univariate analyses showed that the inclusion of onomatopoeia, $F(3, 27) = 12.77, p = .000, \eta^2 = .59$, character delineation, $F(3, 27) = 6.14, p = .003, \eta^2 = .41$, expressions of emotion, $F(3, 27) = 4.83, p = .008, \eta^2 = .35$, and expressions of defeat of expectation/negatives, $F(3, 27) = 16.57, p = .000, \eta^2 = .65$, differed significantly between the groups. The inclusion of intensifiers, $F(3, 27) = 2.95, p = .051, \eta^2 = .25$, repetitions, $F(3, 27) = 1.40, p = .265, \eta^2 = .13$, expressives, $F(3, 27) = 0.94, p = .436, \eta^2 = .09$, direct reported speech, $F(3, 27) = 2.13, p = .120, \eta^2 = .19$, indirect reported speech, $F(3, 27) = 1.35, p = .281, \eta^2 = .13$, elongation, $F(3, 27) = 1.25, p = .310, \eta^2 = .12$, and exclamation, $F(3, 27) = 2.22, p = .109, \eta^2 = .20$, did not differ significantly between the groups. Roughly the same amount of repetitions, expressives, direct reported speech, indirect reported speech, elongation and exclamation were included in the narratives by each group.

For the inclusion of onomatopoeia, post-hoc comparisons using the Games-Howell test indicated that all three refugee groups differed from the natives in the use of onomatopoeia in their narratives (all $p = .017$), since none of the participants in the refugee groups included such evaluative devices in their narratives. The natives included on average 0.67 onomatopoeia (SD = 0.50) in their narratives. Since the cells of the three refugee groups are empty, this significant difference, however, only means that the natives differ significantly from zero.

Although the univariate test showed that there was a statistically significant difference between the four groups with regard to the use of character delineations, post-hoc comparisons using the Games-Howell test indicated that there were no significant differences. There were, however, two differences that came close to significance, namely the one between the lower educated adult refugees (M = 0.10, SD = 0.32) and the natives (M = 0.78, SD = 1.09, p = .052), and the difference between the highly educated A1/A2 participants (M = 0.71, SD = 1.25) and
the natives (M = 0.78, SD = 1.09, p = .070). The fact that the univariate analysis and post-hoc test were inconsistent, might be caused by the small sample sizes.

For the use of expressions of emotions, post-hoc comparisons using Gabriel’s test indicated that the lower educated A1/A2 group (M = 2.00, SD = 1.63, p = .015) and the highly educated A1/A2 group (M =1.86, SD = 1.07, p = .021) used less expressions of emotions in their narratives than natives (M = 5.00, SD = 2.55). All the other groups did not differ significantly from each other.

For expressions of defeat of expectation and negatives (one variable), post-hoc comparisons using Gabriel’s test indicated that all three refugee groups used significantly less of these devices than the natives. The lower educated A1/A2 group included on average 0.60 of these devices (SD = 0.70, p < .001), the highly educated A1/A2 group 2.71 (SD = 1.38, p = .003), and the highly educated B1/B2 group 3.20 (SD = 1.79, p = .024). The natives included on average 6.22 (SD = 2.59) expressions of defeat of expectations and negatives in their narratives. All the other groups did not differ from each other for this variable.

Although the main analysis did not find a significant effect for exclamation, post-hoc comparisons using the Games-Howell test did find a significant result. The lower educated adult refugees (M = 0.10, SD = 0.32) included significantly less exclamations in their written narratives compared to the natives (M = 3.78, SD = 2.91, p = .022).
5. Discussion and conclusion

This chapter discusses the findings of this research. First, a short introduction of the conducted study is given in Section 5.1. Thereafter, the results for each of the three specific elements of the analyses (narrative length, narrative structure and evaluative devices) are discussed, in a similar way as in Chapter 4. After these sections, the reliability of the coding, as described in Section 3.6.1, is discussed in Section 5.5. Although several specific limitations are discussed in the relevant sections immediately, some general limitations of this study will be discussed separately in Section 5.6. One of the most important common limitations is the relatively small sample size, which affects all the performed sub-analyses individually. This limitation should be taken into account when discussing the results. Finally, some concluding remarks are given based on the research question formulated in Section 2.8.

5.1 Introduction

Migration rates have increased worldwide, of which asylum migration is one of the most frequent forms. Never before there were so many people seeking for a safe place to live, because their home countries are terrorized by violence and war. This increase is also visible in the Netherlands, where the number of asylum seekers and refugees also increased dramatically. A common misunderstanding is that these refugees and asylum seekers are low(er) educated, while actually they are not (since many of them have high educational skills and qualities). The education and skills these people acquired in their home country cannot always be transferred directly into relevant skills for the host country, forcing refugees to study again in their ‘new’ country (in this case the Netherlands). Moreover, because little is known about the second language skills of refugees, the integration process becomes problematic.

This study explores the second language skills (in Dutch) of highly educated adult refugees by looking at their written narrative production. In order to see if there is something ‘special’ about highly educated adult refugees, a comparison is made between lower educated adult refugees and highly educated adult refugees. Nine Dutch written narratives of lower educated adult refugees on an A1/A2 level are compared with seven Dutch written narratives of highly educated adult refugees on an A1/A2 level and five Dutch written narratives of highly educated adult refugees on a B1/B2 level. Written narratives of nine native speakers of Dutch are used as a baseline for Dutch language proficiency. From these narratives, different aspects and functions were distracted based on work by Labov and Waletzky (1967), Labov (1972) and Peterson and McCabe (1983). Later on, these aspects were divided into three different sections:
narrative length, narrative structure (including orientation, complication, evaluation, resolution/result and coda) and the use of evaluative devices (including intensifiers, repetitions, onomatopoeia, expressions of emotion, character delineations, expressives, direct reported speech, indirect reported speech, expressions of defeat of expectation and negatives, elongation and exclamation). It is expected that highly educated adult refugees are more proficient in Dutch as a second language than lower educated adult refugees, which will result in better written narratives (i.e. more native-like narratives) produced by the highly educated adult refugees than written narratives produced by the lower educated adult refugees.

It should be mentioned that the aim of this study is highly explorative, since, to my knowledge, no earlier research is performed on written narrative production of highly educated adult refugees in the Netherlands as an isolated group. Narratives are supposed to be a good indicator of overall language proficiency and they are found to be universal in human cultures, but for the scope of this research, this method is therefore also explorative, in a way that it is not sure if the method is appropriate for examining language proficiency of refugee second language learners. Prior research showed that narrative research is a suitable method for identifying the strengths and problems language learners encounter in acquiring a language, but most of the previous research is based on monolingual children’s narrative production and narrative production of monolingual children and adults with disorders. Much less is investigated about the (written) narrative production of second language learners, and not all of the narrative components of children are relevant for adult second language learners, since the groups differ in the cognitive capacities they possess. Moreover, refugee second language learners constitute a specific group, since they are likely to bring psychological problems with them in their fleeing process. Besides, although narratives are a universal phenomenon in human cultures, the way in which they are shaped can differ between cultures.

5.2 Narrative length
The results of the statistical analyses on narrative length show that the lower educated adult refugees and the highly educated adult refugees on an A1/A2 level include significantly less clauses in their written narratives than the natives. Hence, their narratives are significantly shorter than the narratives of the native speakers. The highly educated adult refugees on a B1/B2 level, however, did not include significantly less clauses in their narratives compared to the natives. Their narratives are thus not significantly shorter than the narratives of the native speakers. This might suggest that people learning a second language on a B1/B2 level are
coming close(r) to being native-like when it comes to narrative length, whereas people (both lower and highly educated) on an A1/A2 level still have to learn a lot when it comes to narrative length. The analyses of variance do not show evidence that the lower educated adult refugees include significantly less clauses in their narratives compared to both highly educated adult refugees on a low and an intermediate second language level. Moreover, there is also no statistical evidence that the two highly educated groups include a statistically different amount of clauses in their written narratives.

The relatively large omega squared effect size suggests that 51 percent of the variance in narrative length is associated with group membership (i.e. the educational and language level of the participants). It was expected that all groups would differ from each other, in a way that the lower educated adult refugees produced the shortest narratives, followed by the highly educated adult refugees on an A1/A2 level, in turn followed by the highly educated adult refugees on a B1/B2 language level, with the natives producing the longest narratives. The statistical findings of this study thus only partially support this expectation.

When just taking the mean number of clauses into account instead of only looking at the results of statistical analyses, the differences that occur do correspond with the expectations. The narratives of the lower educated adult refugees are the shortest with 29 clauses on average. The written narratives of the highly educated adult refugees on an A1/A2 level are about ten clauses longer than the narratives of the lower educated adult refugees, with an average total of 39 clauses. The narratives of the highly educated adult refugees on a B1/B2 level, in turn, are longer than the narratives of the highly educated A1/A2 group. They consist, on average, of 51 clauses. The narratives of the natives are, with 77 clauses on average, the longest. The observation that the differences between the groups are so large, might suggest that statistical analyses should find significant differences if more participants were included in the groups. Moreover, there also seems to exist some individual variation in length of the narratives between the refugee groups and the natives. This might suggest that there are more individual language differences in terms of narrative length for people writing in their native language than for people writing in their second (or foreign) language. A possible explanation for the variation could be that native speakers possess a large amount of language knowledge (i.e. their language repertoire is really extensive), of which they are able to choose what to use. For example, some people choose to write an extensive story and use a lot out of their repertoire, whereas others choose to write a brief story and use only some devices out of their repertoire. Second language learners, on the other hand, possess only a small (or a smaller) amount of language knowledge. They might have fewer options to choose from, making it more likely that
they use everything they know. This factor might possibly minimize the individual variation between different second language learners.

In general, the results are in line with results of prior research (see for example Liskin-Gasparro, 1996, and Kang, 2003 and 2006), in a way that narratives seem to become longer the more proficient someone becomes in the second language. The more proficient someone is, the more someone knows about a language (and the bigger someone’s vocabulary will be), making language use easier and less complicated. It should be mentioned that beginning language learners do not learn all the language components at once. This is a gradual process, so the production is also likely to increase over time. However, comparisons with native speakers as a baseline are not always fair, since earlier research by Kang (2003) found that Korean second learners of English even produced shorter narratives in their native language (Korean) compared to native speakers of English in their mother tongue. So, there might be an effect of language, regardless of language proficiency. Furthermore, this might also indicate a possible cultural interference of the mother tongue. More research, in which participants are asked to write a narrative in both their first and their second language, is necessary to gain insights into cultural interferences that might exist. Taking the context of this study into account, especially the refugee participants should be asked to write a narrative in Arabic (their first language) to filter out possible effects or differences which are caused by culture (i.e. language background), but which are now possibly attributed to language proficiency and educational level.

When interpreting the results of this study, it should be taken into account that the narratives of some of the participants seem incomplete, in a way that they are not formally ended. For example, some narratives end with an interrupted clause. This might indicate that participants were not able to complete their narrative, possibly because they were not proficient enough to do it, because they felt time pressure (despite the fact that participants were not bound to a time limit), or they might got tired. In order to make valid comparisons, all participants should have written complete narratives. If their writing is interrupted because of a lack of proficiency, this might be an indication that language proficiency plays a role in the production of written narratives. In addition, statistical bias might exist due to the relatively small sample size (which will be extensively discussed in Section 5.6)

5.3 Narrative structure

Current literature states that narrative clauses are supposed to possess two functions, namely a reference function and an evaluative function (Labov & Waletzky, 1967). The referential
function is actually a description of what happened in the story and it is used to orient the listener to whom the narrative is about and what actions take place. Labov and Waletzky (1967) and Labov (1972) state that “good”, completely developed narratives consist of six structural elements, which are mainly based on reference in narratives. Those six functions are abstract, orientation, complication, evaluation, resolution/result, and coda. Except for the abstract element, all elements occurred in (at least one of) the written narratives. Following Labov and Waletzky (1967) and Labov (1972), the finding that no abstract clauses occurred in the narratives might indicate that none of the narratives is complete. However, it might also be the case that the frog-story prompt is not suitable for including abstract clauses, possibly because participants get restricted in their writing or because the story is originally child-based (and that abstract sentences do not fit such child language). Further research, in which for example different prompts will be used (both in story retelling form, such as the frog-story prompt, as well as in a more personal-experience form), could investigate whether some structural elements are only suitable for specific prompts or not.

5.3.1 Type narrative structure
Since Labov and Waletzky (1967) and Labov (1972) stated that “good”, completely developed narratives consist of six structural elements (abstract, orientation, complication, evaluation, resolution/result, and coda; see Section 5.3), it was hypothesized that the written narratives of the natives contain more different types of structural elements compared to the narratives of the highly educated adult refugees and lower educated adult refugees, and the narratives of the highly educated adult refugees contain more different types of structural elements compared to the narratives of the lower educated adult refugees. Neither the results of the statistical analysis completely confirm this expectation, nor does inspection of the means. Except for the abstract element, all elements occurred in (at least one of) the written narratives.

The statistical univariate analysis of variance shows that the natives indeed use more different types of structural elements in their narratives than the lower educated adult refugees, but not significantly more than both highly educated refugee groups. They only include more different types of structural elements than the highly educated adult refugees on an A1/A2 Dutch as a second language level, and not compared to the highly educated adult refugees on a B1/B2 Dutch as a second language level. Furthermore, there are also no significant differences between the lower educated adult refugees and the highly educated adult refugees, and between the two highly educated adult refugee groups. Interestingly, however, the highly educated adult A1/A2 refugees include slightly more different types of structural elements in their narratives.
(M = 3.29) than the highly educated adult B1/B2 refugees (M = 3.20), but only the highly educated A1/A2 participants differ significantly from the natives. Although this difference is really small, statistics show that the group with the higher mean differs from the natives, whereas the group with the lower mean does not. The only possible explanation for this finding could be the size of the groups, which is seven for the A1/A2 group and five for the B1/B2 group. Five participants might possibly not be enough to find a significant result, whereas seven seems to be just enough to detect a significant difference.

Inspection of the means, however, does show differences between the groups. The natives score highest with 4.44 out of 5 different types of structural elements (abstract is not taken into account, since this element did not occur at all). Regarding the expectations set up in Section 2.8, the group that would score second highest would be the highly educated adult refugees on a B1/B2 second language level. The means, however, show something different, namely that the highly educated adult refugees on an A1/A2 second language level score second highest, with 3.29 different types of structural elements on average. As discussed earlier, however, the difference between the two highly educated adult refugee groups is really small (maybe even too small to base conclusions on). The lower educated adult refugees score is, as expected, the lowest with 2.30 different types of structural elements on average. They include one different type less than the highly educated adult refugees on the same language level. There is also not much individual variation within the group, suggesting that the amount of different types of structural elements included in the written narratives is quite stable. The individual variation for the highly educated B1/B2 group is, however, somewhat bigger than the variances of the other groups. This might be caused by the relatively small sample size of this group compared to the other groups.

In short, it seems that the lower educated adult refugees do indeed use the least different types of structural elements in their narratives. They also seem to include less different types of structural elements than the highly educated adult refugees and the natives. The highly educated adult refugees also seem to include less different types of structural elements than the natives, but there does not seem to be differences between the two highly educated groups. This might, of course, be caused by the finding that the groups differ in their narrative length (where participants who produce shorter stories have less ‘chances’ to include different types of structural elements). More research is, however, necessary to see whether there are actual statistically significant differences between lower and highly educated second language learners and natives.
5.3.2 Token narrative structure

All four experimental groups produced the most clauses in the complication section, with the following descending order (from most to least): natives, highly educated B1/B2 refugees, highly educated A1/A2 refugees, and lower educated adult refugees. This is in line with the expectations. Although the amount of clauses seems to differ between the groups, the content of the complication section seems to be similar, indicating that the stories with more complication clauses include more detailed information. Moreover, the fact that the participants produced most clauses in this section seems to be in accordance with the function, namely comprising a series of events and serving the main body of the narrative. The statistical analyses, however, only show that the natives include significantly more clauses in the complication section compared to the lower educated adult refugees and the highly educated A1/A2 participants. Therefore, based on the results of the statistical analysis, the hypothesis is only partially supported.

In the orientation section, again, out of the four groups, the natives produced the most clauses, followed by the highly educated refugees on an intermediate second language level. This time, however, the lower educated adult refugees include more clauses in this section than the highly educated adult refugees on a low second language level. Since this difference is actually really small, it might be the case that it is just a coincidence that the lower educated adult refugees on a low second language level score higher than the highly educated adult refugees on the same language level. Moreover, the standard deviation of the highly educated group is somewhat larger compared to the standard deviation of the lower educated group (which indicates that more individual variation exists between the participants in this group), possibly explaining the finding that the lower educated adult refugees score higher than the highly educated A1/A2 refugees. The orientation element is, next to the complication element, the element in which participants include the second most clauses. The univariate test shows that there is a significant difference between the groups on the amount of clauses they include in the orientation section, but post-hoc comparisons indicate that there are no significant differences between the groups. The fact that there is inconsistency between the univariate test and the post-hoc test is likely due to the small sample sizes, thereby lacking statistical power. There is, however, one difference that almost reaches significance and that is the one between the highly educated A1/A2 participants and the natives. This makes sense, since the highly educated A1/A2 group is the group who produced the least clauses in the orientation section. Since prior research found that orientation sections are typically missing in narratives of less proficient adults, or that they include less clauses to introduce the characters of the story, it was
expected that there was again the following descending order (from most to least): natives, highly educated B1/B2 refugees, highly educated A1/A2 refugees, and lower educated adult refugees. Based on the results found, the hypothesis is only partially accepted. Nonetheless, all participants included an orientation section in their narrative, even the refugees on a low second language level (A1/A2), so the assumption that orientation clauses are typically missing in narratives of less proficient adults is not supported by this study. They do, however, use less orientation clauses than participants on a higher (second) language level.

Concerning the content of the orientation clauses, some differences occur between the four experimental groups. In the literature it was stated that not all narratives might have a clear orientation section at the beginning of the story, but that it is possible that orientation clauses are interjected at other points of the narrative. Except for the lower educated adult refugees, all groups include orientation clauses at the beginning of their narrative. Only the lower educated adult refugees use orientation clauses later on in their narrative (this is, however, still at the beginning, but sometimes the section was interrupted by complication clauses). This might suggest that producing all orientation clauses in one section might be a skill acquired later in the language acquisition process, or it might be a skill highly educated adult refugees already mastered, whereas lower educated adult refugees did not. Moreover, in the literature it was stated that orientation sections not necessarily include all four elements (person, time, place, and behavioral situation). Out of the 31 participants in this study, only eight include all four elements in their orientation section, of which four people are natives, two are highly educated on an A1/A2 level and one is lower educated. The fact that not all four elements need to be included is in line with what was stated in the literature, and therefore it might be the case that not all elements are necessary in order to construct a good and complete orientation section. However, there is not a clear pattern visible between the groups. It is obvious that the native participants include all four elements more frequently compared to the other groups. However, none of the highly educated adult refugees on an intermediate level include all the elements, whereas they were expected to turn second on this topic. In addition, all participants, except one, included a person in their narrative. This might suggest that the person is the most important part of an orientation section (and therefore maybe also of the whole narrative). Next, most participants also include a behavioral situation in their orientation section, suggesting that this might be the second most important part of the orientation section. Time and place are the elements that participants use less often, with time being used a little more often than place, suggesting that place is the element that is least important and/or learned later in the second language learning process. However, place is also the element that is used the least in the
narratives of the natives, so it might be an orientation element that is not considered that important (since native speakers do not use it always as well).

The evaluation element is a section in which the lower educated refugees do not include many clauses. There are only two participants who include a clause in this section. All the others do not include clauses in this section. This indicates that producing clauses dealing with attitude and point of view are characteristics that are not very common for lower educated adult refugees on an A1/A2 language level. However, it is very likely that this lack is caused by the language level and not the educational level, since all three refugee groups use this element very infrequently compared to the natives. Previous research, in which it was found that second language learners use less clauses that describe the point of view of the narrator (see Kang, 2003), supports these findings. Statistical analyses state that the natives only include more clauses in this section than the lower educated adult refugees, but not compared to the other two refugee groups. Therefore, the expectation that all the groups would differ from each other is not completely supported.

As expected, no statistically significant differences were found between the groups in the amount of clauses included in the coda section, suggesting that clauses that serve to mark the coda and clauses that convey the moral of the narrative are used equally frequently on different levels of (second) language proficiency and educational level. However, inspection of the means shows a descending order, in which the natives score the highest and the lower educated adult refugees score lowest. Moreover, highly educated A1/A2 participants score higher than the highly educated B1/B2 participants. Here again, the highly educated refugees on a low second language level score higher than the highly educated refugees on an intermediate level. This looks counterintuitive, since the groups differ in their language level (with the B1/B2 group being more proficient). A possible explanation for this difference could be the very small sample sizes and the small difference in sample sizes. There are only five participants in the intermediate group, which might not be enough to get reliable general results. Maybe if more people participate in this group, this negative difference will fade away.

For the resolution/result section, no specific expectations were set up, but it seems that this aspect is only developed later on in the language learning process, since only natives included clauses in this section. None of the refugees used clauses in the resolution/result section. This might explain why previous research did not delve into detail about this aspect, since it apparently does not occur in written narratives of second language learners. Nevertheless, statistical analyses show that the natives differ significantly from all three refugee groups, but this actually only means that the natives differ significantly from zero. It might be
the case that when the mean of one of the groups becomes more than zero, this difference would not be found. That would indicate that the groups do not differ from each other, instead of one group differing from zero. Once the groups still differ from each other when the mean becomes more than zero, it might be concluded that the groups do indeed differ. For now, the only conclusion that can be made is that the natives differ from zero (and actually not from one of the groups). However, the fact that none of the refugees include clauses in this section seems to be caused by a lack of second language proficiency. There is thus also no difference between lower educated and highly educated adult refugees (on the same second language level).

Labov and Waletzky (1967) stated that narratives without an orientation, complication, and resolution/result section are incomplete. Of the 31 narratives analyzed in this study, only five narratives consist of both an orientation element, a complication element and a resolution/result element. All these narratives are originating from native speakers. However, there are still four native speakers who did not include all these three elements in their narratives. On the one side, the fact that only native speakers include these three elements might suggest that only natives are able to produce complete narratives (and thus non-natives, even the ones on a B1/B2 language level, cannot). On the other side, however, the finding that not all nine native participants include all three elements suggests that even the natives produce incomplete narratives. So, it remains unclear whether a complete narrative must consist of at least an orientation section, a complication section and a resolution/result section. More research is necessary to investigate this. Moreover, different prompts should be used to investigate if there is an effect of narrative type (i.e. story retelling or personal narrative) on narrative structure.

Just as the results about narrative length (Section 5.2), the results with regard to narrative structure in the current section might also suffer from statistical bias due to the small sample sizes and missing variables. As mentioned before, the statistical bias that might exist will be extensively discussed in Section 5.6.

5.4 Evaluative devices

Next to a referential function, narratives are supposed to possess another function, namely an evaluative function. The evaluative function of narrative clauses conveys the meaning of the narrative, emotional information as reasons for telling the story, what the narrative means to the speaker, and a certain kind of attitude towards the events (Labov & Waletzky, 1967; Peterson & McCabe, 1983; Peterson, 1990). This attitude can be expressed through various
linguistic strategies, like intensifiers, repetitions, onomatopoeia, expressives, character delineations, expressions of emotion, (in)direct reported speech, defeat of expectation/negatives, elongations, and exclamations. Labov (1972) stated that the kind of story does not change with increasing proficiency, while the degree of including different evaluative function does increase with increasing proficiency. More proficient language users will write more detailed stories, also in terms of evaluative devices. Therefore, evaluation is considered to be the most important part of a narrative (Labov, 1972), but at the same time it is also the part that differs the most across cultures (Kang, 2003).

5.4.1 Type evaluative devices
As expected, the natives use the most different types of evaluative devices in their written narratives, followed by the highly educated adult refugees on an intermediate Dutch as a second language level, and the highly educated adult refugees on a low second language level. The least different types of evaluative devices are used by the lower educated adult refugees, who use, on average, barely three different evaluative devices in their narratives. This outcome meets the expectations of this study, and this is also found in earlier research (see Labov, 1972, and Liskin-Gasparro, 1996), which found that second language learners write less detailed stories and that they possess a smaller repertoire of emotional functions. There was, however, not one participant who used all eleven different types of evaluative devices, what might suggest that using eleven different devices provides an overload of information. Although this overload of information may be the case, it should be mentioned that the frog-story prompt might not be the right story for using that many evaluative devices.

The statistical analyses, however, show something different: only the natives and the highly educated B1/B2 participants include more different types of evaluative devices than the lower educated adult refugees. 49 percent of the variance is associated with participants’ group membership (i.e. language level and educational level), which is a large effect size, suggesting that this result is likely to be found when the research gets repeated with other participants. Although there is no significant difference, an interesting result is that the mean of the highly educated A1/A2 group is more than two points higher than the mean of the lower educated group, suggesting that the highly educated A1/A2 participants do differ from the lower educated refugees, since they use, on average, two different types of evaluative functions more than the lower educated adult refugees.

The finding that there is a descending order in the amount of different evaluative devices produced in written narratives suggests that the use of evaluative devices is a characteristic of
better (second) language proficiency. The more proficient someone is, the more evaluative devices someone will use and the more detailed and complex the story will be. Moreover, it seems that the better educated someone is, the more evaluative devices he or she will use in writing a narrative. This speculation, however, is not supported by statistical results, so more research is necessary to figure out in what ways different second language learners differ from each other with regard to the inclusion of evaluative functions. In addition, the evaluative devices annotated in this research are not all evaluative devices that are available in a language. It might be the case that more devices occurred in the narratives, despite of the fact that these were not annotated. Further research could use more and/or other devices to investigate their effect on (second) language proficiency and educational level.

5.4.2 Token evaluative devices

Not all of the four experimental groups use all eleven evaluative devices coded in this research. For example, the lower educated adult refugees on a low second language level and the highly educated adult refugees on an intermediate language level do not use repetitions, onomatopoeia, and elongation in their written narratives. The only device that the highly educated adult refugees on a low second language level do not use is onomatopoeia. Compared to the highly educated adult refugees on an intermediate second language level, they do use repetitions and elongations. The means are, however, very low (0.29 and 0.57 respectively), suggesting that these are still devices that occur very rarely in narratives of second language learners. On the other hand, natives do use these devices only occasionally as well (less than once per narrative), indicating that these are devices that might be less important in storytelling, even for native speakers. Apparently, they do not add that much in terms of information to narratives. For repetitions and elongations, statistical analyses did not find any significant results, even though these devices did not appear in the narratives of some groups. This suggests that the differences between the different groups are too small to conclude that they differ significantly from each other. This strengthens the assumption that these devices might be unimportant in telling a story. Concerning the use of repetitions, the expectation that the narratives of the lower educated adult refugees contain more repetitions compared to the narratives of the highly educated adult refugees and the natives, and the narratives of the highly educated adult refugees contain more repetitions compared to the narratives of the natives, should be rejected. Although no statistically significant differences are found, it actually seems to be the other way around, in a sense that native speakers use most repetitions, instead of the lower educated adult refugees. A
possible explanation for this reversed finding might be that proficient language users, compared to less proficient language users, feel freer to use repetitions and dare to include language aspects specific for oral language production in their narratives. In addition, they are likely to use more expressions which include repetitions, such as ‘’meer en meer’’ (‘’more and more’’) compared to less proficient language users. Moreover, when taking oral narrative production into account instead of written narrative production, it is more likely that less proficient (second) language users use more repetitions, since they are likely to hesitate more in their language production because of their imperfect language knowledge. A recommendation for further research is to compare the use of repetitions between oral and written narrative production in order to see if differences occur. Concerning the use of elongations, no specific expectations were set up, since previous research did not delve into detail about these aspects. The finding that there were no large (statistically significant) differences between the four experimental groups might explain why prior research did not discuss this device. Just as mentioned before, it seems to be a less important (or even an unimportant) aspect of written narrative production.

As discussed above, none of the refugee participants use onomatopoeia. These results might indicate that the use of onomatopoeia is a language characteristic acquired during a later stage of the language learning process, as the vocabularies become bigger. Statistical analyses seem to support this, since a significant difference is found between the three refugee groups and the natives in the use of onomatopoeia. Just like mentioned before, however, this significant result actually only indicates that the natives differ significantly from zero. This finding is not in line with the expectations based on earlier research, in which it was found that second language learners use more onomatopoeia in their narratives (suggesting that onomatopoeia are easier to use than other equivalents for these words). Since no evidence was found in this study, it might be the case that the use of onomatopoeia is not language independent, but specific to certain languages. Kang (2006), for example, found that Koreans use more onomatopoeia in their second language narratives than natives. Possibly, Korean is a language in which onomatopoeia are often used (and therefore Koreans also use it often in their second language), whereas this is not the case for Arabic and Dutch, the main languages of this study. No clear argument is given in Kang’s (2006) research for the finding that second language learners used more onomatopoeia compared to native speakers. However, a possible argument might be that non-native speakers use an onomatopoeia instead of the ‘normal’ equivalent, because the equivalent is missing in the vocabularies of second language learners, but they do know how to express it with a sound (i.e. an onomatopoeia). This research did, however, not find any support...
for this assumption, so more research on the use of onomatopoeia is necessary in order to see in which contexts speakers use it and on what level they use it (or start to use it).

Devices that seem to occur more often as someone becomes more proficient (and educated), are expressions of defeat of expectation/negatives and exclamation. Previous research did not delve into detail about these devices, so no specific hypotheses were set up for them. For the use of expressions of defeat of expectation/negatives, statistical analyses support this partially. All three refugee groups include significantly less of these elements in their written narratives compared to the natives. No statistical evidence was found for the assumption that the more proficient and educated someone becomes, the more expressions of defeat of expectation someone will use. The means, however, suggest that all groups differ from each other. The more proficient and the better educated someone becomes, the more expressions of defeat of expectation/negatives seem to be used. This is, however, not statistically supported, so more research is necessary to investigate the use of expressions of defeat of expectation and negatives. For now, it could only be assumed that the use of negatives and expressions of defeat of expectation comes with a better language command. A possible theory for this assumption is that reflecting on the non-occurrence of expectations is cognitively a rather demanding activity, which is not easily transferred to linguistic expressions.

For the use of exclamation, varying results are found, in the sense that the main analysis did not find any significant result (with a medium effect size), but the follow-up test did (in the direction of a significant difference between the natives and the lower educated adult refugees). This might suggest that natives use more exclamations than lower educated adult refugees, however, contradictory results are found. Inspection of the means seems to show an effect in the expected direction, namely that the more proficient someone becomes, the more exclamations he or she will use in written narratives. An explanation for this might be that the use of exclamation marks has to do with punctuation, which might be a language aspect less valued in lower levels of language proficiency, whereas it becomes more valued in higher levels of proficiency. For people with a lower second language level, the main goal might be to be understood by others (i.e. transferring information), whereas in later stages of language learning, not only understanding is important (i.e. the function), but also the form of the language.

Compared to the devices that seem to occur more often the more proficient and educated someone becomes, no devices seem to appear that clearly indicate that they are used more often the less proficient and educated someone is. There are, however, some devices that are used more often by a group with a lower language proficiency than by a group with a higher language
proficiency. Lower educated adult refugees on an A1/A2 level, for example, use more expressions of emotion and indirect reported speech than highly educated adult refugees on the same language level. This seems, however, to be a coincidence, since the mean differences are really small for both devices (less than 0.30). In general, both A1/A2 groups do include significantly less expressions of emotions in their narratives than the natives, suggesting that this is a function learned later on in the language learning process. Although this finding was not expected, an explanation might be that finding the linguistic means to express emotions in written texts is more difficult than in oral communication. Probably, less proficient writers might feel like holding back to introduce everyday oral language elements in written texts. The content of the expressions of emotions that the participants with lower language levels use has mainly to do with basic emotions, such as 'bang' (afraid), 'blij' (happy) and 'boos' (angry). There is not that much variation in expressions of emotion. However, the better someone’s language proficiency is, the more variation there seems to be in emotional expressions and the more derivatives of basic emotional words will be used.

In general, no significant differences were found for indirect reported speech, although native speakers seem to use a little bit more indirect reported speech compared to the other groups. Since the differences are small, the expectation that the written narratives of the natives contain more indirect reported speech compared to the narratives of the highly educated adult refugees and the lower educated adult refugees, and the narratives of the highly educated adult refugees contain more indirect reported speech compared to the narratives of the lower educated adult refugees, seems to be rejected. Moreover, indirect reported speech seems to be used relatively infrequently by all participants. There is no straightforward explanation for this, but it might be the case that the frog-story prompt is not really suitable for adding indirect reported speech. Since it is also not frequently used by speakers of Korean and English in similar research projects (see Kang, 2003), the language in itself might not be of influence (for example that a certain language uses, in general, more indirect reported speech than another language). However, more research is necessary to see whether groups differ in their use of indirect reported speech.

Other devices that seem to be used more often by participants on a lower language level compared to participants with a higher language level, are elongations, repetitions, and direct reported speech. Highly educated adult refugees on a low second language level, for example, use elongations, repetitions, and direct reported speech more often than the highly educated adult refugees on an intermediate second language level and the natives. For repetitions, this also seems to be a coincidence, since the mean differences are small and because the number
of observations is really low. Elongations are even used most of all by the highly educated A1/A2 group, but compared to the natives, the difference is only small. Statistical analyses also indicate that all groups include roughly the same amount of repetitions and elongations in their written narratives. No specific hypotheses were set up for elongations, since previously conducted research did not discuss this topic extensively. The fact that elongation occurs very infrequently in the written narratives might explain why previous research did not discuss it. Elongations seem to be not that important in written narrative production. The same seems to hold for repetitions. For direct reported speech, however, a different pattern was observed. Here, the highly educated A1/A2 participants use direct reported speech almost two times more than the highly educated B1/B2 participants. The difference between the natives and the highly educated B1/B2 participants is even bigger (the difference is more than four). Taking the mean of the lower educated group into account (the mean is 0.50), the highly educated B1/B2 participants seem to behave strange when it comes to the use of direct reported speech, because the means of the other groups show a clear descending order. It is very likely that this surprising difference is due to the really small number of observations in this group. When ignoring the mean of the highly educated B1/B2 participants, the expectation should be rejected. Results did thus not find evidence for the expectation that the narratives of the lower educated adult refugees contain more direct reported speech compared to the narratives of the highly educated adult refugees and the natives, and the narratives of the highly educated adult refugees contain more direct reported speech compared to the narratives of the natives. Since the mean of the lower educated adult refugees differs a lot from the mean of the highly educated adult refugees on the same language level, the use of direct reported speech seems to be dependent on educational level. This might be explained by the fact that in direct reported speech, the writer has to be more accurate and to-the-point than in indirect reported speech. Also, the adult refugees may have been taught in their language courses that direct reported speech involves specific punctuation rules. Although the means differ a lot from each other, statistical analyses did not find any differences. Therefore, concluding remarks based on the results should be interpreted with care.

It was expected that the written narratives of the natives contain more instances of indirect reported speech and character delineations compared to the narratives of the highly educated adult refugees and the lower educated adult refugees, and the narratives of the highly educated adult refugees contain more instances of indirect reported speech and character delineations compared to the narratives of the lower educated adult refugees. For the use of indirect reported speech, this expectation seems to be rejected, as discussed earlier. For the use
of character delineations, the results are ambiguous. The means do show, as expected, findings that are somewhat in the direction of the expectations. However, not the natives include most character delineations in their narratives, but the highly educated B1/B2 participants. The difference between these two groups is, however, small. There are also some differences between the A1/A2 groups, but these are small as well (only 0.19). Initially, the results of the statistical analyses showed a significant result in the main analyses, but this effect disappeared in the post-hoc comparisons. Differences that are close to significance are the difference between the lower educated adult refugees and the natives and the one between the highly educated A1/A2 refugees and the natives. This is surprising, since the natives are not the ones who produce, on average, most character delineations. As discussed before, the highly educated B1/B2 participants include most character delineations. Based on the means, it would be expected that the two A1/A2 groups would differ from the highly educated B1/B2 group. Statistical results, however, show something different, likely caused by the fact that the number of observations in the highly educated B1/B2 group is too low to conduct proper statistical analyses. Maybe if more observations were done in the highly educated B1/B2 group, statistically significant results would show up between this group and the A1/A2 groups. In addition, if more observations are carried out (and group sizes are held equal), the B1/B2 participants would not show up as the group producing most character delineations. For now, it might be a coincidence that out of the five participants, a lot of them use character delineations, whereas if the group size increases, the variation becomes more equal. Inspection of the means still suggests that people on a low(er) second language level do not use character delineations frequently. An explanation for this might be their incomplete language knowledge (or the less developed language knowledge, compared to the people on an intermediate second language level).

Next to expressions of defeat of expectation/negatives, elongation, and exclamation, there were no specific expectations for the use of intensifiers and expressives. The use of elongation already showed up to be roughly the same between all participant groups, whereas for the use of expressions of emotions, the lower language levels seem to include less of these devices compared to the natives. For the use of exclamation marks, mixed results are found. Statistical results show that the use of intensifiers in written narratives is roughly the same in each group, but inspection of the means indicate that the lower educated refugees include least intensifiers, followed by the highly educated A1/A2 participants, then the highly educated B1/B2 participants, with the natives scoring highest. The differences between the three refugee groups are, however, quite small. Nevertheless, the natives clearly include more intensifiers
than all three refugee groups. This might suggest that the use of intensifiers comes with increasing language proficiency. However, since no statistical evidence was found, more research is necessary to study the use of intensifiers in written narrative production. Expressives seem to be unimportant in storytelling, since they occur very infrequently in the narratives of the participants. This might indicate why prior research did not delve into detail about this evaluative device. However, expressives might be important in narratives of personal experience, but further research should investigate this.

The eleven evaluative devices coded in this research are by no means the only possible evaluative devices people can use when producing language. For example, adverbs, hedges, mental state of the characters, words that contain high evaluative content, attention getters and what even more, can be used as devices to add meaning and emotional information to a story. Moreover, it is very likely that differences in the use of evaluative devices occur, dependent on whether stories are written down or spoken out (i.e. oral). For example, the use of hedges is a device that is likely to be used more often in spoken language than in written language, since people have more time to think about their language production in written language than in spoken language. Further research could include more different evaluative devices and could compare its use in written language production and in spoken language production. Moreover, a different narrative type, such as narratives of personal experience, could be elicited to investigate if the use of different evaluative devices is dependent on the kind of story being told. Lastly, the strength of the concluding remarks (like the remarks in this section about evaluative devices) depends on the sample size that is used in the testing procedure. Since sample sizes were small, a recommendation for further research is to test the hypotheses using a larger sample size.

5.5 Inter-annotator agreement

As discussed in Section 3.6.1, there is a relatively low interrater reliability between the scores on the orientation element variable and the coda element variable, suggesting that the ratings of the first rater are not in line with the ratings of the second rater. To conduct proper and reliable statistical analyses with these variables, however, these scores should actually have been roughly the same. Because the dataset is already quite small, no variables were removed from the statistical analyses. Besides, the intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC’s) of the remaining individual structural element variables, the average ICC’s for the five elements (narrative length, type structural elements, token structural elements, type evaluative devices,
and token evaluative devices), and the mean ICC for all elements together are high enough to conclude that the reliability of scoring is sufficient, at least for the remaining variables. A possible reason for these relatively low ICC scores might be that incomplete instructions were given to the second rater, leading to deviating coding procedures. Moreover, the chosen research method might be too subjective to get a sufficient inter-annotator agreement. In order to get a reliable scoring method in the future, further research should delve into more detail about the specific structural elements. In that way, clearer guidelines could be set, making the scoring procedure more reliable. Moreover, more different persons could be used to rate the data to check if differences in rating are still present.

5.6 General limitations

Optimally, a study like this should not only be conducted in the second language of the participant, but also in the first language, to see how cultural differences interact with written narrative production. This was, however, beyond the scope of this research. Further research should integrate written narrative production in the participants’ first language, next to written narrative production in the second language, in order to investigate in which ways narrative production differs between first languages and in order to make valid comparisons. Furthermore, a major shortcoming of this study was the use of the wordless picture book ‘Frog, where are you?’ by Mercer Mayer (1969) as an elicitation tool. Although the use of this book enabled reliable comparisons between different subjects (since they were instructed to talk about the same content), it may also have hampered the expression of individual differences. For example, participants might be prompted in such a way that they were not able to write freely. Additionally, this prompt is known as a children’s story, which might therefore has been inappropriate for adult narrative elicitation.

The results which are obtained by performing different statistical analyses might not be completely reliable and generalizable, since the number of observations in this study is actually too low to conduct a proper statistical analysis on. Because of the small sample sizes (respectively ten, seven, five, and nine), and because of some empty cells (equal to a score of zero/no occurrence), statistical analyses might be unable to detect significant differences. Where possible, adjustments are made to the used statistical analyses, such as corrections for groups in which variances are unequal. The results of the statistical analyses should be interpreted with caution and cannot be considered as facts. They are supplemented with a more qualitative based analysis. More research with more participants in each of the groups is
necessary to see whether the statistical results found in this research will hold. In addition, covariates as length of stay in the Netherlands, motivation to stay in the Netherlands, length of stay in a reception center and the completion of an integration course should be added, despite the fact that these turned out to have no effect in this study. In possible follow-up studies with more participants, these covariates could show up as contributing and reinforcing factors of second language proficiency. Nonetheless, this study made a preliminary step in investigating the written narrative discourse in Dutch as a second language of highly educated Syrian refugees. Although the highly explorative design of this study, some trends in written narrative production can be observed. Further research could take these results as a starting-point.

5.7 Conclusion
This study explored the Dutch second language proficiency of highly educated adult refugees. It has provided an analysis in which the Dutch written narrative production is compared for Syrian refugees on different second language and educational levels. In addition, comparisons are made with native speakers of Dutch. While most of the previous studies only focused on second language proficiency in general or written narrative production of monolingual children and adults with disorders, this study focused on the written narrative production of specifically highly educated adult refugees. Since almost no research was performed on the second language proficiency of refugees, this study is highly explorative, in a sense that no clear suitable research methods were available. With the use of narrative research, which is supposed to be a good indicator of overall language proficiency and which is found to be universal in human cultures, the aim of this study was to gain insights into the second language proficiency of highly educated Syrian refugees.

In general, it is found that the written narratives of highly educated Syrian refugees seem to be considerably shorter than the written narratives of native speakers of Dutch, but they seem considerably longer than the written narratives of lower educated Syrian refugees. Moreover, highly educated Syrian refugees’ inclusion of structural elements and evaluative devices seems to be more constrained compared to native speakers, but not compared to lower educated Syrian refugees. This suggests that second language learners, and highly educated adult refugees in particular, possess a smaller repertoire of discourse and emotional functions than native speakers of Dutch, but when proficiency increases, this repertoire also appears to increase and people might be more likely to use a variety of linguistic resources to provide context to the story. However, more detailed quantitative and qualitative analyses need to be conducted, with
different modes of language production (written vs. oral), different types of narratives (story retelling vs. personal narratives), and different language and cultural backgrounds, in order to provide a complete picture of highly educated refugees’ discourse production. Although no solid statistical results can be presented due to the modest sample size, this study could be considered as a preliminary step in investigating highly educated adult refugees’ second language proficiency in Dutch. Additionally, problems and difficulties second language learners may encounter in producing an extended (written) discourse in their second language are explored and documented in this study.
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Appendix A

Survey questions

In order to reduce the length of the appendix, the original format of the survey (as presented to the participants) and the translated Dutch questions have been omitted.

1  First name + surname
2  Age
3  Gender (male / female)
4  What is your nationality?
5  In which country were you born?
6  In which country have you lived longest?
7  In which city / village were you living?
8  This is a: big city (urban area) / small city (urban area) / countryside (rural area) / other (i.e. asylum center)
9  How long have you lived there? (in years)
10 How long have you been living in the Netherlands? (in months)
11a Have you lived in an asylum center in the Netherlands / Are you currently living in an asylum center in the Netherlands? Yes / no

If you checked ”no”, go to question 12
11b How long have you lived in an asylum center in the Netherlands? / How long have you been living in an asylum center in the Netherlands? (in months)

12a What level of secondary education have you followed in your home country? Basic Education Certificate / Vocational/General Secondary Education / no secondary education / other
12b Have you obtained the diploma? Yes / no
13a Did you study in your home country (secondary vocational education / higher education / university)? Yes / no

If you checked ”no”, go to question 14
13b At what level did you study? Higher vocational education / higher education / university
13c How long have you studied? (in years)
13d Did you finish your study in your home country? Yes / no
14a Did you have a job in your home country? Yes / no

If you checked ”no”, go to question 15
14b What kind of job did you have in your home country?

If you checked ”no”, go to question 16
15a Have you ever come into contact with the Dutch language when living in your home country? Yes / no
15b How often did you come into contact with the Dutch language? (in times a week)
15c How proficient were you in Dutch before you came to the Netherlands? Very proficient / proficient / moderate / not proficient / not proficient at all
16a Which languages have you learned at home as a child?
16b Do you still speak those languages? Yes / no
17 Do you speak other languages? Yes, which languages / no
18 Do you think it is important to learn Dutch? Very important / important/ neutral / unimportant / very unimportant
19a Did you follow an integration course in the Netherlands? / Are you currently following an integration course in the Netherlands? Yes / no

If you checked ”no”, go to question 20
19b Have you obtained a diploma for this course? Yes / no
20 Do you want to stay in the Netherlands? Absolutely / very much / doesn’t matter / rather not / not at all
Appendix B

Narratives

All the raw data (i.e. written narratives) used in this study.

- Numbers 110 till 119 correspond with the lower educated adult refugees on an A1/A2 Dutch as a second language level.
- Numbers 210 till 216 correspond with the highly educated adult refugees on an A1/A2 Dutch as a second language level.
- Numbers 220 till 224 correspond with the highly educated adult refugees on a B1/B2 Dutch as a second language level.
- Numbers 300 till 308 correspond with the native speakers of Dutch.

110

Anas in de boos. Anas zet een zijn kamer een de avond met zijn hond een zijn liefe kekker en hij denk hoe moet volgende dag de keker laaten bij de rever. In de avond de kekker gin weg van zijn pot. Anas slaapt nog een de hond ook. Volgende dag Anas word wakker een hij ziet de kekker niet in het pot. Anas zoekt overaal naa zijn kekker de hond was ook aan het zoeken met hem. Anas een zijn hond roeppen kekker van de raam een kajkon. De hond is gefalen uit de raam en Anas is ban doordat. Anas gin snel naar buiten een zijn hond paken een bos kijken naar hem toe. Anas gin met zijn hond in de boos zoeken een de bij vliecht overal. De hond spreent aan de bijen. Een Anas kijk in een gatje in de groend dan komt een mol bij zijn huis een Anas geschet. Anas kijkt boven de boom en hoend heeft de huis van de bijen gevallen. Te gelijk komt de ul uit zijn huis en Anas geschikt een gin vallen aan de boom een de bijen worden boo van hoen en gin achter hem aan. De ul is boos door Anas en hij slaat hem. De ul is terug naar zijn huis hij is rusteg en Anas gin door zoeken. Anas toevalag aan de hert gezet en hij is vast aan de hofd van de hert. En de hert gin rene en de hond ook. Anas en de hond is gevallen naar de water. En hun zijn op elkaar gevallen. Anas en de hond horen iets van achter de stork. Hun gin steken kijken. De hond en Anas zijn boven de stork aan te kijken. Was zijn kekker met zijn vrouw lief zetten bijekaar. En dan komen hun konderen ook bij. Hij pak zijn kekker en hij zwijt de famili van en gin terug naar tuis met drie naar een lang en moe dag en Anas is heel blij.’

111

Omer zat een zijn hond een de over hond met zijn denk hoe moe vragende dag de kikker bij de rever. In de avond de kikker gin weg van zijn pot maar Omer weker worden wil kijk de kikker de kikker is weg zij denk hoe kan de kikker weg gan. Omer in hond van ons zoeken in de kikker in de slaap kamer ook de hond maar de hond zijn hofd in de pot. Omer ook kijk in buten in hond ook maar hond gefalg in uit de raam in de pot is kapot. Vant Omer bak de hond. Omer met ons hond zoeken de kikker in de pos maar de hond spelt met pijen in Omer kijk de huis van mol. de mol is boos ook de bijen boos in de hond. de hond grote problem makt met bijen. Omer zoekt in de.
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De kind is blij, hij kijkt op de kikker en de hond ook. De kind is slapen en de kikker naar kamer. De kikker is afwissel en de kind is boss. De kind zokt over kikker maar hij is niet vindt. Oh! Dat is problem. De hond falt over ram. De kind is boss. De kind heb bontij. De kind op de bom. De hound. De kind is spelen met dieren zonder family. De dieren zijn blij.

de jongen en hond en kikker waren op slaapkamer en zij waren blij, daarna de jongen en hond ging naar de bed en slapen en in deze momentje de kikker ontsnappen. op de ’s ochtends de jongen en hond opstaan maar de kikker was niet op de kamer, dus zij bijgen opzoeken over hem in de kamer maar niets zij keken van raam maar ook niets. de jongen werd verdrietig en bigende de hond troostend hem, nadat gaan zij naar bos, kikkeeeeeeeeeeer schreeuwdt de jongen en de hond ruikt geur maar niets be jongen zoekt op gaatjes en bijen vaalt van de boom, meteen de jongen steigte naar andere boom en hound ontsnapping van de bijen, toen de uil uitgaan van de boom de jongen bang en vallen van de boom. daarna zij voortzetten de opzoeken over de kikker op bos, in de laatste zij hebben gevonden een meer dichtbij dit meer was de kikker bezoekt zijn familie daarna zij terugkeer naar thuis en de kikker meenemen.

'S avonds was ergens een jongen in zijn kamer met zijn hond, de jongen had een kikker gevonden en zet hem in een groote glass, de jongen en de hond hebben naar de kikker bekijken "oh! wat een lief kikker!", Nadat hebben ze geslapen. "s nachts ging de kikker weg uit de glass. De volgende morgen hebben ze tegen glass bekijken maar de glass licht was. Zij konden nog niet de kikker zien. Ze gingen overal om de kikker te zoeken, kamer binnen, buiten de raam en zeggen "mijn kikkertje! waar ben je! ik mis je!", terwijl valde de hond binden en de groote glass van de kikker had gebroken, dus heeft de jong boos geantwoord, maar de jongen ging nog zoeken en zeggen "waar ben je!...". Dan de hond heef en honingen ruiken "mmm lekker honing!" dacht hij. De jong vond een gaat in het grond maar helaas het was een andere dier. de honingen ding met bijen heeft gevald en de jongen ging in de boom zoeken 'misschien de kikker is daar' dacht hij, maar het was ook niet de kikker, het was een uil. de uil was boos omdat hij buiten de boom ging en de jongen valde beneden. daarna hij staat op groote steen en pak en boom houd maar het was niet het was een hert hoeren, de hert deuwen ze (de jongen en de hond) beneden de berg naar de spring, ze antwoordten nat. toen proberen ze te uit gaan, de jongen heeft iets gezien, "weest stil!" de jongen heeft de hond gerteld. wat was dat? "wow... een oud kikker met zijn gezin en zijn kikker!", "eindelijk hebben we gevonden" de jongen dacht, heel lief kikkertjes de kinderen van de oude kikker. heel mooi! "maar nu ga ik mijn kikkertje nemen en weggaan " vertelde hij. Dan ginen ze naar hun huis en zeg tegen de oude kikker gezien "Zorg je gezin en tot ziens.."

Tummy met hij hond. tummy zit met hem hond spellen met de kikker. dan hij gaat slappen en de kikker infiltratie naar buiten. in morgen hij kijkt naar de kikker oooh!! waar hij is? vraag tummy de hond. tummy met de hond begent zoeken in de kamer, hij is bang. de hond staan op raam en over hij naar beneden. nu tummy echt boos op hem. hij heb gezocht in het huis en er is geen kikker. hij mout buiten zoeken, hij is naar de bos gegaan. wat is dat? tummy heb bijen gezien. er is een eekhoorn ook, de hond heb met de bijen gespelt en ruiken het huis van hun. ooh lekker! er is honing. hij moet naar de kikker zogen zegt tummy. tummy klimmen het boom en een uit ingevallen vaalt tummy van het boom en hij gaat snel. Hij verbergen achter een roost. wat is dat? "wow... een oud kikker met zijn gezin en zijn kikker!", "eindelijk hebben we gevonden" de jongen dacht, heel lief kikkertjes de kinderen van de oude kikker. heel mooi! "maar nu ga ik mijn kikkertje nemen en weggaan " vertelde hij. Dan ginen ze naar hun huis en zeg tegen de oude kikker gezien "Zorg je gezin en tot ziens.."

In een nacht de jongen heb gespeled met hem hond en kikker in salpkamer. Wanneer de jongen en de hond ga naar bed te slapen de kikker plan om te ontsnappen en hij slagt. Wanneer de jongen opstaant en vindet de kikker ontsnapping en hij aanvagt en op zoekt en hij heeft niet gevonden met hij hond. hij gaat naar buiten het huis te aanvangen met hij hond en hij zien een boom en zij heeft een bijenkorf en dichtbij het een gat. de hond spelet met
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er was eens. Hij zit op de stoel. hij heeft een mooi slaapkamer. hij praat met zijn dieren. hij mediteert. het hij kikker. hij heeft geslapen. hij sta op dan hij niet de kikker gefonde. hij draagt zijn kleding dan gaat de ram open darna hij schreeuwit kikker kikker en de de hond ruiken in de pak en de hond hij heeft gevallen op de de ram darna zijn gaan naar buiten en samen schreeuwt hij heeft en gaatjes gefonde en de dier bijn zijn neus hij beklimmingen op de boom ok niet gefonde en hij ook gevallen en de hond rans en de hert zijn gevallen him in de lake en in goedheid zijn gevonden de kikker hij gezokt zijn familie zij hadden heel blijen en zijn trugen naar zijn huis tevreden.

216
Er zijn een kind, een hand, een kinkken, een laarzeen, een kleine stoel, een t-shirt, een bed, een lamp met groote raam. Er zijn een kind met het hond spellen met een kinkken. Na de spellen met de kinkken de kind gaat slapen op zijn bed daarna de kind staat op en hij heef gezien dat de kinkken wegt van zijn pakje. De kind beslest dat hij de kinkken opzoek dan hij draagt zijn kleding. Hij opent de raam en zegt ik ben voor een kinkken opzoeken terwijl hij de kinkken bekijken de hond volt van de raam en de gaat zo snel naar buiten te bekijken wat gebuerd voor de hand Maar niks gebuerd en dat is goed. de kind beslest dat hij naar het bios gaat en daar opzoeken. En toen hij is gelopen, hij heeft een byen gezien en zo meteen gaat bekijken en hij heeft ook een eekhoorn en zijn rouken smeireg. De byue voelt van bloom en de kind gaat boven de bloom anders de buyen maat hem ziek en terwijl hij de bloom klimmen een voor hem valt hem. De uli vecht him dan de kind gaat boven de steene en zegt iemand hier mij helpen plotseling een gaatjes zo meteen him helpen samen gaan snel. Maar helaas de proces niet complete want de kind en de hind vallen op de zwampaat. De kind gaat achter een valt boom verbergen en recente hij vindt de mooie leuke gezin van de kinkken en in het laatse hij neemt een kleine kinkken van de famielei en treug naar zijn huis blij.

220
Toen de maan scheen in de avond, zat Max in zijn kamertje met zijn hond loony en zijn nieuwe vriend de kikker! Max was heel blij om een nieuwe dier te hebben, dus zat hij de kikker in een glazen pod en ging slapen. Toen Max en Loony sliepen, ging de kikker uit de pot. ‘s Ochtend wilde Max met de kikker spelen en een naam aan hem geven, maar de kikker was weg!! Max en Loony zochten de kikker overal. in de laarzen, in de pot en in de tuin! Maar konden hem niet vinden! ‘Waar ging onze nieuwe vriend de kikker?’ zie Max. ’Loony pas op! Waarom vast je hoofd in de pot?” Loony’s hoofd was vast binnen de pot toen hij bezig was met naar de kikker kijken. Max viel van het raam en dus werd de pot gebruiken. ”Loony je moet goed oppassen!” zie Max. Toen de twee vrienden bezig waren met de kikker zoeken, zaggen ze veel bijen. De bijen hadden een bijenkorf bij de grote boom. Er was een kleine gatje beneden de boom. Max dacht dat de kikker binnen het gatje was. Maar de gatje was een huis van de kleine muis! ”Oie, sorry ik dacht dat de kikker hier kwam!” Max was bezig met een ruzi met de bijen toen ging Max boven de oude boom om naar de kikker te zoeken. De bijenkorf viel op de grond en de bijen waren boos op Loony. Een uit kwam uit het huis in de oude boom en Max was bang en viel van de boom. De uil vliegten boven Max en dan ging naar een takje te zitten. Max klom een grote steen en riep aan de kikker. Maar de steen opstond!
Wat? Het was niet een steen maar een grote rendeer! Max was op de hoofd van de rendeer toen het begon rennen. Max was bang en Loony ook! De rendeer gooide Max en Loony in de kleine vijver. "Ach! Kijk nou, we zijn nat" zie Max, toen hoorden zij de kikker's stem!! Ze wilden de kikker nog vinden en daarom gingen zij achter de stem. Ze klimpen een grote boomstam. Achter de grote boomstam was er twee kikkers, de kikker van Max en zijn partner. "Kikker! Je hebt een partner, daarom moest je teruggaan?" Zie Max. Tussen de gras bij de vijver kwam er kleine kikkertjes heen. Dit was de gezin van de kikker. Max vond een ander vrijezillegge kikker die mee naar huis gaan en in de glazen pot wonen. Max en Loony en de nieuwe vriend de kikker Noon gingen terug naar huis en tot ziens aan de kikker's gezin gappen.
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Een jaar geleden was er een kind. Dit kind had een hondje en kikker. Het is avond, in die tijd zaten hij en zijn hondje het kikkerje te stralen. Het kikkertje zat in een pot. Toen het kindje had geslapen, en zijn hondje ook, gine het kikker op de pot. S'morgens werden het kindje en het hondje wakker, en zij verbaasden zich dat het kikkertje wegginge, daarna zoketen ze overal in de kamer, en ook in de laarzen. Het kindje opende het raam van zijn kamer en schreeuwe de hardop. Helaas kon het kind het kikkertje niet vinden, plotseling viel het hondje van het raam op de grond, toen ging het kind buiten en pakte het hondje. Ze gingen samen buiten en liepen het kikkertje te zoeken, maar er kwamen heel veel bijen tegen ze. Het hondje schreeuwe en probeerde de bijenkorf die op de boom hing te halen, en het kind vond het kikkertje in een gatje. Wat erg! de bijen korf viel op de grond en het kindje klom de boom. Toen ging de bijen achter het kindje en het hondje rende heel snel, terwijl het kindje op de grond viel, want er kwam een uit tegen hem, het kindje schreemde zich zelf van de uit, hij bekloem in een grote stoorn en scheuwe hard. en de uit stond op het tak uit te kijken. Er kwam een groot diert tegen het kind en laadde hij op zijn rug om rene snel met het hondje. toen viel het kindje en het hondje in het sloot en dit dier bleef staan. Daar ze verdankten neet en ze hebben gewomen. Het kindje zat dichtbij de boomstam vraagde dat het hondje stil moest zijn en toen gingen ze erover, daar vonden ze 2 kikkers en hun kleine kikkertjes. Ten slotte nam het kindje zijn kikkertje mee en deed de groeten aan de rest van de kikkers, terwijl de kikkers op de boomstam stonden. Eindelijk ging het kind samen met zijn hondje en zijn kikkertje terug naar zijn huis.
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Lang geleden, was er een jonge en zijn kleine hond. Er was ook een Kikker die in een glaze pot zit. In een nacht, klimt de kikker van zijn pottje. En loopt weg. De jonge en zijn hond waren aan het slapen. Toen ze wakker werden, zagen ze dat de kikker weg was. De jonge heeft naar de kikker gezocht. Zelfs in zijn vader larzen. De hond was aan het ruiken in de kikker optje. De jonge heeft het raam open gemaakt. En riep naar de kikker. De Hond heeft zijn hoofd in de kikker pottje. en zijn hooft kan niet makkelijk eruit. Ze waren aan het ropen voor de kikker. De hond heeft de jonge noes gebeten. Uit de bijen nest kwamen bijen. De bijen schreeuwde en probeerde de bijenkorf die op de boom hing te halen, en het kindje vond het nest. Daarna zei het kind voor zijn hond: "Kikker! Je hebt een partner, daarom moet je teruggaan?" Ze klimpen een grote boomstam. Achter de grote boomstam was er twee kikkers, de kikker van Max en zijn partner. "Kikker! Je hebt een partner, daarom moest je teruggaan?" Zie Max. Tussen de gras bij de vijver kwam er kleine kikkertjes heen. Dit was de gezin van de kikker. Max vond een ander vrijezillegge kikker die mee naar huis gaan en in de glazen pot wonen. Max en Loony en de nieuwe vriend de kikker Noon gingen terug naar huis en tot ziens aan de kikker's gezin gappen.
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Het is nacht en het kind zat in zijn slaapkamer en hij speelte met zijn hond, en er is een kikker ook zat in hem, en toen het kind sliep met zijn hond, was de kikker uit het iemmer springen, en toen het kind wakker was, vond hij de kikker niet, vervolgens begon het kind op de kikker zoeken en het kind stapte zijn hoofd in de emmer, en toen het kind voor de kikker roepte, viel de hond van het raam naar de grond, en bracht de iemmer. De hond was verder aan het zoeken voor de kikker in de bomen. Alsook in de gaatjes en reken. Uit het gaatje kwam een rat uit. De rat ging het kind samen met zijn hondje en zijn kikkertje terug naar zijn huis.
Er was eens een jongetje genaamd Bas en zijn hondje Sammie. Ze gingen samen op pad en kwamen een kikker tegen. Deze probeerde ze met man en macht te vangen. Toen dat gelukt was deden ze de kikker in een pot. Om hem veilig op te bergen. In de avond voor het slapen gaan keek hij samen met Sammie heel aandachtig naar de pot. Want ze vonden de kikker natuurlijk reuze interessant. Bas begon te gaperen en besloot maar is lekker te gaan slapen. Sammie kwam er lekker bij liggen. Zo vielen ze samen in slaap. De kikker vond het helemaal niet leuk in de pot. Dit was zijn kans om te ontsnappen terwijl de twee lekker lagen te slapen. Hij deed heel stilletjes en kon net met zijn pootjes aan de rand komen. Zo klonk hij er ook uit en weg was hij. De volgende ochtend niks vermoedend werden Bas en Sammie helemaal vrolijk wakker. Ze keken meteen naar de pot waar de kikker in zat. Toen zagen ze dat de kikker weg was. Waar is de kikker nu gebleven? Ze starten een zoektocht en zoeken alles af. Ze keken in de schoenen, onder het bed en overal maar nergens was de kikker te bekennen. Bas zei tegen Sammie dat hij is moest ruiken in de pot zodat ze hem via die sporen konden gaan zoeken. Sammie was zo ver in de pot gedoken dat hij vast was blijven zitten. Hij probeerde er alles aan te doen om los te komen. Het lukte maar niet. Hij zag nog maar een uit weg en dat was uit het raam springen. Dit deed hij ook en kwam precies met de pot op grond. Deze klapte kapot. Ondertussen was Bas naar buiten om te zoeken waar de kikker was. Hij schrok zich helemaal kapot toen hij de hond uit het raam zag springen. Het was ook een flinke klap. Bas ging snel naar buiten om te kijken of Sammie niet gewond was. Dit was gelukkig niet want hij sprong gelijk in zijn armen en begon in zijn gezicht te likken. Net alsof er niks gebeurd was. Hier was Bas niet zo blij mee maar had hem snel vergeven. Ze gingen verder met de zoektocht richting het bos. Ze bleven ondertussen roepen naar de kikker maar ze hoorde maar niks. Eenzaam aangekomen in het bos zien ze een hol zou hij daar in verstopt zitten. Bas roept hard door het hol heen. Zo hard dat de muis het beu is en blijft in zijn neus. De muis zegt duidelijk dat de kikker hier niet zit maar hij. wegwezen zegt de muis. Sammie is lekker aan het spelen in het bos en zit op een iets aan de boom hangen. Wat zou dat nou toch zijn? Het is net een bal waar je lekker mee kan spelen. Hij is zo aan het spelen en sprongen dat het plots op de grond valt. Ooh nee het is een Bijenkorf ziet Sammie. Hij rent zo snel mogelijk weg. Bas was ondertussen bij een ander hol aangekomen. Deze keer in een grote boom. Hij roept weer heel hard. Deze keer is de uit niet blij goori hem uit de boom. De kikker is hier niet wegwezen. Bas gaat gauw verder en probeert de uit af te schudden. Hij loopt precies tegen een grote berg aan. Dat is handig als ik daar bovenop ga staan. Kan ik heel ver kijken. Dan kan ik zo misschien de kikker vinden. Hij klimt er bovenop en roept weer naar de kikker. Hij ziet voor zich twee takken. Hij voelt eraan. Wat raar nou die bewegen. Mee dat hij het vast heeft valt hij voor over op een Hert. Dat was het gewei. Hij word mee gesleurd door het hert. Sammie is er achter aan. Het hert probeert van Bas af te komen en gooit hem van af middern in de rivier. Sammie springt achter zijn baasje aan en plonzen alle twee in het water. Als ze aan het bijkomen zijn van de val horen ze op eens iets. Ze horen gekwaak. Ze luisteren naar het geluid en sluipen er naar toe. Ssst zegt Bas tegen Sammie stil zijn. Ze mogen ons niet horen. Ze denken dat het achter die boomstam vandaan komt. Ze kijken er heel voorzichtig overheen. Kijk nou hier het is de kikker. Het is er niet een maar twee. Ook zijn vriendinnen. Wat leuk hij heeft een vriendinnetje. Ze kijken samen naar
het stelletje en mee komen er allemaal baby kikkertjes aan. Het is een hele familie. Nu snappen ze waarom de kikker er vandoor was gegaan hij moest terug naar zijn familie. Ze spelen nog lekker met de hele familie en zien op eens dat het donker word. Ze zeggen dat ze snel terug moeten voor dat het helemaal donker word. Ze zijn nu natuurlijk ook al heel ver in het bos. Ze nemen afscheid en wensen de kikkers het beste. De kikkers zwaaien en kwaaken ze uit tot ze hun niet meer kunnen zien.
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Er was eens een klein jongetje die rustig lag te slapen in zijn bed. Op een ochtend werd hij wakker en kwam hij erachter dat zijn lievelingshuisdier ’de kikker' uit zijn slaapkamer was geslopen. Het jongetje was erg verdrietig en ging de kikker samen met zijn hond zoeken. Hij keek overal: in zijn kamer, uit het raam, buiten, etc. Toen zijn hond uit het raam viel, was hij even bang dat hij zijn hond ook kwijt zou zijn. Gelukkig bleek dit mee te vallen toen hij beneden kwam en zijn hond weer vrolijk rondliep. Ze deden er samen alles aan om de kikker terug te vinden, maar tevergeefs. Hij riep zo hard hij kon en zijn hond blafte ook mee, in de hoop dat de kikker ergens op zou duiken. Maar wederom tevergeefs.. Het jongetje keek overal waar hij kon kijken, zelfs in een holletje onder de grond. Of zijn schrik kwam daar een mol uit die niet blij was met zijn bezoekje. Tegelijkertijd wilde de hond kijken in een bijenkorf en ergerde zich aan zijn eigen jag. Maar had hij niet door dat de bijen dit niet zo leuk vonden. Tot zijn grote schrik kwam er ineens een hele zwerm met bijen achter hem aan. Hij rende zo hard hij kon totdat hij de bijen kwijt was. Toen het jongetje het wat hogerop wilde gaan zoeken om wat meer over het landschap uit te kunnen kijken, kwam hij er tot zijn grote schrik achter dat hij niet een tak vasthield, maar een eiland! Als dat maar goed gaat.. De eland pakte het jongetje tussen zijn hoorns en gooide hem het water in. De hond wilde het jongetje redden en sprong er dus ook achteraan. Plof! Samen in het water.. Gelukkig waren ze nu wel van de eland af en konden ze verder gaan met hun zoektocht naar de kikker. Toen ze uit het water terug op de oever klommen, zagen ze een boomstam liggen. Misschien zat de kikker daar wel achter verstopt? Nee heb je, ja kun je krijgen dachten ze het. Misschien zat de kikker achter hier een hond dus liepen ze er maar naartoe. En tot hun grote verbazing zagen ze het: de kikker! Eindelijk is hij weer teruggevonden. En o wat lief, samen met zijn vrouwje en zijn baby's. Nu wist het jongetje in ieder geval dat de kikker weer herenigd was en dat het wel goed zou komen met hem in de grote natuur. Het jongetje en de hond zwaaiden het lieve gezinnetje uit en gingen weer samen terug naar huis. Eind goed, al goed.
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Het was een leuke dag geweest voor Barry, zijn teckel Kees en zijn kikker Kikker die hij die middag buiten gevonden had. Nu was het tijd om naar bed te gaan. Hij gaf Kees nog een aai en samen keken ze naar Kikker die tevreden in zijn glazen pot zat. Wat Barry niet wist was dat Kikker zat te wachten tot hij eindelijk zou gaan slapen om er dan snel vandoor te gaan uit die vreselijke pot. De volgende morgen toen Barry wakker werd bleek Kikker te zijn verdwenen. Samen met Kees zochten ze heel de kamer door maar hij was nergens te bekennen. Barry keek overal en Kees die in zijn enthousiasme om Kikker te vinden vast kwam te zitten in de glazen pot en paradoos door het raam naar buiten viel. De pot was stuk en Barry was flink boos. Eerst Kikker weg en nu zijn glazen pot ook...
nog is stuk. Er zat niets anders op dan hem te gaan zoeken. Barry keek in elk holletje en gaatje of hij daar misschien zat terwijl Kees vooral afgeleid was door een beienest. Misschien zat die in dat gat in de boom, dacht Barry. Hij klom erin keek naar binnen maar daar was de grote dikke uil die daar bleek te wonen niet blij mee en duwde hem zo achterover zijn boom uit! Kees werd ondertussen achterna gezeten door een zwerm bijen dus de zoektocht ging alles behalve goed. Barry werd wanhopiger en ging roepen om Kikker. Hij klom boven op een grote rots en riep zo hard als hij kon. Om niet te vallen hield hij zich goed vast aan een tak. Maar die tak was helemaal geen tak, het was het gewei van het grootste hert uit het bos! Die was niet blij dat Barry zomaar aan hem zat, tilde hem op en liet hem zo het water invallen samen met Kees. Plons. Eenmaal in het water dacht hij dat hij gekwaak hoorde. Hij luisterde nog eens goed en nu wist hij het zeker, hij hoorde Kikker achter een oude boomstam roepen! Barry hielt zijn vinger tegen zijn lippen om Kees te laten weten dat hij stil moest zijn. Dan zouden ze Kikker besluiten, vangen en weer meenemen naar huis. Ze keken samen over de boomstam en waren verrast door wat ze toen zagen. Kikker was niet alleen maar zat met mevrouw kikker en hun acht kleine kikker kinderen te spelen. Toen Barry dat zag snapte hij meteen waarom Kikker bij hem weg was gegaan, hij wou naar zijn familie! Met zijn alle hebben ze nog even gezellig gezeten en totdat het echt tijd was om naar huis te gaan voor Barry. Omdat hij zag dat Kikker hier thuis hoorden wist hij dat het zielig zou zijn om Kikker mee te nemen en gevangen te houden. Hij en Kees zeiden Kikker, zijn vrouw en kinderen gedag en spraken af om nog eens langs te komen. Iedereen was blij.