

**Do multilingual speakers have one single underlying idiolect or multiple idiolects
bound to specific languages?**

A cross-linguistic study

Fabiënne Eken

s4465725

Radboud University

Nijmegen

Bachelor Thesis

English Language and Culture

J. Geenen

15 August 2019

Abstract

This thesis sets out to explore the notion of idiolect. Idiolect, the individual language habits and choices of one person, is an established notion within the field of language and other social studies. There is, however, still a debate on the importance and the role of idiolect. This thesis contributes to that debate by trying to establish the foundation of idiolect, asking the question: do multilingual speakers have a single underlying idiolect or multiple idiolects bound to their specific languages? This thesis tries to answer that question by cross-linguistically analysing English and Dutch data from five multilingual speakers. The analysis is based on the authorship analysis markers suggested by Chaski (2012) and looks for markedness and transfer. Cross-linguistic markedness and bi-directional transfer in both lexical and structural elements would indicate a single cross-linguistic idiolect. The results suggests that, while there is strong evidence in favour of a single underlying idiolect, the majority of the outcomes are ambiguous, which calls for more research in larger, more comprehensive datasets consisting of more and other languages.

Key words: idiolect, cross-linguistic markedness, bi-directional transfer

Table of content

1. Introduction
2. Literature review
3. Method
4. Analysis
 - 4.1. Character level
 - 4.2. Word level
 - 4.3 Sentence level
 - 4.4 Text level
5. Conclusion
6. References
7. Appendix
 - 7.1 Original transcripts
 - 7.2 Translated transcripts

1. Introduction

The world we live in is changing fast and society is becoming more individualistic. It seems as if our languages are reflecting this change. However, individualism in language is inherent: where there is variety and choice, there is individualism. Since the rise of sociolinguistics, there has been a debate on whether the social aspects of language or the individualistic aspects of language take the upper hand. This debate comes together, for example, in what Labov (1978) calls the Saussurean Paradox: “the social aspect of language is studied by observing any one individual, but the individual aspect only by observing language in its social context” (p. 186). The individualistic aspect of language is what we call idiolect. Idiolect is most broadly described as the ‘consistent speech patterns in pronunciation, lexical choice or grammar that are specific to a particular speaker’ (Schultz, 2007). Higginbotham (2006) expands on this definition by saying that idiolect is not about what is right or wrong, it is about preference. At first glance, idiolect seems well defined and comprehensible. There is, however, overlap with other linguistic concepts such as dialects and sociolects. Whilst in theory the three notions differ substantially, dialect being a variant related to region and sociolect being a variant related to a speech community, in practice it can be very hard to determine where dialect or sociolect ends and where idiolect begins (Schultz, 2007).

During the first few decades of sociolinguistics most theorists dismissed the importance and the role of the idiolect. Nowadays, more and more theorists and researchers acknowledge the notion of idiolect, its importance and its effect on other linguistic areas such as language change and (second) language acquisition. Despite this shift in stance, there is still little research on the notion of idiolect, its system and its effects. In order to establish these, one would have to establish its roots: whether idiolect is an inherent concept or one bound to specific languages. This research aims contribute to this goal. It does so by asking the question: by cross-linguistically analysing English and Dutch data, can one determine whether multilingual speakers have a single underlying idiolect or multiple idiolects bound to specific languages?

2. Literature review

Underlying theories

Most of the debate surrounding idiolect stems from or mentions Saussure's approach to language. Saussure (1962) divides *langage*, language as a whole, into *langue* and *parole*. He defines *parole* as speech acts and *langue* as the underlying system of rules that govern language. More importantly, he defines *langue* as the social part of language, only existing due to a contract between the members of the speech community and therefore as something uniform, communal and social (Saussure, 1962). Arguments against idiolect or the importance of idiolect flow from Saussure's theory. Barlow (2013) mentions the dismissal of idiolect by a certain group of linguistic theorists, which is rooted in the ideas of generalism and of language as a communal concept, dismissing the individualistic aspects. Labov (1978) states that linguistic theorists are in the habit of excluding social behaviour and the study of speech, focusing on the homogeneity of language, especially in areas such as grammar, and therefore not on language variation (p. 186-7).

Hudson (1996) describes the more recent yet also widely accepted view that while the social aspect of languages is of importance, the individual aspect might be even more important: "if we don't understand how the individual works, to that extent we shan't be able to understand how collections of individuals behave either" (p.10). Johnstone (2000) argues against the structuralist linguists adhering to Saussure's theory and emphasises the importance of the individual within linguistic theory and linguistic change. She states that anyone thinking about linguistic change 'is forced (...) to confront questions about the relationships between individual speakers and languages', claiming that any language variation or change starts with one individual (p. 409). Johnstone (2000) does not dismiss the social aspect of language but feels it should be the context in which the study of the individual should be placed.

Even though the individualistic aspects of language are more and more included in linguistic research and theories, the debate on which aspects, social or individualistic, play the crucial role is ongoing. While researchers such as Hudson (1996) and Johnstone (2000) make valid points, there is relatively little research into the individualistic variations of speakers i.e. their idiolect and thus only relatively weak arguments for the importance of the individualistic aspects of language. It is peculiar, however, that whilst there is little known about idiolects and how they form and function, the notion of idiolect is mentioned in various academic fields.

Idiolect within linguistics

The idea of idiolect is well established in the field of linguistics, even though its role within the linguistic system is still up for debate. The notion of idiolect appears in both theoretical and practical subfields of linguistics and occurs in other academic fields as well, such as literature and social sciences. Malmkjær (2017) discusses idiolect in relation to language awareness. She mentions that being aware of the existence of idiolect is a crucial part of language awareness, because language awareness starts with awareness about your own language use. She states that “no matter how similar two people’s language habits are, even when they declare that they are speaking the same language, in fact no two people’s language habits are the same” (p. 452). Kirchhoff (2006) describes the importance of differentiating and understanding different speech characteristics, such as idiolect, for the purpose of speech processing and the development of speech applications (p. 20). The more variations these applications can process the better they work. Coulthard (2004) describes how the notion of idiolect is important to the practice of authorship analysis within the field of forensic linguistics. Idiolect is used as a tool to guide authorship attribution which can be very successful, especially when there is a small pool of suspects. Coulthard (2004) mentions the Unabomber case as an example, where the perpetrator was found by comparing their published manifesto with old letters written by one of the suspects (pp 432-433). Plagiarism is another area of

linguistics that Coulthard (2004) discusses in which the notion of idiolect plays an important role. Coulthard claims that plagiarism is based on the expectation that every writer, when trying to get the same point across, will express that point in a similar yet by no means identical way (2004, p. 343). Farahmandian et al (2016) emphasise how a character's idiolect can impact the tone and message of a novel, using *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* by James Joyce as example. Van der Merwe (2014) shows how writers have their own idiolect and how this can affect their oeuvre and influence, using *Lost* by Hans-Ulrich Treichel as an example.

It seems apparent from the examples mentioned above that individualistic variation and thus idiolect play a crucial role in multiple language-related fields, theories and tools, even though little is known about the idiolect's place in the linguistic system. Understanding the notion of idiolect, its role and its roots, whether speakers have one single underlying idiolect or multiple idiolects bound to specific languages, can help expand our knowledge on the linguistic concepts, theories and tools mentioned above and others. However, not all researchers fully agree. As mentioned before, there are linguists who dismiss the notion of idiolect, due to various linguistic convictions. There are also linguists and researchers who have critiqued the notion of idiolect.

Controversies concerning idiolect

Coulthard (2004) critiques the existing notion of idiolect, more specifically the assumption some researchers are quick to make: that one's idiolect is one's linguistic fingerprint. Even if there were no overlap between individual idiolects, which there is, the amount of data required to consider one's idiolect as a fingerprint is impractical and unachievable, at least in the foreseeable future. Barlow (2013) mentions the controversies surrounding the notion of idiolect. He claims that there is hardly any empirical research on idiolect, for reasons both theoretical and practical. As mentioned above, many theoretical linguists adhere to the idea of language as a communal and social phenomenon and therefore lack the interest or belief to research individual variations or

systems. Practical issues that Barlow (2013) raises are the fact that idiolects have the potential to be irregular and unstable, and the fact that an idiolect may overlap with a sociolect, which would have priority over the idiolect (p. 2).

Malmkjær (2017) discusses idiolect in relation to translation and claims that idiolect does not translate. She notes that some linguistic elements can be characterised to the speaker in the translated text but only by a very experienced translator. In theory, she claims, a person's idiolect is bound to one language unless they are bilingual (p. 459). Malmkjær (2017) provides evidence for the claim that idiolect does not transfer easily. She mentions that the Dutch translation of Don Quichot fails to capture the different styles of speech used in the original text, by the main character, in order to demonstrate a social gap between the main character and other characters. Malmkjær (2017), however, fails to provide any evidence or source for her very strong claim that a person's idiolect is bound to one language.

Labov (1978) and many other linguistic theorists focus on the homogeneity of language. To support this choice, Labov (1978) mentions four difficulties which arise when studying speech (p. 188-191). First of all, Labov (1978) points out the ungrammaticality of speech. He claims that spoken language cannot be proper empirical evidence since it contains mistakes, self-corrections and does not give a good insight into the speaker's competence. Secondly, Labov states that it is difficult and sometimes even impossible to place variation of speech within the linguistic structure. Thirdly, Labov states the objective and practical problem of hearing and recording speech for research purposes. Finally, Labov claims that speech corpora are inadequate for the study of syntax and deep analysis of phonology. A separate problem Labov (1978) describes which may influence this study is the conflict between generative semantics and interpretive theory. Linguistic theorists often fall in the habit of defending their statement from the point of view of 'their dialect' (p. 198).

While the issues raised by Barlow (2013), Malmkjær (2017) and Labov (1978) are valid and should definitely be taken into account during this and any further research, their arguments in no

way dismiss the reasons for or validity of research into idiolect. Their points only exemplify the unknown factors of (individual) language variation and should only encourage further research instead of dismissing it.

Transfer

Finally, two linguistic concepts, namely transfer and the linguistic “super-ego”, throw a spanner in the works when theorising about the roots and functioning of idiolect, especially an underlying idiolect. Hall (1951) claims that individuals form a linguistic “super-ego” which represents what they feel are the rules they and their speech-community should uphold (p. 25). The linguistic “super-ego” is a representation of their dialect but most importantly their perception of it, sometimes regardless of the facts. Hall (1951) also mentions the influence of the linguistic “super-ego” on foreign language learning. He claims that learners often adhere to their own speech habits as if it were speech law and that breaking those laws feels either immoral or ridiculous. If the hypothesis of the linguistic “super-ego” were to be proven it would automatically dismiss the hypothesis of the single underlying idiolect, and the other way around.

Transfer or linguistic interference is described by Weinreich as elements in an utterance, spoken by a bilingual, which belong to one language whilst the rest of the elements in the utterance belong to a second language (1974, p. 7). Weinreich (1974) distinguishes phonic interference, grammatical interference and lexical interference. Earlier views on the topic were concerned with the influence of the native language (L1) on the target language (L2). Recent views, however, include that the directionality of transfer can go both ways (Smith, 1994, p. 13). One could claim that utterances providing evidence for the single underlying idiolect are simply the result of transfer or bi-directional transfer, however, to simply dismiss complete idiosyncratic linguistic styles displayed cross-linguistically by speakers would be ill-advised. There is a possibility that transfer and bi-directional transfer are only the way a speaker’s idiolect manifests itself cross-linguistically. In order to establish this and to either redefine transfer or to dismiss the cross-linguistic importance of idiolect, it is most crucial to uncover whether speakers have one single underlying idiolect or multiple idiolects bound to a specific language.

3. Method

Data

The data collected is verbatim transcribed spoken data of a retelling of a cartoon of Tweety and Sylvester by five different participants (Savage 1970, 2017). The participants were asked, on two different occasions, to watch the cartoon and were told they had to retell the story to another “dummy” participant, who’s only actual function was to be a listener. They were told that the focus of the research was on the performance of the listeners’ memory in order to elicit a natural narrative. The participants were allowed to watch the cartoon as many times as they wanted, until they felt confident enough to retell it. The participants were allowed to take notes when watching the cartoon but they were not allowed to have these notes with them whilst narrating. The first time, the participants were asked to recount the story in Dutch. The second time, after watching the clip again, the participants were asked to retell what happened in English. The narrations were recorded and transcribed. The Dutch transcripts were translated verbatim in order to make cross-linguistic analysis more manageable.

Procedure

The data was analysed with the markers of forensic authorship analysis in mind. As mentioned above, idiolect can be used as a tool in the practice of authorship analysis within the field of forensic linguistics (Coulthard, 2004). The markers of forensic authorship analysis are described by Chaski (2012). According to Chaski (2012), authorship analysis should be focussed on four different linguistic levels. Those levels are a) character level b) word level c) sentence level and d) text level. At character level, single characters such as punctuation, letters and numbers are analysed, either individually or in relation to each other. At word level, words can be analysed on the basis of their function, their meaning, length, frequency, variation and their relation to other

words. At sentence level, sentences can be analysed on the basis of Part-Of-Speech (POS) tagging, constituent structure, sentence type and average sentence length. Text level includes analysing a text on the basis of its length, paragraph length and genre or discourse strategy (Chaski, 2012, Linguistic level: which linguistic units are used? para. 1). The analysis of these different levels can be coded in three ways. Linguistic coding is, as described by Chaski, “the spectrum of methods for keeping track of linguistic features in a text” (Coding: how is the linguistic analysis recorded? para. 1). The three major types of linguistic coding are a) a list of examples b) frequency counts and c) binary coding, which refers to either the presence or absence of a linguistic feature and the significance of that presence or absence. Frequency counts can best be interpreted when they have a baseline or when the count is normalised to the text length (Chaski, 2012, Coding: how is the linguistic analysis recorded? para. 1).

The data was analysed per linguistic level looking for markedness in either language and for bi-directional transfer, meaning that the English and Dutch data were analysed and compared cross-linguistically. Instances of bi-directional transfer and instances of cross-linguistic markedness can be used as arguments for speakers having one single underlying idiolect.

As mentioned before, some researchers of transfer include the process of bi-directional transfer into their definition of transfer (Smith, 1994). This clashes with other views, for example the notion of the linguistic “super-ego” (Hall, 1951). Cases of bi-directional transfer can be used to argue a single cross-linguistic idiolect because they provide evidence for the existence of an underlying concept being applied to both languages.

The second type of concept that can be used as an argument for the notion of one idiolect is markedness found in both or all acquired languages, either semantic or syntactic. A textual element is marked, in the context of this research, when the element is used in an unusual or incorrect way or has a relatively high frequency. If a speaker has a marked preference for certain lexical elements or structural elements, this might point towards a preference for a certain underlying concept and

thus an underlying idiolect. Markedness is found by subjectively looking at all the textual elements of the isolated texts. The bar for markedness is set lower. After the initial search for markedness, the texts of the different participants were compared with each other to find additional yet less strict marked elements which only appear in the data of one or a few of the participants. Such textual elements might be common in the given language but can still be a marker of a speaker's idiolect, because they involve a lexical or syntactic choice. By comparing the participants these 'less strict marked textual elements' will come to light. Neither of these arguments completely dismiss the process of transfer. They do, however, question the established definition of transfer and more importantly the underlying process or triggers of transfer.

Elements of markedness found in only one of the languages analysed do not necessarily dismiss the notion of one underlying idiolect. These elements can be the result of the issues arising when trying to distinguish an idiolect or when analysing texts cross-linguistically, in other words: issues that might arise. The first and most obvious reason for markedness in only one language is that the element simply does not translate. This can be the case for both semantic and structural elements relying on the language's lexicon and on its grammatical system, respectively. Hudson (1996) coins the terms of 'individualism' and 'conformity', describing them as linguistic forces and stating that individual variation depends on the "relative strengths of these two forces" within a language (pp. 12-13).

Another language-based difficulty is the fact that one's idiolect overlaps with one's sociolect and dialect. While it is debated how much idiolect is bound to one language, sociolects are more likely to be bound to one language, depending on the speech community, and dialects even more so. The fact that certain marked elements are used in one language and not in the other might be explained by the possibility that the marked element results from the speaker's sociolect or dialect.

The cognitive problem of memory arises because of the way the data was collected. It is desirable to collect cross-linguistic data on a similar subject in order for semantic analysis to be

possible and structural analysis to be more manageable. In order to elicit this type of data from the participants, the participants have to be primed with information. In this research the clip of Tweety and Sylvester was used. In order to create data in two different languages, the process has to be carried out at two different occasions, meaning the participants watched the clip at two different occasions. This means that the memories accessed to retell the narrative were potentially different. This might have been because of internal factors such as tiredness and concentration or external factors such as disturbances. The participant might have simply noticed and thus stored different elements to the story each time. The issue of memory can result in marked textual elements being left unanalysed cross-linguistically, not because the markedness is missing in the other language, but because the entire event in which the marked element was used is missing.

A final obstacle that can occur in this research is a participant's proficiency. Markedness in one of the languages might occur due to the speaker having an underlying personal preference which one is unable to express in the other language, due to a lack of proficiency. Other textual elements might seem marked and therefore idiosyncratic and appear in one of the languages whilst they have no equivalent in the other language. This might be because the element is required in the former language because of a lack of proficiency and is therefore not necessary in the latter language. An example of this is participant 1's seemingly habitual phrase: 'let's just put it that way', used twice in a short amount of time. Due to its intonation and cluster speed, this phrase might come across as habitual. When looking at the context, however, participant 1 is struggling to describe the situation and after a number of self-corrections, it becomes clear that participant 1 uses this phrase to sum up, conclude and move on from the unfinished description. This is something that would not occur if the participant were proficient enough, at that moment in time, to describe the situation accurately or desirably.

The relatedness of English and Dutch is a potential disturbing factor that should be taken into account. English and Dutch are both Germanic languages. They share, for example, many

phonemes, cognates and language conventions but they differ, for example, in word order, inflection and pragmatics. The relatedness of these two languages makes the cross-linguistic analysis more manageable and might aid the research and its outcome in general. It should, however, be considered that the relatedness between these languages might also account for certain marked textual elements. An example of this is that English and Dutch differ in some grammatical systems such as inflection and word order. These rules might overrule personal preferences and styles that a speaker might have. These opposing consequences are a result of how languages vary in general and emphasise the fact that any claims made in this research should most definitely be verified by similar research using data from different languages.

4. Analysis

4.1 Character level

The data collected exists of transcripts from participants using free speech, transcribed verbatim. This entails that some elements of the data are harder or impossible to analyse using the markers for authorship analysis, since this method is mainly based on written texts and documents. Spelling and punctuation, for example, cannot be analysed since these elements simply do not exist in the collected data. The use of free speech does entail the presence or more prominent presence of other analytical units, in the case of this research: contractions.

Contractions

Contractions are used in both writing and speech. There are, however, many forms of writing in which the use of contractions is unfavourable. In speech, especially free speech, the use of contractions can be a lot more ambiguous and can therefore be a notable marker for authorship analysis. In the data, two types of contractions can be distinguished. The merging of two words, one of which is usually a verb, is mostly used in English. An example is the negation of a verb like

‘wasn’t’. The shortening of a word in pronunciation is used more often in Dutch but also occasionally in English. As the table below shows, there is a cross-linguistic imbalance of the total use of contractions in English and Dutch for all participants. From this data one could argue that contractions are a textual element that provides evidence against the single underlying idiolect. One should take into account, however, that while the shortening of words is a preference which is relatively widely applicable, the merging of words is much more rule governed and different in both languages. In order to make substantial claims about the position of contractions in an argument either against or for a single cross-linguistic idiolect, further research on other languages will have to be carried out.

Contractions per 100 words			
	Merge	Shorten	Total
P1 English	1.64	0.54	2.17
P1 Dutch	0.48	5.45	5.93
P2 English	0.46	x	0.46
P2 Dutch	0.08	3.67	3.76
P3 English	2.03	x	2.03
P3 Dutch	x	1.68	1.68
P4 English	1.40	x	1.40
P4 Dutch	0.10	5.75	5.85
P5 English	0.72	x	0.72
P5 Dutch	0.82	3.81	4.63

4.2 Word level

In comparison to character level analysis, word level analysis supplies many textual elements to be analysed. Since word level analysis is focussed on individual words and not so much

on structure, the elements uncovered in the analysis of this level relate to the lexical and semantic aspects of idiolect.

Lexical choices

Brennan claims that within conversation lexical choices are constrained to a ‘shared conceptualisation, which they mark by using the same terms’ by the process of lexical entrainment (1996, p1). By analysing the data from all the participants, however, it can be claimed that within this lexical entrainment there is still room for individual variation. By cross-linguistically comparing the data from individual participants, it becomes apparent that certain participants have an underlying disposition for certain concepts which is then applied to both languages through their lexical choices. These lexical choices are more often than not morphologically unrelated and are therefore less likely to be the result of transfer. Participants 1, 3 and 5 describe the female character in the clip as ‘the woman’ in English and ‘de vrouw’ in Dutch. While morphologically unrelated, these terms are relatively unmarked and arguably one of the most general terms available to describe an adult female character and are thus to be expected. More interestingly, participant 2 describes the same female character as ‘grandma’ in English and ‘oma’ in Dutch. Since the primary data shown to the participant does not include this term or any stereotypical visualisation of this term, the use of this term by participant 2 must be the result of some underlying language concept, habit, belief or style. Participant 4, at first, describes the female character as ‘the woman’/‘de vrouw’ as well. They then, at slightly different stages of the narrative in English and in Dutch, make the lexical decision to elaborate on their thought process concerning the description of the female character: ‘I think it was the mother or the babysitter’/‘en dan wordt die moeder of oppas maar ik denk moeder boos’. Again, this need to elaborate on these terms in a similar way in both English and in Dutch, ought to be the result of an underlying language concept, habit, belief or style.

The next scene includes a new and fourth character, a youngster, which allows for the same type of analysis and argumentation. Participants 2, 3 and 5 all describe the youngster as ‘a baby’/‘een baby’, even though it could be argued that the fourth character is not a baby but rather a toddler or young child since it can sit up straight by itself. In Dutch, participant 2 does seem to be able to distinguish a baby from a child as they start off by calling the youngster ‘un kindje’, but they immediately self-correct to ‘een baby’. Since there are no indications that either English or Dutch demands the use of this specific and arguably incorrect term, it can be classified as an individual preference. The terms ‘a baby’/‘un kindje’ differ morphologically yet are semantically comparable cross-linguistically. This indicates that there must be an underlying concept. It cannot be denied, however, that ‘baby’ is a cognate. In both English and Dutch, ‘baby’ is a common word with a relatively high frequency. The markedness in this context results from the arguably incorrect use. Participant 4 makes some peculiar lexical choices in describing the fourth character. Their narrative shows a distinction in their underlying concepts of different age groups. In Dutch they consequently call the youngster ‘t kindje’. In English they start off by using the word ‘baby’ but then self-correct and use ‘toddler’. Further along in the narrative, however, they revert back to using ‘baby’. The word baby, in comparison to the word toddler, has a higher frequency and therefore might feel more natural to use. Participant 1 shows the same distinction in their underlying concepts of different age groups. They introduce the youngster in the semantically similar terms ‘child’/‘kindje’, which they use twice, after which they mention the youngster once more but address it as ‘baby’/‘baby’. Notwithstanding the fact that the exact pattern of use occurs in both languages, the fact that participant 1 switches from the arguably correct term to the arguably incorrect term without self-correction is even more peculiar.

The introduction of a fifth character, another animal, again allows for the same type of analysis and argumentation. Participants 3 and 5 plainly describe the character by the type of animal they are: ‘the dog’/‘die hond’ and leave it at that. Participant 2 elaborates on that description by

adding an adjective concerning the size of the dog: ‘a huge dog’/‘een grote hond’. Participant 1 chooses to introduce the dog by their breed: ‘bulldog’/bulldog’. It is hard to determine how these lexical items came to be in participant 1’s vocabulary, because they are cognates. ‘Bulldog’ originates from English and the knowledge of the Dutch ‘bulldog’ could be a case of bi-directional transfer but since it is the name of a breed it is hard to determine in what languages, spoken by participant 1, the knowledge of the word originated. It is obvious, however, that participant 1 found the underlying concept of the breed of the dog of importance and therefore made the lexical choice to include it in their narrative. Participant 4 combines the descriptions mentioned above. They introduce the fifth character, like participants 3 and 4, by the animal that they are: ‘a dog’/‘een hond’, after which they continue to comment on the size and the breed of the dog: ‘a big bulldog’/‘een soort grote buldog’.

In the data there are plenty of lexical choices made by the participants which could be classified as idiosyncratic. All these lexical choices are to some extent cross-linguistically balanced. While it is debatable whether the cognates baby and bul[l]dog originate in the lexicons via transfer or bi-directional transfer, the other marked lexical choices are morphologically unrelated and clearly argue for a single underlying idiolect.

Semantic contextualisation of complex noun phrases

As the analysis above has elucidated, it can be argued that there are underlying concepts to the lexical choices made by speakers, which come to light when cross-linguistically comparing the data. The analysis of complex noun phrases helps strengthen this argument because the more elements to a phrase the greater the chance of a cross-linguistic imbalance, meaning a cross-linguistic balance between complex phrases carries more authority. Participant 4 provides two complex noun phrases to help illustrate this.

Example 1 English: ‘helpless little creature’

Example 1 Dutch: 'klein onschuldig diertje'

Example 2 English: 'snarky little comment'

Example 2 Dutch: 'een of andere sarcastische opmerking'

The morphological structure and the individual semantics of the lexical elements of the complex noun phrases above might not correspond cross-linguistically but the overall concepts and even the overall tones conveyed are extremely similar. None of the individual lexical items are morphologically similar. The nouns 'comment' and 'opmerking' are most similar semantically, followed by the semantically similar adjectives 'little' and 'klein' and the nouns 'creature' and 'diertje', 'creature' being more inclusive than the Dutch counterpart used. Individually, the adjectives 'helpless' and 'onschuldig' have very different meanings. 'Helpless' would sooner be translated to 'hulpeloos' in Dutch and defined as "unable to do anything to help yourself or anyone else" (Cambridge dictionary). 'Onschuldig' translates conventionally to 'innocent' in English, meaning "not guilty, not involved or not intending to harm anyone" (Cambridge dictionary). While 'snarky' and 'sarcastische' are adjectives with different strict definitions they can be interpreted similarly, as they are in this context, and can convey the same tone, as they do. 'Little' and 'een of andere' are least semantically related out of the lexical elements in both examples. In this context, however, both elements are used to devalue the overall concept conveyed by the complex noun phrase, giving them a similar semantical context. Even though at first sight these utterances seem quite different from each other, after careful analysis it is apparent that there must be some sort of underlying cross-linguistic concept behind these lexical choices.

Diminutives

It is clear that English and Dutch differ in the way they show the smallness of a lexical element. The most common way in Dutch is to add the suffix '-je' to a noun. In English an adjective such as small or little is placed in front of the noun. When cross-linguistically comparing the data it

becomes clear that there is little balance to the use of diminutives between the English and Dutch data. In the Dutch data, the participants are more inclined to use the diminutive form, even when it is not necessarily essential. An example of this is ‘filmpje’, which both participants 1 and 5 use, and ‘bankje’, which both participants 1 and 2 use. The video is not necessarily short and the bench is not necessarily small. Other uses of the diminutive form such as ‘kindje’ can be interpreted as redundant or as a pleonasm, since a child is always relatively small and since the child in the clip is arguably not smaller than what would be deemed normal. Notably, diminutives that are of relevance, such as diminutives used in a direct quote by participant 1 or in the complex noun phrases mentioned above, do appear in both the English and Dutch data. This all seems to balance out the cross-linguistic imbalance of use of diminutives.

Another factor that should be taken into account when interpreting this cross-linguistic imbalance of the use of diminutives is the economy principle. The linguistic economy principle is one that can be broadly applied and states that a speaker only says what they need to say in order to get their messages across to economise on time and effort. Since in English speakers need to add a full word in order to convey the smallness of a noun, it is possible that the economy principle might account for some of the cross-linguistic imbalance that can be found in the data of participant 2. In Dutch, participant 2 only uses the diminutive form of the noun: ‘vogeltje’. In English participant 2 uses the diminutive ‘little’ when they first describe Tweety the bird. In the following instances, participant 2 only uses the noun ‘bird’ without the diminutive. Presumably, participant 2 does have the underlying concept of describing Tweety as a ‘little bird’. After this was made clear the first time, however, the economy principle came into play.

What complicates the discussion of the use of diminutives even more is the fact that participant 3 does not use any diminutives at all. This markedness seems to point towards an idiosyncratic preference, but it lacks strong evidence since other factors could be at play.

The analysis of the diminutives found, or not found, in the data leads to an ambiguous outcome. This is presumably not only the result of the different diminutive systems used by English and Dutch, but also of the very strong inclination Dutch speakers have to use a diminutive (Shetter, 1959) whilst the pattern shown in English might be the result of the economy principle. In order to make any substantial claims about the role diminutives play in the proving or disproving of one single underlying idiolect one will have to look at other languages.

Bi-directional transfer of lexical items

The cognates *baby* and *bulldog*, used by multiple participants, have been discussed before. It is hard, if not impossible, to determine, after so much time has passed since the acquisition, from which language these lexical items came to be in the individual lexicons of the participants and thus to determine whether these were the result of bi-directional transfer. Fortunately, the data includes other possible instances of bi-directional transfer. In the Dutch narrative, participant 1 uses ‘*sprayde*’ consisting out of the English stem ‘*spray*’ and the Dutch inflection for past singular ‘*-de*’. This is very clearly a case of bi-directional transfer, even though ‘*spray[ed]*’ cannot be found in the English data. This is most certainly because of the issue of memory. The entire event described containing ‘*sprayde*’ in the Dutch data cannot be found in the English data. Similarly, participant 4 uses the English noun ‘*event*’ in the Dutch narrative but it is not used in the English data, again, presumably, because of the issue of memory. Other very clear examples of lexical bi-directional transfer are the use of ‘*knock[s] out*’, by participant 2, and the verb ‘*too pop*’ and the noun phrase ‘*pet shop*’, by participant 4. These lexical elements are used in both English and Dutch, in the same context, describing the same event and while they are common phrases in English they can be classified as non-normative in Dutch. Participant 3 exhibits a rather interesting case of bi-directional transfer. In the Dutch narrative, they use the English noun phrase ‘*chewing gum*’, which is clearly a case of bi-directional transfer. In the similar context in the English narrative, however,

participant 3 uses the noun phrase ‘bubble gum’. At first these lexical choices might seem confusing, but the fact that this underlying concept and its variety of related lexemes can be and are, by choice, applied cross-linguistically only argues for a single underlying idiolect.

Marked verb selection

In the data presented to the participants a lot of actions happen. Evidently, these actions are described by the participants using verbs or verb phrases. The actions happening in the clip are, of course, interpreted by the participants through their own frame of reference, after which they have a variety of verbs and verb phrases available in their lexicon to choose from. The disposition of the participants, especially marked dispositions, to choose a specific verb or verb phrase could point towards an underlying single idiolect. Participant 1 uses the verb phrase ‘end up’/‘kwamen [ze] terecht in’ to describe how Tweety and Sylvester arrive in town. This is a very passive way of describing the action, in both English and Dutch, as if going to town is something that happened to Tweety and Sylvester, something they had no control over. This passiveness does not become evident from the original data, the clip, or the data from the other participants. It can therefore be classified as a marked verb selection occurring cross-linguistically.

Participants 3 and 5 exhibit another non-normative verb selection. When describing the action of Sylvester moving the youngster out of the frame and taking its place, participants 3 and 5 use the verb: ‘steals’/‘steelt’. This cross-linguistic verb selection is marked because the verb to steal would normally be used for those things that can be considered one’s property, generally not for humans. An unmarked verb selection would be to kidnap or a more general verb, such as to take away, which participant 2 uses.

Participant 3’s verb selection shows multiple marked choices. The first marked verb selection is ‘comes’. For some instances, the Dutch data includes a Dutch equivalent, for example: ‘hij komt dichterbij’. The Dutch verb ‘komen’ is, in this context, unmarked. Within the context of

the English data, other instances in which ‘comes’ is used could arguably be classified as non-normative. For example the clause: ‘Sylvester comes and steals’, in which comes is more or less redundant, or the collocation: ‘comes towards [the woman]’, in which the verb ‘comes’ would be considered normative. There is a cross-linguistic imbalance in the markedness of this specific verb selection. The second example is the verb ‘opmerkt’. From the primary data and the English data it becomes clear that participant 3 presumably meant the verb ‘merken’, which is both morphologically and semantically closely related to ‘opmerkt’, but in this context, means something else. The English equivalent participant 3 uses is unmarked. These instances of verb selection show that participant 3 exhibits marked verb selection in both English and Dutch, but there is no cross-linguistic balance. It should be taken into account that participant 3 is multilingual and also speaks French. It could be possible that the participant’s knowledge of French is the cause of this outcome. French data would have to be collected in order to find out why participant 3 makes use of marked verb selection in both English and Dutch without a cross-linguistic balance and to make any substantial claims on how these specific instances of marked verb selection provide evidence either for or against the single underlying idiolect.

Collocations

Similarly to complex noun phrases, non-normative collocations can be strong markers for a cross-linguistic idiolect, because complex textual elements carry more authority than individual textual elements when they do have a cross-linguistic balance. One of these marked collocations is found in the Dutch data and is used by participants 2, 3 and 5. It is the collocation: ‘vliegt op’, which is used to describe Tweety flying to a windowsill. It is a marked collocation because the subtext of the verb and the tense used in this context indicate a moving action from one location to another. The preposition ‘op’, however, generally indicates that the action or state of the agents takes place in one location, more specifically on top of that location. Within the context, the English

translation would be 'on'. In the English narrative, all three participants use the collocation: 'flies/flew up'. In English, this is an unmarked collocation. Due to the morphological similarity and the semantic similarity of the prepositions, it can be claimed that the use of the marked collocation 'vliegt op' in Dutch is a result of bi-directional transfer.

Participant 3 uses multiple marked collocations in both their English and Dutch narrative. Examples are 'verborgen na [een krant]', 'schreeuwt op [Sylvester]' and the previously mentioned 'comes towards [the woman]'. The equivalents of these collocations, however, are either unmarked or non-existent. This means that there is a cross-linguistic balance in the use of marked collocations but not in specific instances of marked collocations. It should, again, in this instance, be taken into account that participant 3 is multilingual and speaks not only English and Dutch but also French. In order to determine whether the use of non-normative collocations is something that is a result of participant 3's idiolect or a result of negative transfer based in the French language, French data must be acquired and analysed.

Pronouns

Indirect use of the pronouns 'you' and 'je'

The pronoun 'you' and its Dutch equivalent 'je' are not uncommon in the data. They are used when directly addressing the listener. This mostly happens at the beginning and the end of the narrations and is mostly used by the speaker to check whether the listener understands what they are talking about. A second and common instance when 'you'/'je' is used is when the speaker is directly quoting or imitating speech produced by the characters in the clip. There is, however, one specific use of the second person singular pronoun that could be classified as a marked usage. It is the instance when the pronoun is used in a clause that describes something happening or changing. The use of 'you' and 'je' in combination with a verb in present tense makes it seem as if the speaker is talking about what the listener is looking at, at the moment of speaking, but that is not the case.

The speaker is describing what ‘you’/‘je’ would see or hear if the listener were to watch the clip at that moment in time. In other words, what the speaker saw or heard when they were watching the clip.

English example: “you get a sort of fading out and they move on to the next scene”

Dutch example: “daarna zag je in een keer in een volgende scene dat...”

This indirect use of the second person singular pronoun is not grammatically incorrect or extremely uncommon in either English or Dutch. It is, however, only used by one participant in this study, participant 1, allowing this type of use to be classified as an idiosyncratic preference with non-normative use in both English and Dutch. This means it can be used as an argument in favour of the single underlying idiolect.

Relative pronouns

As one would expect, all participants make use of the English personal pronouns ‘he’ and ‘she’ as subject when retelling the actions of the characters. In Dutch, participants 1, 2, 4 and 5 have a marked excessive preference for the relative pronoun ‘die’ and its contracted form ‘ie’, over the expected personal pronouns ‘hij’, ‘zij’ or ‘ze’. This excludes the use of ‘die’ and ‘ie’ as strict anaphor, when ‘die’ and ‘ie’ are preceded or followed by the related noun phrase. Participant 3 does not exhibit this preference, so therefore one could claim that the above mentioned use of ‘die’ and ‘ie’ is a personal preference. It is, however, hard to argue for one single underlying idiolect using this data. The preference for the relative pronoun that participants 1, 2, 4 and 5 have exhibited excessively is one that simply does not occur in English as far as the collected data can show. In order to use this specific textual element to argue either for or against the single idiolect, research into other languages would have to be carried out.

	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5
he / she	3.40	9.51	5.52	4.89	2.39
hij / zij / ze	0.48	1.17	6.74	1.23	0.54
die / ie	6.09	4.26	0.42	4.11	2.72

Transitions

As mentioned before, the use of free speech as data excludes some elements, such as punctuation, from the analysis. This does mean that other elements can be included, elements which would not be as readily available for analysis in written text. The most interesting one is, seemingly, the fact that all participants rarely form full sentences but rather opt for stringing along sentences with transitions. This seems to be an effect of the type of data collected, namely the retelling of a series of events. What makes this phenomenon so interesting is how the different participants use the transitions, the frequency of certain transitions and the cross-linguistic use of the transitions. While it is clear that all five participants favour ‘and’ in English and ‘en’ in Dutch as main transition to string along their sentences and clauses, with participant 5 using them 7.64 and 8.17 times per a hundred words, respectively, the use of other transitions and their cross-linguistic balance is semantically all over the place.

In English, participant 1 prefers the temporal transition ‘then’ to indicate the sequence of events. They use the causality transition ‘so’ only when it is absolutely necessary to indicate causality. In Dutch, participant 1 uses the temporal transition ‘toen’ and the causality transition ‘dus’ a lot more interchangeably. The use of the coordinating transition ‘but’ in English and ‘maar’ in Dutch, while relatively small, is a lot more cross-linguistically balanced. Participant 1 has a preference for the use of the temporal transitions ‘daarna’ and ‘weer’ in Dutch whilst they do not use an English equivalent for either.

Like participant 1, participant 2 seems to balance the use of the Dutch transitions ‘dus’ and ‘toen’. Unlike participant 1, however, participant 2 favours the English causality transition ‘so’ over the temporal transition ‘then’. The use of the coordinating transitions ‘but’ and ‘maar’ is again fewer than the other transitions. However, participant 2 does use the English ‘but’ more often than ‘maar’. Participant 2 also uses the temporal transition ‘weer’ in Dutch, and, contrary to participant 1, does use the English equivalent ‘again’. For the temporal transition ‘when’ participant 2 only uses a Dutch equivalent once.

Participant 3 has a clear preference for the causality transitions ‘so’ and ‘dus’, using ‘then’ only once and ‘toen’ only four times, even though the cross-linguistic balance between ‘so’ and ‘dus’ is off. The use of the coordinating transitions ‘but’ and ‘maar’ is greater in comparison to most other participants. The English temporal transitions ‘while’ and ‘when’ are used by participant 3 even though both have no Dutch equivalent present in the data. Participant 3 is the only participant who uses both the Dutch temporal transition ‘daarna’ and an English equivalent, namely ‘after’.

Participant 4, very obviously, favours the Dutch temporal transition ‘dan’ over its Dutch equivalent ‘toen’ and makes staggeringly less use of its English equivalent ‘then’. Even though participant 4 does not favour the causality transitions ‘so’ and ‘dus’, just like participant 3, the cross-linguistic balance is off. The use of most other transitions by participant 4, such as the coordinating transitions ‘but’ and ‘maar’, is a lot more cross-linguistically balanced.

Participant 5 shows the same pattern as participant 4, favouring the temporal transition ‘dan’ after ‘en’ and not using ‘toen’ at all. The cross-linguistics balance between ‘dan/toen’ and ‘then’ is in favour of Dutch as is the imbalance between the temporal transitions ‘again’ and ‘weer’. The imbalance of the coordinating transitions ‘but’ and ‘maar’ and the causality transitions ‘so’ and ‘dus’ is in favour of English.

From this analysis it is difficult to form a strong argument either against or for the single underlying idiolect. There is a great cross-linguistic imbalance, but this is to be expected due to the

semantically flexible and interchangeable nature of the transitions. In order to make any substantiated claims using transitions a much larger dataset should be collected and analysed.

Transitions (total amount and ratio per 100 words)										
	P1	ratio	P2	ratio	P3	ratio	P4	ratio	P5	ratio
and	43	5,84	57	6.53	47	6.83	61	6.09	32	7.64
en	38	6.08	67	5.60	31	6.53	51	5.24	30	8.17
but	4	0.54	10	1.15	17	2.47	16	1.60	5	1.19
maar	5	0.80	6	0.50	8	1.68	18	1.85	1	0.27
so	10	1.36	22	2.52	21	3.05	24	2.40	5	1.19
dus	23	3.69	43	3.59	12	2.53	12	1.23	1	0.27
then	29	3.94	10	1.15	1	0.15	17	1.70	8	1.91
toen	44	7.05	41	3.43	4	0.84	x	x	x	x
dan	3	0.48	3	0.25	1	0.21	49	5.03	21	5.72
again	6	0.82	14	1.61	4	0.58	9	0.90	1	0.24
weer	10	1.60	16	1.34	x	x	8	0.82	5	1.36
when	x	x	9	1.03	2	0.29	2	0.20	x	x
als	x	x	1	0.08	x	x	1	0.10	2	0.54
while	x	x	1	0.11	2	0.29	1	0.10	x	x
ondertussen	x	x	x	x	1	x	x	x	x	x
because	5	0.68	2	0.23	1	0.15	3	0.29	1	0.24
want	4	0.64	1	0.08	1	0.21	5	0.51	1	0.27
after	x	x	x	x	2	0.29	1	0.10	x	x
daarna	5	0.80	x	x	3	0.63	x	x	x	x

Filler words and phrases

A final textual element which can be analysed on word level is filler words and filler phrases. Filler words and phrases can be very strong markers of authorship because an extremely large number of lexical units can be used as filler words and because they have very flexible semantics. This makes the use of filler words and phrases very personal. Unfortunately, this flexibility also makes them difficult to analyse. Without some sort of insight into the speaker's thought process it can, at times, be difficult to distinguish when phrases such as 'I think' are used as a main clause or as a filler phrase. It can also be difficult to determine when filler words are used either to allow for more time to think or to weaken a statement. Looking at filler words and phrases cross-linguistically, the analysis becomes even more complicated and dependent on the context. Some common filler words have literal translation in other languages such as 'of course'/'natuurlijk' and 'actually'/'eigenlijk', while 'uh[m]' is cross-linguistically applicable. Other common filler words, however, such as the English 'like' and the Dutch 'zeg maar', only translate in certain contexts.

The filler word that is arguably the least ambiguous is 'uh[m]'. Cross-linguistically it is morphologically and semantically similar as it is used in both English and Dutch to fill up time a speaker might need to think about what to say next. The frequency count could indicate the disposition a speaker might have to fill their thinking time with 'uh[m]'. The differences between the participants suggest that the use of 'uh[m]' can be classified as a personal preference. The cross-linguistic imbalance suggests that no argument can be found in favour of the underlying single idiolect. One should, however, take into account that the purpose of the filler word 'uh[m]' is to fill up thinking time and that the amount of thinking time needed can differ due to memory or due to proficiency. More research and, more specifically, more data including self-reflection of participants on instances where they needed thinking time, could illuminate a clearer cross-linguistic balance in the use of 'uh[m]' and possibly other filler words. The binary decision of not filling up thinking

time is, however, hard to uncover since the actual thinking time of a speaker is hard to pinpoint, even by the participants themselves, leaving this still an ambiguous potential argument.

Frequency count of the use of ‘uh[m]’

	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5
English	2.45	8.14	4.07	5.39	7.40
Dutch	1.76	8.93	11.16	3.9	5.17

4.3 Sentence level

Clausal structure

The underlying structure to speech might provide even stronger evidence for an underlying idiolect. Whilst the disposition a speaker might have for the selection of certain semantic clauses is definitely an element of the idiolect, the structure, the relationship between and the linking of clauses is of equal and maybe even of more importance to the argument for one underlying idiolect, since semantics can be a lot more flexible and interchangeable.

Structure and position of transitional phrases

As mentioned above, the semantic analysis of the transitions used by the participants does not seem to reflect a cross-linguistic pattern and lacks a strong argument for the single underlying idiolect. The semantics of most transitions are flexible and while on one hand the meaning is dependent on the context it appears in, on the other hand, quite a few transitions are interchangeable. The latter implies, however, that the underlying structure to the use of transitions has the potential to reflect a cross-linguistic balance. The collocation of a transition and a temporal transition appears in both the English and the Dutch data. Examples are ‘and then’/‘en toen’ and ‘but then’/‘maar dan’. These collocations are, however, used by all participants, making it hard to argue that this specific structure is marked or a personal preference. Participant 2 is the only

participant showing some personal structural preference: in English they combine three transition in one clause. This results in either ‘but and then’ or ‘and but then’. The Dutch equivalent of this is the construction is: transition - filler word - transition, resulting in ‘en nou toen’. While this instance of personal structural preference suggests that there is an underlying cross-linguistic structure, the flexible and interchangeable middle element, a transition in English and a filler word in Dutch, shows just how complex these structures can be to analyse. Since the data lacks any other examples of these types of personal structural preferences, it is ill-advised to make any hard claims on the evidence this might be in favour of the underlying single idiolect. More data should be collected in order to substantiate any potential argument.

Elucidation of noun phrases

Noun phrases are very common in the data because of its nature. The participants were asked to retell the narrative of a video which included a lot of visual aid and therefore triggered a lot of descriptiveness. While the fact that there are many descriptive noun phrases is presumably a result of the type of data obtained, the way each participant forms, structures and expands on these phrases is highly idiosyncratic. The cross-linguistic similarities to these idiosyncratic preferences can argue for the single underlying idiolect. Participant 2 exhibits the clearest, most expanded example. The structure of their setting of the scene in the beginning of their narrative is extremely similar cross-linguistically. They start off with introducing the first character by the type of animal they are and by revealing the name of the bird, after which they describe the action the bird is doing and its location:

English: ‘there was um a little bird | called Tweety | and | he was uh bathing himself
| in um in um in like a water fountain’

Dutch: ‘uhm er was un-unne vogeltje | en | die heette Tweety | enne | die was zich
aan het wassen | in een fontein’.

Participant 2 continues with introducing the second character, their name, their location, their state and the action that follows:

English: ‘and uh and uh there was a cat | Sylvester | (...) | he was sitting on a bench | (...) | and hiding behind a newspaper | and uh and | he got to the fountain | he put-uh he opened his mouth’

Dutch: ‘enne er was dus een kat | en | die heette Sylvester | en | die zat op een bankje | (...) | achter unne krant verstopt | (...) | enne op een gegeven moment ging die naar de fontein toe | en | deed ie z’n mond open’

It is clear that in both English and Dutch, participant 2 describes the same thematic roles and semantic information, cross-linguistically, in the same order for the two characters, Tweety and Sylvester. Comparably, participant 3, whilst setting the scene, mentions the same semantical features as participant 2, but they structure and prime the given information in their own way. Participant 3 mentions the genre and the two main characters together, does not elaborate on what type of animal they are and continues with a time adjunct. They elaborate on the first character’s action and location, after which they elaborate on the second character’s location:

English: ‘is-a story of Tweety and Sylvester | (...) | and | we can see Tweety bathing | (...) | in a fountain | while S-Sylvester is actually hiding behind a newspaper’

Dutch: ‘het is het verhaal van uh Tweety en Sylvester | en | Tweety | en uh | in het begin uhm neemt Tweety een bad | in een uh ja in een park | en uh Sylvester is verborgen na een krant’

Participant 1, whilst sharing both semantic and thematic features with both participant 2 and 3, chooses instead to expand on the second character, Sylvester, with an action and a goal: ‘and then Sylvester came along (...) trying to eat Tweety’/‘Sylvester die kwam naar het toe die wilde hem opeten’. Participant 5, like participant 3, starts off with the introduction of the source and the two main characters. They expand on Tweety and Sylvester by their action and their goal, respectively.

In English, however, their description is more extensive, also describing the type of animals the characters are.

English: ‘(...) | like the bird and the cat | okay | so I watched | a video of those two | and uhm | what happened was | that Tweety | was at- was taking a bath | in like a bird bath | in the park | and uh | Sylvester | tried to eat | him’

Dutch: ‘ik heb | naar een filmpje gekeken | van Tweety en Sylvester | (...) | Tweety die aan het badderen was | in zo’n vogelbadje | (...) | nou | Sylvester | wil die- wil ’t vogeltje tuurlijk pakken’

Finally, participant 4 is the only participant who exhibits a relatively large difference in expanding on the characters of Tweety and Sylvester. In English they do note that that Tweety and Sylvester are a bird and a cat, in Dutch they do not. A second cross-linguistic difference is that in English, participant 4 describes Tweety’s action after which they describe his location, while in Dutch they describe it the other way around:

English: ‘(...) | Tweety | washing | himself | in a fountain’

Dutch: ‘(...) | zat | Tweety | in een soort uh vogel fonteintje | een bad aan het nemen is’

Participant 4 is the only participant who exhibits two differences in the introduction of the characters. Other differences in the narratives of the other participants could be attributed to the issue of memory. The rest of the data provided above strongly suggests a cross-linguistic structure and style and thus provides evidence to argue for the existence of a single underlying idiolect.

Selection and structure of thematic roles

At 1.48 in the clip, the participants saw Tweety finding refuge from Sylvester with a female character after Sylvester’s first attempt to eat Tweety. The lexical choices made during the introduction of this character have been discussed already. The underlying clausal structure of this

part of the narrative is interesting as well. All the participants describe this event using similar elements but in their own way while these descriptions match cross-linguistically. Participant 1 finishes introducing the two main characters Tweety and Sylvester, before moving on to the introduction and description of the female character, by disclosing the location: ‘it was in a park’/‘Dat was allemaal in ’t park.’ They then go on describing the action the agent carries out on a secondary location. Finally, they describe another action the agent carries out followed by the patient and the instrument. Interestingly, participant 1 is the only participant who uses the female character as the primary and only agent in this context, in both English and Dutch.

English: ‘(...) | a woman | who was sitting | on a bench | (...) | and | she | hit | him | with eh an umbrella’

Dutch: ‘d’r zat | een vrouw | op een bankje | (...) | en | die | sloeg | Sylvester | met een paraplu’.

Participant 2 expands more on the meeting, including the action of Tweety asking for help and of Sylvester leaving the scene: ‘Tweety uhm uh saw grandma sitting on a- on a bench (...) and so he uh was going to her to to to ask for help and uh uh she uh she hit uh hit Sylvester on the head with an umbrella and uh so yeah he went away again’. In Dutch the structure of the description is nearly identical, participant 2 only inverts the instrument and the location: ‘on the head with an umbrella’/‘met een paraplu op z’n kop’. Participant 3, cross-linguistically, does not expand on Tweety’s meeting with the woman and leaves it at: ‘(...) uh finds help at a woman’/ ‘hij gaat hulp vragen bij een vrouw’. Just as participants 1 and 2, participant 4 opts to describe the woman by nature of her physical position and location: ‘Tweety ran to a woman sitting in the park’/‘rent Tweety naar een vrouw die in ’t park zit’. After this description, participant 4 chooses to include an indirect quote from Tweety before moving on to the action the woman undertakes:

English: ‘he told | her | uh something like | the cat | is trying to grab | me | and | the woman | got really mad | at Sylvester’

Dutch: ‘hij zegt | van oh ja | hij | probeert me te pakken | uh en | die vrouw | die |
wordt | dus | heel boos | op Sylvester’.

Finally, participant 5 does not disclose the location of the woman but chooses to describe who she is with before describing the action she performs in a lot more general terms:

English: ‘Tweety | flew away | to a woman | with a baby | and | the woman | helped |
Tweety | get rid of | Sylvester’

Dutch: ‘Tweety| vlucht dan | naar een vrouw | met een baby | en | die vrouw | die
red | Tweety | van | Sylvester’

While all participants have the same thematic roles and semantic information available to them, they all independently select and structure these clauses. While there is no perfect cross-linguistic balance, the number of cross-linguistic similarities can definitely argue for an underlying structural idiolect.

4.4 Text level

The analyses at word and sentence level provide a substantial number of textual elements to analyse. It is, however, more difficult to find relevant elements at text level. This is partly explained by the fact that, in general, there are fewer elements at text level to analyse to begin with. The nature of the data collected causes this number to decline even more. The genre of the data is pre-decided, and the text or paragraph length depends not only on the length and structure of the original data, but also on the memory of the participants. This makes the analysis of most of the elements at text level irrelevant. One element of text level analysis is significant in the context of this research and that is the tenses used by the participants.

Tense

The differences in the use of tense by the participants indicates that the use of tenses can be classified as an idiosyncratic preference. There is, however, a divide in consistency of cross-linguistic balance between the participants' use of tense in the data. Participants 2 and 3 are consistent in their choices of tense in both English and Dutch. Their use of tense could suggest an underlying idiosyncratic preference for certain tenses in certain types of genre. Participant 2 uses past tenses to retell the sequence of events, only shifting to the present tense when directly quoting a character. Participant 3 chose to use the present tense for the complete duration of the story. Participants 1, 4 and 5 are cross-linguistically inconsistent in their use of tenses. Participant 1's use of tense in Dutch is similar to that of participant 2: past tenses in general, present tense when directly quoting a character. In English, however, they switch back and forth between past and present tenses. Participant 4's use of tense in English is also similar to that of participant 2: using past tenses and switching to present tenses when quoting a character or when addressing the listener. In Dutch, participant 4 seems to start off in past tense as well saying: 'op een gegeven moment zat Tweety...' before switching and telling the rest of the story in present tenses. Participant 5 displays a similar pattern in Dutch. They set the scene in the past tense: 'die aan het badden was' before continuing to tell the rest of the story in present tenses. In English, however, they use past tenses, except when addressing the listener. While the description of their use of tenses might come across as slightly confusing, the actual use of tenses by participants 4 and 5, per individual language, is not marked. The cross-linguistic difference might therefore be a result of proficiency levels, knowledge of pragmatics rules or other linguistic concepts which surpass idiosyncratic preference. This evidence can therefore not necessarily be used as an argument either for or against one single underlying idiolect.

5. Conclusion

The analysis executed in this research highlights the complexity of the notion of idiolect and of the question whether idiolect is a cross-linguistic or a language specific concept. In order to obtain useful data in two languages sacrifices in textual elements had to be made. Because of this, only one textual element was existent or relevant for analysis on both character level and text level. The use of contractions, analysed on character level, has an ambiguous outcome because of the different systems and conventions English and Dutch have pertaining to contractions. The use of tense, analysed on text level, cannot be used as a clear cut argument either since there is a possibility that the seemingly idiosyncratic use of tense is influenced by proficiency, pragmatic conventions or other linguistic concepts.

The analysis carried out on word level and on sentence level provided the bulk of the textual elements that serve as evidence either for or against the notion of a single underlying idiolect. The cross-linguistic balance between the marked lexical choices, marked complex noun phrases and the indirect use of the personal pronouns, and the presence of bi-directionally transferred lexical elements, all analysed on word level, provide strong evidence for a single underlying idiolect. The analysis of diminutives and relative pronouns have ambiguous outcomes. The cross-linguistic imbalance seems to indicate a language-specific idiolect, however, it should be taken into account that both of these textual elements are more common or only possible in Dutch. The outcomes of the analysis of marked verb selection and of marked collocations are divided. For both textual elements there are examples which are either cross-linguistically marked or the result of bi-directional transfer, which can clearly be used to argue for the underlying idiolect. For both there are also examples, all produced by participant 3, which suggest that there is language-specific influence on participant 3's speech by the third language that they speak, namely French. Finally, the outcomes of the analysis of the cross-linguistic idiosyncratic use of transitions and of filler words and phrases is ambiguous as well. While the analysed elements that argue for the underlying idiolect are strong, the other elements are ambiguous but do not necessarily dismiss the notion of

the underlying idiolect, due to other linguistic concepts interfering. This outcome suggests that there is a substantiated need for more research on a larger dataset which consists of more languages.

The cross-linguistic balance of the structure of the elucidation of noun phrases and the structure and selection of thematic roles, both analysed on sentence level, form strong arguments for a single underlying structural idiolect. The analysis of the structure of transitions gives some indication that it could argue for the underlying idiolect, but there is a lack of data and more research is required.

There are quite some textual elements analysed which strongly suggest that speakers do have one single, both semantical and structural, cross-linguistic idiolect. The outcomes from the analysis on the majority of the textual elements, however, remain inconclusive. Lack of data and the interference of other linguistics concepts or cognitive issues such as memory prevent any considerable conclusions from being drawn and substantial claims from being made. This research has, however, indicated that there is something to the idea of a single underlying cross-linguistic idiolect and has provided evidence which suggests the need for further research.

6. References

- Barlow, M. G. (2013) Individual usage: a corpus-based study of idiolects. *Linguistics* 18(4).
- Brennan, S. E. (1996). Proceedings from ISSD '96: *Lexical entrainment in spontaneous dialog*. Philadelphia, PA: Acoustical Society of Japan.
- Chaski, C. (2012). Author identification in the forensic setting. In L. M. Solan and P. M. Tiersma (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of language and law* (pp.489-503). Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199572120.013.0036
- Coulthard, M. (2004). Author identification, idiolect, and linguistic uniqueness. *Applied Linguistics*, 25 (4), 431–447. Retrieved from <https://doi-org.ru.idm.oclc.org/10.1093/applin/25.4.431>
- Farahmandian, H., Haonong, P., Baniadam, I, Rezanezhad, A. & Imanjani, E. (2016). The identity correlation between individual identity and verbal characteristics in a portrait of the artist as a young man. *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies*, 3(2), 557-571. Retrieved from <http://ijhcs.com/index.php/ijhcs/article/view/2759>
- Hall, R. A. (1951), Idiolect and linguistic super-ego. *Studia Linguistica*, 5(1) , 21-27. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9582.1951.tb00474.x
- Helpless. (n.d.). In *Cambridge dictionary online*. Retrieved June 16, 2019 from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/helpless>
- Higginbotham, J. (2006). Languages and idiolect: Their language and ours. In E. Lepore & B.C. Smith (Eds.) *The Oxford handbook of philosophy of language* (pp. 140-148). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hudson, R. A. (1996). *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Innocent. (n.d.). In *Cambridge dictionary online*. Retrieved June 16, 2019 from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/innocent>
- Johnstone, B. (2000). The individual voice in language. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 29, 405-424. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ru.idm.oclc.org/stable/223426>

- Kirchhoff, K. (2006). Language characteristics. In T. Schultz & K. Kirchhoff (Eds.), *Multilingual speech processing* (pp. 5–32). Burlington, MA: Academic Press.
- Labov, W. (1978). *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Malmkjær, K. (2017). Language awareness in translation. In P. Garrett & J.M. Cots (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of language awareness*. Retrieved from <https://www-routledgehandbooks-com.ru.idm.oclc.org/doi/10.4324/9781315676494.ch31>
- Merwe, van der P., (2014). 'Everything is autobiographical': Hans-Ulrich Treichel's idiolect in *Lost* (1999). *Literator*, 35 (2), 1-9.
Retrieved from <https://literator.org.za/index.php/literator/article/view/1151>
- Saussure, de F. (1966) *Course in general linguistics*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- Schultz, T. (2007). Speaker characteristics. In C. Müller (Ed.), *Speaker classification I: Fundamentals, features, and Methods* (pp. 47-74). Heidelberg: Springer.
- Shetter, W. Z. (1959). The Dutch Diminutive. *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 58(1), 75-90. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27707226>
- Ssavage1970. (2017). *Sylvester ep 16 home tweet home 1950* [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.dailymotion.com/video/x58firg>
- Weinreich, U. (1974). *Languages in contact: Findings and problems*. The Hague: Mouton.

7. Appendix

7.1 *Original transcripts*

Participant 1 - English

Okay, so I need to tell you a story. I just watched a video: do you know the show uh Tweety and Sylvester with the dog and the bird?

So I watched this six minute clip and well it was a cartoon, obviously, and uh in the cartoon Tweety was bathing in a fountain and then Sylvester came along and Sylvester was sort of crunching over the fountain trying to eat Tweety and then Tweety was bathing and he used his tongue as a towel so (laugh) and then uh he realised he was using a cat tongue as a towel so they eh were chasing each other Sylvester was chasing Tweety they were running around the park and, it was in a park, and then uh Tweety ran towards a woman who was sitting on a bench for help, he was imitating, like help I'm being chased by a cat and then the woman was scolding Sylvester and she hit him with eh an umbrella I think. That's a lot of details sorry. And then um uh you get a sort of fading out and they move on to the next scene. Uh next to the woman is a child on a sort of stroller tricycle thing one with those things at the end and then uh Sylvester takes the child and pretends to be the child. and then he's crying like give me pretty little birdy cuz he wants to eat Tweety and then the woman gives Tweety to Sylvester and then uhm she finds out it wasn't a baby so they hit him again I think she hits him with a plank this time okay and then uhm you they run around the park again and then he walks to ... there's a bulldog in the park so uh Sylvester is chasing Tweety and Tweety then you see the bulldog walking there and he's very imposing, very angry - well he's not necessary angry, he just looks scary let's just put it that way. And then uh Tweety walks next to the bulldog so Sylvester has to back off and then Sylvester pretends to be the bulldog. Like he's walking in the same manner and on the same leash somehow and then Tweety finds out and runs again and then they end up getting out of the park cuz uh syl- Sylvester and Tweety go into town. They just chase each other into town and then he uh Tweety flies up to a window it's a flat somewhere third fourth high up let's

just put it that way and then uh Sylvester uses bubblegum to fly up as well like he blows a bubble and then he flies up. and then uh his bubble bursts cuz Tweety popped it and then he fell down again and half way down he blew it up again and then Tweety gave him an anvil to hold so he fell down but then I think if I'm correct he came back up again but I'm not really sure and then he fell back down and then Tweety place a pillow with an anvil in it on the ground so he fell on it and then he was standing, Sylvester was standing on the corner with another fade out in between cuz you keep seeing different clips work with different things together and then he hits the bulldog with a shovel so the bulldog chases Sylvester around and then Tweety calls the pet shop to ask if they have any more cats because he's fresh out. Okay that's a long story but I hope you got it.

Okay, I might, may have forgotten a scene but that can happen, so, okay, do you get it or? Okay

Participant 1 - Dutch

Okay dusseh. Ik moest een filmpje kijken van Sylvester en Tweety, dat ken je wel denk ik. En 't begon met Tweety die in een fontein zat, en die was een bad aan het nemen en Sylvester die uh kwam naar hem toe die wilde hem opeten, zoals gewoonlijk en uhm Tweety dacht dat Sylvester's tong een handdoek was dus ging zich daarmee afdrogen. Maar toen kwam ie d'r achter dat uh dat 't Sylvester was toen gingen ze elkaar achtervolgen in 't park. Dat was allemaal in 't park en d'r zat een vrouw op een bankje en die zag wat er gebeurde dus die vrouw die greep in die sloeg Sylvester met een paraplu en toen kon Tweety dus ontsnappen, toen ging Tweety later bij de vrouw zitten lezen toen kwam Sylvester d'r weer aan die deed alsof ie een kindje was wat naast de vrouw, naast de bank zat een kindje op zo'n loop fietsje uhm en toen deed ie dus alsof ie die baby was en toen ging ie huilen 'n vroeg ie om Tweety om een vogeltje en toen kreeg ie die vogel van die vrouw maar toen probeerde die hem op te eten en toen sloeg de vrouw hem van ja ik heb toch gezegd dat je geen dingen in je mond mag stoppen dus toen eindigde er weer een scene toen gingen ze naar een volgende scene waarin Sylvester een val ging zetten zo'n traditionele val met zo'n stokje waar je dan

dingen onder legt en daar toen zat Tweety op Sylvester's hoofd en Sylvester was tegen zichzelf aan het praten en Tweety zei ja je krijgt uh uhm ja zo vang je die vogel echt wel ja ja inderdaad toen kwam ie er achter wacht hij zit op m'n hoofd dat is niet m'n eigen stem dus toen sloeg ie zichzelf met een stok dus toen kon Tweety weer ontsnappen en toen daarna uhm even denken oh ja toen liep Tweety naast een hele grote bulldog in 't park en kreeg je een eng muziekje d'r bij en toen liepen ze dus samen dus kon Sylvester niets doen want ja dan valt die bulldog-bulldog hem aan dus toen bleef ie met hun mee lopen zeg maar of hij bleef op afstand dus toen daarna zag je in een keer in een volgende scene dat Sylvester in plaats van die bulldog daar liep dus toen had Tweety dat niet in de gate want die dacht dat ie nog steeds naast die hond liep. dus ha het is een best wel lang verhaal dus uhm toen kwam er-kwam ie weer achter hem aan gingen ze elkaar weer achtervolgen toen kwamen ze terecht in 't uh in de stad daar had Tweety die vloog omhoog op een flat gebouw en die ging op een raam zitten en Sylvester die had kauwgum bij dus die blies een kauwgombal en die vloog ook omhoog maar toen prikte Tweety die kauwgombal door dus toen viel die weer naar beneden toen blies ie opnieuw een kauwgombal omhoog, en toen kwam die weer omhoog en toen gaf die un Tweety gaf een aambeeld aan Sylvester dus ja dan val je wel naar beneden en toen daarna kwam die weer omhoog toen ie het liet vallen dat aambeeld en daarna liet ie hem nog een allerlaatste keer naar beneden vallen en toen legde Tweety een kussen klaar voor hem met dat aambeeld d'r in dus toen viel die op dat kussen en dat deed dus pijn dus toen was ie weer ontsnapt en toen daarna kwam uh die bulldog was weer in de stad en toen stond Sylvester om de hoek klaar om Tweety met een schep te slaan maar dat-toen sloeg ie dus die bulldog dus toen werd die bulldog achtervolgd en toen kreeg je de laatste scene in het park waar uhm Sylvester deed alsof ie een boom was en hij had 't nestje op z'n arm en hij maakte vogel geluiden volgens mij ja en toen kwam die bulldog d'r aan want die wilde aan die boom gaan ruiken en toen sprayde Sylvester met water en toen rende die bulldog weg en toen rende die bulldog achter Sylvester aan en toen belde Tweety naar de dieren

winkel van he hebben jullie nog katten want ik heb er helemaal geen meer. En dat was 't. lang verhaal sorry maar dat was 't.

Participant 2 - English

Okay so um there was um a little bird called Tweety and he was uh bathing himself in um in um in a like a water fountain and uh and uh there was a cat Sylvester and he it's like yeah he wanted to chase he wanted to catch-a the bird so he was sitting on a bench and slowly approaching Tweety and hiding behind a newspaper and uh and he got to the fountain he put uh he opened his mouth and uh Tweety thought he thought he he'd found a towel so he pulled the tongue out of uh out of his mouth and used it as a towel and uh but then when he turned around he found out it was uh it was actually Sylvester so he ran off course and Sylvester chased him uh yeah so uh they both ran off and then Tweety uhm uh saw grandma-grandma sitting on a-on a bench uh and with a-with a baby and so he uh was going to her to to to ask for help and uh uh she uh she hit uh hit Sylvester on the head with an umbrella and uh so yeah he went away again but then he uh uhm took the uh baby who's sitting on a small bike and uh he put the clothes on and disguised himself as-uh as the baby and uhm tried to get closer to Tweety but uhm and then he tried to ask for uh, the grandma please can I have uhm that little bird as a toy I want to play with it and so she like okay okay so she gave Tweety to-to Sylvester but uhm then he puts it- puts the bird in his mouth but the grandma saw it and gave him a spanking for it so he uh spit out uh the bird again because- and Tweety also helped to give him a spanking and uh uh yeah so he ran off again and uh then the next step he tried to uh to uh put a trap out for uh the bird for the bird but uh Tweety was actually sitting on his head while he was doing so and uhm well he was sitting there for a while and uhm Sylvester was waiting and then he talk- he started talking so Sylvester found out he was actually sitting on his head so he took a large like a baseball uhm bat and hit himself on the head and of course knocks himself out so uhm yeah and he ran again Tweety ran again and uh next thing he uh he em encountered uh a huge dog so he

stayed very close to the dog to be safe because Sylvester was afraid of the dog of course but uh then uh Sylvester uh pushed the dog away and uh or yeah he pushed him so hard he himself uh got the collar on his neck so and he was trying not to-to uhm trying to get close to the bird again but then Tweety saw it again and he ran off and Sylvester behind him and when he finally got uh got the bird he smacked him so hard he flew up like twenty stories of a building and he was up the building and syl-Sylvester stared chewing bubble gum and it became su-such a big balloon it was like an air balloon so he flew up in the air and when he was almost there Tweety uh he had a needle and he uh uhm yeah stuck it in the balloon and it popped and yeah he went down again and he blew it up again so he went up again and thi-this time Tweety put like uhm some bricks in his hands so he was so heavy that he would f-go down again and uhm when he went up again uhm he went so high that he was far past the building and this time Tweety put a-took a catapult and he shot him out of the air and uh when - I think he jumped down and he he when he, Tweety put a- like a cushion on the floor to give him a soft landing but he put the brick in the- in the cushion so it wasn't very soft and uh yeah the last trick uh that Sylvester tried was to disguise himself as a tree so he stood inside a tree and hold out like a bird nest to try to get Tweety to go into the birds nest which he did and uh but then just when he was about to-to eat it- eat the bird the huge dog-dog came again and started sniffing around and uh yeah when he finally when the dog found out it was Sylvester inside the tree he started chasing him again and that was uhm the end of the story and I think uh Tweety he called the pet shop to tell him there was like uhm a cat in need or something yeah so that was the end of the story. Yeah. Thank you

Participant 2 - Dutch

Nou uhm er was un-unne vogeltje en die heette Tweety enne die was zich aan het wassen in een fontein en hij was gewoon lekker aan het zingen enne er was dus een kat en die heette Sylvester en die zat op een bankje bij de fontein achter unne krant verstopt en hij kwam steeds wat dichterbij

enne telkens een stukje dichterbij op de bank enne op een gegeven moment ging die naar de fontein toe en deed die z'n mond open om 't vogeltje op- om Tweety op te eten en uhm Tweety die uh m die uhm wilde net unne- un handdoek pakken dus hij pakte de tong van-uh syl- van Sylvester en hij droogde zich daar mee af en toen merkte die ineens van oh dat is uh dat is geen-uh handdoek dusseh nou toen rende die er van door en uh Sylvester d'r achter aan en uh na een tijdje zag Tweety een oma op een bankje zitten dus-uh hij rende er naar toe en-uh vroeg om hulp zo van he ja d'r zit een kat achter mij aan uh help en-uh toen kwam uh kwam Sylvester dus er aan gerend toen sloeg die oma met een paraplu op z'n kop en-uh nou toen droop die weer af en uh toen zat-uh Tweety zat daar bij die oma op dat bankje en oma had unne un kindje- een baby bij zich op een driewieler dus-uh toen had Sylvester iets nieuws bedacht hij dacht dan-uh verkleed ik me als die baby dus hij-hij nam die uh baby mee op die driewieler en verkleedde zich als-uh als die baby en kwam die weer terug en-uh toen begon die te zeuren om , ik wil met dat-uh met dat vogeltje spelen daarzo, ik wil 't vogeltje dus-uh nou toen-uh zei die oma okay hier zo mag je met 't vogeltje spelen nou toen stopte die hem dus in z'n mond maar dat zag die oma dus gaf ze hem een pak slaag zei hoe vaak heb ik je wel niet verteld dat je geen spullen in je mond mag-mag stoppen en-uh ja Tweety dus die pakte dus zo'n honkbal knuppel en die sloeg natuurlijk mee ja-ja hoe vaak-uh heb ik je wel niet uh je mag geen spullen in je mond stoppen en-uh nou toen droop ie dus weer af en uh toen bedacht ie nou dan moet ik weer iets anders bedenken om uh te pakken te krijgen dus toen uh toen uh kwam Tweety die zat-uh die zat in een boom die ging op 't hoofd van Sylvester zitten en ondertussen ging Sylvester ging un-uh een va- zetten die een val om-uh Tweety te pakken te krijgen en uh dus hij maar wachten maar Tweety zat natuurlijk op z'n hoofd en-uh die zat tegen hem te praten ja je ben wel slim en-uh he ja zo krijg je hem- zo krijg je hem wel te pakken en uh toen had ie op een geven moment dus door dat ie op z'n hoofd zat en toen pakte hij dus ook de honk- de honkbal knuppel en-uh toen sloeg op z'n hoofd maar was natuurlijk op z'n eigen hoofd was niet- was mis natuurlijk dus-uh hij sloeg zichzelf knock out en Tweety ging er weer van door natuurlijk nou en-uh Sylvester

weer d'r achter aan en uh toen uh zag Tweety een grote hond dus-uh daar zo verstopte die zich bij want Sylvester was natuurlijk bang voor de hond en toen uh nouja wandelde die eindje mee met die hond, die zat aan een lijn en toen kwam uh Sylvester-uh heel hard aangerend en-uh die schopte zo hard tegen die hond dat de hond uit de riem vloog dat Sylvester d'r zelf in zat, in de halsband zeg maar en-uh dus die liep zo heel stilletjes mee als- in de hoop ie- dat Tweety 't niet door zou hebben zodat ie hem weer op zou kunnen eten nou net toen die hem wilde pakken toen-uh merkte Tweety oh dat is-dat is Sylvester dus hij rende er weer van door en-uhm nouja Sylvester d'r achter aan en toen uhm kreeg die hem bijna te pakken en toen sloeg die hem zo hard dat ie- dat Tweety een heel hoog gebouw op vloog dus hij zat zeg maar heel hoog in een venster bank uh in een op een ja bij een gebouw en-uh nou toen dacht-uh Sylvester ja hoe krijg ik hem nou dan te pakken dus-uh toen dacht () oh ik heb nog een stukje uh kauwgum dus hij begon kauwgum te kauwen en toen blies ie dus een hele grote bel en zo ging ie dus vloog die dus om hoog en toen kwam ie daar boven aan en uh toen prikte Tweety met een naald prikte uh de de bal de ballon zeg maar kapot en-uh nouja toen viel ie natuurlijk weer naar beneden dus hij begon opnieuw een bel te blazen enne nou toen ging ie weer omhoog toen-toen die er bijna was toen-uh gaf- toen stopte Tweety een grote uh baksteen in z'n ha- in z'n armen en dus zakte die dus weer naar beneden en-uh nou de derde keer toen-uh ging ie eigenlijk zo hard omhoog dat ie veelste hoog vloog dus hij vloog helemaal voorbij en-uh toen pakte Tweety een katapult en schoot hem zo uit de lucht zeg maar en-uh maar hij wilde hem-uh uhm toen vloog ie zelf ook naar beneden van 't gebouw af en-uh had ie een kussen ge-gepakt zodat-uh zodat Sylvester niet-uh te hard zou neer komen dus-uh Sylvester die plofte op 't kussen maar-uh toen kwam dus zo'n-uh toen bleek dus-uh dat ie d'r een baksteen in had gestopt dus toen was het niet een hele harde uh hele zachte landing en-uh toen uh nouja dus weer achter elkaar aan natuurlijk dus-uh en de volgende 't volgende wat-uh Sylvester probeerde was om-uh om zich te verstoppen in een boom dus-uh hij deed zich hij verkleetde zich als een boom zeg maar en probeerde zo Tweety te lokken in een vogelnestje met uh met wat gefluit zo-enzo dus Tweety kwam zo in 't vogel nest

en-uh ja toen probeerde die hem dus te pakken en toen op dat moment kwam die grote hond er weer aan en-uh die snuffelde zo rond de boom en toen rook die dat 't ineens- rook die dat het de kat was dus uh nouja de hond natuurlijk weer achter-uh achter Sylvester aan en-uh Tweety die uhm die vloog weer weg dus die was weer ontsnapt en-uh toen belde die-uh de uh belde die 't dieren asiel en zei van hebben jullie nog wat-uh katten? Ik ben-uh- ik zoek een kat nouja dat was 't einde van 't verhaal, dus hij was ontsnapt.

Participant 3 - English

So is-a story of Tweety and Sylvester. And uh it starts in a park and we can see Tweety uh bathing and singing and playing in a fountain while s-Sylvester is actually hiding behind a newspaper in a row of other men reading newspapers and he's spying on Tweety and he comes slowly to the fountain and open his mouth as to um uh offer his tongue for- as a towel so Tweety doesn't realises and takes the tongue as a towel but then he realises he's - he has seen a cat and he starts to run and so they run after each other and Tweety finally uh finds help uh at a woman uh who uh on who's shoulder he sits and Sylvester still running after Tweety comes uh towards the-the woman but she has a umbrella and she starts hitting him and screaming at him and so he just uhm goes back silently but Tweety's still besides her and resting and that woman actually has a baby and she's reading and not paying attention so Sylvester comes and steals the baby and disguises into the baby and comes and cry for uh Tweety to play with him so she just gives Tweety to the cat and he just eat him and - but unfortunately the woman actually punishes him because she uh thinks her baby has uh eaten the cat she punishes him for not uh putting objects into his mouth so once again his uhm punished and uh Tweety also uh also screams at him uh but uh yes Tweety after this flies onto the branch of a tree and uh Sylvester waits his- has seen him so waits for him under the tree with (t)his ? but Tweety uh has seen actually the stare - the snare of course and flies onto the head of Sylvester and while Sylvester is waiting for him he starts to talk to him to distract (inaudible) to Sylvester and so he

realises he's on his head and hits himself so he's knocked out but he still runs after Tweety but Tweety comes back walking by a dog so uh Sylvester when when they both walk a little bit apart from each other he runs uhm to Tweety but he cannot stop on time and runs into the dog and gets the collar and so is uh imprisoned in the - in the lead uhm but well since he's a cat I think he can manage to go through it and still runs after Tweety but Tweety can fly so he flies onto the window of a building and Sylvester finds bubble gum and uses it as balloon to to fly up to Tweety but Tweety has a needle so he pierces the bubble but he has another bubble gum so he eats it quickly and flies back to Tweety but Tweety has an enclume (French for anvil) so he gives it to Sylvester who sinks but when he throws it away he he - he's still able to fly so Tweety throws a stone at him and he falls back onto a pillow which Tweety has set on the ground but he had hid the enclume under the pillow so he's knocked out again and uh a bit after this, he - Sylvester is waiting behind the corner of the street for Tweety and he's seen the dog coming so he takes a shovel to hit the dog but actually the dog is so strong that the shape of the face of the dog is uh gets printed into the - the shovel takes the f- the shape so he runs away and disguises himself into a tree and whistles into a - blows whistles in the shape of a bird to make Tweety come Tweety uh who was uh with that woman again just quietly resting comes onto the branch but the big dog comes and Sylvester throws water at him so the dog realises it's actually not a tree and starts to run after him and Tweety is saved once again and that's the end of the story.

Participant 3 - Dutch

Dus uhm het is het verhaal van uh Tweety en Sylvester en Tweety en uh in het begin uhm neemt Tweety een bad in een uh ja in een park en uh Sylvester is verborgen na een krant uhm maar hij komt dichterbij Tweety en hij - en Tweety gebruikt een tong uh om zich te af te drongen uhm maar hij opmerkt niet dat uh 't Sylvester is maar uhm toen hij dus uh uh het op merkt uh begin hij te

lopen en hij gaat hulp vragen bij een vrouw die uhm / die helpt hij en - helpt hem en uh schreeuwt op uh Sylvester dus uhm daarna uh leest zij een boek rustig in 't park uh en uh ze heeft een baby naast haar en Sylvester - Sylvester komt en uhm steelt de baby en uh hij verkleed zich zoals de baby en begint te schreeuwen en te wenen om aandacht te krijgen en de vrouw geeft hem Tweety om te spelen- om mee te spelen en dus hij is blij hij- z'n plan werkt en hij eet uh Tweety maar de vrouw is uh uh is-uh bo- is boos want uh de baby kan niet uh z'n spul z'n z'n dingen eten dus ze schreeuwt- schreeuwt nog eens op Sylvester uhm dus Tweety eh is nog eens vrij en hij vliegt uh op een boom- op een boom uh en Sylvester heeft hem gezien dus hij uh wacht op hem on- uh onder de boom maar Tweety vlieg op z'n kop dus hij wacht op niks eigenlijk en - en toen hij opmerkte dat Tweety op z'n kop is uhm wilt hij zich slagen maar 't werkt niet uhm daarna uh ja daarna uhm loopt Tweety naast een hond om beschermd te hebben en uhm toen hij een beetje verder van de hond komt uh komt Sylvester en uhm ja uhm hij ja hij hij eigenlijk hij loopt tegen de hond en krijgt de dit (hand gesture) rond z'n hals en uhm Tweety opmerkt niet dat het un - dat het Sylvester is en niet de hond meer dus hij walkt- hij hij loopt ernaast en uhm toen hij het opmerkt begin hij verder- uh sneller te lopen en vliegt hij op de venster van een gebouw en uh dan gebruikt Sylvester een chewing gum- chewing gum om- als een luchtballon te ja te vliegen maar Tweety heeft een naald dus hij uh maakt z'n plan kapot en uh Sylvester begint opnieuw met een nieuwe chewing gum te vliegen en uh Tweety geeft hem een zware ijzeren ding dus hij valt opeens en ja en daarna wacht Sylvester uh op Tweety uh na de hoek van een straat maar het is niet Tweety dat komt het is de hond en uh dus hij begint te lopen en dat is het einde denk ik oké.

Participant 4 - English

So I read some story about Tweety and Sylvester uhm but you know like the bird and Sylvester's the cat uhm and it started with Tweety washing himself in a fountain uh he was just bathing and

uhm Sylvester was hiding behind a newspaper uh sitting on a b-park bench and he was just moving closer and closer and Tweety didn't notice uhm until Sylvester tried to grab him he tried to eat him but Tweety accidentally grabbed his tongue to use as a towel and then he noticed uh that something was off and he saw uh that Sylvester was trying to eat him so he ran away uh and then uh a chase followed so they chased each other around a fountain but uh Sylvester couldn't grab Tweety he kept escaping uh after that Tweety ran to a woman sitting in the park uhm and he told her uh something like the cat is trying to grab me and the w- the woman got really mad at Sylvester and she yelled at him and told him he should be ashamed of himself to- to chase after a helpless little creature and he was very bad cat and uhm and then uhm yeah Sylvester went away again but the woman was with a little baby a toddler uh on a baby bike uhm and the woman was reading a book and she was very uhm uh distracted by the story so she didn't pay attention and Sylvester grabbed uh the- the little baby and disguised himself as the baby uh and the woman didn't notice so he asked can the baby have the pretty birdie the woman said okay fine I think it was the mother or the babysitter uhm so she gave Tweety to Sylvester but when Sylvester tried to eat Tweety uh the woman got mad because she told the baby many times that she didn't put things in her mouth so uhm she spanked him and then Tweety spanked him some more with a piece of wood so he lost again and then Tweety went to sit on Sylvester head while Sylvester build some kind of a trap out of a stick and- and a box that was supposed to fall on Tweety but Tweety saw everything because he was sitting on his head and then he made like a snarky little comment about what are you doing I think the bird will never fall for that or will definitely fall for that I don't remember but uh and Sylvester was like yeah he will totally fall for that and then wait who said that and then he realised Tweety was on his head so he grabbed a big stick and he hit himself on his head but of course he didn't get Tweety but he got his own head so got a huge bump on his head and then uhm there was a part with a dog there was a big bulldog walking in the park and dogs don't really care about birds but cats're scared about dogs so uhm so Tweety uh stayed nearby the dog and he walked with him for a while uhm and Sylvester

was really scared so he was scared to go near him then then Sylvester bumped into the dog I think and the dog I don't know I don't remember exactly but he got in the place of where the dog was walking but Tweety was walking with his eyes closed feeling really proud of himself so he didn't notice that Sylvester was walking next to him and then uhm he saw and he got really scared and uh then they chased each other again uh and when they uh ran past a building Tweety decided to fly so he flew up and sat in- in a window I think uhm and Sylvester of course can't fly so he grabbed a piece of gum and he blew like a big bubble uh so he could also uhm like float into the air and uh as soon as he uh was high enough to reach Tweety Tweety grabbed a needle and popped the bubble so he fell down then he tried again with another piece of gum uh and Tweety gave him like a big uh stone anvil uh so he was really heavy so he uh sank down again and uh then he dropped the anvil and tried again but Tweety had a little catapult and and I don't know used a stone or something to pop the bubble again and then he- he fell for a third time then he tried to oh no Tweety uh put a pillow underneath uh where Sylvester would fall but he hid the same anvil he used inside uh the pillow so Sylvester fell really hard and Sylvester got mad so he tried to hit uhm hit Tweety with a shovel or something but he accidentally hit the dog who was sort of- reappeared again uhm and then Sylvester disguised as a tree uhm with a little birds nest in it and he used a whistle to imitate bird noises to lure Tweety towards the little birds nest and Tweety fell for it so he was sitting inside the nest but uhm then the dog reappeared and Sylvester tried to uhm get the dog to leave by using a water gun on him I think and the dog got really angry so he attacked the tree uhm and Tweety flew away and Sylvester was- ran a- like he ran away getting chased by the dog again and that was kind of the end of it and then Tweety said- uhm grabbed a phone and he called the pet-pet shop and he said can I have a new uh cat because mine flew or something so I think the moral of the story is that he liked the chase and wanted another cat to chase him now I think that's about it

Participant 4 - Dutch

Okay uh nou 't verhaaltje gaat dus over Tweety en Sylvester en op een gegeven moment zat Tweety in een uh soort uh vogel fonteintje een bad aan 't nemen is en hij is zichzelf aan 't wassen is een hij toch ja denk 't wel hij is zichzelf aan 't wassen en uh Sylvester zit zeg maar verscholen achter een krant uh en hij komt steeds een beetje dichterbij en uiteindelijk wil die Tweety gaan pakken wil die hem opeten maar Tweety let niet op en dan pakt ie de tong van Sylvester als handdoek en dan daarom merkt ie dus dat uh Sylvester daar zit uh en dan schrikt die en dan begint er een soort uh ja noem 't achtervolging, uh rennen ze rondjes om een soort fontein ook denk ik uhm ja maar hij krijgt hem steeds net niet te pakken, dan rent Tweety naar een vrouw die in 't park zit uhm en die zit een boek te lezen uh met een kindje naast zich uh en hij rent naar die vrouw toe en gaat zich achter die vrouw verschuilen en hij zegt van oh ja hij probeert me te pakken uh en die vrouw die wordt dus heel boos op Sylvester van en zegt dan van ja hoe kun je zo tegen zo'n klein onschuldig diertje en slaat hem met haar paraplu uhm maar Sylvester die geeft steeds niet op en die ziet dat kindje is denk ik 't dochtertje of ja of misschien een oppaskindje van die vrouw maar in ieder geval is 't kindje wat bij die vrouw hoort uhm en dan uhm v- trekt ie dat kindje weg, dat kindje zit op een fietsje en uh vermomt ie zich als 't kindje en komt op 't fietsje aanrijden en dan zegt ie tegen die vrouw ja ik wil 't mooie vogeltje en die vrouw zegt dan tegen 't kindje oké hier heb je 't mooie vogeltje dus dan heeft Sylvester Tweety maar dan stopt ie hem in z'n mond en dan wordt die moeder of oppas maar ik denk moeder wordt uh boos want dat-ze heeft al zo vaak tegen d'r kind gezegd dat ze moet ophouden met dingen in de mond te stoppen en uh dus dan mislukt 't eigenlijk weer uh dan ja de volgorde maakt niet zoveel uit ik denk dat dan 't stukje kwam dat uh Tweety op Sylvester's hoofd gaat zitten en uhm daardoor heeft uh hij niet door dat Tweety d'r is en dan zit ie hem te zoeken maar dan kan die hem niet zien uh en dan maakt ie een of andere val, zet die in elkaar, van een stok en een doos zodat ie d'r onderkomt enzo maar Tweety ziet dus alles gebeuren want hij zit d'r

bovenop uh en dan maakt Tweety een of andere sarcastische opmerking van kan je 't allemaal zien want ik kan 't wel zien van hierboven ofzo zoiets uhm en dan slaat Sylvester zichzelf heel hard op z'n hoofd met een stok in de hoop Tweety te slaan maar dat mislukt en dan slaat ie zichzelf uh dan komt er een stukje met een hond een soort grote bulldog komt er aanlopen en Tweety blijft daar in de buurt want Sylvester is een kat dus die is bang voor honden en honden boeit 't niet zo veel als er een vogel is zeg maar maar dan blijft ie er de hele tijd langs lopen en dan wordt ie een beetje trots en doet ie z'n ogen dicht van ik loop hier en heeft ie niet door dat de hond de ander kant op is gelopen en dat Sylvester nu naast hem loopt dus dan wordt ie weer bijna gepakt maar uiteindelijk niet uh dan ohja omdat ie omhoog vliegt uit eindelijk en dat kan Sylvester natuurlijk niet en gaat ie ergens heel hoog in een raamkozijn zitten en dan uh pakt Sylvester kauwgom en blaast ie een grote kauwgumbal en dan vliegt ie ook zo omhoog u hm maar Tweety heeft een naaldje bij zich gelukkig dus dan popt ie zo de of hoe noem je dat, ja pop, ja die bel kapot zodat ie weer naar beneden vlieg gelukkig heeft ie nog een stukje kauwgom dus dan maakt ie weer een bel en dan uhm heeft Tweety een of ander aambeeld bij zich wat heel zwaar is en dat geeft ie dan zo aan Sylvester dus die zakt dan weer gewoon naar beneden tuurlijk uh en dan uiteindelijk gaat ie nog een keer omhoog maar dan schiet Tweety hem weer met een katapultje en dan zegt ie oh ik vang je wel op en dan legt ie een kussen neer maar dan in dat kussen zit dat aambeeld weer verstopt dus dan uiteindelijk valt Sylvester nog heel hard uhm dan probeert Sylvester Tweety te slaan met een schep maar hij slaat per ongeluk die hond die opeens weer voorbij loopt uhm dus dan wordt ie door hem achter na gezeten en dan was 'r volgens mij nog een dingetje hmm nee 'k weet 't niet meer denk ik er was nog een laatste event zeg maar ja uhm nouja die weet ik dan niet meer en dan uiteindelijk dan uhm misschien was dat 't ook wel 'kweet niet maar dan uiteindelijk dan uh is Sylvester weg misschien wordt die wel achterna gezeten door die hond ofzo ik weet niet meer en dan uh dan belt Tweety de pet shop dat ie een andere kat wil dus dat ie 't eigenlijk wel leuk vond, volgens mij ik

kon 't niet zo heel goed verstaan maar volgens mij is dat waar die over praat dus dat is een beetje de conclusie van 't verhaal ja ik hoop niet dat ik nou iets vergeten ben maar ja weet niet oké.

Participant 5 - English

Okay uhm so I think you know Tweety and Sylvester like the bird and the cat okay so I watched a video of those uhm two and uhm what happened was that Tweety was at was taking a bath in like a bird bath in the park and uhm Sylvester tried to eat him and with his mouth open uhm Tweety grabbed his tongue, tried to use it as a towel and then found at that it was actually a cat attached to the tongue and uhm then I think Tweety flew away to a woman with a baby and the woman uhm helped Tweety get rid of Sylvester and uh then Sylvester uhm I think stole the baby's clothes with the baby actually in them I don't know wh- where the baby went but uhm put on the baby's clothes and pretended to be the baby and then the- a- claiming that he wanted uh Tweety and then the woman gave Tweety to Sylvester and uh he put the bird in his mouth and the woman found out that uh the cat wasn't actually her baby and hit him and I think Tweety hit him as well uhm then uhm Tweety sat on top of Sylvester's head and he laid a trap uhm and Tweety kept talking to him and he eventually found out that the bird was on his head and uh hit himself in the face then oh there was a really weird dog and uhm I think Sylvester pretended to be the dog so he could be near Tweety uh the bird found out and flew on top of a high building and Sylvester had some chewing gum and blew a bubble so he could rise to the top of the building to catch Tweety uhm but uh Tweety pricked the bubble with a needle and he fell down but he had another piece of chewing gum blew another bubble and then Tweety had an anvil you know like a really big heavy thing and uh Sylvester crashed again but uh Tweety laid I think a pillow for him and uh below that pillow was another anvil uh and then Sylvester thought Tweety was coming around the corner so he grabbed the shovel and then hit Tweety but it was actually the dog and was chased away by the dog and uhm Tweety

called the pet store to ask if they have any more cats because he's fresh out of cats, that's what happened, okay.

Participant 5 - Dutch

Okay nou ik heb naar een filmpje gekeken van Tweety en Sylvester en moet jou gaan vertellen wat daarin is gebeurd uh 't begon met Tweety die aan 't badden was in zo'n vogelbadje

Ja 't vogeltje ja en uh nou Sylvester wil die - wil 't vogeltje tuurlijk pakken en uh doet z'n mond open en Tweety pakt dan zijn tong denkt dat 't een handdoek is en uh ja probeert die kat natuurlijk 't vogeltje op te eten en Tweety vlucht dan naar een vrouw met een baby en die vrouw die redt Tweety van Sylvester en uh slaat Sylvester met een paraplu of parasol iets dergelijks en Tweety slaat uh slaat hem dan met een stok of een plank en uh Sylvester steelt dan die baby en pakt die babykieren doet alsof ie die baby is om dan zo dat vogeltje dan van die vrouw te krijgen en uh oh ja zij geeft dus wel dat vogeltje geeft ze aan hem en uh dan doet hij 't in z'n mond en dan slaat ze hem weer. Tweety vliegt dan weg op een flat en, oh nee, ja en dan doet ie ja vliegt ie weer op een flat en dan heeft Sylvester uh kauwgum in een bel - of blaast ie zo'n bel van waardoor die opstijgt en als ie dan boven is geeft Tweety hem zo'n aambeeld zo'n - weet je wat dat is zo'n groot zwaar ding en dan valt ie naar beneden en dan uh heeft ie nog een stuk kauwgum en gaat ie weer omhoog en dan uh legt Tweety een kussen voor hem neer voor als die weer valt en dan ligt onder 't kussen een aambeeld uh en zijn ze weer in 't park en dan uh verkleed Sylvester zich als een boom met een vogelnestje erop en Tweety gaat er dan in zitten en die hond die wil plassen tegen die boom uh maar komt er dan achter dat 't een kat is en ja jaagt Sylvester weg en dan is Tweety zegt iets van uh belt - volgens mij belt Tweety dan op van uh hebben jullie nog een kat want uh ik heb er geen meer. Dat is 't.

7.2 Translated transcripts

Dutch transcripts translated to English

Participant 1

Okay so. I had to watch a film of Sylvester and Tweety, I think you know that. And it started with Tweety who sat in a fountain and who was taking a bath and Sylvester he came to him he wanted to eat him as usual and uhm Tweety thought that Sylvester tongue was a towel so he went to dry himself off with that. But then he found out that uh that it was Sylvester then they went to chase each other in the park. That was all in the park and there was a woman sat on a bench and she saw what happened so that woman she intervened and she hit Sylvester with an umbrella and then Tweety could escape then Tweety later went to sit with that woman reading when Sylvester arrived back again who pretended like he was a child which next to the woman, next to the bench sat a child on such a walk bike uhm and then he acted like he was that baby and then he started crying and asked he for Tweety for the little bird and then got he the bird from that woman but then tried he to eat him and then the woman hit him like yes I have told you that you can not put things in your mouth so then ended again another scene then they went to the next scene in which Sylvester sets a trap, such a traditional trap with such a stick under which you can put things and there then sat Tweety on Sylvester head and Sylvester was talking to himself and Tweety said yes you get uh uhm yes like this you will catch the bird really yes yes exactly then he found out wait he sits on my head that is not my own voice so then he hit himself with a stick so then Tweety could escape again and then after that uh think for a lit oh yes then walked Tweety next to a very big bulldog in the park and you had a scary music with it and then they walked together so Sylvester could not do anything because yes then the bulldog attacks him so then he kept on walking with them (say it like that) or he stayed on a distance so then afterwards you see in one go in a next scene that Sylvester instead of that bulldog walked there so then Tweety had not realised because he thought that he w still was walking next to that dog so ha it is kind of a long story so uhm then came e he went to

chase behind him again went again to chase each other then they ended up in the uh in the city there Tweety had he flew up on a flat building and he went to sit on a window and Sylvester he had gum with him so he blew a bubblegumbubble and he flew up as well but then Tweety poked that bubblegumbubble through so then he fell back down again then he blew again a bubblegumbubble up and then he came back up again and then he gave uh Tweety gave an anvil to Sylvester so yes then you fall back down and then after that he came back up again when he let drop that anvil and after that he let him for one last time fall back down again and then Tweety put a pillow ready for him with that anvil in it so then he fell on that pillow and that obviously hurt so then he escaped again and then after that came uh that bulldog was again in the city and then Sylvester stood around the corner ready to hit with a shovel Tweety but that-then he hit that bulldog so then that bulldog was chased and then you got the last scene in the park where uhm Sylvester pretend like he was a tree and he had the nest on his arm and he made bird noises I think yes and then arrived that bulldog because he wanted that tree to smell and then Sylvester sprayed with water and then that bulldog ran after Sylvester and then Tweety called to the pet shop like he have you anymore cats because I don't have any anymore and that was it long story sorry but that was it.

Participant 2

Well uhm there was a little bird and he was called Tweety and he was washing himself in a fountain and he was just singing and there was a cat and he was called Sylvester and he sat on a bench by the fountain hidden behind a newspaper and he came a little bit closer every time and every time a bit closer on the bench and at a given moment he went to the fountain and he opened his mouth to (eat) the bird- to eat Tweety and uhm Tweety he uh he uhm wanted just at that time grab a towel so he grabbed the tongue of uh Sylvester and he dried himself with that and then he noticed all the sudden like oh that is uh that is not a towel so well then he ran away and uh Sylvester after him and uh after a while Tweety saw a grandma sitting on a bench so uh he ran towards it and uh asked for help like

he yes there is a cat chasing me uh help and uh then Sylvester came running then that grandma hit with an umbrella on his head and uh well then he cleared off again and uh then Tweety sat- sat there with that grandma on that bench and grandma had a child- a baby with her on a tricycle so then Sylvester had come up with something new he thought then I dress up as that baby so then he took that baby with him on that tricycle and dressed himself up as that baby and came back again and started to nag about I want to play with the little bird over there I want the little bird so well then uh said that grandma okay here you may play with the bird well then he put him in his mouth but that saw that grandma so she gave him a spanking said how many times haven't I told you that you cannot put stuff in your mouth and uh yes Tweety he grabbed such a baseball bat and he hit of course as well yes yes how many times uh haven't I told you uh you cant put stuff in your mouth uh well then he cleared off again and uh then he thought well then I have to again think of something else to uh to get to catch so then uh then uh came Tweety he sat he sat in a tree he went to sit on the head of Sylvester and in the mean time Sylvester went to set- he set a trap to uh catch to get Tweety and uh so he is just waiting but Tweety sat of course on his head and uh he was talking to him yes you are smart and uh yes this is how you get him and uh then he had at a certain moment realised that he was on his head and then he grabbed also a base-the baseball bat and uh then he hit on his head but was of course on his own head it wasn't- it missed of course so uh he hit himself knock out and Tweety went away again of course well and uh Sylvester after him again and uh then uh Tweety saw a big dog so uh there he hid himself with because Sylvester was of course scared for the dog and then uh well he walked a small distance along with that dog who was on a leash and then Sylvester came running really hard and uh he kicked so hard against the dog that the dog flew out of the leash that Sylvester was in it himself, in the leash so to say and uh so he walked along very quietly as to- in the hope he- that Tweety wouldn't realise so that he could eat him again well just as he wanted to grab him then uh Tweety noticed oh that is-that is Sylvester so he ran away again and uhm well Sylvester after him and then uhm he had almost caught him and then he hit him so hard

that he-that Tweety a very tall building flew up so he sat as to say very high on a windowsill uh in a on a yes at a building and uh well then Sylvester thought yes how am I going to get him now so then thought oh I still have a piece of gum so he started to chew gum and then he blew a very big bubble and so he went-so he flew up and then he arrived up there and uh then Tweety popped with a needle puffed uh the the ball the ballot as to say broken and uh well then he fell of course back down again so he began again to blow a bubble and well then he went up again when-when he was almost there then Tweety gave- put a big uh brick in his ha- his arms and so he sank down back down again and uh well the third times then he went basically so hard up that hie flew way to high so he flew completely past and uh then Tweety grabbed a catapult and shot him like that out of the sky as to say and uh but he wanted him uhm uhm then he flew himself also down off the building and he had grabbed a pillow so that Sylvester wouldn't come down to hard so uh Sylvester he thudded on the pillow but uh then came so such an uh then it turned out that he had a brick put in so then it was not a very hard uh very soft landing and uh then uh well so again after each other of course so uh and the next the next thing uh Sylvester tried was to uh to hide himself in a tree so uh he did himself- he dressed himself up as a tree so to speak and tried to lure Tweety in the birds nest with uh with some whistling and all so Tweety came in/to the birds nest and uh yes then he tried to catch him and then at that moment came the big dog again and he sniffed around the tree and then he smelled all the sudden that it was it was the cat so uh well the dog of course again after uh after Sylvester and uh Tweety he uhm he flew away again so he got away again and uh then he called the uh he called the animal shelter and said something like have you got anymore uh cats? I am uh I am looking for a cat well that was the end of the story so he escaped.

Participant 3

So uhm this is the story of uhm Tweety and Sylvester and Tweety and uh in the beginning uhm Tweety takes a bath in a uh yes in a park and uh Sylvester is hidden behind a newspaper uhm but he

comes closer Tweety and he and Tweety uses a tong uh to dry himself off uh but he doesn't realise that uh it is Sylvester but uhm then he so uh uh he realises uh starts to walk and he goes to ask of help with a woman who uhm she helps he en helps him and uh yells at Sylvester so after that uh she reads a book quietly in the park uh and uh eh has a baby next to her and Sylvester-Sylvester comes and steals the baby and uh he dress up like the baby and starts to scream and to cry to get attention and the woman gives him Tweety to play with- to play with and so he is happy he-his plan works and he eat uh Tweety but the woman is uh uh is uh angry because uh the baby can not eat his stuff his things so she yells yells again at Sylvester uh so Tweety eh is yet again free and he flies uh on a tree on a tree uh and Sylvester has seen him so he waits for him be- uh below the tree but Tweety flies on his head so he waits for nothing basically and- and the he realises that Tweety is on his head uhm he wants to hit himself but is doesn't work uh after that uh yes after that uhm Tweety walks next to a dog to have protection and uhm when he comes a bit further from the dog uh Sylvester comes and uh yes uh he yes he he basically he walks against the dog and gets the this (hand gesture) round his neck and uhm Tweety realises not that it uh dat it is Sylvester and not the dog anymore so he walks he he walks next to it and uhm then he realises it he starts further-uh walks faster and he flies on a windowsill of a building and uh then Sylvester uses a chewing gum-chewing gum to-as a hot air balloon to yes to fly but Tweety has a needle so he uhm makes the plan broken and uh Sylvester starts again with a new chewing gum to fly and uh Tweety gives him a heavy iron thing so he falls again all the sudden and yes and after that waits Sylvester uh on Tweety uh after the corner of a street but it isn't Tweety that comes it is the dog and so he begins to walk and that is the end I think okay.

Participant 4

Okay uh well the little story is about Tweety and Sylvester and at a certain moment Tweety sat in a uh sort of uh bird fountain is taking a bath and he is washing himself is a he right yes I think so he is washing himself and uh Sylvester is as to say hidden behind a newspaper uh he keeps coming a bit closer and eventually wants he wants to grab Tweety he wants to eat him but Tweety doesn't pay attention and then he grabs the tongue of Sylvester as towel and then because of that he realises that uh Sylvester is sitting there uh and then he got scared and then begins a sort of uh yes call it a chase, they run circles around a sort of fountain as well I think uhm yes but he gets him still just not then Tweety runs to a woman who sits in the park uhm and she sits reading a book uh with a child next to her uh and he runs to that woman and goes to hide behind that woman and he says oh yes he tries to get me uh and that woman she gets really angry at Sylvester like and says then like yes how can you like this against such a small innocent little animal and hits him with her umbrella uhm but Sylvester he still does not give up and he sees that child it's I think the daughter of yes or maybe (the child she looks after) of that woman but in any case it is the child which to that woman belongs uhm and then uhm v-he pulls the child away that child sits on a little bike and uh disguises himself as the child and on the bike drives up and then he says against that woman yes I want the pretty little bird and that woman says then to the child okay here you have the pretty little bird so then Sylvester has Tweety but then he puts him in his mouth and then that mother or babysitter gets mad but I think mother gets uh mad because that -she has said so many times to her child that she has to stop with putting things in her mouth and uh so then it fails basically again uh then yes the order doesn't matter that much I think that then the bit came that uh Tweety goes to sit on Sylvester head and uhm because of that he doesn't realise that Tweety is there and then he is looking for him but then he cannot see him uh and then uh and then he makes some sort of trap, het puts that together, from a stick and a box so that he comes underneath it and so on but Tweety sees all this happening because he sits on top of it uh and then Tweety makes some sort of sarcastic remark like can you see

everything because I can see everything from up here or something like that uh and then Sylvester hits himself very hard on his head with a stick in the hope to hit Tweety but that fails and then he hits himself uh then there is a bit with a dog a sort of big bulldog comes walking and Tweety stays in the neighbourhood because Sylvester is a cat so he is scared for dogs and dogs don't care as much when there is a bird so to say but then he stays the whole time walking next to and then he becomes a bit prideful and he closes his eyes like i'm walking here and he doesn't realise that the dog the other way went and that Sylvester now walks next to him so then he gets almost caught again but eventually just not uhm then oh yes because he flies up eventually and that Sylvester can't do of course and he goes somewhere very high in a windowsill to sit and then uh Sylvester gets gum and he blows a very big gum bubble and then he flies as well up uhm but Tweety has a needle with him fortunately so then he pops the or how do you call that yes pops yes that bubble broken so that he flies back down again fortunately he has another piece of gum so then he makes another bubble and then uhm Tweety has some sort of anvil with him which is very heavy and that he gives then to Sylvester so he just sinks back down again of course uh and then eventually he goes again one time up but then Tweety shoots him again with a little catapult and then he says oh I will catch you and then he puts a pillow down but then in that pillow sits that anvil again hidden so then eventually Sylvester falls still very hard uhm then Sylvester tries to hit Tweety with a shovel but he hits by accident the dog who suddenly again walks past uhm so then he gets by him chased and then was there according to me another thing hmm no I don't know it anymore I think there was another final event so to say yes uhm well that I don't know then anymore and then eventually then uhm maybe that was it as well don't know but then eventually then uh Sylvester is gone maybe he is being chased by that dog or something I don't know anymore and then uh then Tweety calls the pet shop that he wants another so that he actually liked it, according to me I couldn't really understand it well but according to me that is what he talks about so that is kind of the conclusion of the story yes I hope I didn't forget anything but yes don't know okay

Participant 5

Okay well I have watched a little film of Tweety and Sylvester and have to tell you what happened in it uh it started with Tweety who was bathing in such a birdbath yes the little bird and uh well Sylvester wants to- wants the bird of course to catch and uh opens his mouth and Tweety grabs then his tongue thinks that it is a towel and uh yes that cat tries of course to eat the little bird and Tweety escapes then to a woman with a baby and that woman she saves Tweety from Sylvester and uh hits Sylvester with an umbrella or parasol something like that and Tweety hits uh hits him then with a stick or plank and uh Sylvester steals then that baby and grabs those baby clothes pretends to be that baby to then that bird get from that woman and uh oh yes she gives surely that bird she gives it to him and uh then he puts it in his mouth and then she hits him again. Tweety flies away then on a flat and oh no yes and then he does yes he flies again on a flat and then Sylvester has uh gum in a bubble or he blows such a bubble through which he rises and when he gets up there Tweety gives him such an anvil such a - you know what that is such a big heavy thing and then he falls back down and then uh he has another piece of gum and he goes again up and then uh Tweety puts a pillow down for him for when he again falls and then lies underneath the pillow an anvil and they are again in the park and then uh Sylvester dresses himself up as a tree with a birds nest on it and Tweety goes to then sit in it and that dog he wants to pee against that tree uh but finds out that it is a cat and yes chases Sylvester away and then Tweety says something like uh calls I think Tweety calls up like have you got a cat because I don't have any anymore that is it.