



LUND
UNIVERSITY

**“I love using the gerund!”: An Empirical Study on the Complementation of
Emotive Verbs in English**

Ann Hermansson

Autumn 2019

Supervisor: Eva Klingvall

Centre for Languages and Literature

Lund University

Abstract

This essay concerns the complementation of the English emotive verbs *like*, *love*, *hate* and *prefer*. In English, gerund-participial and infinitival complements often receive semi-synonymous semantic interpretations when complementing emotive verbs. All the while, both complement types supposedly convey separate semantic interpretations, resulting in that they commonly appear in contexts expressing habit and hypotheticality, respectively. The reality of these two, somewhat contradictory, claims was investigated through a speaker-judgement task (completed by 64 native speakers of English), with 30 test items distributed across two lists. Additionally, this essay features a short translation task (Swedish to English, completed by 35 Swedish advanced learners of English). The data from the speaker-judgement task was analysed with the help of *t*-testing, with the purpose to see if a specific complement type was more (un)accepted in one context (hypothetical/non-factual and habitual/factual) than another, or in general. The results could unfortunately not be statistically supported due to the study being too small. However, the results of the items appearing in a context expressing habit showed a marginal statistical significance in favour of gerund-participial complementation. Furthermore, there was a clear preference of one complement type in some specific instances. Nonetheless, the results showed that there in general was no explicit preference for either complement type in either context, or in general. The results from the translation task showed that 42.9% of the participants produced translations featuring only infinitival complements, while 45.7% produced an infinitival construction in a hypothetical context and a gerundial construction in a habitual context, respectively.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Background	3
2.1 The Catenative Construction and Non-Finite Complements	3
2.2 The Semantics of Gerund and Infinitival Complements.....	5
2.3 The Gerund-Participle – English vs. Swedish	7
2.4 A Note on Second-Language Acquisition – with a Swedish Perspective.....	9
3. Materials and Methods	11
3.1 The Speaker-Judgement Task	11
3.2 The Translation Task	12
4. Results and Discussion.....	13
4.1 Results from the Speaker.-Judgement Task.....	14
4.1.1 Hypothetical/Non-Factual Context.....	14
4.1.2 Habitual/Factual Context.....	16
4.1.3 Vague Context	18
4.1.4 General Discussion of the Speaker-Judgement Task	19
4.2 The Translation Exercise – Results and Discussion	21
5. Conclusion.....	23
References	25
Appendix 1 – Speaker-Judgement task items	27
Appendix 2 – Translation task: participant questionnaire and answers	31

1. Introduction

In big grammar guides of English, one topic that commonly receives extensive outlining is that of the English verb phrase. There is often much variation within different verb phrases, as it is possible for different verbs to take a variety of complements. Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad and Finegan (1999) account for the different clausal verbal complement types in English and their respective usage and distribution, based on corpus data. Aligning with other grammarians (see Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech & Svartvik (1985) and Huddleston & Pullum (2002)), they explain that some predicate verbs are restricted regarding what complements they take, while others accept several different complement forms. However, the complements are not completely interchangeable; the chosen complement is said to trigger a specific semantic reading. Which complement is preferred is determined by the context the utterance appears in. Taking the infinitival and gerund-participial complements (referred to as simply *to*-clauses and *ing*-clauses by Biber et al.) as examples, the former will convey a more uncertain or hypothetical meaning, whereas the latter indicate a more factual or non-hypothetical one. Yet, English emotive verbs like *love*, *hate*, *like*, and *prefer* can take either an infinitival construction or a gerund-participle as complement with, sometimes, little significant difference in meaning. Consider the following representative examples of this phenomenon:

- (1) I love eating!
- (2) I love to eat!

Both (1) and (2) could be argued to receive the same semantic reading, namely that the speaker enjoys the activity of eating, despite their deviating syntactic features. Huddleston & Pullum use the verb *like* to explain the semantic difference between complements of some emotive verbs, but make evident that the difference in meaning is vague, at best. However, they still argue that one is more appropriate than the other in a certain context (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002, p. 1242). Thus, one could wonder if a native speaker would for example depreciate a gerundial construction when it is complemented to an emotive verb in a hypothetical scenario. According to the Bolinger Principle, different syntactic constructions should entail different semantic meanings (Bolinger, 1968, qtd. in Rudanko, 2017, p.3). If this is true, there should be at least somewhat of a semantic difference between non-finite complements to emotive verbs in English. Furthermore, that semantic difference should be the reason for one complement type being more acceptable in one context than the other. Whether there is a preference for one

specific non-finite complement in an explicit context is something this study seeks to investigate.

English and Swedish, two Germanic languages, share a significant number of syntactic features. However, there are certain instances where they differ – one specific instance being that there exists no gerund participial verb form in Swedish. In English, gerund participles occur as, for example, non-finite complements to certain verbs. Non-finite complements can additionally appear in the form of an infinitive clause, as is the case in Swedish. Sentence (3) is an example of an English verb that takes a gerund complement, where the Swedish translation equivalent contrastively contains a complement in the infinitive:

(3) I enjoy going to the cinema. [Sw: Jag tycker om att gå på bio]

Inappropriately using an infinitive construction instead of a gerund is one of several frequent mistakes that a Swedish learner of English may make, according to Davidsen-Nielsen and Harder (2001, p. 31).

The aim of this essay is to make an empirical investigation on the topic of complementation of emotive verbs in English that take either an infinitival or gerund-participial complement. If the grammarians are correct, there should not be any clear difference between gerundial and infinitival complements regardless of context; if the Bolinger Principle is correct, there consequently should be a difference. Furthermore, if Davidsen-Nielsen and Harder (2001) are correct, Swedish speakers of English should show a tendency of producing infinitival constructions rather than gerundial. The research questions this essay seeks to answer are:

- What are native speakers' preferences regarding gerund-participial or infinitival complements of emotive verbs; to what extent is one complement type preferred in either a hypothetical, habitual or 'vague' context, when appearing as complement to an emotive verb?
- How do Swedish learners of English translate Swedish constructions containing a non-finite complement of emotive verbs appearing in hypothetical or habitual contexts?

These questions will be investigated through a speaker-judgement task and a translation task, respectively. The rest of this essay will be structured as follows. First, I will present and discuss the catenative construction in English, with a focus on the syntactic and semantic aspects of non-finite complements in catenative constructions. I will, additionally, provide a brief

overview on language acquisition with a Swedish perspective. Then, I will present the experiments, participants and method of analysis. Finally, I will present and discuss the results of both experiments and conclude my findings in a concluding section.

2. Background

2.1 The Catenative Construction and Non-Finite Complements

There are several important distinctions to be made on the differences between certain types of verbs. It would be convenient to simply label verbs as either auxiliaries or main verbs, but in reality, the categorisation of verbs is not quite as easy as that. ‘Catenative’ verbs are verbs that in their semantic and syntactic nature are not typically auxiliaries nor main verbs. Instead, they are viewed as intermediate between auxiliaries and main verbs. Although there is some consensus as to how to classify catenatives, there are also vastly deviating views on the topic among scholars. In this section, I will bring up some of these views; I will discuss Quirk et al. (1985) and their theory on the catenative construction and contrast it to the viewpoint of other scholars – particularly Huddleston and Pullum (2002).

Quirk et al. (1985) use formal criteria to distinguish between pure auxiliary verbs and main verbs. For example, auxiliaries put no restriction on the clausal subject and are operators in negating and interrogative clauses. Consider these representative examples with the modal auxiliary *could*:

- (4) His net worth *could* increase by 5 per cent.
- (5) He *could* not go to work.
- (6) *Could* my mother go to work?

The name ‘catenative’ derives from an ability to string verbs together in a chain-like construction – i.e. the catenative verbs’ ability to catenate. Their semantic qualities are similar to those of auxiliaries, as they often express modality or aspect. Additionally, they do not put any restrictions on the clausal subject; but, like main verbs, they require do-support in negating or interrogative clauses (Quirk et al., 1985, p. 147):

- (7) John did not *appear* to attack the burglar (Quirk et al., 1985, p. 146)

(8) **Appeared* his net worth to increase by 5 per cent?¹

Huddleston and Pullum (2002) and Mindt (2002) partly oppose Quirk et al.'s view on concatenation; Huddleston and Pullum explain the catenative construction as not only confined to be a propensity among a limited set of verbs: "The term 'catenative' is applied to the non-finite complement, and also to the verb that licenses it [...] and the construction containing the verb + its complement" (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002, p. 65). By that analysis, a catenative construction is simply a construction containing a verb that takes a non-finite complement (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002, p. 1177). Quirk et al. contrastively make a point of the ability of concatenation not being "confined to catenative verbs, but [also a] characteristic of semi-auxiliaries and main verbs followed by nonfinite complements as objects" (Quirk et al., 1985, p. 147). In other words, concatenation is possible with main verbs and their non-finite complements, but that does not make them 'catenative' by classification. Mindt, however, aligns with Huddleston and Pullum and classifies catenative constructions as finite, catenative verb phrases rather than main verbs followed by a non-finite object clause (Mindt, 2002, pp. 94-98). The focus of this essay is four emotive verbs, namely *like*, *love*, *hate*, and *prefer*. They are all verbs that can take non-finite complements and could, according to Huddleston and Pullum (2002), thus be regarded catenative. They are all listed by Huddleston and Pullum as verbs that appear in both complex and simple catenative constructions – the complex construction being one with an intervening noun phrase, as in *I'd like him to do it*, while the simple construction is one without an intervening noun phrase, as in *I love to read* (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002, pp. 1229-1231). This essay features only simple catenative constructions.

Biber et al. (1999) give an overview on complementation in English, presenting the four most prominent complement types, which they call "*that*-clauses, *wh*-clauses, *to*-infinitive clauses and *ing*-clauses [references and boldness removed]" (Biber et al., 1999, p. 658). While all four constructions are common complements to predicates like adjectives and verbs, they are not invariably appropriate complements to any predicate. According to Biber et al., verbs like *like*, *hate*, *love* and *prefer* all take infinitival and gerundial constructions, but not declarative clauses (Biber et al., 1999, p. 755). In the introduction to *Infinitives and Gerunds in Recent English*, Rudanko (2017) specifically problematizes the topic of complement-taking predicates, which he calls "CTPs" (Rudanko, 2017, p. 2). He refers to scholars like Noonan (1985), Huddleston and Pullum (2002) and Bolinger (1968), and raises one key problem regarding

¹ The asterisk (*) symbolises that the sentence is ungrammatical.

CTPs, namely that of pairing the predicate (e.g. the main verb) with a complement that matches the semantic relationship sought after. Ergo, there is a semantic interrelationship between complement and complement taker; according to the Bolinger Principle, two distinct syntactic constructions (e.g. two different complements) should trigger distinct semantic interpretations (Rudanko, 2017, pp. 2-3). This phenomenon will be further discussed and elaborated in the next section.

2.2 The Semantics of Gerund and Infinitival Complements

The semantic features of gerund and infinitival complements are usually clear, depending on the verb that controls them. Despite this, there are verbs that can take both complement types with, supposedly, “little appreciable difference” (Quirk et al., 1985, p. 1192). This ability of taking either complement with little semantic difference is mainly observed among verbs of aspect (such as *start*, *stop*, *cease* and *begin*) and emotion (such as *like*, *love*, *hate* and *prefer*) (Biber et al., 1999, p. 758-759). As previously mentioned, they can appear in different patterns; this essay will focus on the verb + non-finite-complement pattern, i.e. the simple catenative construction.

Biber et al. (1999), Huddleston and Pullum (2002) and Quirk et al. (1985) all discuss what meaning non-finite complement types convey when used for verb complementation. Verbs which allow a clear semantic interpretation of their complement are verbs like *try* and *remember*. The first of the following examples denote an interpretation that the speaker remembered the act of closing the window, whereas the second can be semantically interpreted as expressing the speaker’s success in closing the window:

(9) I remembered *closing* the window.

(10) I remembered *to close* the window.

Different complements of the previously mentioned emotive verbs acquire different semantic interpretations as well: “[...] the bias of the infinitive toward ‘potentiality’ tends to favour its use in hypothetical and nonfactual contexts [...] [and] the [gerund] participial construction is favoured where the speaker is referring to something which definitely happens or has happened” (Quirk et al., 1985, p. 1192). This explicit connection between the infinitive construction and hypotheticality is supported by the fact that emotive verbs that take an infinitive complement often are preceded by the modal verb *would* (Biber et al., 1999, p. 758), as in *I would like to go abroad someday*. However, there seem to be cases where the choice

between the two non-finite complements is irrelevant for the semantic interpretation. Huddleston and Pullum somewhat explains this duality:

[T]here are many contexts where [a] [*I like to stay home at weekends*] and [b] [*I like staying home at weekends*] would be equally appropriate, but there are also some favouring one or the other. Suppose you ask me to go bushwalking next week-end but I wish to decline: [a] would here be more appropriate than [b]. Conversely if I am currently enjoying a week-end at home [b] is more appropriate than [a]. (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002, p. 1242)

Additionally, Quirk et al. give the following examples of this phenomenon (one containing the modal *would* with no supposed preference of complement), but do not elaborate on the topic:

- (11) Do you prefer [to cook / cooking] for yourself, or [to eat / eating] in a restaurant? (Quirk et al., 1985, p. 1192)
- (12) Brian *would loathe* [to live / living] in the country. (Quirk et al., 1985, p. 1192)

The examples given by Huddleston and Pullum and Quirk et al. lead to a conclusion that although there could exist a preferred complement due to the given context of the utterance, there are exceptions that contradict the expected pattern. Biber et al., who base their information on corpus-data, make an important observation: infinitive clauses are at least twice as frequent as gerund ones. Moreover, both the infinitival and gerund-participial verbal complements are most common in written language, although the gerund-participle is not particularly frequent at all (Biber et al., 1999, p. 745;749-750). Herbst, Heath, Roe and Götz (2004), who have compiled extensive data on the complementation of predicates in English through a corpus analysis, confirm the complementation tendencies with the verbs of this essay; with all verbs, the infinitival complement is far more frequent. The only verb where there could be less of a difference in complement frequency is *hate*, where both the infinitive and the gerund-participle are marked as ‘very frequent’ and ‘frequent’, respectively (Herbst et al., 2004, p. 377; 493; 508; 606). The frequency data could suppose that the gerund-participle generally is more limited in use, since there seem to be more restrictions placed on when a gerund-participle is appropriate compared to the infinitive.

There are other aspects, other than pure semantic ones, that affect the choice of complement. For example, *hate* has a strong idiomatic sense when complemented with a verb in the infinitive, especially when used in the first-person singular in constructions like *I hate to*

say this, but... (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002, p. 1242). The corpus examples of this in Herbst et al. (2004) are, similarly, ones like *I hate to disappoint you, I hate to do this [...]* and *I hate to say it [...]*. The idiomatic sense, the ‘collocative bond’, of this kind of expression is used for politeness reasons, to soften the reality of what is being said (Herbst et al., 2004, p. 377).

2.3 The Gerund Participle – English vs. Swedish

A major difference between Swedish and English syntax is the lack of the gerund-participle in Swedish. Moreover, the translation equivalents of the emotive verbs in this study all take an infinitival construction as complement in Swedish (Teleman, Hellberg & Andersson, 1999, pp. 573-574), while in English, they can be complemented with either an infinitival or gerundial construction. As this study will partly focus on gerund-participle verbal complements in English and how they are used by advanced Swedish speakers of English, it is first and foremost important to understand what the gerund is, and how it differs from other participial verb forms in English and Swedish.

I will for the sake of simplicity use the traditional definition of gerund-participles, despite there being much discussion on how to classify them properly (see e.g. Huddleston & Pullum (2002)). The gerund-participle, derived through an affixation with the suffix *-ing*, is “verb-like in that [it] can have a direct object as [its] complement and can be modified by an adverb of place, time, etc. but the phrase containing them functions as subject [...] or as object [...]” (Brown & Miller, 2013, p. 279). In other words, the gerund-participle is a verb form that behaves as if it were a noun while remaining verbal in its qualities. It is not equivalent to the present participle, although the two are similar in that their morphological structure is identical. (13) is an example of a sentence with a verb in the gerund form, while (14) is an example of the present participle:

(13) I enjoy *being* outside

(14) I was *running* outside.

Additionally, there is a difference between the gerund and a nominalised verb; the latter can also be constructed through adding the suffix *-ing* to the verb, but syntactically, nominalised verbs are easily recognised as they can both be modified by adjectives and take determiners. The italicised word in (15) is thus an example of a nominalised verb (i.e. a noun derived from a verb) and (16) is an example of a gerundial construction:

(15) His slow *running* annoyed me.

(16) I like *reading*.

The distinction between a nominal verb and a gerund-participial verb is not always clear. Sentence (16) can be seen as “ambiguous between an *-ing*-clause and a noun phrase with a verbal noun in *-ing* as its head” (Quirk et al., 1985, p. 1065), since *reading* functions as the clausal object – a clausal function often occupied by nouns. However, would *reading* be followed by a noun like *books*, the subordinate clause *reading books* would be the clausal object. In that case, it would be easier to determine the verb as gerundial.

Both the present participle verb form and nominalised verbs are common in Swedish; however, as previously stated, there is no gerund verb form in Swedish. The Swedish present participle is constructed through adding the suffixes *-ande* or *-ende*, as in *En hoppande kanin* ‘A jumping rabbit’. The present participle can be used as both attributive and predicative adjectives but is considered to have a verbal interpretation (Teleman et al., 1999, p.582; 583-584). Nominalised verbs are on the other hand often derived through the affixation with the suffixes *-ing* and *-ning*, as in (17) and (18) below; however, there are also nominalised verbs having been directly transferred from the present participle form (Teleman et al., 1999, p. 38). The nominalised verbs behave like nouns in that they can be preceded by determiners and/or constructed with the determiner-equivalent suffixes *-en/-et*. Compare these representative examples:

(17) *Simningen* var mycket spännande! ‘The swimming was very exciting!’

(18) Hennes *hoppande* störde mig. ‘Her jumping annoyed me.’

The English translations of (17) and (18) show that *swimming* and *jumping* are not to be analysed as gerund-participles in English, but as nominalised verbs. They would in a clausal analysis thus be interpreted as noun phrases together with their respective determiners *the* and *her* – and not gerund-participles. This section has provided information that claims that there is no gerund-participial verb form in Swedish; thus one could wonder how Swedish L2 learners of English use a gerundial construction in English when there is no equivalent in their mother tongue. This query will be elaborated further in the following section.

2.4 A Note on Second-Language Acquisition – with a Swedish Perspective

Through research it has become evident that one's native language will have a substantial influence on the acquisition of a possible L2. Odlin (1989) defines this influence as 'transfer' and explains that it "is the influence resulting from similarities and differences between the target language and any other language that has been previously (and perhaps imperfectly) acquired" (Odlin, 1989, p. 27). Transfer can be positive or negative, as syntactic, vocabular and phonetic patterns of previously learnt languages can both smoothen and complicate the process of acquiring of a new language. Given that this study, in a small capacity, will examine how Swedish learners of English use the gerund-participial vs. infinitival complements in catenative constructions, I will in this section provide a brief overview of second-language acquisition and account for some problems that may arise when native speakers of Swedish produce English as their L2.

The concept of transfer is closely connected to those of cross-linguistic influence and interlanguage. Lightbown and Spada (2013) summarize some important traits of interlanguages:

Analysis of a learner's interlanguage shows that it has some characteristics influenced by previously learned languages, some characteristics of the second language, and some characteristics, such as the omission of function words and grammatical morphemes, that seem to be general and to occur in all interlanguage systems. Interlanguages have been found to be systematic, but they are also dynamic, continually evolving as learners receive more input and revise their hypotheses about the second language. The path through language acquisition is not necessarily smooth and even. Learners have bursts of progress, then reach a plateau for a while before something stimulates further progress. (Lightbown & Spada, 2013, p. 43)

While transfer captures the process of L2 acquisition, interlanguage concerns the outcome, the result, of language transfer. Positive transfer will, due to cross-linguistic similarities between the two languages, ease language acquisition, and negative transfer will cause errors or inappropriate language-production tendencies (Odlin, 1989, p.167;168). Studying interlanguage, then, means studying "the language systems of language learners, or simply [...] language learners' language [italics removed]" (Corder, 1981, p. 66). In other words, the interlanguage is an 'intermediate' language, with influences, transfer, from both the learner's native language and any other languages previously or partly acquired.

Not only are both Swedish and English Germanic languages; the Scandinavian Viking invasion of England in the eighth century led to Old Norse leaving a formidable footprint on the development leading up to what we now know as Modern English. Thus, Swedish and English share many similar traits – both syntactical, morphological and vocabular (Gelderen, 2014, p. 11; 100-104). Consequently, English is not too difficult to learn for a native speaker of Swedish, as the similarities enable much positive transfer during the language acquisition process (Davidsen-Nielsen & Harder, 2001, p. 21). Nonetheless, both the present participle and the gerund verb form seem to be problematic for Scandinavian L2 learners of English to master, since they are either uncommon or non-existent in their mother tongue. Once they have learned it, Scandinavian L2 learners of English tend to overuse the present participle (and the present progressive verb form) (Hasselgård, Lysvåg & Johansson, 2012, p. 187). Thus, Scandinavians will often favour a present progressive construction, although a simple present could be more appropriate. In the representative example below, the present progressive can trigger a semantic interpretation similar to ‘I currently, but not permanently, live in Lund’:

(19) I am living in Lund [vs. I live in Lund].

Scandinavians also show tendencies of using an infinitive construction where a gerund one is more appropriate (Davidsen-Nielsen & Harder, 2001, p. 31; Hasselgård et al., 2012, pp. 187-188). The following example from Davidsen-Nielsen and Harder (2001) demonstrates these tendencies:

(20) *I really must stop to smoke. (Meaning ‘... stop smoking.’) (Davidsen-Nielsen & Harder, 2001, p. 31)

This essay includes a brief experiment on how advanced Swedish L2 learners of English use the infinitive and the gerund-participle, conducted through a short translation task on university students of English. The results of this will be presented in section 4.2.

3. Materials and Methods

3.1 The Speaker-Judgement Task

In order to investigate in what context infinitival/gerundial complements to emotive verbs are appropriate, I carried out a speaker-judgement task for native speakers of English. The experiment contained items containing one of the verbs *like*, *love*, *hate* and *prefer* complemented by either a gerund-participial or infinitival complement. The participants were to rate every item regarding acceptability, using a five-point Likert scale, 1 being labelled as ‘sounds completely off’ and 5 as ‘sounds perfectly fine’. Note that because some items did not consist of only one sentence, but two, I will refer to all test items as ‘utterances’ and not ‘sentences’.

There were 45 items in total, out of which 15 were filler items. 10 of the 30 test items contained a context-providing clause expressing ‘hypotheticality’, 10 contained a more habitual/factual context clause, and 10 were vaguer regarding context. 15 items featured a gerund-participial complement, and 15 featured an infinitival. The items were distributed across two lists, and each test item appeared in two versions – where one list featured a gerund-participial complement, the other featured an infinitival complement. (21) is an example of the same item in two different versions:

- (21) a. My aunt loves shopping, and she does it every day.
b. My aunt loves to shop, and she does it every day.

Item (21)a. was thus provided in one of the lists, but not the other. This enables an acceptability-rating from native speakers of English without having to pose two sentence options against each other. The Likert scale, additionally, gives the participants the ability to provide a more nuanced judgement on each utterance, as an intermediate number can express that a sentence is not completely unacceptable nor perfectly acceptable. Furthermore, it is important to note that in a speaker-judgement task like this, it is impossible to discern exactly what the participants do not like about an utterance receiving a low score. However, if each utterance pair receives low scores in their respective list, that could be a hint that the score is triggered by an overall ill-phrasing, rather than by a specific complement type. A brief analysis on utterances with low scores in both lists will be presented in section 4.

The test items were randomly inserted into a Google Forms survey template, together with the filler items. In order to prevent the same verb appearing twice in a row, I manually

moved some items around and subsequently distributed the two lists among native speakers of English. Additional to being asked to rate each sentence in regard to how well they sound, the participants were asked to state their age and native language(s). The collected data was analysed with the help of *t*-testing. For the utterances expressing either a habitual or hypothetical context, I used a one-tailed *t*-test on the premise that one complement type according to the literature should be preferred over the other. For the utterances expressing a vague context, I conversely used a two-tailed *t*-test, as the preferred complement type was unclear. The speaker-judgement task, the participants' ratings, and the results of the *t*-tests are included in the Appendices.

There was a total of 64 participants (N=64) completing the speaker-judgement task. 32 participants saw list number 1, and 32 participants saw list number 2. The task was distributed mainly on the digital social media platform Facebook, but also through direct contact with native speakers of English. The participants all stated that they were native speakers of English, although a few ($n=6$) were bilinguals with either Swedish, Afrikaans or French as their mother tongue, apart from English. Furthermore, only four participants stated what English variety they spoke (for example 'British English' or 'American South'). Since the participants were not asked to specify what variety of English they spoke, the possibility of there being preference differences between different English varieties has not been included in the data analysis. The participants were between 18 and 71+ years old, but a majority ($n=42$) stated that they were between 18 and 30 years old. Since there was such an over-representation of participants in that age category (18-30), age was not taken into consideration when the data was analysed.

3.2 The Translation Task

The translation task consisted of three short utterances in Swedish. As was the case with the speaker-judgement task, one test item featured two short sentences following each other. Because of this, I will refer to these test items as 'utterances', as well.

One utterance was constructed to trigger a translation featuring a gerund-participial complement, and a second to feature an infinitival one, based on what scholars have said about gerund-participial and infinitival complements being more common in habitual and hypothetical scenarios, respectively (Quirk et al., 1985, p. 1192). Both utterances featured the emotive verb *älskar* 'love', which was purposely selected due to it having a clear translation equivalent in English. A Swedish verb like *gillar* could be translated to both *like* and *enjoy*, but it could also be translated into something similar to *take great pleasure in*, which would only

allow for a gerund complement, since prepositions cannot take infinitival complements (Hasselgård, Lysvåg & Johansson, 2012, p. 24). Consequently, a construction like *take great pleasure in* would not be relevant for this study. The third utterance was a filler sentence containing the emotive verb *ogillar* ‘dislike’.

The translation exercise was distributed among Swedish learners of advanced English, namely undergraduate students of English at Lund University. The participants were asked to fill out their age and native language(s). There was a total of 40 participants – five of which stated another native language than Swedish. Due to this, those five participants’ answers have been discarded. One participant gave another Scandinavian language as their L1, namely Danish; that answer has been included as the consulted literature for this essay to some extent spans over the entire Scandinavian language branch and is not exclusively applicable to speakers of Swedish. Moreover, there were eight participants who stated an additional language than Swedish when asked about their native languages. Those participants will be regarded as bilinguals, and their answers have been included in the data analysis. Thus, the total number of answers that have been analysed is 35.

The material was subsequently analysed in light of what the literature says about the gerundial vs. infinitival pattern of verb complementation in English, as well as in light of the results of this study’s speaker-judgement task. The translation exercise can be found in Appendix 2, and a summary of the participant answers will be presented and discussed in section 4.2.

4. Results and Discussion

This section is divided into two: 4.1 covers the results of the speaker-judgement task, and 4.2 covers the results of the translation task. All utterance pairs along with their ratings, calculated mean value (\bar{x}) and standard deviation (SD) are included in Appendix 1. Please note that firstly, not all utterances are presented in this section and that secondly, the utterance pairs in Appendix 1 are not labelled in the same way as they are labelled in this section.

4.1 Results from the Speaker-Judgement Task

Complement	Hypothetical Context	Habitual Context	Vague Context	Total Mean Value	<i>p</i> -value, two-tailed
Gerundial	3.615625	3.93125	4.240625	3.929166667	0.437301708
Infinitival	3.715625	3.6875	4.022443182	3.808522727	

Table 1. Average means for both complement types in the respective contexts, total mean value for both complement types and the two-tailed *p*-value

Context	<i>p</i> -value, one-tailed	<i>p</i> -value, two-tailed
Hypothetical	0.366617003	-
Habitual	0.096632299	-
Vague	-	0.462953984

Table 2. *p*-values for each context

The significance of the collected data in this study can be presented with the help of *p*-values, probability values. If a *p*-value happens to be $p > 0.05$, there is no statistical significance of the results – i.e., the sample population of the conducted study is either not representative of the entire real-world population and/or the null-hypothesis (there being no preferential difference between either complement type) is true. A high *p*-value, however, could also be the result of there being simply too few test items to be analysed – and that is what seems to be the case of this study (as shown in tables 1 and 2). Even though the results of this study are not statistically significant, there are still some interesting observations that can be made. These observations, with the support of a few selected utterance pairs, will be presented and discussed in the following sections.

4.1.1 Hypothetical/Non-Factual Context

Complement type	\bar{x}	<i>p</i> -value, one-tailed
Gerundial	3.615625	0.366617003
Infinitival	3.715625	

Table 3. Average mean and *p*-value of all utterances in a hypothetical context

Prior to the start of this experiment, the assumed hypothesis was that an infinitival complement would receive higher ratings than a gerund-participial one when appearing in a context that expressed hypotheticality. However, the *p*-value shows that the results are not of any statistical significance – thus, according to this study, one could argue that neither complement is explicitly preferred. Since corpus data show that the gerund-participle is less frequent in use

(Biber et al., 1999, p. 754), it was of interest to see if the gerund would be accepted at all in scenarios expressing explicit hypotheticality. When comparing the mean values of every sentence pair, it became evident that the differences were generally very small – sometimes only differing by one or two decimals. Still, there were a few utterance pairs where the gerund-participial complement, surprisingly enough, received a higher rating than the infinitival one. Consider the following representative example, which, in addition, is one of the utterance pairs with the largest mean value difference among the sentences with a hypothetical/non-factual context:

	\bar{x}	SD	<i>p</i> -value
[a] I hate driving late at night. Luckily, I have never done it.	3.5	1.565762723	0.0467217212146103
[b] I hate to drive late at night. Luckily, I have never done it.	2.875	1.361924634	

Table 4. Average mean, standard deviation and *p*-value of utterance pair [a]/[b]

Neither of these two utterances received noticeably high scores, with average means of 3.5 and ~2.9, respectively. When the mean values were compared, it showed that the preference of [a] is significant (one-tailed *t*-test, *p* <.05), although only marginally so. This utterance stands out when compared to the others in the ‘hypothetical’-utterance category, as the context clause is not incorporated in the same matrix clause as the one containing the verbal complement. Thus, a preference for the gerund-participial could be the result of viewing the complement-containing clause in isolation; nonetheless, this cannot be proven. Considering that the only syntactic difference between the two utterances is the complement, and that the mean-value difference is statistically significant, this is at least one example of a deviation from the presupposed pattern of complementation in hypothetical/non-factual contexts.

Despite the previously mentioned deviating utterance pair, there were instances where a sentence pair confirmed the grammarians’ hypothesis, as shown by the example below:

	\bar{x}	SD	<i>p</i> -value
[c] He rarely does it, but he secretly loves eating with his hands.	4.2187	1.00753211	0.048623436
[d] He rarely does it, but he secretly loves to eat with his hands.	5	7	
	4.5625	0.56440091	

Table 5. Average mean, standard deviation and *p*-value of utterance pair [c]/[d]

Both utterances [c] and [d] received high mean values, and comparing the means shows that there is a low probability of these values being the result of mere chance ($p < .05$). However, there was another instance where the infinitival complement received higher ratings, with a considerably higher mean value difference than the other utterance pairs:

	\bar{x}	SD	<i>p</i> -value
[e] Ian has never lived in the countryside, but still, he prefers living there.	2.1562 5	1.2210353 88	0.0236340 13
[f] Ian has never lived in the countryside, but still, he prefers to live there.	2.8437 5	1.4834435 74	

Table 6. Average mean, standard deviation and *p*-value of utterance pair [e]/[f]

The example above is interesting for several reasons; not only did it receive the lowest ratings of any of the utterance pairs in the hypothetical/non-factual context, it was also the utterance pair with the highest difference in mean value and consequently the utterance pair with the highest statistical significance. Nonetheless, neither utterance received particularly high ratings. Since there is no other difference between these utterances except for the verbal complement, the low mean values for both utterances are most likely an indication of there being something strange in the overall formulation. When taking into consideration that the semantic interpretation of the utterance is highly contradictory (someone having a preferred place of living despite never having lived there), it is not strange to assume that the utterances’ intrinsic contradictory nature could be the reason behind the general low scores.

4.1.2 Habitual/Factual Context

Complement type	\bar{x}	<i>p</i> -value, one-tailed
Gerundial	3.93125	0.096632299
Infinitival	3.6875	

Table 7. Average mean and *p*-value of all utterances in a habitual context

The data for the utterances in a habitual/factual context has also been analysed using a one-tailed *t*-test. As table 7 above shows, a mean value comparison of the complement types in this context slightly favours a gerund-participial complement. The difference, although not big enough to assure statistical significance, could be viewed as marginally significant; the *p*-value might not be that of $p < .05$, but it is, nonetheless, $p < .1$. From this study, it is thus possible to show that there might be a slight preference for a gerund-participial complement over an infinitival one when it appears in a habitual/factual context.

There were several examples of utterance pairs where the gerund-participial version received considerably higher mean value ratings than its infinitival equivalent. Consider this representative example:

	\bar{x}	SD	<i>p</i> -value
[g] Anna has never liked taking her vitamins, but she still does it every morning.	4.5625	0.759350317	0.001428841
[h] Anna has never liked to take her vitamins, but she still does it every morning.	3.75	1.27000127	

Table 8. Average mean, standard deviation and *p*-value of utterance pair [g]/[h]

Not only is the mean value difference in the example above so clear that there is a less than 1% chance of it being the result of mere chance ($p < .05$), the standard deviation of the ratings of [g] is considerably lower than those of [h]. However, the mean value of [h] is not that low; it is not even below 3. Hence, it would be dubious to claim that the infinitival construction of this utterance is inappropriate, regardless of the high ratings of the gerundial construction. However, we could conclude that it is indeed an utterance where the gerund-participial complement could be viewed as more accepted than the infinitival one.

Even though there was a slight majority of utterance pairs that showed a preference for a gerund-participial complement in a habitual/factual context, there were instances where an infinitival complement produced a somewhat higher (albeit only slightly higher) mean value, as well. Furthermore, a couple of utterance pairs received identical or nearly identical mean value scores. Tables 9 and 10 below are examples of these respective phenomena:

	\bar{x}	SD	<i>p</i> -value
[i] I prefer and will always prefer going to the cinema over watching movies at home.	3.875	1.23784412	0.307211182
[j] I prefer and will always prefer to go to the cinema over watching movies at home.	4.03125	1.230902501	

Table 9. Average mean, standard deviation and *p*-value of utterance pair [i]/[j]

	\bar{x}	SD	<i>p</i> -value
[k] She actually likes doing the dishes instead of having to cook, and it has now become a habit in our family.	3.90625	0.9283830897	0.5
[l] She actually likes to do the dishes instead of having to cook, and it has now become a habit in our family.	3.90625	1.117583078	

Table 10. Average mean, standard deviation and *p*-value of utterance pair [k]/[l]

It is important to note that while it might be interesting to analyse these utterance pairs as they both deviate from the assumed hypothesis, the validity of this data cannot be statistically guaranteed. Their respective p -value is that of $p > .05$; for both utterances pairs, this may be an indication of chance having been at play, rather than the mean value differences being an actual representation of the real world. Consequently, it implies that there could be no preference for either complement type – confirming the null-hypothesis of there being no preference for either complement.

4.1.3 Vague Context

Complement type	\bar{x}	p -value, one-tailed
Gerund	4.240625	0.462953984
Infinitival	4.022443182	

Table 11. Average mean and p -value of all utterances in a vague context

The high p -value of the utterance pairs in this category ultimately confirms the null-hypothesis; in other words, we can assume that, among these utterances, there is no significant preference for either complement type. Most of the utterance pairs containing a vague expression of context (i.e. not explicitly habitual nor hypothetical) received strikingly similar mean values, irrespective of which complement the emotive verb took. Table 12 below is an example showing just that:

	\bar{x}	SD	p -value
[m] When I'm travelling, I usually like being at the airport with time to spare.	4.65625	0.700662129	0.847839015
[n] When I'm travelling, I usually like to be at the airport with time to spare.	4.6875	0.592289162	

Table 12. Average mean, standard deviation and p -value of utterance pair [m]/[n]

A total of 30 participants ranked these utterances with either a 4 or a 5, on both lists. Neither utterance received a 1, as implied by the SD-value. If both mean values are rounded up to one decimal, the utterances would receive the same mean value, namely $\bar{x} \approx 4.7$. There is thus no significant difference between either utterance or complement.

Interestingly, there were two utterances that stood out from the rest. For the following utterance pairs, the infinitival versions ([p] and [r]) have received considerably lower ratings than their gerundial equivalent:

	\bar{x}	SD	<i>p</i> -value
[o] I don't like not having the opportunity to speak my mind.	3.4375	1.318295576	~0.000023
[p] I don't like to not have the opportunity to speak my mind.	2.125	0.94185815	

Table 13. Average mean, standard deviation and *p*-value of utterance pair [o]/[p]

	\bar{x}	SD	<i>p</i> -value
[q] It doesn't matter if they're friendly, I will always hate discussing my personal life with strangers.	4.09375	1.117583078	~0.000197
[r] It doesn't matter if they're friendly, I will always hate to discuss my personal life with strangers.	2.84375	1.393750452	

Table 14. Average mean, standard deviation and *p*-value of utterance pair [q]/[r]

The mean difference is clearest with pair [q]/[r]; [q] received ratings of 4 and 5 by 23 participants (~71.9%), while [r] only received 11 ratings (~34.4%) of either a 4 or a 5. Contrastively, only 3 participants (~9.4%) rated [q] with a 1 or a 2, while 14 participants (~43.8%) rated [r] with a 1 or a 2. There is thus a somewhat clear consensus that [q] is a perfectly acceptable sentence, while one can show that a weak majority of the participants thought that [r] sounded off. Since the only difference is the verbal complement, we could assume that this is another example where the complements in fact are not interchangeable. The *p*-values of both [o]/[p] and [q]/[r] furthermore confirms said assumption, as they indicate a rejection of the null-hypothesis.

4.1.4 General Discussion of the Speaker-Judgement Task

The purpose of this study was to investigate to what extent a semantic interpretation influences the choice of verbal complement of emotive verbs, on the basis of scholar's previous work. Grammarians like Huddleston & Pullum (2002), Quirk et al. (1989) and Biber et al. (1999) all state that the semantic difference of non-finite complements of verbs such as *like*, *love*, *hate* and *prefer* is not always clear-cut, suggesting that there is, sometimes, no significant semantic difference between the two complement types. All the while, scholars like Bolinger claim that a "difference in syntactic form always spells a difference in meaning" (Bolinger, qtd. in Rudanko, 2017), which is supported by the previously mentioned grammarians as well. There is a juxtaposing relationship between these claims; is difference in meaning between the complements non-existing, then the complementation of emotive verbs becomes, drawn to an

extent, arbitrary. However, this would probably be strongly denied by scholars. Nonetheless, the Bolinger Principle seems to be both confirmed and denied.

Judging by the results of this specific study alone, it is not possible to validate the Bolinger Principle, with regard to the complementation of emotive verbs; instead, there seems to be a general insignificance whether the emotive verb is complemented with a gerund participle or an infinitive construction. In other words, there is no noticeable preferred non-finite complement type in a hypothetical/non-factual or habitual/factual context, or in general. Interestingly, the context type that showed marginal statistical significance was the one expressing habitual/factual scenarios. Furthermore, the preference in said context was of the gerund-participle, instead of the infinitive. Although this confirms the hypothesis that a gerund-participial complement could be of preference in a habitual context, both complement types received virtually identical ratings when appearing in a hypothetical context. Despite the marginal habitual+gerund preference, there is not enough evidence that a gerund-participial construction would be less associated with a hypothetical meaning. Biber et al. (1999) and their frequency-based grammar say that “*ing*-clauses rarely occur with a hypothetical meaning” and, in addition, that infinitival complements are at least twice as common as gerund-participial ones (Biber et al., 1999, p. 757; 745). This is, as known, supported by Herbst et al.’s (2004) data, which clearly shows the overall higher frequency and/or favouring of infinitival constructions as complements to all emotive verbs featured in this study. Taking all this into account, one might assume that due to the low frequency of the gerund-participle in English, it would not be surprising if an infinitival complement received high acceptability ratings regardless of context, when contrasted to the gerund-participle. This, however, cannot be proven by this study. Instead, the total mean of every utterance with a gerund-participial complement was strikingly similar to those containing an infinitival complement (see table 1 above). There were individual instances in a given context where a specific type of complement was explicitly preferred (as shown in the previous section), yet, the results of this study only confirm what scholars like Quirk et al. (1985) say of there in general being a semi-synonymous reading of gerund-participle and infinitival complements of emotive verbs.

There are, however, a few things we must take into consideration when analysing the results of this study. Firstly, this was a small-scaled study with relatively few participants and, especially, few test items. Secondly, the participants did not partake in this study under controlled circumstances in a lab. Instead, it was a self-paced survey that the participants completed in their own home-environment. Thirdly, the participants were not asked to state any indication of their highest achieved level of education; there could consequently be participants

with both an educational level that is below average, as well as participants who could be read up on this specific topic. These are all factors that could cause variation in the judgements (see Schütze (1996)). This study is thus very general, and not considerate of correlations between specific participants and their ratings. The participants were asked to state their age and native language(s), although that data was not taken into consideration (as explained in section 3.1).

There were five utterances in this study that featured the modal *would* with a verb taking a gerund-participial complement, for example *I would absolutely hate running into my old college friends*. The semantic ambiguity of this utterance was not taken into consideration before the start of this study. It could trigger a past habit reading, namely *When I used to run into my old college friends, I hated it*; however, one of the purposes of this study was to investigate the acceptability of a gerund-participial complement in a hypothetical context. In this case, the hypothetical reading would be that of *If I ever run into my old college friends, I would hate it*. If the utterance received a past habit interpretation, it would be no surprise if it were given a high rating on the Likert scale, since it conforms to the pattern of past-habit constructions. Nevertheless, how the participants understood this utterance can never be known. Thus, we cannot for sure know if the high ratings for this specific utterance were due to the gerundial construction being accepted in hypothetical scenarios or because it was interpreted as a factual event in the past.

4.2 The Translation Exercise – Results and Discussion

Sentence	Complement	Number of Answers
<i>Jag älskar att läsa! Jag gör det varje söndag!</i>	Gerundial	20 (57.1%)
	Infinitival	15 (42.9%)
	Total: 35 (100%)	

Table 15. Participants' choice of complement for test utterance 1

Sentence	Complement	Number of Answers
<i>Jag har aldrig gjort det, men jag skulle älska att läsa.</i>	Gerundial	4 (11.4%)
	Infinitival	31 (88.6%)
	Total: 35 (100%)	

Table 16. Participants' choice of complement for test utterance 2

For test utterance 1, *Jag älskar att läsa! Jag gör det varje söndag!* 'I love [reading/to read]! I do it every Sunday!', 20 (57.1%²) participants produced a translation featuring a gerund-participial complement, and 15 (42.9%) produced a verbal complement in the infinitive. For test utterance 2, *Jag har aldrig gjort det, men jag skulle älska att läsa* 'I have never done it, but I would love [reading/to read]', there were 4 (11.4%) translations featuring a gerund-participial complement, and 31 (88.6%) featuring an infinitival complement. The 42.9% who produced an infinitival complement for test utterance 1 all produced an infinitival complement for test utterance 2, as well. Similarly, the 11.4%, who produced a gerund-participial complement for test utterance 2, one of which were a bilingual of Hungarian and Swedish, also produced a gerund-participial complement for test utterance 1.

Table 15 shows that a slight majority (57.1%) among the test subjects chose a gerund-participial complement for the sentence paired with the habitual context-sentence *Jag gör det varje söndag!* 'I do it every Sunday!'. Similar to what Herbst et al. (2004) say, this could be due to the fact that there is a weak semantic difference between the two complement types, enabling a choice of either complement. However, as the provided context expresses that the speaker's reading occurs habitually, a gerund-participle could be considered preferred – at least if considering that gerund-participles supposedly have such a prominent habitual semantic interpretation (Herbst et al., 2004, p. 508).

It is quite easy to understand that a clear majority of the participants chose an infinitival complement with test utterance 2 ['I have never done it, but I would love to read'] since it contained the modal *skulle* 'would'. This confirms what literature says about how a *would* + emotive verb construction carries "a strong preference for the infinitival" as it "projects into the future and resembles a verb of wanting" (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002, p.1242). The utterance furthermore contained a clear hypothetical context – although it is probably the modal verb that triggers the infinitival complement, to a greater extent (Consider Herbst et al. (2004), who clearly present the high frequency of *would* + infinitive constructions). Regardless, there were four participants who chose a gerund-participial complement for test utterance 2, and they additionally chose a gerund-participle to complement test utterance 1 as well. The consulted literature for this essay does not specifically bring up that Swedish speakers of English overuse the gerund-participle. Nonetheless, it has been stated that there is a tendency among Swedish speakers to overuse the present participle and present progressive. One could thus wonder if the same tendency of 'inappropriate' overuse is applicable to the use of a gerund-participle. For

² All percentages in this section have been rounded up to one decimal.

this to be adequately claimed, there must be much more extensive research done, as the results from this short study are not evidence enough for such a tendency.

Choice of Complement	Number of Answers
All gerunds	4 (11.4%)
All infinitives	15 (42.9%)
1. Gerund 2. Infinitive	16 (45.7%)
	Total: 35 (100%)

Table 17. Complement Choices – Overall Data

42.9% of the participants (15 participants) did not only choose an infinitival construction with the hypothetical clause, but also chose to complement the verb in test sentence 1 with an infinitival construction. 45.7% (16 participants) chose a gerund-participial complement with test utterance 1 and an infinitive with test utterance 2, and 11.4% (4 participants) chose only gerund-participial complements. The 42.9% who chose infinitival constructions for both utterances could be a result of Swedish speakers' tendency of overusing the infinitive. However, as an infinitival construction with utterance 1 *Jag älskar att läsa! Jag gör det varje söndag!* is not unacceptable, it is impossible to generalise and say that this is exclusively the reason. One participant who produced a gerundial-complement translation wrote an additional translation in brackets in the infinitive. This additional translation was, however, followed by a comment saying, 'although I probably wouldn't say that'. With especial consideration of the results of the speaker-judgement task discussed in section 4.1, which ultimately confirmed the semi-synonymous reading of gerundial and infinitival complements of emotive verbs, there is no way to claim that either way of complementation is inherently 'wrong' in any specific context.

Not only was this a small-scaled task, the participants did not undergo any kind of language-proficiency tests prior to the translation task. Thus, even though they were learners of advanced English on a university level, there was no indication of how well they, in reality, know and produce English. For a study like this to be representative of the real population, it must be elaborated and supervised in a more sufficient way.

5. Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to investigate to what extent the semantic interpretation of non-finite complements of emotive verbs interfere the acceptability of said complements in clearly

expressed contexts; in other words, if gerundial or infinitival complements would be equally accepted in contexts expressing either hypotheticality or habit. This was investigated through a speaker-judgement task (completed by native speakers of English) and a translation task (completed by Swedish undergraduate students of English). That non-finite complements often receive a semi-synonymous reading with emotive verbs (claimed by for example Quirk et al. (1989)) can be confirmed by the results of the speaker-judgement task, to some extent. However, there were some indications of the Bolinger Principle being true, since there were some individual cases where one complement type was quite clearly preferred. Nonetheless, no generalisations on the basis of the collected data could be made. Further, the translation task did not fully confirm the theory of Davidsen-Nielsen and Harder (2001); however, it did show that the infinitival construction was somewhat more favoured than the gerundial. In order to reach more adequate conclusions on the topic of the semantic restrictions on non-finite complements, a larger study would have to be carried out with more test items, participants and care. A topic for further research could be to investigate if there are any sociolinguistic influences on the preference of verbal complements. Furthermore, a larger speaker-judgement task could be carried out to both native speakers and Swedish learners of English, to enable a more elaborate investigation on whether Swedish and native speakers of English differ regarding the preference of verbal complements.

References

- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S. & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Longman.
- Bolinger, D. (1968). Entailment and the Meaning of Structures. *Glossa* 2(2), pp. 119–127
- Brown, E.K. & Miller, J.E. (2013). *The Cambridge Dictionary of Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Corder, S. P. (1981). *Error Analysis and Interlanguage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Daidsen-Nielsen, N. & Harder, P. (2001). Speaker of Scandinavian Languages: Danish, Norwegian and Swedish. In B. Smith & M. Swan (Eds.), *Learner English: A Teacher's Guide to Interference and Other Problems*. (pp. 21-36) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gelderen, E. V. (2014). *A History of the English Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hasselgård, H., Lysvåg, P. & Johansson, S. (2012). *English Grammar: Theory and Use*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Herbst, T., Heath, D., Roe, I. F. & Götz, D. (2004). *A Valency Dictionary of English: a Corpus-Based Analysis of the Complementation Patterns of English Verbs, Nouns and Adjectives*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co.
- Huddleston, R. D. & Pullum, G. K. (2002). *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lightbown, P. M. & Spada, N. (2006). *How Languages are Learned*. (4. Ed.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mindt, D. (2002). A Corpus-based Grammar for ELT. In *Teaching and Learning by Doing Corpus Analysis: Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Teaching and Language Corpora, Graz 19-24 July, 2000*. (pp. 91-106). Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi B. V.

- Noonan, M. (1985). Complementation. In T. Shopin (Ed.) *Language Typology and Syntactic Description – Volume II: Complex Constructions*. (pp. 42-140) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Odlin, T. (1989) *Language Transfer: Cross-linguistic influence in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. Harlow: Longman.
- Rudanko, J. (2017). *Infinitives and Gerunds in Recent English: Studies on Non-Finite Complements with Data from Large Corpora*. Palgrave Macmillan. Retrieved from <https://search-ebshost-com.ludwig.lub.lu.se/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat07147a&AN=lub.5040372&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Schütze, C. T. (1996). *The Empirical Base of Linguistics: Grammaticality Judgements and Linguistic Methodology*. Chicago, IL.: The University of Chicago Press.
- Teleman, U., Hellberg, S. & Andersson, E. (1999). *Svenska Akademiens Grammatik 3 Fraser*. Stockholm: Svenska Akademien.

Appendix 1 – Speaker-Judgement Task Items

Utterances – Habitual/factual context	\bar{x}	SD	Answers 1-2	Answers 3	Answers 4-5	Total
I hate being angry with my children. It's always awful.	3,78125	1,069650983	6	4	22	32
I hate to be angry with my children. It's always awful.	3,25	1,459120371	12	3	17	32
Don't you just hate being alone at Christmas? I for sure do.	3,59375	1,240691145	7	9	16	32
Don't you just hate to be alone at Christmas? I for sure do.	2,78125	1,430866532	16	6	10	32
I absolutely love singing, since my family sang together all the time when I was younger.	3,53125	1,135479862	4	13	15	32
I absolutely love to sing, since my family sang together all the time when I was younger.	3,75	1,117583078	6	6	20	32
She loves cleaning her room; it works like some sort of stress-relief.	3,90625	1,25362378	7	2	23	32
She loves to clean her room; it works like some sort of stress-relief.	3,9375	1,293594642	6	3	23	32
Since there is so much traffic in the afternoon, I have always preferred taking the subway home from work.	4,40625	0,837021409	1	4	27	32
Since there is so much traffic in the afternoon, I have always preferred to take the subway home from work.	4,28125	0,991394424	4	0	28	32
After having experienced heart break in a club before, I always prefer staying at home on weekends.	3,65625	1,358589757	8	3	21	32
After having experienced heart break in a club before, I always prefer to stay at home on weekends.	3,21875	1,156590512	10	7	15	32
I prefer and will always prefer going to the cinema over watching movies at home.	3,875	1,23784412	6	5	21	32
I prefer and will always prefer to go to the cinema over watching movies at home.	4,03125	1,230902501	6	2	24	32
I like cooking Italian food, and I do it every time my nan, who's Italian, comes over.	4,09375	1,117583078	3	6	23	32
I like to cook Italian food, and I do it every time my nan, who's Italian, comes over.	3,96875	1,121185289	5	5	22	32
She actually likes doing the dishes instead of having to cook, and it has now become a habit in our family.	3,90625	0,92838309	2	9	21	32

She actually likes to do the dishes instead of having to cook, and it has now become a habit in our family.	3,90625	1,117583078	5	6	21	32
Anna has never liked taking her vitamins, but she still does it every morning.	4,5625	0,759350317	1	2	29	32
Anna has never liked to take her vitamins, but she still does it every morning.	3,75	1,27000127	6	6	20	32

Utterances – Hypothetical/non-factual context	\bar{x}	SD	Answers 1-2	Answers 3	Answers 4-5	Total
I would love skiing if I were given the opportunity to try it!	3,9375	1,162241994	4	7	21	32
I would love to ski if I were given the opportunity to try it!	4,125	1,184578324	3	8	21	32
I have never tried it before, but I would love going out for picnicks in the summertime.	3,0625	1,366358476	12	7	13	32
I have never done it before, but I would love to go out for picnicks in the summertime.	3,375	1,338029365	9	5	17	32
John hates eating in restaurants, but the truth is that he has never tried it.	3,9375	1,457737974	6	4	22	32
John hates to eat in restaurants, but the truth is that he has never tried it.	3,4375	1,293594642	8	7	17	32
My boss prefers sorting out conflicts as soon as they arise, but so far there has been none.	4,21875	1,069650983	3	3	26	32
My boss prefers to sort out conflicts as soon as they arise, but so far there has been none.	4,03125	1,230902501	4	2	26	32
I would like gambling, were it not for my general financial irresponsibility.	3,59375	1,456008131	8	3	21	32
I would like to gamble, were it not for my general financial irresponsibility.	3,625	1,288910518	7	7	18	32
We hate saying this, but we don't want you to come to our wedding.	4,25	1,107161439	5	1	26	32
We hate to say this, but we don't want you to come to our wedding.	4,6875	0,820601668	2	1	29	32
I genuinely like reading, but I've never really done it.	3,28125	1,135479862	10	7	15	32
I genuinely like to read, but I've never really done it.	3,59375	1,456008131	9	3	20	32
He rarely does it, but he secretly loves eating with his hands.	4,21875	1,007532117	3	4	28	32
He rarely does it, but he secretly loves to eat with his hands.	4,5625	0,56440091	0	1	31	32

Ian has never lived in the countryside, but still, he prefers living there.	2,15625	1,221035388	21	5	6	32
Ian has never lived in the countryside, but still, he prefers to live there.	2,84375	1,483443574	14	5	13	32
I hate driving late at night. Luckily, I have never done it.	3,5	1,565762723	10	2	20	32
I hate to drive late at night. Luckily, I have never done it.	2,875	1,361924634	12	7	13	32

Utterances – Vague context	\bar{x}	SD	Answers 1-2	Answers 3	Answers 4-5	Total
You know that I always hate disappointing you.	4,53125	0,761339016	1	2	29	32
You know that I always hate to disappoint you.	4,31818	1,069650983	4	3	25	32
I don't like not having the opportunity to speak my mind.	3,4375	1,318295576	9	8	15	32
I don't like to not have the opportunity to speak my mind.	2,125	0,94185815	23	7	2	32
No, I'm not saying that I didn't have any friends growing up – I just really loved reading.	4,46875	0,761339016	1	2	29	32
No, I'm not saying that I didn't have any friends growing up – I just really loved to read.	4,0625	1,045342975	3	4	25	32
I know that Rob is a total slob, but would you prefer living alone for the rest of your life?	4,21875	0,90640641	1	4	27	32
I know that Rob is a total slob, but would you prefer to live alone for the rest of your life?	4,21875	1,184152753	4	1	27	32
When I'm travelling, I usually like to be at the airport with time to spare.	4,6875	0,592289162	0	2	30	32
When I'm travelling, I usually like being at the airport with time to spare.	4,65625	0,700662129	1	1	30	32
I would absolutely hate running into my old college friends.	3,96875	1,307160799	8	0	24	32
I would absolutely hate to run into my old college friends.	4,5	0,842423539	1	1	30	32
It doesn't matter if they're friendly, I will always hate discussing my personal life with strangers.	4,09375	1,117583078	3	6	23	32
It doesn't matter if they're friendly, I will always hate to discuss my personal life with strangers.	2,84375	1,393750452	14	7	11	32
He seems to prefer to eat by himself when he is at school.	4,5625	0,759350317	1	2	29	32
He seems to prefer eating by himself when he is at school.	4,53125	0,671271062	0	3	29	32

He looked like the kind of person that likes travelling, but I couldn't tell for sure.	4,1875	0,997981835	2	7	23	32
He looked like the kind of person that likes to travel, but I couldn't tell for sure.	4,46875	0,761339016	1	2	29	32
My aunt loves shopping, and she does it every day.	4,25	1,047269876	4	2	26	32
My aunt loves to shop, and she does it every day.	4,5	0,983738754	2	2	28	32

Utterances - Fillers
I dislike to tell you this, but I overheard our professor saying that you failed the exam.
I hate that I never understand what he's saying.
Usually, I don't recommend visiting Sweden in January, but I would prefer that you visit me sooner rather than later.
I tell you all the time, I hate it when you buy me presents!
Don't you enjoy to go abroad over Easter?
She told me that she dislikes to exercise, but I see her at the gym almost every day.
Would you like seeing my record collection?
Cats generally dislike to have a bath.
I have always enjoyed to sleep in.
I hate to think that my mother-in-law doesn't like me.
He has never loved me, and he never will.
Trust me, Adam has always preferred vanilla over chocolate.

Appendix 2 – Translation task: participant questionnaire and answers

Please translate the sentences below into English. Don't think too hard about your answer!

1. Jag ogillar att läsa, det är det värsta jag vet. :

2. Jag älskar att läsa! Jag gör det varje söndag! :

3. Jag har aldrig gjort det, men jag skulle älska att läsa. :

What is/are your native language(s)? : _____

Age: _____

Thank you for your help!