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1.0 Introduction

Learners of a foreign language are presented with many challenges as they struggle to gain command of the language. One is faced with differences in grammar and syntax in addition to learning a new vocabulary. That is not as straightforward as one might think – words do not always cover exactly the same meaning in two languages and this may cause misunderstandings. One of the areas where meaning is expressed differently in English and Norwegian is the expression of future. This thesis aims to describe how the English future expression *BE going to* is used by native speakers and Norwegian learners of English, and to find out whether or not the *BE going to*-construction is used appropriately by Norwegian students.

1.1 Expressing future time in English

One of the questions that arise when discussing future in English is whether or not English has a future tense. Berglund (2005) gives a thorough explanation of how the notion of a future tense has been treated by other scholars. She does not take a stand herself, but presents both views of the debate.

There are three main arguments against a future tense in English. The first one is that tense is not morphologically marked. Berglund (2005: 29) refers to Quirk et. al. (1985), who view tense as a category realized strictly by verb inflection. This means that they disregard a future tense in English. They choose to operate with the notion of FUTURE TIME, which can be expressed by a number of grammatical constructions. Further, Berglund (2005) lists Crystal (2003), Joos (1968) and Jespersen (1933) as other scholars who share this view. They all agree that English has only two tenses, present tense and past tense, also known as the preterite, or as Joos puts it: past tense and non-past.

The second argument against a future tense is that there is no one distinct way to refer to the future (Berglund, 2005: 29). There are several expressions one could use that refers to more or less the same thing, *will/shall, BE going to*, simple present, present progressive and adverbial constructions may all refer to actions that has not yet happened.

The third and last main argument is that the constructions we use to express futurity may also be used for other purposes (Berglund, 2005: 30). *Will* and *shall* are modal auxiliaries, and *BE*
going to is often referred to as a semi-modal, as in Biber et. al. (1999: 484). Palmer claims will “often does not refer to the future at all” (Berglund, 2005: 30).

Other scholars have no arguments against a future tense in English. Close believes one is handicapped without the notion of tense and that the term is necessary to explain meaning and function of verb phrases which have future reference (Close, quoted in Berglund, 2005: 30). Berglund (2005) also refers to Wekker (1976), who provides counterarguments to the ones already mentioned. If tense should only be recognized when a verb form refers exclusively to time, there would be no tenses in English at all, Wekker argues, as past and present tenses may also be coloured by modality (1976: 18). When modal verbs refer to the future, they always add some element of for example ability, permission or possibility to the meaning of futurity. This is not a reason to discard the future tense. Will and shall can in fact be used to make purely neutral and factual statements about future events, unlike other modals like can, may and must. Future tense in English can be expressed in a colourless way using the will/shall-construction, with BE going to functioning as a suppletive form and a variant (Wekker, 1976: 18).

As we can see futurity is a rather fuzzy area; it is difficult to draw conclusions even for native speakers. When we take into consideration that the different constructions are not semantically equal, that they often overlap but do not always have the same meaning, the picture is further complicated.

1.2 Meaning implied in the BE going to construction
Joos (1968) says that the BE going to-construction implies that the future event is assumed rather than determined, as opposed to future expressions like BE to. Using BE going to “the future event is taken for granted as a proper part of future reality without any suggestion that there had to be a cause to make it so” (1968: 22) and “there is no emotion, desire, intention, resolution, compulsion, or the like” (1968: 23). The construction expresses a completely colourless “future tense”, the only uncoloured future English has (1968: 23). This opinion does not seem to be shared by other scholars, as will become evident in the following paragraphs.

Wekker (1976) has a separate chapter on the use of future BE going to. The implications conveyed by BE going to are frequently different from those of the will/shall construction.
The two constructions may overlap semantically, but they do not always carry the same meaning. Wekker (1976) points out that this may represent a problem for non-native speakers, because they are unaware of the semantic differences: their English may sound strange although the sentences they produce are not strictly ungrammatical (1976: 123). There are both stylistic and semantic factors to consider; BE going to is for example more common in speech than in writing (Wekker, 1976: 123).

Leech (2004) describes BE going to + infinitive as the second most important way of expressing future time in English, after will. The general meaning of the construction is future outcome of present intention and future outcome of present cause (2004: 58). According to Leech, will is the expression which best reflects a neutral or colourless future (2004:56), while BE going to most often does not, although the two expressions may also be interchangeable with little difference in meaning (2004: 60).

The future outcome of present intention most often occurs with a human subject where the action involved is a conscious exercise of the will (Leech, 2004: 59). BE going to is a stronger expression than intend, because BE going to leads us to think that the intention will be carried out, while intend is less committing. The intention is often that of the sentence’s subject, but this is not always the case, for example with passive sentences (2004: 59).

The future outcome of present cause may be found with human, non-human or inanimate subjects. Use of BE going to in sentences with a present cause tells us that there is something going on in the present that will influence the future action. As Leech (2004:59) puts it, “THE TRAIN OF EVENTS LEADING TO THE FUTURE HAPPENING IS ALREADY UNDER WAY”. One of the examples he uses to illustrate this is “She’s going to have twins” versus “She will have twins”. The latter is a general prediction and does not have roots in the present, while the former implies that the woman is already pregnant, ultrasound has shown two foetuses, and she will give birth within months, weeks or days. It is not always this obvious which meaning is implied, a sentence may be interpreted to mean one or the other. Leech’s example is “He’s going to arrive late at the concert”, which can mean “That is his intention” or “That is what will happen, if he goes on like this” (2004: 59).

BE going to implies that there are factors in the present that make the future happening likely, but that does not mean will and BE going to cannot replace each other. In many cases, they
can. *BE going to* may signal prediction without any intention or cause involved, this is especially common in more informal English and in speech (Leech, 2004: 60). Even if *BE going to* is said to be more deeply rooted in the present than is *will*, this does not necessarily mean that the action referred to will take place in the immediate future. In fact, the use of *BE going to* does not guarantee that the future action will ever take place at all, it may just as well imply that an intention were not followed through, as in “He was going to sue me, but I persuaded him it would be pointless” (2004: 61). This interpretation is common when *BE going to* is used with the past tense, and also with the present perfect form: “He’s been going to fix that for months” (2004:61). However, the future can be referred to in the past, for example in novels, without the interpretation that the action was not fulfilled.

### 1.3 Historical development

The *BE going to*-construction is a classic example of grammaticalization. The term refers to the process where lexical items and constructions in certain linguistic contexts have come to serve new grammatical functions. *BE going to* functions as an auxiliary, where *going* derives from the main verb *go*, which denotes movement. These two forms where once polysemous before *BE going to* started to take on a new meaning in the 15th century. The various stages that developed during the grammaticalization process still coexist in Modern English, so there are many ambiguous cases. For example, “*I am going to marry Bill*” may mean “*I intend to marry Bill*”, but it may also mean “*I am leaving/travelling in order to marry Bill*” (Hopper & Traugott, 2003: 1-3).

In the process, the concrete meaning of *go* is lost and we have a new fixed expression denoting a new meaning. Where *go* used to refer to movement in space, it refers to movement in time in the *BE going to*-construction. The change was made possible because there is an inference of futurity from purposives; if one is travelling or going somewhere in order to do something, that action necessarily has to take place in the future (Hopper & Traugott, 2003: 1-3).

### 1.4 Colloquial language

As mentioned in section 1.2, *BE going to* is claimed to be more common in colloquial language. Wekker notes that “*Be going to* occurs most frequently in informal spoken English, but it is by no means confined to it.” (1976: 123). He finds that the expression is most common in the spoken radio and television recordings in his material, and that the written
material contains considerably fewer occurrences, of which most examples are found in novels. “It seems that in more informal styles of English (particularly in speech) be going to is beginning to rival will as a fairly neutral future auxiliary”, Leech claims (2004: 60). In other words, BE going to may substitute will as a future referent without adding meaning to the utterance, this use is increasing, and is more common in speech. Leech (2004: 58) also explains how BE going to is often reduced to gonna, particularly in speech, but this is a non-standard spelling. Gonna is found as a separate entry in several dictionaries, for example in the Concise Oxford Dictionary: “gonna – contr. informal going to” (2001: 610). Berglund (2005: 23) states that “It seems to be generally understood that gonna is a variant form of going to”. However, one would not expect to find the contraction used in formal writing.

1.5 Research question

As already established, the expression of future time in English is not as straightforward as one might think. However, native speakers do not seem to have problems choosing the right expression, they do so more or less subconsciously. They may not think it through every time they express the future, but they are probably able to tell whether an expression sounds right or wrong in a particular context and may also be able to explain the implied meaning when asked why they choose the expressions they do. For learners of English it may be more complicated. English is taught all over the world, but not all learners are exposed to the language on a daily basis, which makes it a lot harder to acquire the subconscious knowledge native speakers have. My hypothesis is that learners of English are less aware of the semantic differences and the general use of the different future expressions. I would like to test this by looking at how Norwegian-speaking learners of English use the BE going to-construction, compared to how British and American students use BE going to.

To get an idea of how the expression of future time in Norwegian works, I will begin with a study of the differences between will and BE going to and their Norwegian correspondences for which I have used the English-Norwegian Parallel Corpus. This will allow me to comment on how English and Norwegian future expressions are similar and/or different, thus to see if any differences create problems for Norwegian learners of English. The examples with BE going to will be studied in more detail. Subsequently, I will study the use of BE going to in the Norwegian component of the International Corpus of Learner English (see further chapter 2).
Contrastive analysis involves a systematic comparison of the linguistic systems of two or more languages. The main idea behind this kind of analysis was to identify problem areas of second language acquisition that language learners with the same linguistic background may have (Ringbom, 1994: 168). Contrastive Analysis went through a rapid development in the 1960s, and its limitations were soon discovered. Scholars took interest in another approach called Error Analysis, which sought to explain the learner’s errors by referring to their mother-tongue, rather than to predict the learner’s behaviour. Error Analysis also had its limitations – the main problem being small corpora and ill-defined error categories. In the later years, computer technology has made it possible to collect large corpora of natural, authentic language, and Contrastive and Error Analysis has gained new interest (Gilquin, 2001: 96-97).

There are different kinds of corpora, and the terms “translation corpora” and “comparable corpora” are often used. Translation corpora consist of original text and translations of these; comparable corpora contain original text in two or more languages which have similar content or text type features. It is an advantage if these two types of corpora can be combined, as in the English-Norwegian Parallel Corpus, Gilquin states (2001: 97).

Another possibility is to compare two varieties of the same language, for example native language vs. learner language or interlanguage. Gilquin (2001), following Granger (1996), uses the term Contrastive Interlanguage Analysis for this. This approach allows us to focus on what kinds of errors learners do, but also on the things they get right. Here too, a good corpus is of great importance – factors like learner’s mother tongue, knowledge of other languages, proficiency level and whether the text was originally a written text or a transcript of speech should be registered (Gilquin, 2001: 99). Today, there are several such corpora available.

Contrastive Analysis and Contrastive Interlanguage Analysis can be combined in what is known as the Integrated Contrastive Model. A study which compares two languages may be used to formulate predictions about the learner’s interlanguage on the basis of the notion of transfer. Learners of language tend to “transfer the forms and meanings and the distribution of forms and meanings of their native language and culture to foreign language and culture” (Gilquin, 2001: 100). A CA study may also serve as a diagnostic tool when trying to explain errors in learner language. I will attempt to use the Integrated Contrastive model, by first studying data from the ENPC, to see if there is possible to make any predictions on how
learners use the *BE going to-*construction, before studying data from a learner corpus which will be compared to a reference corpus.
2.0 Corpora used

For the background study which compares English and Norwegian, I have used the ENPC, which is the English-Norwegian Parallel Corpus. It consists of 30 fiction texts and 20 non-fiction texts in each language and each of these is translated. Both original texts and translated ones are searchable and may be compared. All in all, the corpus contains about 2.6 million words\(^1\). It was completed in 1997 by researches from the University of Oslo, and has since then been extended to include even more languages\(^2\). A partially tagged version has been made, but for this paper I have used the untagged version. Section 2.1 gives further details on the search procedure.

In order to study how students use the \textit{BE going to}-construction I have looked at two corpora: NICLE and LOCNESS. NICLE is short for the Norwegian component of the International Corpus of Learner English, or ICLE. ICLE consists of more than 2 million words all in all, and pupils from 19 different mother-tongue backgrounds have contributed, thus ICLE consists of 19 sub-corpora, one of them being NICLE\(^3\). NICLE consists of 317 essays, with a total length of about 212,000 words, according to the corpus search manual. Most of the essays are argumentative, some of the topics are “Crime does not pay”, “The prison system”, “The Television – Opium of the Masses?” and “Feminism”, but there are also literary essays on for example Arthur Millers “Requiem”. The youngest student is 18 and the oldest 54 years old, the majority are in their early twenties. Some of the learners have used reference tools, while others have not.

LOCNESS is an abbreviation of Louvain Corpus of Native English Essays, a corpus built up by essays written by both American and British students, from different educational levels. The total number of words is 324,304, made up of 60,209 words from British pupils’ A-level essays, 95,695 words from British university students’ essays and 168,400 words from American university students’ essays. All students are native speakers, although a few have

http://www.hf.uio.no/forskningsprosjekter/sprik/korpus/index.html

http://www.hf.uio.no/ilos/forskning/forskningsprosjekter/enpc/

http://cecl.fltr.ucl.ac.be/Cecl-Projects/Icle/icle.htm#heading1
parents or grandparents with other linguistic backgrounds. The essays are mainly argumentative, with topics such as “Abortion”, “Legalization of marijuana”, “Death penalty”, “The Welfare system” and “Surrogate motherhood”, but some literary essays on e.g Hamlet are also included. The students’ age span range from 17 to 48 years old 4.

2.1 Search procedures
In the ENPC I had to enter four different search strings to get the material I wanted. I only wanted to search in English original texts, but one has to search separately in fiction and non-fiction. I wanted to see how BE going to in English is translated into Norwegian, whether the implied meaning is kept and which correspondences are used. The results I wanted could not be retrieved easily from a simple search, so I entered going in the main search box and “AND +1 to” in the first filter, thus to specify that I only wanted hits where going was immediately followed by to. This search gave 267 hits from the fiction texts and 23 hits from the non-fiction ones. After having manually removed the cases where going to was not followed by a verb, I was left with 249 sentence pairs. In addition, I did two simple searches for gonna, and found 13 examples in fiction texts and none in the non-fiction ones. All together there were 262 sentence pairs. Because I wanted to briefly compare the translations of will and BE going to, a simple search for will was performed, without any filters, in English original texts. I manually removed the cases where will was a noun, and made a list of the first 100 relevant hits.

The other two corpora are not provided with their own search interfaces, so I used the computer program WordSmith (Scott, 2007), specially designed for corpus analysis. The program’s Concord-function does not only count the number of times a word or expression is found in text, but also provide the context it occurs in. The search box allows for entering more than one word, so the search string was simply going to. As with the search-function in ENPC, Wordsmith also came up with hits that were not relevant to my study, where BE going to was followed by a noun, as in “going to bed”. These examples can easily be removed from the list with a special zap-function. I also entered search strings for gonna in each corpus. All together there were 67 relevant hits in LOCNESS and 69 in NICLE. Two of the 69 examples from NICLE showed use of gonna.

---

The figure above is a screenshot of WordSmith. A) shows the total number of occurrences, the column marked B) shows the files in which each sentence is found. C) shows that the concordance lines may be sorted after which words precedes or follows the search string. The search string “going to” is coloured blue, the word in the first position left of it is coloured red, as this was chosen as main sort. Second and third sort are coloured green. The highlighted concordance line is also given at the bottom of the screen - marked D) – where even more of the context is provided. The columns with numbers show things like entry number and where in the sentence the search string occurs.

2.2 Categories
Before collecting the material for this study, I knew I wanted to look at the implied meaning of the BE going to-construction and examine how Norwegian students make use of this compared to native speakers, thus the meaning of each sentence had to be analysed. I set up three different categories – 1) Prediction, 2) Intention and 3) Cause - knowing that some of the examples would be hard to place. In some cases the meaning was particularly hard to
interpret, so I added a category: 4) Ambiguous. The ambiguous examples will be discussed in
detail, so to see if they should rather be placed in a more clearly defined group.

While analysing the data, I decided to also identify some grammatical categories of each
sentence - animacy and grammatical person. Along with the classification based on meaning,
this information could help me detect any differences in the way Norwegian students and
native speakers use the BE going to-construction. In the animacy-category I defined three
groups – 1) Human 2) Non-human and 3) Inanimate. Identifying the grammatical person
would tell me who would perform the future action.

Data from all three corpora were analysed in this fashion, except for the examples with will,
which I have only included to compare the Norwegian correspondences with those of BE
going to. I have not studied the sentence-pairs with will in much detail, but have simply read
through them, noted that they all seem to signal prediction, and made a table, which can be
found in section 3.0, showing the frequencies of the correspondences.

The sentences and analyses were organized in FileMaker Pro. Examples from corpora were
saved as tab-separated text files, which can easily be imported into a FileMaker form. Each
sentence is shown in a separate page, and extra information can be added. The occurrences are
easy to count, one simply right-clicks the word you want to count, for example Inanimate.
FileMaker then counts all occurrences of Inanimate in the chosen category. The pages
containing an occurrence are singled out so that they can be studied separately, which makes
it easier to compare examples within a certain group. The illustrations below show
screenshots from FileMaker – figure 2 is a page with an example from NICLE; figure 3 shows
an example from the ENPC. The examples from the corpora I used required different fields.
In the ENPC analysis, there are fields for: “English sentence”, which shows the original
English sentence and “Translation”, which shows the Norwegian counterpart. The fields for
“English semantic group” and “Norwegian semantic group” have four categories: Prediction,
Intention, Cause and Ambiguous, as explained above. In the fields for “English subject” and
“Norwegian subject” the categories are Human, Non-human and Inanimate, and in the fields
for “English person” and “Norwegian person”, the categories are first person singular, first
person plural, second person singular and so on. There are also fields which show the
reference of the sentences, and a field for text type, where the possible options are Fiction and
Non-fiction. The field called “Translated with” is very important, as it shows the Norwegian
correspondences of *BE going to*, and allows me to single out all the examples of one particular correspondence, which makes it easy to compare them and study them closer. Each entry also have an identification number, these are for use in FileMaker only and are not referred to in this thesis. In case any of the examples need additional information, there also is a comment field.

Figure 2. Screenshot of ENPC data in FileMaker Pro

The fields for the NICLE and LOCNESS analyses are somewhat different than those described for the ENPC; NICLE and LOCNESS are not parallel corpora like the ENPC and so there is no need for any fields for corresponding sentences or for correspondences of *BE going to*. Each sentence has an identification number for use in the FileMaker program, and a reference field which shows from which text the example is extracted. There is a field called “Sentence” where the examples are displayed, and then there are fields for “Semantic group”, “(The animacy of) Subject” and “Subject person”, where the categories are the same as in the ENPC analysis. I have also included a field for negation in the NICLE and LOCNESS analyses, but this is not commented upon in the thesis, as there were no interesting results.
Figure 3. Screenshot of NICLE data in FileMaker Pro
3.0 Data from the ENPC

The approach I would like to use when looking at my material is the Integrated Contrastive Model; cf. section 1.6 and Gilquin (2000/2001). I will start with the data from the ENPC, compare the correspondences to will and BE going to, and look closer at the sentence pairs with BE going to to see what they can tell me about expressing future in Norwegian.

Table 1. Correspondences of will in English original fiction texts in the ENPC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correspondences of will, original fiction</th>
<th>Frequency/ %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SKULLE5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VILLE</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOMME til</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modal</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simple present</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLI</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA tenkt å</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paraphrase</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>omitted</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Correspondences of BE going to in the ENPC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correspondences of BE going to, ENPC</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SKULLE</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VILLE</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOMME til</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modal</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simple present</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLI</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA tenkt å</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paraphrase</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>omitted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>262</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 SKULLE, VILLE etc. are lemmas that include all forms of the word, for example is both skal and skulle included in SKULLE.
The tables show that although the frequencies differ, the actual correspondences are basically the same. This suggests Norwegian does not have any one expression which covers the same meaning as *BE going to* does, which in turn possibly could cause problems for Norwegian learners of English language. However, there may be implied meaning in the Norwegian expressions as well. To find out if there is, one will have to study the expressions in context. It also seems as if implied intention in English sentences corresponds with *HA tenkt å* in Norwegian - the Norwegian word for *think* in perfect aspect.

I will present a random selection of the sentences with *will* to illustrate the meaning they convey.

1. *Anything you feel we can work into the film will be welcome.* (ABR1)
   *Alt du mener vi kan innarbeide i filmen, er velkomment.* (ABRIT)

2. *In there, one will always be a stranger, will never “belong”.* (ABR1)
   *Der kommer man bestandig til å være en fremmed, kommer aldri til å "høre til".*
   (ABRIT)

3. *“Luke will start at the local school this year,” said Harriet (DL1)*
   *"Luke skal begynne på den lokale skolen i år," sa Harriet, "og Helen skal begynne neste år."* (DLIT)

4. *“Not just a trustworthy hook [sic!], but a book people will like to read.* (RDA1)
   *Ikke bare en pålitelig bok, men en bok som folk har glede av å lese.*
   (RDAIT)

All these examples show prediction, as do all other examples with *will*. The speakers or writers are not implying additional meaning (of e.g. intention) as is possible in the *BE going to*-construction; in these examples the future expressed is colourless – at least in the English original. Before looking at the implied meaning of *BE going to* and leaving the examples with *will*, it would be interesting to study the correspondences of both constructions in more detail. The figure in section 3.1 compares the percentages of the correspondences shown in tables 1 and 2.
3.1 Correspondences to will and BE going to

SKULLE corresponds to both will and BE going to, but is almost five times as common as a correspondence to the latter – 7 % compared to 34 %. VILLE is a common correspondence of both constructions, but is more than twice as common in sentence pairs with will than in those with BE going to. KOMME til is also common, and there is little difference in how often they occur. Simple present, other modals than VILLE/SKULLE and constructions with BLI are more common as correspondences to will than they are to BE going to; with HA tenkt å and paraphrases it is the other way around. In two sentence pairs with BE going to in the English sentence, the constructions has not been translated at all. Then there are a few sentence pairs with correspondences that do not occur more than once, these are grouped together and marked “other”.

![Figure 4. Correspondences to BE going to and will. ENPC, Norwegian translations.](image)

Figure 4. Correspondences to BE going to and will. ENPC, Norwegian translations.

(5) **When will it be like this again?** (ABR1)

*Når skal det igjen bli som nå?* (ABR1T)

(6) **Forty years of being women will boil through them, and leave them as they are now, heavy and cautious, and anxious to please.** (DL2)

*Og i førti år framover skal kvinneskjebner rase gjennom disse kroppene, og når årene har brent pikebarna ut, kommer de til å være nøyaktig som de er i dag, tunge og forsiktige, og oppsatte på å gjøre alle fornøyd.* (DL2T)

(7) **"And Helen will start next year."** (DL1)

*"Luke skal begynne på den lokale skolen i år," sa Harriet, "og Helen skal begynne neste år.*** (DL1T)
Examples (5), (6) and (7) all show sentence pairs where *will* corresponds to *SKULLE*. *Will* and *SKULLE* are colourless markers of future in all of these sentences, English and Norwegian alike. This is also true for the rest of the sentence pairs with *will/SKULLE*.

(8)  "If that’s the tone you’re going to take, we’ll just sit any damn place we happen to end up." (AT1)
    "Hvis du skal ta den tonen, kan vi bare sette oss der vi daler ned." (AT1T)

(9)  “We are going to join the I.R.A.” (DL2)
    "Vi skal slutte oss til I.R.A.” (DL2T)

(10) “How long is it going to take to pay off?” (DL1)
    "Hvor lang tid skal det betales over?” (DL1)

The three examples above are sentence pairs where *SKULLE* corresponds to *BE going to* rather than *will*. The *BE going to*-construction is not used as a colourless marker of the future in examples (8) and (9), which all imply intention. Example (10) shows that the construction may also be used for making neutral predictions of the future. This will be discussed further in section 3.2. As for now, it is interesting to see that *SKULLE* corresponds to both the neutral *will* and the neutral use of *BE going to*, but that it also serves to express the implied meaning which *BE going to* may have. *SKULLE* is also the most frequent correspondence to *BE going to*.

(11) "So how long will it take?" I asked. (DF1)
    "Hvor lang tid vil det ta?” spurte jeg. (DF1T)

(12) “If the presentation can be managed, it will certainly be done." (RDA1)
    "Hvis det i det hele tatt er mulig å få henne presentert, vil det helt sikkert skje. “
    (RDA1T)

(13) "Please, will you men stop being silly and threatening one another," said Maria.
    (RDA1)
    "Vil dere to slutte med å være så dumme og true hverandre," sa Maria. (RDA1T)

(14) "So will you keep him?" Macon said. (AT1)
    "Du vil beholde ham?“ sa Macon. (AT1T)

The most common correspondence to *will* is *VILLE*, as in examples (11) – (14) above. As in the case of examples (5) – (7), these can also be interpreted as a neutral expression of future.
However, one should note that Norwegian VILLE is not always a colourless future expression. It may function merely to denote prediction or to refer to something which naturally follows from something else (Faarlund et. al, 1997: 618), but it is equally often used as a future referent and intention marker combined. VILLE may imply that the subject has a will, wish or intention (1997: 616-617), and it is not always clear whether or not a sentence is meant to convey intention or pure prediction. The sentence pairs in (11) and (12) are neutral or colourless. In example (13), the English sentence is neutral, the Norwegian translation is a bit ambiguous. In example (14), the English sentence is fairly neutral, while the Norwegian one strongly implies intention. The verb à ville has the same root as to will, both verbs derive from the Old English verb willan, or wiljan in gothic (Falk and Torp, 1991: 984)⁶, and has a root meaning of willingness. This meaning is clear in the Norwegian sentence in (14).

(15) He looked fitted out for some sporting occasion: in fact, he was off skiing shortly, like Deborah, who was here with her little air of an exotic bird that had alighted in a strange place and was kept there by curiosity - she was not going to admit to admiration. (DL1)

Han så ut som om han var utstyrt for en sportstur, og han skulle faktisk like etter på ski sammen med Deborah, som var her med en mine lik en eksotisk fugl som hadde landet et eller annet merkelig sted og ble der av nysgjerrighet - hun ville såvisst ikke innrømme noen beundring. (DL1T)

(16) "You do n't know what I was going to say." (DL2)
"Du vet jo ikke hva jeg vil spørre om engang."

(17) In the first place she was n't at all sure what she was going to see. (RD1)
For det første var hun slett ikke sikker på hva hun ville få se. (RD1T)

VILLE is in fact a future referent and intention marker combined in examples (15) and (16), where it corresponds to BE going to. In the Norwegian sentence in (15), the translator has added an adverb, såvisst, which underlines the strong intention implied by the original. The English sentence in example (17) also contains BE going to, while the Norwegian correspondence is VILLE, but in this case there is no implied intention, neither in the English nor the Norwegian sentence. Like is the case with SKULLE, VILLE may be used to express different meanings in addition to its function as a future referent.

---

⁶ Oxford English Dictionary Online, search string ”will”. http://www.oed.com/
Merriam-Webster Online, search string “will”. http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/will
"Angus will fall asleep, and Jean will look down her nose," said Arthur, not placated at all. (FWI)
"Angus kommer til å sovne, og Jean vil sitte der med sin ovenfra-og-nedad-mine," sa Arthur, ikke formildet i der hele tatt. (FWIT)

(19) It was much more than just What will the neighbours think? (RDAI)
Det lå mer bak enn Hva kommer nabøene til å si? (RDAIT)
Examples (18) and (19) are sentence pairs where will corresponds to KOMME til. Neither of these four sentences convey implied meaning; they represent neutral predictions. This is interesting, since KOMME til has things in common with BE going to. They are both constructions built up around a verb of motion, although the verbs involve different directions.

Faarlund et. al. (1997) claims that komme til å + infinitive expresses (future) time and in addition has a modal meaning where the speaker predicts the future based on the knowledge he or her has in the moment of speaking (1997: 543). In Leech’s terminology, komme til å + infinitive may express prediction but also present intention or cause. Faarlund et al. (1997) states further that since the same expression may express both prediction and modality, a clear-cut distinction is not always possible (1997:544). This is probably true for all of the material I have looked at.

(20) I just need this single, simple repair job but unfortunately it’s going to take a few days to do it. (ATI)
Det var bare nødvendig med denne lille reparasjonen, men uheldigvis kommer det til å ta noen få dager å få det gjort. (ATIT)

(21) After a while his wife said, "Whatever happens, I’m going to fight." (AHI)
Etter en stund sa hans kone: "Uansett hva som skjer, kommer jeg til å slåss." (AHIT)

Two examples with BE going to confirm both Faarlund et. al’s (1997) and Leech’s (2004) claims. If we go with Leech, the sentence pair in example (20) is predictive, while (21) implies intention. KOMME til express both meanings equally well.

(22) Anything you feel we can work into the film will be welcome. (ABR1)
Alt du mener vi kan innarbeide i filmen, er velkommen. (ABR1T)

(23) "Caroline will bring him." (ATI)
"Caroline kommer med ham. (ATIT)
Simple present is another common correspondence of *will*. In English, simple present may occur in different scenarios, according to Leech (2004: 63-66). In dependent clauses introduced by conditional, temporal and manner conjunctions like *if, unless, when, as* and so on, the simple present occurs in a subordinate future use. The main clause may or may not contain *will/shall*. In “I’ll tell you *if it hurts*”, the main clause is constructed with *will*, in “Phone me *as soon as you get there*”, the main clause is an imperative clause where *will/shall* have not been used. The dependent clauses “*if it hurts*” and “*as soon as you get there*” are both constructed with simple present. This is because the situations in the dependent clauses are something given or assumed to be the case rather than a prediction. The simple present in the dependent clauses may be said to be a subordinate future, because it depends on the future reference in the main clause (2004: 64).

The simple present may also be used in independent clauses, and is then referred to as *futurate*. Leech (2004: 65) provides an explanation on its use; it represents *future assumed to be fact*. The uncertainty normally attributed to the future is not expressed in the futurate, the future event is presented as a fact or a categorical statement, and is thus a special or marked form. In a similar way, the simple present may signify a plan or arrangement which is regarded as unalterable, and which is felt to be an impersonal or collective one, made by for example a committee or by court of law. In its futurate use, the simple present has to be accompanied by an adverbial referring to time, unless it occurs in narrative sequence or in a context where the time of the future action easily can be assumed (2004: 66).

The Norwegian translations of the English sentences in examples (22) and (23) are independent clauses where the futurate is used rather than *VILLE/SKULLE* or other expressions of future. Faarlund et. al. (1997:570) say the choice between simple present and the present future in sentences which refer to the future depends on what kind of action the verb denotes. As in English, the present tense often occurs with an adverbial with time reference. The use of present tense with future reference is more common in cases with punctual verbs and where the verb describes the beginning or the end of an action. Non-durative verbs often involves a transition to a new, future situation, and do not really require adverbials or future referents. Sentences with durative verbs in the present tense may also express future, but require e.g. an adverbial which provides a non-durative meaning. Present tense is also common with durative verbs describing a condition which will last in the future. The future reference may be found in the context as well as in the actual sentence (1997: 571).
**KOMME** as in example (23) is not a durative verb, the action is not ongoing; and the simple present functions as a future expression without an adverbial with future reference. The verb in example (22) is durative, but we understand from the context that the sentence refers to a future action. The Norwegian sentences in (22) and (23) both imply intention, while the English counterparts are more ambiguous.

(24) "It's going to cost more," said Bert, "but we will buy peace and quiet." (DL2)  
"Det koster vel litt," sa Bert, "men så kjøper vi oss fred og ro." (DL2T)

(25) *I mean, you are n't going to find anything cheaper than the caravan.* (PDJ3)  
*Jeg mener, du finner ikke noe billigere sted å bo enn campingvogna her.* (PDJ3T)

Simple present is not as common as a correspondence to *BE going to* as it is to *will*, only in 8.8% of the material, compared to 21% in the case of *will*. However, examples (24) and (25) are also sentence where the Norwegian sentence refers to *future assumed to be fact* (Leech, 2004: 65). Neither of the Norwegian verbs in simple present are durative.

(26) "Perhaps nothing *will* come of it after all." (RDA1)  
*Kanskje blir det ikke til noe allikevel.* (RDA1T)

Sentence pair (26) above is another example of the simple present. The examples with *BLI*, which can be translated literally into *BECOME*, is used in 9 percent of the material with *will*, and was singled out in a separate category because it was far more common than other verbs in the simple present with a futurate use. The verb *BLI* refers to a process under development and thus refers to actions in the future even in the simple present. However, (26) does not refer to a plan or arrangement, and both the original English sentence and the translated Norwegian one are plain predictions.

(27) "It's *not going to* be nearly as difficult as you think now." (DL2)  
"Det blir ikke halvparten så vanskelig som dere tror nå." (DL2T)

*BLI* also corresponds to *BE going to*, though not as frequently as to *will*. Just like in example (26), the sentence pair in (27) are predictions without any additional meaning implied.

(28) "*We are going to* give it a rest," announced Harriet. (DL1)  
"Vi har *tenkt å* ta det litt med ro," erklærte Harriet. (DL1T)
Figure 4 reveals a correspondence to \textit{BE going to} that does not correspond to \textit{will} at all. This has its natural explanation as \textit{HA tenkt å} expresses intention, and this meaning is not attributed to \textit{will}.

(29) I \textit{was going to} wait until another time we met, but I may as well tell you now. (AH1)
\textit{Meningen var å vente til en annen gang, men jeg kan like godt si det nå.} (AH1T)

Some of the sentences with \textit{BE going to} have been paraphrased in translation, as in example (29). Neither of the sentences with \textit{will} have paraphrased translations; this is probably just a coincidence. Note that the material where \textit{will} is found is considerably smaller than the \textit{BE going to}-material.

In this material, \textit{will} is used as a neutral future referent whereas \textit{BE going to} is not. Joos’ (1968: 23) claim that \textit{BE going to} is the only colourless future marker in the English language is not supported, while Wekker’s (1976) and Leech’s (2004) theories are in agreement with the material from the ENPC.

\textbf{3.2 Implied meaning in sentences with \textit{BE going to}}

Having presented the correspondences to \textit{will} and \textit{BE going to} in the material from the ENPC, I want to look closer at the three categories mentioned in section 2.2. I will comment on the implied meaning of constructions with \textit{BE going to} in greater detail, as well as the subjects and grammatical persons in the sentences which make up my data. Figure 5 below shows the distribution of implied meaning, while table 3 shows the exact numbers.
Plain prediction without any extra meaning is the most common use, both in original and translated sentences. They match almost one to one: prediction is found in 101 of the English original sentences and 103 of the Norwegian. Implied intention is found in 89 English and 92 Norwegian sentences. The 5 sentences which do not match are probably found in the Intention/prediction category, where English sentences counts 50 and the Norwegian ones 43. In other words – the English sentences are ambiguous, while their Norwegian counterparts are less so. In the Cause category and in the more ambiguous Cause/Prediction category the sentence pairs seem to have matching meanings. Two of the sentences have been omitted in translation. The sentence pairs which do not match will be commented on, as will a small, random selection of the other examples.
As it turns out, the results are not as easily explained as expected. It is true that most of the differences are due to ambiguous sentences in English having been translated into less ambiguous ones in Norwegian, but there are also examples of sentences with a predictive or intentional meaning in English having been translated into a Norwegian verb phrase that is open to more ambiguous interpretations. There are even cases where the meaning has changed completely in translation, from prediction to intention in one sentence pair and the other way around in two of the sentence pairs. The sentences which clearly refer to a cause have kept the implied meaning in the translations, so the boundary between intention and prediction seems to be fuzzier than those between cause and the other categories.

(30) "They are going to have four more children," Dorothy said, appealing to the others." (DL1)
"De kommer til å få fire barn til," sa Dorothy og appellerte til de andre." (DLIT)

(31) "And who's going to do all the work?" (DL2)
"Og hvem vil du få til å gjøre drittarbeidet?" (DL2T)

In examples (30) and (31), the English sentences with BE going to are classified as Intention/prediction as they may express intention or prediction or a mix between the two, depending on how one chooses to read. The Norwegian translations have been labelled either Intention or Prediction, so they are less ambiguous. In (30), it would be natural to interpret that the persons mentioned intend to have four more children, because one cannot really predict such a thing with certainty. However, the translation signals Prediction rather than Intention, even if this sounds odd, so the English example has been classified as ambiguous; there is of course a possibility that the English sentence was meant as a prediction as well. The context shows that the English sentence is meant to refer to Intention. The Norwegian translation sounds like Prediction, but when the same topic is brought up later on in the text, the Norwegian translation refers to Intention. The sentence "'You aren't really going to have four more children?' enquired Sarah, sighing — and they all knew she was saying, four more challenges to destiny." corresponds to "'Det er ikke sant at dere har tenkt å få fire barn til?' spurte Sarah og sukket — og de visste alle at hun mente det var fire utfordringer til skjebnen.'". It seems as if the translator was a bit unlucky in her choice of words in example (30). The English sentence in (31) may be meant as a prediction or an utterance of intention. It could easily be grouped in the Intention category, but as the subject is not the speaker or a group in which the speaker takes part, we cannot tell for certain. The Norwegian translation
has been paraphrased, and is an example of Intention. The speaker asks another person present who he or she intends to assign the work to.

(32) “I’m going to have a drink if you won’t.” (DL2)
    "Om du ikke trenger en drink, så gjør i hvert fall jeg det nå.” (DL2T)

(33) “If you don’t shut up right now, I’m going to make you go back to your own bed.”
    (TH1)
    "Hvis du ikke tier stille nå, får du gå og sove i din egen seng.” (TH1T)

The speaker in the English part of example (32) intends to have a drink, in the translations, he says that he needs one, even if the person he is talking to does not. The English sentence conveys Intention, the Norwegian one Prediction. The translation is paraphrased. This is also the case in example (33), in the English sentence it is stressed that the speaker intends to take action if the listener does not act as he pleases, in the Norwegian sentence the consequence mentioned is the same, but the speaker’s part is not stressed, the translation is slightly paraphrased, and we have Intention in the English sentence and Prediction in the Norwegian one.

(34) "And how are we going to pay for it all if I am pregnant?” (DL1)
    "Og hvordan skal vi klare å betale for dette hvis jeg er gravid?” (DL1T)

(35) “No bank’s going to look at him after that.” (FW1)  
    “Ingen bank kommer til å se på ham etter det.” (FW1T)

In the cases where cause is referred in the English sentences, the Norwegian counterparts hold the same meaning. In most of the cases the cause is given in a conditional clause as in (34), but there are a couple instances where the cause is referred to by other means. In (35) that/det refers to a reason which is not specified in the example.

(36) "Fun evening this is going to be,” was all he could think of to say. (FW1)
    "Det blir nok en festlig aften,” var alt han kunne komme på å si. (FW1T)

(37) “We’re all going to get either cancer or heart disease.” (JB1)
    "Vi kommer alle til å få enten kreft eller hjertetøbbel.” (JB1T)

(38) “He confided to friends he trusted that he was going to cancel debts but leave the large estates intact.” (JH1)
"Han betrodde venner han stolte på at han aktet å slette gjeld, men la store eiendommer være ubeskåret." (JH1T)

(39) "Only I'm going to have a yappy Pekinese, and chase kids off my lawn." (MA1)
"Bare at jeg skal ha en gneldrende pekingeser, og jage ungene fra plenen med stokken min." (MA1T)

Examples (36) through (39) are sentence pairs where the meaning is unchanged in translation. (36) and (37) are predictions, not coloured by intention. There might be a cause which leads the speaker’s to make these claims, but they are not referred to in the example sentences. Both examples seem to be direct speech, they both occur in fiction where the writer has included dialogue between characters. As explained in section 1.2, the colourless use of the BE going to-construction most often occurs in informal language and particularly speech (Leech, 2004: 60).

In (38) and (39) both original texts and translations refer to the future outcome of present intention, as described in Leech (2004, 58). The subjects have plans for the future, which they – at least at the time of speaking – intend to go through with.

(40) "Because we're going to live here." (ST1)
"Fordi det er her vi skal bo." (ST1T)

(41) "Where we're going to sit." (AT1)
"Hvor vi skal sitte." (AT1T)

(42) "Who is going to pay for it?" (DL2)
"Og hvem skal betale for det, da?" (DL2T)

In some cases it is difficult to decide which meaning the writer has had in mind. The examples could probably have been labelled either the one or the other; I have chosen to group them in a separate category because there were so many cases where I could not be quite certain. It would probably have been a lot easier to group the examples if I had studied more of the context; as it is, I have only considered the relevant sentences which contains BE going to. In (40), the use of BE going to may signal intention, but because the subject is we and the speaker explains that this is the place they will live from now on to a person which may very well be included in we, it does not sound as if the listener has intended to live there. One can imagine an adult explaining to a child that this is just how it will be. (41) may or may
not imply intention: the utterance is merely a (dependent) clause, and not much information is given. (42) may be paraphrased “Who will pay for it?” or “Who intends to pay for it?”, so both Prediction and Intention are likely interpretations.

(43) There’s enough petrol for this afternoon, I expect, but how am I going to get the children to school tomorrow morning?“ (FW1)
Det er nok bensin til i ettermiddag, tenker jeg, men hvordan skal jeg få barna på skolen i morgen tidlig?” (FW1T)

(44) I hung around my father, climbing on the back of his old armchair or leaning against his legs when strangers were there and understanding snatches of what was being said: the man had beaten her, he was drunk every night, he was going to lose his job with a builder. (NG1)
Jeg hang over fars stolrygg eller støttet meg mot knærne hans når det kom fremmede, og oppfattet bruddstykker av det som ble sagt: mannen hadde slått henne, han var full hver kveld, han stod i fare for å miste jobben hos byggmesteren. (NG1T)

Cause and prediction also have fuzzy boundaries. Example (43) could be classified as either prediction or cause. The clause in which BE going to occurs has a predictive meaning, but it is implied in another clause that the speaker will be out of petrol tomorrow morning, thus giving a reason or cause for the worry. In (44), we are told that a man is going to lose his job. We are also told this man is violent and gets drunk every night, and this might be at least part of the reason why he will be fired, but we cannot say for certain that this is why; it depends on how one interprets.

All in all it looks as if the Norwegian translators are true to the original meaning in the text. In the cases where original and translation do not match, it is due to translations having been paraphrased. There is a slight tendency towards Norwegian translators choosing less ambiguous meanings, this might be due to differences between the expressions in the two languages, but is likely to be a result of disambiguation; translators tend to simplify and clarify the text, for example by replacing difficult pronouns with forms which allows more precise information, or by adding quotation marks (Baker, 1993: 244). Most likely the ambiguous cases in both English and Norwegian could have been classified differently, there may be information given in the context which could tell whether the utterances were meant to convey a clearer meaning. In any case, the differences are so little that it would be wrong to claim that Norwegians are more accurate in their references to the future. What one can say
with certainty is that in fiction, the *BE going to*-construction are frequently used to refer to the future outcome of present intention, but that colourless predictions of the future are even more common. Because most of the material has been collected from fictional texts which are likely to include dialogue, this is not too surprising. The meaning is generally kept as it is in translation.

### 3.3 Animacy of subjects in sentences with BE going to

The second category I will look at is animacy. Figure 6 reveals that a human subject is most common in both original texts and translations; in translations there are a few inanimate subjects and very few non-human animate ones. In some of the Norwegian translations, we find that the subject has been omitted; cf. table 4 and examples (47)-(50).
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**Table 4. Animacy of subjects in the ENPC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENPC</th>
<th>ENG Frequency</th>
<th>ENG %</th>
<th>NOR Frequency</th>
<th>NOR %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-human</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inanimate</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is the case in the category of implied meaning, the sentence pairs do not match one to one. A human subject is by far the most common in both English and Norwegian sentences, although there are seven more of them among the English examples. The non-human subjects
seem to add up, while there are three more cases of inanimate subjects among the Norwegian translations. It appears that the English corresponding sentences to those with an omitted subject all have human subjects and that two English sentences with human subjects have been paraphrased with inanimate subjects in translation. There are four instances where the subject has been omitted in Norwegian.

(45) “It is the beginning of at least eleven long years of schooling that all of you are going to have to go through.” (RD1)  
"Det er begynnelsen på minst elleve år på skolen.” (RD1T)

In (45), the that-clause is completely left out in the Norwegian translation; the subject has been omitted as well as the rest of the clause. In the four instances where the Norwegian subjects have been omitted, the English sentences have human subjects as expected.

(46) “You’re not going to find it easy after that.” (DL2)  
“Det blir kanskje ikke lett å omstille seg igjen.” (DL2T)

(47) “I was going to wait until another time we met, but I may as well tell you now.” (AH1)  
“Meningen var å vente til en annen gang, men jeg kan like godt si det nå.” (AH1T)

(48) “Actually, he looked good, but not like he was going to quickly ease any neighborhood suspicions.” (JSM1)  
”Han tok seg i grunnen bra ut, men ikke på en måte som straks kunne berolige mistenksonne naboer.” (JSM1)

All the mismatches in the table are due to paraphrases in the Norwegian translations. The subjects have either omitted as shown above, or they have been changed. The paraphrased subjects have been classified in the same way as all the other subjects, so an English sentence with a human subject may correspond to a Norwegian sentence with a non-human subject, making a direct comparison of the sentences impossible. (46) has a human subject, replaced with inanimate det (lit. that) in the paraphrased Norwegian counterpart. In (47) the intention conveyed by the use of BE going to with a human subject is kept in the form of the noun mening en (lit. the meaning); thus the subject has changed from human to inanimate. The clause containing BE going to in (48) has also been paraphrased in translation, and the human subject is replaced with an inanimate one.
Subjects in English and Norwegian clearly function in much the same way. Inanimate subjects are slightly more common in Norwegian when considering this material, but as the difference is only 1%, there is no reason to believe this is a general tendency in the Norwegian language.

3.4 Grammatical person in sentences with *BE going to*

*BE going to* is most often used with a subject in the third person singular, but the first person singular is also quite frequent. The second person singular, first person plural and third person plural are fairly common, while the second person plural is little used. There are only small differences between English and Norwegian; only 9 sentence pairs of the 262 have a subject with a different grammatical person in the translated sentence. However, none of the categories of grammatical person match one to one. There is a deviation of only 1 or 2% within each category, but Norwegian seem to favour the third person singular and plural over the first and the second person. As we already know from section 3.3, four subjects have been omitted in translation and cannot be grouped.
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In English original texts

In Norwegian translations
Table 5. Grammatical person in the ENPC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENPC</th>
<th>ENG Frequency</th>
<th>ENG %</th>
<th>NOR Frequency</th>
<th>NOR %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. person singular</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. person singular</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. person singular</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. person plural</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. person plural</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. person plural</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omitted in trans.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>262</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>262</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(49) "I just need this single, simple repair job but unfortunately it's going to take a few days to do it." (AT1)
"Det var bare nødvendig med denne lille reparasjonen, men uheldigvis kommer det til å ta noen få dager å få det gjort." (AT1T)

(50) “Flasy and too easy, that was the life of the rich; but now he was going to be beholden to it.” (DL1)
”Forlorent og altfor lettvint, det var de rikes liv, men nå kom han til å stå i avhengighetsforhold til det.” (DL1T)

(51) “But he - my father - would say, "My son’s going to be a writer". (NG1)
"Men han - min far - sa: "Min sønn skal bli forfatter." (NG1T)

(52) “The road was going to be a main road to the airport.” (RDO1)
“Veien skulle bli hovedvei til flyplassen.” (RDO1T)

The most frequent category is the third person singular, where the majority of the examples have the pronoun it or a personal pronoun like he or she as subject, as in (49) and (50). There are also many sentence pairs where the subject is the name of a person or another noun referring to a human being, as in (51). Only very few cases have a noun referring to a thing as subject; (52) is one of them.

(53) "These madmen are going to go on." (DL1)
"Disse galningene har tenkt å fortsette." (DL1T)

(54) "So if they’re going to christen you Walter they’d better put a couple of names in front of it, one for your spell in the pram plus another for the long haul up to becoming Walter." (JB1)
"Så om de skal døpe deg Walter, er det best de settet et par navn foran, ett for tiden i barnevognen og ett for det lange strekket frem til du blir Walter.” (JB1T)
(53) and (54) show how the third person plural is used in the material. A noun referring to a group of people is sometimes used, or the subject may consist of the names of two or more people. The use of the pronoun *they*, as in example (54), occurs most frequently.

(55) “*There’s a story inside me which I’m going to write, no matter how long it takes.*”
    “Jeg har en historie inni meg som jeg skal skrive, uansett hvor lang tid det tar.”

(ABR1)  
(ABR1T)

(56) “*Then when I’m sure that he does understand, that he really does realize, that he feels just terrible, I’m going to open my purse and pull out a gun and shoot him between the eyes.*” (AT1)
    “Og når jeg så er sikker på at han skjønner det, at han virkelig begriper, at han føler seg ussel, så skal jeg åpne vesken min og dra frem en revolver og skyte ham mellom øynene.” (ATIT)

(57) “*How am I going to get through to July?*” she demanded, in a low appalled voice.
    “*Hvordan skal jeg komme meg gjennom juli?*” spurte hun med lav, skjelvende stemme.

(DL1)  
(DL1T)

(58) “*We are going to give it a rest,* announced Harriet.” (DL1)
    “*Vi har tenkt å ta det litt med ro,* erklærte Harriet.” (DLIT)

(59) “*We’re all going to get either cancer or heart disease.*” (JB1)
    “*Vi kommer alle til å få enten kreft eller hjertetøbbel.*” (JBIT)

Most of the cases with a first person subject also express intention, like in examples (55) and (56). The speaker in (55) intends to write a story; while the speaker in (56) plans to shoot someone. The correlation is not surprising; thoughts and activities of the mind are obviously more available to the person who is doing the mental activity. It is easier to speak about one's own thoughts and plans than those of other people. (58) expresses intention, and this is also very clear in the Norwegian corresponding sentence. The Norwegian correspondence *tenkt å* (lit. “thought to”) + *verb* is a common way of referring to plans for the future. First person subjects also occur with other meanings, like in examples (57) and (59), which are predictive.

(60) “*Anyway, I'm sure you're going to cheer up again one of these days.*” (MD1)
    “*Men jeg er sikker på at du snart vil blomstre opp igjen.*” (MDIT)

(61) "*Are you going to run a hotel?*" enquired Frederick reasonably, determined not to make a judgement. (DL1)
Second person subjects do not seem to correlate with any of semantic groups; sentences with second person subjects may have either a predictive meaning, or imply intention or a cause. The sentence pair in example (60) has a predictive meaning and a second person singular subject, both in original and translation. The use of *BE going to* instead of *will* in (60) also makes it sound more reassuring – the use of *will* would sound more formal and possibly less heartfelt. The sentences in (61) both have second person plural subjects and an implied intention in the question asked.

(62) “I *’m going to* talk to her.” *(JSM1)*

*(P) (JSM1T)*

(63) “If you don’t shut up right now, I *’m going to* make you go back to your own bed.” *(TH1)*

“Howis du ikke tyst nå, får du gå og sove i din egen seng.” *(TH1T)*

There are nine sentence pairs in which the subjects are not in the same person in original and translation. Four of these mismatches are due to the omitted Norwegian translations mentioned in section 3.3; the subjects in the English corresponding sentences are in the second person plural, third person singular, first person singular and third person plural. The other mismatches are due to paraphrases as in section 3.3, and it is not surprising that the relevant examples are the same as those with differences concerning animacy; both animacy and person are references defined by the subject. Examples (45) – (48) are all cases where the grammatical person is changed in translation. In example (62) the English sentences have not been translated at all and (63) is another instance of change in subject.

3.5 General comments

Norwegian does not have a single expression which covers exactly the same meaning as the *BE going to*-construction does according to Leech (2004), but the same meaning can be conveyed through other expressions of future. These expressions do not have exclusive meanings, and are equally good correspondences to *will* as they are to *BE going to*. Other than that, the material does not reveal any great differences between the two languages. Most of the original sentences are translated fairly directly into Norwegian, with the meaning and the subject kept. Where this is not the case, the English original sentence has been paraphrased in
translation. The sentence pairs in question do not stand out in any way; they have nothing in common which suggests they had to be paraphrased to make meaning. It is likely that the paraphrases are stylistic choices rather than semantic ones; that they were chosen because of the context, to create variation or make the text flow better. It is also important to note that since I have only looked at one direction of translation, the validity of the contrastive analysis may have been affected.
4.0 Data from LOCNESS and NICLE

The second part of this study is to look at how Norwegian learners of English use the *BE going to*-construction. As explained in section 2, the data for this analysis is collected from the NICLE corpus; the reference corpus is LOCNESS. My hypothesis is that Norwegian learners may have trouble using the *BE going to*-construction correctly, because the contrastive study showed that there is no one Norwegian expression that corresponds to *BE going to*.

The tables below show that Norwegian students do in deed use *BE going to* for other purposes than native speakers do. The corpus material is relatively small, but there are distinct differences showing tendencies that are not likely to be random. The overall frequency distribution of the construction makes the differences even more significant, *BE going to* is in fact more common in NICLE than it is in LOCNESS. There are 69 occurrences of *BE going to* in NICLE, which is a corpus of approximately 212,000 words, so the construction occurs 3.25 times pr. 10,000 words. LOCNESS contains of 324,304 words all together, and the construction occurs 67 times, which means it is found 2.06 times pr. 10,000 words.\(^7\)

Table 6. Semantic groups in NICLE and LOCNESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic group</th>
<th>NICLE</th>
<th>LOCNESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguous</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Animacy of subjects in NICLE and LOCNESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animacy</th>
<th>NICLE</th>
<th>LOCNESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>85,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-human</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inanimate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undefined</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^7\) NICLE: 69/212,000*10,000 = 3.25
LOCNESS: 67/324,304*10,000 = 2.06
Starting with table 6, the Prediction and Intention categories are particularly interesting. Norwegian students use *BE going to* with implied intention in 46.4% of the cases, while native speakers only imply intention in 19.4% of the cases. The Prediction category show a similar gap, but the other way around – while native speakers use *BE going to* for prediction in more than half of the sampled sentences, Norwegian learners only do so in 20.3% of the material. It looks as if Norwegian learners overuse implied intention and underuse *BE going to* as a more neutral future expression. “The reason behind this is to make sure that the discussion I am going to bring out is based on what I feel is important to focus on, according to the given text.” is a typical example of Intention from the NICLE material. “In many NFL teams the players try to determine how much money they are going to make the following year.” is an example of how native speakers may use the *BE going to*-construction.

Implied cause is about as common among the Norwegians as it is among native speakers. Both corpora contain one sentence each which may be interpreted as implied intention, implied cause or as a fairly neutral expression. Then we are left with two categories which can be neutral or imply intention or a cause. Originally, some of the LOCNESS examples were placed in these categories as well, but I decided they were not as ambiguous as I first thought and managed to group them in the regular categories. This was not as easy with the examples from NICLE. Some of them seem to be the results of bad language, and these sentences will be studied in closer detail in section 4.1, along with a selection of sentences representing the other tendencies mentioned.

Animacy is also treated differently among native speakers and Norwegian speakers, the latter seems to prefer human subjects in sentences with *BE going to*. The discrepancy is 30%, so Norwegian students are obviously overusing human subjects as well as implied intention. Native speakers use non-human subjects about 2% more often than the non-natives, and inanimate subjects almost 28% more often.
Table 8. Grammatical person in NICLE and LOCNESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical person</th>
<th>NICLE Fr.</th>
<th>NICLE Percent</th>
<th>LOCNESS Fr.</th>
<th>LOCNESS Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. person singular</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 person singular</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. person singular</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. person plural</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. person plural</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. person plural</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 also reveals differences. Norwegian learners overuse the first person and underuse the third person. The subject is in the first person singular in 33.3% in the sentences produced by Norwegian learners compared to LOCNESS, but only in 9% in sentences produced by native English speakers. The pattern is similar for the first person plural. Norwegians use *we* in 18.8% of the 69 examples with *BE going to*, British and American students only does in 4.5% of their 67 sentences. While native speakers use *BE going to* when they write about other people, Norwegian students seem to refer to themselves much more often. Hasselgård (forthcoming ms. p. 8) makes the same observation: “A striking feature of the NICLE essays is the frequent use of self-reference; i.e. direct reference to the writer as writer or as participant in a story. This is shown mainly in the use of first-person singular pronouns, but there are also first person plural pronouns where the reference is not general, but specifically includes the speaker and a limited number of other people.”

### 4.1 Implied meaning in sentences with *BE going to*

Prediction is the most common meaning of *BE going to* in the ENPC, both in the original sentences and in the translations. This is also the case in LOCNESS. NICLE however, has intention as the most common meaning. References to cause seem to be more used in NICLE and LOCNESS, but the ENPC has more ambiguous cases. Note that all examples in section 4 is quoted exactly as they are given in the corpora; grammar errors and spelling mistakes are not corrected.
Prediction is by far the most common use of *BE going to* among the native speakers. The following four examples serve to illustrate this use.

(64) *The case state that Goodrich Company did not mind that they were going to lose money on the original deal, but they knew that air craft brakes would be very profitable for them.* (L-usarg11)

(65) *The claims that the Lottery was going to be a poor persons tax seem justified by the fact that Lottery profits are now incorporated into the government’s accounts.* (L-alevels5)

(66) *This, as everyone is well aware, is not going to be achieved with ease, but the more tolerant every member state is of each other, the more successful the Single Europe will be.* (L-brsur3)

(67) *Obviously, a united Europe is not going to erase centuries of culture to form one identifiable "European culture"; but this might always be a worry for the British, (and probably, for other countries too).* (L-brsur3)

These examples are from essays and not fictional text; thus neither of them are examples from dialogue as was often the case in the ENPC material. Examples (64) to (67) all have predictive meaning. 55% of all the sentences produced by native speakers contain *BE going to* used as a colourless future reference, and this is perhaps somewhat surprising if we consider what Leech claims is the general meaning of the construction; that of “future outcome of present intention” or “future outcome of present cause” (2004: 58). However,
Leech also recognize the increasing use of *BE going to* in neutral contexts (2004: 60). Young people often are the first ones to embrace changes in the language, and this may be the explanation to why a neutral use of *BE going to* is so common in this material.

(68)  *But the truth is that is never going to happen in the real world, unless we decide to have students in practice.* (N-noho1011)

(69)  *Something we do not know though, is what is going to happen in the future.* (N-nobe1015)

(70)  *You know you are going to have a busy day at work, and will not find time to have lunch.* (N-noos1023)

The *BE going to*-construction is used as a neutral prediction of the future by Norwegian students as well, but only in about 20 % of the cases. Some of these are examples (68) to (70). Neither of them imply intention or refers to a cause. English-speaking students should have a better command of the language, and if we see their distribution between the semantic groups as the norm, Norwegian students are underusing *BE going to* as prediction by 30 %. There is nothing strange about the construction of predictive sentences in NICLE; they are simply not as frequent as one would expect when comparing to the LOCNESS data.

(71)  *People are going to use drugs regardless of what anyone say.* (L-usarg1)

(72)  *The last area I’m going to touch on is intercontinental relations.* (L-usarg1)

(73)  *This raises the moral issue, ‘is it right and just to kill animals if we aren’t going to eat them’?* (L-alevels3)

(74)  *In conclusion, even though the presence of some of these dilemmas might stop some people considering IVF treatment, the fact is - if couples want to have a baby and can afford it then they are going to use any means possible and IVF is one of them.* (L-alevels8)

Native speakers express intention in 19.4 % of the material, about 1 % less frequent than prediction. One could perhaps expect intention to be more common based on Leech’s claim that future outcome of intention and cause are the general meanings of the construction, but
then colourless prediction is a perfectly good meaning as well. The examples of intention from LOCNESS occur with human subjects in both the first, second and third person.

(75) The reason behind this is to make sure that the discussion I am going to bring out is based on what I feel is important to focus on, according to the given text. (N-nohe1002)

(76) Questions have been raised about the university not being able to prepare the students for the real world, and that is a question I'm going to discuss in this essay. (N-nouo1052)

(77) I'm also going to focus on the woman, because the man who is involved has no legal rights in this matter, unfortunately... (N-noos1029)

(78) My sister and I were talking about how much money our parents were actually going to give us for the trip, hopefully as much as 50 kroner. (N-nouo2013)

Norwegian students express intention a lot more often, in 46.4% of the NICLE material. Compared to the 19.4% in LOCNESS, there is definitely a case of overuse among the learners. Some of the sentences have a 3rd person subject as in example (78), but most of them are in 1st person singular, like (75) to (77). The three examples are very typical; BE going to is used to introduce essay topics. The writer presents his or her intentions for their paper. This use is not particularly common in the native speaker material. The reason for the overuse of semantic intention is identified. English-speaking students clearly have other means of introducing their chosen topics, which Norwegian students do not make use of.

WordSmith has a function which allows for studying the whole text from which an example has been extracted. By double clicking a concordance line, the source text will appear on the screen. From briefly looking at some random source texts from the two corpora, I find that this kind of topic introduction indeed is common among Norwegian students, also with other future referents like will. Native speakers, however, usually do not introduce their topics by presenting their own intentions for the paper; they simply give a short description of the chosen topic, then immediately start the discussion. It seems to be a matter of different writing traditions. This is confirmed by a course book in Norwegian for upper secondary school. The book lists four different types of introduction and explaining one’s intentions for the paper is said to be the standard solution (Haraldsen et.al, 2007: 298).
(79) Solutions to any road problems, are always going to cause groups of people harm. (L-alevels1)

(80) We already know that it is inevitable that when someone becomes infected with HIV, it is going to develop into AIDS, and they are going to die. (L-usarg1)

(81) I wanted him to spend the night because he's in the military and I'm not going to see him for three years. (L-usarg11)

Examples (79)-(81) show the semantic category of cause. There is not any differences to speak of in this category, 15 sentences from NICLE and 16 sentences from LOCNESS refers to some kind of cause, more or less directly. The three sentences above are all produced by native speakers. In example (79), “solutions to any road problems” is directly said to cause people harm. Examples (80) and (81) are also examples of a cause being referred to, even if it is not as explicit. There are factors in the present which lead to or contribute to an event taking place, or as Leech puts it: “the train of events leading to the future happening is already underway” (2004: 59). We know that HIV in (80) is likely to develop into AIDS, and that the latter condition is terminal unless strong medication is prescribed. In example (81), the speaker’s boyfriend or husband is “in the military” and we may assume from the context that he is stationed far from home.

(82) I wish I could be more prepared than I am going to be with one year of pedagogical education. (N-nouo1052)

(83) With the increased use of the Internet, many feared that we were going to be passive and not go out so much. (N-noho1029)

(84) I know what’s going to happen here to, having seen it 4 times before, but here I can at least fast-forward past all the boring stuff. (N-noos1020)

The Norwegian students treat BE going to just like native speakers do, in (82) one year of pedagogical education is obviously not enough to make the speaker feel prepared for the future, in (83) we know that the use of Internet has increased, which in turn may lead to people being passive, and in (84) the speaker knows what is going to happen in the film, because he or she has watched it on four previous occasions.

(85) The question when thinking of Norway is when and how we are going to join a union of European corporation. (N-nouo1026)
(86) **The teachers are also concerned about that we are going to learn the theoretic aspects before the exams.** (N-noho1001)

(87) **It can't be easy for them to be let out of jail knowing that they are going to commit another crime just because they don't know how to do anything else.** (N-nouo2032)

Some of the example sentences from NICLE have an ambiguous meaning. Example (85) may have a predictive meaning or an intentional meaning depending on how one interprets it. A country is really an inanimate subject which cannot have an intention, but one could argue that the subject “Norway” represents the people or politicians of Norway, who in the end decide whether or not the country should join the union. To be able to make a decision like that, the people must have intentions, make plans or take votes. (86) is not a very good sentence, which makes it difficult to interpret what the student have meant to say. The teachers in question have probably stressed the importance of learning everything one should know before sitting for the exam. When studying the context of this particular sentence, one finds that the student thinks theory makes up too large a part of the teacher training, and that the teachers focus too much on learning the theory and not on how the future teachers function in the classroom. **BE going to** does not really fit in at all, so I will not try to analyze it any further. The sentence could be paraphrased as something like “The teachers are also (too) concerned about us (students) learning the theory”. Example (87) could be interpreted in many ways; as if the criminals intend to commit crime when they get out of jail, as if it is just a prediction of what will happen, but the sentence also refers to a possible cause of the future crimes, namely that the criminals do not know how to do anything else.

### 4.2 Animacy in sentences with **BE going to**

The majority of the examples from the ENPC has human subjects, more than 80% of both the English and Norwegian sentences. This also goes for the examples from NICLE, while the LOCNESS examples have human subjects in about 55% of the cases. Instead, the native speakers have a high proportion of inanimate subjects, almost 36% compared to almost 9% in NICLE. The ENPC has inanimate subjects in about 16% of the English sentences and about 17% of the Norwegian sentences. The ENPC has the lowest frequency of non-human subjects, with about 1% each of the examples from the English and the Norwegian sentences, but non-human subjects are not frequently used in the other corpora either.
Figure 9. Animacy in sentences with BE going to. LOCNESS and NICLE.

A human subject is the most common choice both in the learner corpus and the reference corpus, but it is used far more often by the learners. Non-human subjects are not much used by either group, while inanimate subjects are more popular among native speakers.

(88)  *This raises the moral issue, ‘is it right and just to kill animals if we aren’t going to eat them’?* (L-alevels3)

(89)  *And not all children are going to be torn from their adoptive parents.* (L-usarg1)

(90)  *The last area I’m going to touch on is intercontinental relations.* (L-usarg1)

(88) – (90) are three different examples on how human subjects are used by native speakers. Both nouns and pronouns are used; (88) has a human subject in the form of the pronoun *we*, while the noun *children* is the subject in example (89). (90) is one of the rare examples of native speakers using the same kind of topic introduction as the Norwegian students so often do, the intentions of the paper is presented by means of the BE going to-construction in combination with a 1st person singular subject and a verb.

(91)  *I am going to discuss different kind of work and will also take a look at the unequal financial rewards in society.* (N-noag1014)

(92)  *You know you are going to have a busy day at work, and will not find time to have lunch.* (N-noos1023)
Human subjects are much more frequent in the NICLE material than in LOCNESS, and again it is the topic introductions in Norwegian essays which skew the result. The learners refer to themselves and their intentions for the paper using the $BE$ going to construction, so naturally a lot of the material will have human subjects. Intention is about 34% more frequently used by Norwegians, and human subjects are about 30% more frequently used by the learners, so it is likely that the same sentences skew the results for semantic group, animacy and grammatical person. (91) is an example of the typical Norwegian topic introduction, while example (92) contains a human subject in the 2nd person, which is fairly uncommon.

(93) Recently the British government have brought in legislation with respect to how animals, which are going to be slaughtered, should be transported. (L-alevels3)

(94) If the hospital did not comply, the federal government was going to withhold $107 million in Medicare and Medicaid payments, until they chose to comply. (L-usarg1)

Non-human subjects are used for referring to animals, organisations and other things which are neither human nor dead objects. (93) is an example of an animal subject, while (94) refers to a government; both are from the LOCNESS corpus.

(95) Even tough they are experienced criminals I think that the society in the long run is going to benefit from helping the criminals, instead of make them feel not welcome in the society. (N-noag1020)

(96) If the military is going to change into a professional army with fewer soldiers, they would not afford nor need some of the bases, and they would be shut down. (N-nobu1001)

The Norwegian students use non-human subjects in the same way as the native speakers do, the two examples above illustrate how non-human subjects are used. The society in (95) is going to benefit from helping criminals, while the subject is example (96) is the military.

(97) Where do you think that ten million dollars is going to come from? (L-usarg1)

(98) No longer was sex going to be a dark issue. (L-usarg1)

Dead objects, abstract phenomena or actions are all inanimate. Inanimate subjects are more frequently used by English-speaking students, which not surprisingly have a more varied language. In the examples above, both from the LOCNESS corpus, the subjects are money,
more precisely ten million dollars, and sex. Other sentences have subjects like genetic engineering, the long term effect, killing a known murderer and restrictions. Expressions like “there is going to be” or “it is going to be” also occur more than once.

(99) Something we do not know though, is what is going to happen in the future. (N-nobe1015)

(100) It is a fact that for many people the morning decides how the rest of the day is going to turn out. (N-noos1026)

(101) Keeping them in prison later is not going to work, either. (N-nouo1038)

Inanimate subjects are seldom used by the learners of English; there are only six instances of BE going to occurring with this kind of subject. In three cases the subject is what, as in example (99), and refers to some future action. In (100) the inanimate subject is day. One Norwegian student has even chosen an action as subject of the sentence, as shown in example (101). This is a more advanced use of the language; it is probably easier to think of actors as humans.

4.3 Grammatical person in sentences with BE going to

The third person singular is the most frequent grammatical person in the ENPC, as it is in LOCNESS. The first person singular is also common in the ENPC material, in both English and Norwegian sentences. The table below shows that Norwegian learners use the first person a lot more often than do native speakers.

![Figure 10. Grammatical person in sentences with BE going to. LOCNESS and NICLE.](image-url)
Native speakers use third person subjects in almost all their sentences with BE going to. The first person singular and plural are also used, although not very frequently. The second person plural is not used at all, in either of the corpora. The learners mainly write in the first or the third person singular, and subjects in the first and the third person plural are also chosen regularly. The second person singular is used slightly more often by Norwegians than by English-speaking students.

(102) My father suggested the zip-lock bag, and I'm going to have to agree that that is an invention that I cannot live without! (L-usarg1)

(103) This bothered me so much that I made an appointment with the prosecutors office and told them how I felt and that as a victim I was being punished much worse than the criminals because I was going to have to live the rest of my life looking over my shoulder wondering if this was ever going to happen to me again or to someone else. (L-usarg11)

(104) If we are going to accept the advantages which come with genetic engineering we have also to take responsibility for the disadvantages, the stakes are too high to leave this job to the scientists and they can’t be expected to take the moral responsibility for people who misuse the discoveries/inventions thereby causing disaster. (L-alevels8)

The first person singular is used in 9% of the LOCNESS material, while the first person plural has a frequency of only 4.5%. In example (102), the first person is used to express agreement. In example (103), the speaker tells a story in which he or she participates, and unlike the other two cases, there is no intention implied in this sentence. In (104), the first person plural is used to refer to people or the society. Society has the power to make decisions for the future, and by using the first person, the speaker also includes the reader. As we already know, the first person is not frequently used by native speakers for introducing the essay topic.

(105) In this essay I'm going to give some reasons why I feel that the prison system is outdated. (N-noos1019)

(106) But as soon as I get home I'm going to install several new locks in my door. (N-noos1035)

(107) I do not think that I exaggerate if I say that the reactions we get from our surroundings is one of the most important factors in determining what quality of life we are going to have. (N-nouo1024)
The sentences above are collected from the NICLE corpus; (105) is yet another case of the essay introductions we have already looked at. However, Norwegians do use the first person in other contexts as well, often to express intention as in example (106). First person plural subjects often serve the same function as they do in texts by native speakers; to refer to people in general or to society, and at the same time include the reader in this group.

(108) One solution would be to put the odorous food in a bag, but if that cannot be done for some reason (for example, you are going to serve it for a fancy dinner later), you can put the surrounding food in the bag, to keep the smell out. (L-usarg11)

Second person subjects make up 4.5% of the native speaker material, there are only three cases, which all seem to refer to some hypothetical situation, as in example (108). Second person plural subjects are not found in the LOCNESS corpus.

(109) As a woman you have to be strong, well-educated, have faith in your own cause if you are going to win. (N-noos1007)

(110) Even though he got caught I couldn't help thinking of how easy it must be to steal if you just use your head and plan in advance what you are going to snatch. (N-nouo1048)

There are four sentences with subjects in the second person singular in the NICLE corpus, the frequency is 5.8%. As in the reference corpus, there are no examples of the second person plural. Norwegian students also use the second person to refer to hypothetical situations.

(111) Any coach is going to let those guys play their very best because they don't get to prove themselves every game. (L-usarg1)

(112) Do we want to be presenting boxing as good if it is going to cause disruptive behaviour? (L-alevels4)

(113) This is significant because no one likes to think that they are going to die, so extending one's life allows people time to simply enjoy what time they have left, or it might give them the hope that maybe there will be a cure before they die. (L-usarg1)

Subjects in the third person are a lot more common, especially among English-speaking students. Nouns and pronouns are equally common choices. In example 111), the subject is a noun. In 112), the subject is the pronoun it, referring to boxing. The third person plural subject they in example 113) refers to people in general. The majority of the subjects in sentences
produced by native students are in the third person, 44.8% in the singular and 37.3% in the plural.

(114) *But instead of trying to make the situation better, he tries to forget it by focusing on the task that will give him most attention: the speech he was going to give later on that evening.* (N-nouo1002)

(115) *What senior school kid is going to want to know that?* (N-nouo1097)

(116) *That is what I am going to tell my children, and hopefully what they again are going to tell theirs.* (N-noos1038)

Third person subjects are frequently used in the NICLE material too. 26.1% of the material has third person singular subjects, while 15.9% are sentences with subjects in the third person plural. The subject may be a noun or a pronoun, (114) is an example of the use of the pronoun *he*; (115) is an example of the subject being a noun, senior school kid in this case. Whenever the subject is in the third person plural, the pronoun *they* is typically preferred.

### 4.4 Other differences

In addition to the differences which were revealed by looking at various aspects of the sentences, there is one more thing which should be commented on. The contraction *gonna*, which is more informal than *BE going to* and very common in speech, is not used at all in the native speaker material, but there are two cases of it in NICLE, both presented below.

(117) *"He fought it out here", Happy says, "and this is where I'm gonna win it for him."* (N-nouo1003)

(118) *But by a powerstructure of selfabsorbed propertyowners so braindead and stupid they won't even see that if you're too god-damned greedy to pay taxes for schools and services they're not gonna be any good anymore.* (N-nohe1003)

As it turns out, both examples are quotes and not language produced by Norwegian students. Example (117) is a quote from Arthur Miller’s “Requiem”, which is analysed in the paper. Thus the expression is not the student’s own choice; it occurs in a play, written by a playwright who is known for writing dialogue which is close to natural, everyday speech. Example (118) is part of a quote by Jello Biafra, stating that crime is not a result of rap music, but by poor living conditions.
4.5 General comments

Based on the material from NICLE and LOCNESS, Norwegian learners of English seem to have a good command of the use of the *BE going to*-construction. The Norwegians use *BE going to* to express both “future outcome of present intention” and “future outcome of present cause”, as described by Leech (2004: 58-59), but Intention is overused. The third possible meaning, that of neutral prediction, is underused by the learners of English. The first person singular is also overused, but this as well as the overuse of Intention is due to the way Norwegian students present the topic and their own intentions for their essays. Overall, Norwegian learners more frequently refer to themselves. Inanimate subjects are underused, the learners prefer human subjects in sentences with *BE going to*. 
5.0 Conclusion

The *BE going to*-construction may be used in order to express three different meanings; that of neutral, colourless prediction of the future, that of future outcome of present intention and that of future outcome of present cause, as explained in Leech (2004: 58-59). Material collected from all the corpora used in this study, the ENPC, NICLE and LOCNESS, confirms this theory. The ENPC material also confirms that *will* is the only true, colourless future referent in the English language.

Norwegian language has no equivalent expression to the *BE going to*-construction, but operates with a several future referents which all may or may not have additional meaning applied. This is the only major difference between English and Norwegian future reference, and this difference may lead to problems for Norwegian learners of English.

The learner corpus NICLE and reference corpus LOCNESS reveal that Norwegians does not seem to have any problems with the use of the *BE going to*-construction as far as meaning is concerned. *BE going to* is used both to refer to future outcome of present cause and to future outcome of present intention. However, intention is overused by the learners, but this is mainly due to the manner of introducing essay topics. Norwegians tend to present their intentions for the paper by using a 1st person singular subject in combination with *BE going to* and a verb, as in “In this essay *I'm going to give* some reasons why I feel that the prison system is outdated”. *Will* is also used for this purpose. A few of the native speakers have similar introductions in their papers, but this is not common. Most natives skip this part completely and get on with the essay without any explanations beforehand. The overuse of intention seems to be a result of stylistic choices.

English-speaking students use *BE going to* as a neutral future referent more often than Norwegians students do, and even more often than in the ENPC. Leech (2004: 58) claims that the *BE going to*-construction is used for referring to the future outcome of present intention or cause, but that it begins to rival *will* as a fairly neutral future auxiliary, particularly in more informal styles of English (2004: 60). Youngsters often have a more informal language than adults, and young people probably embrace changes in the language sooner than older people do. This might mean that the use of *BE going to* as a neutral future referent is an increasing trend that has not yet reached the Norwegians.
Norwegians also seem to prefer human subjects and avoid inanimate ones. This might be so because human subjects are more easily identified as the agents behind actions, and that sentences with human subjects are easier to relate to for people at a lower proficiency level.

Based on the data from NICLE and LOCNESS, my hypothesis that Norwegian learners of English could have problems using the *BE going to*-construction correctly is shown to be false. This is not a disappointment at all, because it means Norwegian students in general have a better command of the English language than predicted.

Seen in retrospect, it would have been a good idea to look at translations in both directions in the contrastive analysis. As it is, I only look at how English *BE going to* is translated into Norwegian, and not how future expressions in original Norwegian corresponds to *BE going to*.

The ENPC is a large corpus which contains both fictional and non-fictional texts, but it is important to remember that the majority of the texts are extracts from fictional texts, e.g. novels. NICLE and LOCNESS are smaller corpora and contain students’ essays which are non-fictional texts. The ENPC may not be the best source for predicting how Norwegian learners use the *BE going to*-construction, because it mainly consists of a different type of texts.

NICLE and LOCNESS are smaller corpora than the ENPC, and there were not a lot of hits for *BE going to* in either of them, 69 occurrences in NICLE and 67 in LOCNESS. Ideally, one would want to use corpora large enough to give more hits than I got for *BE going to*. The more examples one is able to study, the more likely it is that the examples give an accurate impression of how the word or phrase is used. In a small material, an occurrence of an untypical use will make up a larger percentage of the total material than it would in a larger material. Also, a small material may not contain examples of all the possible ways to use the word or phrase. The material from NICLE and LOCNESS contains examples on most of the categories I wanted to look at, but there is a possibility that the result of my studies is skewed.

There is still more to be said about the topic of this thesis. One could choose to include other types of analyses than those I have chosen. It would be a good idea to include a contrastive analysis of how *BE going to* corresponds to future expressions in Norwegian original texts as
well. A larger study of future time expressions in English and Norwegian would also be interesting; in addition to *BE going to* one could look at will, shall, *BE about to* and so on. The use of simple present to express future is also a topic much could be said about. NICLE and LOCNESS could be the source for further studies on *BE going to* in relation to other expressions of future time.

In this thesis I mainly focus on the categories of meaning Leech has defined for the *BE going to*-construction. Most of the examples I have looked at can easily be placed in one of the categories, but some examples are harder to classify. One might discuss whether or not Leech’s categories are adequate, but I cannot see the need for more categories. The examples I found difficult to classify were ambiguous, they could be interpreted as for example both predictive or as reference to intention. The categories of Prediction, Intention and Cause work well as long as one keeps in mind that the boundaries between them are fuzzy.
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