The Progressive in Scottish English and Standard English: Its Contexts and Functions in the 20th and 21st Centuries

Jaleesa de Regt

5609399

English BA thesis

British English

10,362 words

Supervisor: Nynke de Haas

June, 2020

Abstract

This thesis focusses on the contexts and functions of the progressive in Scottish English. On one hand, it looks at whether Scottish English differs from Standard English and on the other, it ascertains whether there was a change in Scottish English. The periods under investigation are 1990-1995 and 2000-2005. To investigate possible differences, a corpus study was conducted, using the British National Corpus (BNC) and the Scottish Corpus of Text and Speech (SCOTS). The context features this study focussed on were tense and whether a verb was stative or dynamic. Additionally, the functions of the progressive were analysed, based on Römer (2006), Kortmann (2006), and Wada (2013). The results show that there is no effect of corpus or period on frequency, but that there is an effect of level of formality. Additionally, features differ between levels of formality, corpora, and periods. Both basic functions and additional functions differed when comparing Scottish English and Standard. Additionally, Scottish English is more likely to have the progressive appear with a stative verb. Overall, the research confirms that the progressive is used in a wider range of contexts and functions in Scottish English than in Standard English. The results regarding the differences between the two periods were ambiguous. Some features were more likely to occur more often in the earlier period, whereas others were more likely to occur more often in the later period. This shows that the use of the progressive may have expanded on some points, but may have decreased on others. When looking at the effect of level of formality, the progressive is not used in more contexts in informal texts, even though this was expected. This could also be the result of a methodological issue. These results give more insight into the differences between Scottish English and Standard English and show the changes occurring in Scottish English.

Table of contents

1. Introduction

In English, the progressive is a form of the verb *be* combined with a verb which has the suffix *-ing* added to it, as in *I am walking*. This form is most associated with aspect, which is "loosely defined as the internal temporal nature of an event" (Levin, 2013, p. 187). It is often suggested that a wider use of the progressive is a feature of some varieties of English, including Scottish English (cf. Kortmann, 2006). This paper will investigate whether the progressive is used more often in Scottish English than in Standard English and whether it is used in different contexts and/or with different functions. Furthermore, some researchers (cf. Miller, 2008) note that the progressive may be changing in Scottish English. Therefore, this study will also examine whether there has been an apparent change in Scottish English.

2. Theoretical background

2.1 The progressive in Standard English

The use of the progressive in Standard English, specifically the type of verbs with which it can be used, is a topic that is still debated. Some researchers claim that stative verbs (which describe a state, such as *believe*) "resist the progressive", whereas dynamic verbs (which describe an activity, such as *run*) do not (Levin, 2013, p. 188). However, this generalization does not hold universally: the progressive can be used with stative verbs when their meaning is somewhat dynamic. An example can be found in the slogan from McDonald's, here reproduced in (1).

(1) *I'm loving it*

Miller (2008, p. 307) also disputes the traditional claim, based on an analysis of spoken language. His alternative hypothesis is that all stative verbs can occur in the progressive, except for the verb *know*.

Römer (2005) has done a corpus study on spoken, standard, British English, which she used to distil the most frequent functions and contexts for the progressive. She argues that the

progressive has three central (or basic) functions and seven possible additional functions. The central functions are repeatedness, continuousness, and a combination of the two. Continuousness is defined as describing a "single, continuous [event] or action" (Römer, 2005, p. 87). An example of a progressive with repeatedness as the central function can be seen in (2). Römer (2005, p. 87) notes that this is not very frequent.

(2) *Well I'**ve been buying** all the mountain bike magazines lately […] just to get to know what's going on*[1](p, 87)

The example in (2) is not continuous, as buying magazines at different times is a repetition of one action.

An example of a progressive with the continuous function, which denotes a single continuous action, can be found in (3).

(3) *The strange black things that some of you **are holding** in your hands are called riders, and these are end leaves for the storage binder* (p. 87)

Römer (2005) notes that the progressive is used more in continuous than in non-continuous contexts. The example in (4) shows the progressive with the combined central functions.

(4) *I've lost half # a stone but it was only like er because I **was eating** too much before anyway* (p. 87)

The reason for this analysis is that *eating too much* is a single uninterrupted event: it stretches from an unknown starting point to the point where the speaker stopped eating too much. However, as it is not just the case that they ate too much one time, it is also repeated.

In addition to the three basic functions, Römer (2005) argues that there are seven additional functions. These can be combined with any tense and any of the basic functions. The additional functions are, in decreasing order of commonness: general validity, politeness or softening, emphasis or attitude, gradual change and development, old and new habits,

[1] Examples (2) until (11) are all cited by Römer (2005, pp. 87-104). They are examples from either the spoken section of the BNC or the BoE. Emphasis is present in the original in all cases.

framing and shock or disbelief (Römer, 2005, p. 95). General validity means that the utterance is generally true. An example is reproduced in (5) below.

(5) *But in general the people who **are doing** some of the things, a lot of it's probably escapism* (p. 96)

Politeness or softening renders "what is said more polite or less direct", as in (6) (Römer, 2005, p. 97).

(6) *So I **was** just **wondering** how you'd be paid back* (p. 98)

The use of the third function, which expresses emphasis or attitude, is similar to that of the function of shock or disbelief. Both functions are used by speakers to "put stress on something, to convey their (mostly negative) attitude to something, or to express strong surprise or severe doubt about something" (Römer, 2005, p. 99). However, whereas shock and disbelief is used for progressives that express one of these two emotions, emphasis or attitude covers a wider range. An example of emphasis or attitude is given in (7) and an example of shock or disbelief is given in (8).

(7) *You never drank this coffee! **You're** always **buying** things and then wanting Oh! To buy something better!* (p. 99)

(8) *You**'re** not **suggesting** pregnancy's a disease there are you?* (p. 100)

In (7) the speaker conveys that they are not happy with the behaviour of their interlocutor and in (8) shock or disbelief is added. The next additional function is gradual change and development (Römer, 2005, p. 101). An example can be seen in (9).

(9) *I mean you know it's **been** erm **changing** all the time since Sealink […] took it over* (p. 101)

The next function, old and new habits, means that the progressive is used to signify that something is either an old or a new habit as in (10) and (11) respectively.

(10) *How long **were** you **seeing** your boyfriend then before you married him? -- Er, about six years* (p. 103)

(11) *I think now that they, they **are** really erm **accepting** us for the fact that we have brought things that they would never have had* (p. 103)

The final function, framing, is used for a situation where "something new happens while something else is in progress" (Römer, 2005, p. 104). The ongoing action is in the progressive and frames the new interrupting event or action. An example given by Römer is (12).

(12) *So anyway yesterday afternoon I **was checking** through it when the phone went again*

Apart from Römer's (2005) study which looks at all tenses, Wada's (2013) study shows that there are three functions specific to the future progressive tense. These functions have some overlap with Römer's functions, but the future progressive needs to be distinguished from the other two tenses. The reason for this is that the functions are unique to the future tenses and the final function, the current ongoing future, has more of a modal meaning. The first function specific to the future progressive is when it is used to refer to ongoing situations in the future, which Wada (2013) illustrates with the example reproduced in (13). Hereafter, this use will be called ongoing future.

(13) *This time next week they **will be sailing** across the North Sea* (Wada, 2013, p. 392, emphasis added)

The second use, which will be called routine near future further on, is illustrated in (14).

(14) *Your son **will be staying** with the other first formers in block D* (Wada, 2013, p. 392, emphasis added)

Wada (2013, pp. 392-393) argues that this use has six elements. Firstly, it "indicates that some prerequisites for the occurrence of a future situation have already been set up or fixed" (pp. 392-393). Secondly, it tends to refer to "the near but not too-immediate future". However, the future progressive can also be used to refer to the somewhat distant future. Thirdly, it is

usually incompatible with “situations that are not normal or occur suddenly”. The fourth element is compatible with stative verbs. This analysis does not agree with the traditional view as indicated above and is possibly an indication that the view of the compatibility of the progressive with stative verbs is shifting. The fifth element of this use is compatible with the third element as the “participial situation will occur as a daily routine or regular activity”. Lastly, it is “sometimes utilised to describe natural and physiological phenomena”. The final use of the future progressive as analysed by Wada (2013, p. 394), which will be labelled current ongoing future, refers to “a current, ongoing situation”. An example can be found in (15).

(15) *By now they’**ll be eating** dinner* (Wada, 2013, p. 394, emphasis added)

In the current study, these functions are added as possibilities for future progressives. Thus a future progressive can have any combination of Römer’s (2005) basic and additional functions and one of Wada’s functions.

2.2 Scottish English

This study focusses on the use of the progressive in Scottish English. The linguistic situation in Scotland is notoriously difficult to describe (Douglas, 2003) because it is difficult to discern “where one variety ends and the other begins” (Douglas, 2003, p. 25). This paper uses the definition of Scottish English given by Aitken (1997, as cited by Stuart-Smith (2008)). She describes “Scottish English as a bipolar linguistic continuum, with broad Scots at one end and Scottish Standard English at the other” (p. 48). This concept is also the basis for the corpus that was used to analyse Scottish English in the current study, namely the Scottish Corpus of Text and Speech (SCOTS) (Douglas, 2003). Douglas (2003), in a paper on the corpus, makes a distinction between three varieties: Scottish English, Scottish Standard English, and Scots. Scottish English is “a blanket term for all native varieties in Scotland descended from Old English” (Douglas, 2003, p. 25). Scottish Standard English is a standard

variety of Scottish English and has a "reasonably high status" (Douglas, 2003, p. 26). Douglas' (2003) third variety is Scots, which is more difficult to define, as it "does not describe a homogeneous linguistic community" (Douglas, 2003. p. 26). Instead, it is a blanket term for different varieties, such as broad Scots and dialect Scots. In SCOTS, the whole continuum of Scottish English is represented and denoted as Scottish English for clarity and brevity.

Originally, Scottish English is a Northern dialect of British English, which has been influenced by Scottish Gaelic (Stuart-Smith, 2008, p. 51). Filppula, Klemola, and Paulasto (2005) note that in what would today be Scotland Gaelic was the main language at first. English did not come into that part of the country until the modern area. The English language gained territory and Gaelic was "identified with Roman Catholicism and 'incivility'" (p. 147). This raised the need to abolish the Gaelic language and so arguments were made that Gaelic was not the proper language to use in education. Over the years, Gaelic retreated, but this did not happen all at once in every location. It was "first replaced in the speech of the upper classes and in the context of trade and discourse" (p. 148). Now, Gaelic can only be found in "the north-west and in the islands off the north-west of Scotland" (p. 150). Determining the extent of the influence of Gaelic on Scots (and Scottish English) is still an ongoing issue, but there seems to be quite a high degree of influence in various aspects of the language (p. 153).

2.3 The progressive in Scottish English

The progressive is one of the morpho-syntactic features that seems to differ between Scottish English and Standard English. Research on this verb form in Scottish English suggests that it is more widely used there than in Standard English (Beal, 2010; Gachelin, 1997; Grant & Dixon, 1921; Kortmann, 2006; Miller, 2008; Purves, 2002). Kortmann (2008, p. 490) conducted a typological study, based on a large-scale comparative analysis of varieties spoken in the British Isles. He notes the occurrence for many different morphosyntactic features

which he categorizes as pervasive, attested but not frequently used, or neither. One of the features is the “wider range of uses of the Progressive”, which is attested, but not frequently used in Scottish English (p. 491).

Many researchers state that there are certain contexts in which Scottish English uses the progressive and Standard English does not. For example, Kortmann (2006) and Miller (2008) note that in Scottish English, the progressive can also be used with stative verbs. As mentioned above, there is still an ongoing debate on whether the progressive can also be used with stative verbs in Standard English. Therefore it is not yet clear whether Scottish English and Standard English differ on this point. A less debated issue is the functions ascribed to the progressive in Scottish English. Kortmann (2006) states that the progressive is a marker of informality and speaker involvement in Scottish English. The latter could mean that the following additional features from Römer (2005) also occur more often: shock/disbelief and emphasis or attitude. This also shows that speaker involvement is possibly not only a feature of Scottish English. Finally, Miller (2008, p. 307) states that the progressive is used to signify that something is in progress, whereas speakers usually use the present simple to state that something is habitual. However, he goes on to say that this is not the case anymore for younger speakers of Scottish English, as they do not use the present simple in the context of habituality, preferring the progressive instead.

The differences between Scottish English and Standard English may have several causes. One of these is language contact, as the difference may be due to contact with Scottish Gaelic. Ramchand (1993) notes that the progressive in Scottish Gaelic is similar to Standard English. However, there is one crucial difference: the progressive can be used with stative verbs in Gaelic, whereas this is, when following the traditional claim, generally not permittable in Standard English. Possibly this is an explanation for the variation in the use of the progressive in Scottish English. It is also viable that the progressive is a vernacular

universal. Chambers (2004, p. 127) defines vernacular universals as “generalizations about intralinguistic variation”. More simply put, vernacular universals are “phonological and grammatical processes [which] recur in vernaculars wherever they are spoken”. He notes that only a small number of features qualify (Chambers, 2004, p. 128). The progressive is often described as having a wider range in many spoken Englishes, for example, Orkney/Shetland English, Irish English, Jamaican English, and Bahamian English (Kortmann 2008; Kortmann & Szmrescanyi, 2004). Thus, the wider use of the progressive may be a vernacular universal, which means that it may not mainly be due to the language contact with Scottish Gaelic.

3. Research questions and hypotheses

The review of the literature shows that many researchers note that the progressive is used in more contexts and has more functions in Scottish English than in Standard English. Additionally, research shows that the progressive is often used as a marker of informality in Scottish English. However, Kortmann (2008) notes that the progressive is an attested feature of Scottish English, but it is not pervasive. As these findings do not form a complete and clear picture, a corpus study is necessary. On the one hand, it will yield more clarity on its frequency, and on the other, it could confirm the frequency of the contexts and functions of the verb form in a modern corpus. Additionally, it could show whether there are changes in Scottish English, as suggested by, for example, Miller (2008). Therefore, to investigate this topic, two research questions with sub-questions were formulated.

1. Is the progressive used more widely in Scottish English than in Standard English?
    a. Is the progressive used more often in Scottish English than in Standard English?
    b. Is the progressive used more often in one register than the other when comparing these two varieties?

c. Are the contexts and functions in which the progressive is used in Scottish English more varied than those of Standard English?
    i. What are the contexts and functions in which the progressive is used in Scottish English and Standard English?
    ii. Are the proportions significantly different for Scottish English compared to Standard English?

2. Has the use of the progressive in Scottish English significantly widened?
    a. Is the progressive used more often in 2000-2005 than in 1989-1996?
    b. Is the progressive used more often in one register than in the other when comparing these two periods?
    c. Are the contexts and functions the same for 2000-2005 as for 1989-1996?

Regarding question 1a, following Kortmann (2008), it is expected that the progressive is not used significantly more often in Scottish English than in Standard English. However, based on other research (cf. Beal, 2010; Grant & Dixon, 1921; Gachelin 1997; Kortmann, 2006; Miller, 2008; Purves, 2002) it is. Therefore, it will be interesting to see which expectation is correct. The expectation for question 1b is that the progressive is used more often in informal texts, especially in Scottish English. The reason for this is that it is often described as a marker of informality (Kortmann, 2006). This would mean that it is used more in informal texts in Scottish English, which could mean that it is also used in more contexts. For question 1c, the expectation is that the same contexts and functions are found that have been found in previous research. This means that, for the type of verbs and the tenses, verbs are possibly used more in the progressive in Scottish English than in Standard English (Gachelin, 1997; Kortmann, 2006). The functions will be different for the past and present progressive when comparing them with those for the future progressive. As discussed above, the future progressive has three uses that do not occur with past or present progressives. The

possible functions are those found by Römer (2005), to which Wada's (2013) are added. Kortmann's (2006) function of speaker involvement is also included. The expectation is that Römer's (2005) additional functions hold for Standard English and Scottish English. However, since Römer focussed on spoken language and this study will focus on written language, and since Römer's findings only pertain to Standard English, this is still up for debate.

Regarding the answer to question 2, the use of the progressive may have increased. This may be only in frequency, but it could also be that the number of contexts has increased. As noted above, Miller (2008) writes that younger speakers of Scottish English use the progressive not only to signify that an event is in progress but also to signify that the action is habitual. This would mean that the progressive is possibly increasing in use. It could be that it is used in more contexts, but it is also possible that it is used more in contexts where it was already present. Additionally, the expectation is that the progressive is used more often in informal texts, although this probably does not differ when comparing the two periods. Again, this could mean that the frequency of the progressive is higher in informal texts or that the progressive also appears in more contexts and functions.

4. Methodology

To investigate the issue of the use of the progressive in Scottish English, whether its uses and frequency differ compared to Standard English and whether there was a change between 1989-1996 and 2000-2005, a corpus study was conducted. Data from both Scottish English and Standard English were analysed to compare the results of the two. Additionally, data from the later period was analysed and compared to data from the earlier period for Scottish English. The corpus that was used to investigate Scottish English was the Scottish Corpus of Text and Speech (SCOTS). To investigate Standard English, the British National Corpus (BNC) was used. This study focussed on written language. Both corpora have a collection of

both spoken and written texts, but their collection of written texts is more extensive. The periods (1989-1996 and 2000-2005) were chosen based on several factors. Firstly, there were enough texts in both corpora for the earlier period. Secondly, these periods allowed for a study of recent changes. To compare the use of the progressive in both Scottish English and Standard English, the years 1989 until 1996 were analysed. The original idea was to look at 1990-1995, but this was not possible as too few tokens were found. Additionally, for the formal texts in SCOTS in this period, only 115 tokens were found. Therefore, the period was extended to 1980 until 1999 for the formal texts from SCOTS only, as this ensured that there were enough tokens to analyse. 300 tokens should give a good overview of the use of the progressive in both varieties. Additionally, tokens from 2000-2005 were analysed for Scottish English only. This was done to see whether there was a change in Scottish English regarding the progressive.

To ensure that the data was maximally comparable, tokens were extracted from the corpus based on the degree of formality of the texts. This was relevant, because the progressive may be a marker of informality in Scottish English (Kortmann, 2006). Based on the texts available in the corpora, there were three possible register categories: formal, informal and a middle category, formal/informal. SCOTS is already divided into distinct text types and these were categorized by the author into one of the three levels of formality. This was done based on Moorcroft's (2006, p. 40) analysis. According to her informal language, when contrasted with formal language, is characterized by five elements. The first is the extensive use of first, second, and third-person pronouns. A text can still be formal if some personal pronouns are used, but if many are used, it is probably not. Additionally, informal texts make more frequent use of the active voice, although this feature is also common in formal texts. The last four elements are the use of contractions, some non-standard English, shorter sentences, and simpler vocabulary. For the text types present in SCOTS, the ones that

were categorized as informal are advertisement, correspondence/letters, and diary. The ones that have been categorized as formal are announcement, article, essay, instructions, invoice/bill/receipt, novel, prepared text, prose: nonfiction, report, review, and written record of speech. The texts categorized as formal/informal are novel, poem/song/ballad, prose: fiction, script, and short story. Fiction is often in the middle of the formal/informal range. Dialogue is mostly informal, whereas descriptions are mostly formal. This is the case, as dialogue contains more personal pronouns and possibly contractions. Additionally, it could contain more use of non-standard English. These features are less common in descriptions. For the BNC, the categorization was more difficult due to the way the corpus is organized. The categorizations have been made based on the text types (see http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/docs/URG/bibliog.html) and Moorcroft's (2006) features. When a text had much dialogue but also contained more formal descriptions, the texts were classified as formal/informal. This was true for all fiction books. The results of the categorization can be seen in Appendix A.

The investigation of research question 1 consisted of three parts. To investigate whether the progressive was used more often in Scottish English than in Standard English (question 1a), the number of progressives in both Scottish English and Standard English was counted. To this end, each corpus was searched for words ending in *-ing*, and all non-relevant hits were removed by hand. To answer question 1a, the frequency was then normalized per 10,000 words. Finally, the frequency of the progressive was compared, and statistical analysis was performed to ascertain whether the difference was significant or not. To investigate whether the functions and contexts differed between Scottish English and Standard English and whether they differed between levels of formality (questions 1b and 1c), a maximum of 900 progressives were analysed from each corpus. This means that for each level of formality, 300 tokens were analysed for the relevant period (1990-1995 or 1989-1996). These were taken from the tokens obtained in answering question 1a. If there were more than 300 hits,

300 tokens were selected at random. These were then analysed. It was assumed that this sample size would be sufficient to be able to generalize for the text types under investigation. If it was not possible to analyse 300 instances due to a small number of progressives in the corpus for that text type, all relevant instances that were found were analysed and the period was extended. As mentioned above, this was necessary for the formal texts, as only 115 progressives were present in the period from 1989 to 1996. This meant that the period had to be extended from 1980 to 1999. This period is twelve years longer than the others. To be able to use the data, both the 115 cases and the 300 cases (including those first 115 cases) were analysed separately. This enabled the author to ascertain whether the findings for the shorter period (1989-1996) also held for the extended period (1980-1999). Following Römer (2005), Wada (2013), and Kortmann (2006), each set of tokens was then categorised by both context and function. The investigation focussed on the following features for context: verb type (stative, dynamic) and tense (present, past, future). Tense was taken from Römer (2006) and it is relevant here due to the different options for functions per tense. As there is still an ongoing debate on whether the progressive can be used with stative verbs, the verb type was also included. For the function, the available categories were a combination taken from Römer (2005), who focussed on Standard British English, Kortmann (2006), who focussed on Scottish English, and Wada (2013) who focussed on future-specific functions. Following Römer (2005), the basic functions were repeatedness, continuousness, or both. The options for additional functions were general validity, politeness or softening, emphasis or attitude, gradual change, and development, old and new habits, framing, and shock or disbelief. Following Kortmann (2006), speaker involvement was added to the list of possibilities. For future progressives, Wada's (2013) functions were added: ongoing future, routine near future, and current ongoing future. These functions could combine in any way, so a future progressive could have a basic function, one or more additional functions, and one of Wada's

functions. For a past or present progressive, any combination of a basic function and one or more additional functions was possible. In this study, the choice was to focus on Römer's (2005), Kortmann's (2006), and Wada's (2013) functions. The reason for this is that an individual token of the progressive can express various functions at the same time. The options regarding the functions are listed in table 1.

Table 1: Possible functions per tense, based on Römer (2005), Kortmann (2006) and Wada (2013)

	Basic function (Römer, 2005): repeatedness, continuousness, both – 1	**Additional functions (Römer, 2005 & Kortmann, 2006): General validity, politeness/softening, emphasis/attitude, gradual change and development, old and new habits, framing, shock/disbelief, speaker involvement – 0, 1 or more**	**Future progressive function (Wada, 2013): ongoing future, routine near future, current ongoing future – 0 or 1**
Possible tenses	Past, present, future	Past, present, future	Future

Finally, statistical analysis was performed to ascertain whether the differences in frequencies, function, and context between the BNC and SCOTS were significant. Depending on the variables under investigation, either multiple regression analysis, binary logistic

regression analysis, or multinomial logistic regression analysis was conducted. For every test, corpus and level of formality were the independent variables.

To ascertain whether there has been a change in Scottish English, the frequencies of the earlier period were compared to the later period (question 2a). To do this, the number of progressives in SCOTS between the years 2005 and 2010 was counted per level of formality and the frequency was then normalized per 10,000 words. This frequency was then compared to the frequency of the progressive in SCOTS found for the earlier period and statistical analysis was performed to see whether the two periods differed significantly from each other and whether there was an effect of level of formality. Tokens were selected and analysed similarly as for the comparison between 1989-1996 BNC and SCOTS data. There were, however, too few tokens for the informal texts from the later period. As the previous period was already extended as far as possible (until 1999) to be able to find enough tokens for the formal texts in SCOTS for the earlier period, it was not possible to extend the later period into the past. Extending the period forward was also not an option, as there were no relevant texts after 2005. This means that the analysis for the informal texts was done based on only 88 tokens. The author decided to include this level of formality, as it is arguably most like spoken text and could, therefore, indicate interesting differences. Additionally, the progressive can be a feature of informal texts, which could mean that the progressive is used more often and in more contexts in this level of formality. In the analysis, the options for contexts and functions were the same as for question 1b. Finally, statistical analysis was performed to ascertain whether the differences regarding function and context between the two periods were significant. The same tests that were mentioned before were used. However, the independent variables change from corpus and level of formality to period and level of formality.

5. Results and discussion

5. 1 Frequency of the progressive per 10,000 words

Table 2: Frequencies of progressive per 10,000 words per corpus, period and level of formality

Corpus	Level of formality	Period	Frequency progressive per 10,000 words
SCOTS	Informal	1989-1996	73.36
SCOTS	Formal/informal	1989-1996	16.06
SCOTS	Formal	1989-1996	8.84
SCOTS	*Formal*	*1980-1999*	*19.18*
BNC	Informal	1990-1995	14.91
BNC	Formal/informal	1990-1995	30.34
BNC	Formal	1990-1995	0.79
SCOTS	Informal	2000-2005	57.23
SCOTS	Formal/informal	2000-2005	21.50
SCOTS	Formal	2000-2005	19.23

In table 2, the frequencies of the progressive are presented per corpus, period, and level of formality. To investigate whether the frequencies were dependent on either the corpus, the period, or the level of formality, a multiple regression analysis was conducted. This test is used to predict the value of a dependent variable (in this case the frequency) based on the value of two or more other (independent) variables (corpus and level of formality or period and level of formality). First, a multiple linear regression was calculated to predict the frequency of the progressive per 10,000 words based on corpus and level of formality. The regression equation was not significant ($F(2, 3) = 2.159$, $p = .263$), with an R^2 of .59. This means that frequency could not be predicted by looking at the variety of English or the level of formality. The results when only factoring in corpus or level of formality as an independent variable were not significant either.

Secondly, another multiple linear regression was performed to investigate the nature of the differences between the frequencies in the two periods of SCOTS. Multiple linear regression was calculated to predict the frequency of the progressive per 10,000 words based

on level of formality and period. The regression equation was not statistically significant (F(2, 3) = 5.050, p = .110), with an R^2 of .771 This means that frequency cannot be predicted by looking at the period in combination with the level of formality. However, another multiple-linear regression was calculated to predict the frequency of the progressive per 10,000 words based only on level of formality. A significant regression equation was found (F(1, 4) = 13.466, p = .021). Regression coefficients and standard errors for the model with only level of formality as an independent variable can be found in table 3. The model predicts that the frequency per 10,000 words for formal texts is 58.33, for formal/informal texts it is 32.703, and for informal texts, it is 7.073.

Table 3: Multiple regression results for Frequency per 10,000 for the two periods of SCOTS

Frequency per 10,000 words	B	95% CI for B		SE B	ß	R^2	ΔR^2
		LL	UL				
Model						0.77	0.71*
Constant	83.963	42.073	125.853	15.09			
Level of formality	-25.630	-45.021	-6.239	6.98	-0.878*		

Note. Model = "Enter" method in SPSS Statistics; *B* = unstandardized regression coefficient; *CI* = confidence interval; *LL* = lower limit; *UL* = upper limit; *SE B* = standard error of the of the coefficient; ß = standardized coefficient; R^2 = coefficient of determination; ΔR^2 = adjusted R^2. *p <.05

Research question 1a examined whether the use of the progressive was more frequent in Scottish English than in Standard English. The expectations were not clear, as previous research suggested different frequencies. As the effect of corpus was not significant, this

study suggests that Kortmann (2008) is correct. This means that the progressive is possibly used more often in Scottish English than in Standard English, but it is not pervasive. Research question 1b questioned the effect of level of formality on the frequency and use of the progressive. The level of formality was not significant in determining the frequency of the progressive.

Research question 2a investigated whether the frequency of the progressive was higher in the later period (2005-2010) than in the earlier period (1989-1996) for SCOTS. As stated above, the period was not a significant factor regarding frequency. This suggests that the progressive is not used significantly more often in the later period. In contrast to expectations this research shows the progressive is not used more in later periods than in earlier periods. Research question 2b looked at the influence of level of formality on the frequency and use of the progressive. Statistical testing suggests that this independent variable affects the frequency of the progressive. As noted above, the model predicts that the predicted frequency is highest for formal texts, followed by formal/informal texts, and lowest for informal texts. This is not consistent with previous research, as it was suggested that the progressive is a marker of informality in Scottish English.

5.2 Context and functions: SCOTS vs. the BNC

To answer research questions 1b and 1c, the data from the BNC from 1990-1995 was compared to the data obtained from SCOTS for the extended and overlapping period (1989-1996) This was done per dependent variable. All results are presented in table 4. However, only the outcomes of statistical analysis will be discussed, because they explain the differences in the data and clarify the results. The test used to ascertain whether differences were significant was either a binary logistic regression analysis or a multinomial logistic regression analysis, depending on the number of levels of the dependent variable. To ascertain whether the perceived differences in verb type were significant, a binary logistic regression

analysis was performed. The reason for this is that the dependent variable has only two levels, therefore a multinomial logistic regression analysis was not possible. A binary logistic regression analysis predicts the odds of being a case, here either dynamic or stative, based on the values of the independent variables, here corpus or level of formality. To investigate whether the differences for tense and the functions were significant, multinomial logistic regression was conducted. This is used to predict a nominal dependent variable (tense, basic function, additional function, or future function) given one or more independent variables (corpus and level of formality). Another important aspect to note is that there were two samples for the formal texts, one with 300 cases and one with 115 cases. Only the 300 cases were included in one of the multinomial logistic regression analyses, in the other, only the 115 cases were included for the formal texts. This occurred for every dependent variable. For all tests, the threshold of significance was $p = .05$. As can be seen in table 4, some frequencies were quite low, especially for future functions. This low number made it unsuitable for statistical analysis.

Table 4: Frequencies in percentages (absolute numbers) for the BNC and SCOTS

		Formal				Formal/informal		Informal	
		BNC (N = 115)	SCOTS (1989-1996; N = 115)	BNC (N=300)	SCOTS (1980-1999, N=300)	BNC	SCOTS	BNC	SCOTS
Tenses	Present	66.1 (76)	66.1 (76)	68 (204)	66 (198)	43.33 (133)	46 (138)	53 (159)	59.33 (178)
	Past	31.3 (36)	30.4 (35)	27.67 (83)	31 (93)	54.33 (163)	43 (129)	42 (126)	36 (108)
	Future	2.6 (3)	3.5 (4)	4.33 (13)	3 (9)	1.33 (4)	1 (3)	5 (15)	14.67 (14)
Verb type	Dynamic	100 (115)	98.3 (113)	100 (300)	(298)	99.33 (298)	98.67 (296)	100 (300)	87.33 (262)
	Stative	0	1.7 (2)	0	0.67 (2)	0.67 (2)	1.33 (4)	0	22.67 (38)
Basic function	Repeatedness	0	0	0.67 (2)	0	0.67 (2)	0	0	1.67 (5)
	Continuousness	50.4 (58)	73.91 (85)	48 (144)	71 (213)	69 (207)	90.33 (271)	71.67 (215)	31.33 (94)
	Both	49.6 (57)	26.09 (30)	32.52 (153)	29 (87)	30.33 (91)	9.67 (29)	28.33 (85)	67 (200)
		N = 115	N = 115	N = 300	N = 300	N = 300	N = 300	N = 300	N = 300
Additional functions	General validity	6.96 (8)	0	6.67 (20)	0.33 (1)	1 (3)	0	0.33 (1)	1.67 (5)
	Politeness/softening	0.87 (1)	0	0.67 (2)	0	1 (3)	1.67 (5)	0	0.33 (1)
	Emphasis/attitude	0	0.9 (1)	0	0.33 (1)	0.67 (2)	1.33 (4)	0.33 (1)	4 (12)
	Gradual change/development	2.6 (3)	7.8 (9)	3.33 (10)	7.67 (23)	1.67 (5)	2.33 (7)	1 (3)	14.33 (43)
	Old/new habits	5.2 (6)	0	5.33 (16)	0.33 (1)	4.33 (13)	1 (3)	0.67 (2)	2 (6)
	Framing	6.1 (7)	0	3.33 (10)	0	0.67 (2)	2.33 (7)	0.33 (1)	0.33 (1)
	Shock/disbelief	0	0	0.33 (1)	0	2 (6)	2.33 (7)	0	0
	Speaker involvement	0	0	0	0	0	2.33 (7)	0	0.33 (1)
Future function		N = 3	N = 4	N = 13	N = 9	N = 4	N = 3	N = 15	N = 14
	Ongoing future	33.3 (1)	0	61.54 (8)	33.33 (3)	50 (2)	0	33.33 (5)	35.71 (5)
	Routine near future	67.7 (2)	100 (4)	38.46 (5)	66.67 (6)	50 (2)	66.67 (2)	66.67 (10)	64.29 (9)
	Current ongoing future	0	0	0	0	0	33.33 (1)	0	0

5.2.1 Verb type in the BNC and SCOTS

Binary logistic regression analysis was performed to ascertain the effects of corpus and level of formality on the likelihood that the progressive is used with a stative verb. When including 300 cases per corpus for formal texts, the logistic regression model was statistically significant ($\chi^2(4) = 15.323$, $p = .004$). The model explained 25.6% (Nagelkerke R^2) of the variance in verb type and correctly classified 97.4% of cases. SCOTS was 24.45 times more likely to contain the progressive with stative verbs than the BNC. Additionally, the formal texts were 21.37 times more likely to exhibit stative verbs and the formal/informal texts were 7.04 times more likely to do so. When including 115 cases per corpus for formal texts, the logistic regression model still was statistically significant ($\chi^2(4) = 15.330$, $p = .004$). The model explained 22.7% (Nagelkerke R^2) of the variance in verb type and correctly classified 96.8% of cases. Again progressives in SCOTS were more likely to be stative verbs in SCOTS than in the BNC. However, the likelihood decreased when comparing the results to the 300 cases. Additionally, the formal texts were 8.112 times more likely to exhibit stative verbs and the formal/informal texts were 7.04 times more likely to exhibit stative verbs.

5.2.2 Tense in the BNC and SCOTS

Multinomial logistic regression analysis was performed to ascertain the effects of corpus and level of formality on the tense of the progressive. When 300 cases were included the results were the following. The model which included at least one of these factors fit significantly better than a model with no predictors (χ^2 (6) = 64.445, $p < .01$). However, only level of formality was a significant factor (χ^2 (4) = 59.093, $p < .01$). The analysis shows that when compared to the reference category (future tense) the present tense is more likely to occur in formal/informal texts. The same is true for past tense. When the 115 cases were included instead, the analysis had similar outcomes. The model which included at least one of these factors fits significantly better than a model with no predictors (χ^2 (6) = 45.390, $p < .01$). Only

level of formality (χ^2 (4) = 36.962, p <.01) was a significant factor and the predictions were the same.

5.2.3 Basic function in the BNC and SCOTS

Multinomial logistic regression analysis was performed to ascertain the effects of corpus and level of formality on the basic function of the progressive. For the analysis which included 300 cases per corpus for the formal texts the model which included at least one of these factors fits significantly better than a model with no predictors (χ^2 (6) = 115.601, p <.01). Only level of formality was a significant factor (χ^2 (4) = 115.103, p <.01). The analysis shows that, when compared to the reference category, both functions, the function continuousness is more likely to occur in formal texts and formal/informal texts. For the 115 cases, it was not possible to include level of formality as an independent variable as unexpected singularities were encountered in the Hessian matrix. The model with only corpus as a factor did not fit significantly better than a model with no predictors (χ^2 (2) = 3.776, p =.151).

5.2.4 Additional functions in the BNC and SCOTS

Similarly to Römer's (2005) investigation, most of the progressives did not have an additional function and only had a basic function (p. 95). As can be seen in table 4, the highest number of tokens with an additional function for SCOTS can be found in the informal texts, with only 68 tokens. For BNC the highest amount was 59. Multinomial logistic regression analysis was still performed to ascertain the effects of corpus and level of formality on the additional function of the progressive. The analysis which included 300 cases per corpus for formal texts yielded the following results. It was not possible to include level of formality as an independent factor, as unexpected singularities were encountered in the Hessian matrix. The models which included at least one of these factors fit significantly better than a model with no predictors (χ^2 (8) = 35.099, p <.01). The corpus was a significant factor (χ^2 (8) = 35.099, p <.01). The analysis shows that, when compared to the reference category (no additional function) general validity is less likely as an additional function when the corpus is SCOTS.

Conversely, the additional function gradual change and development is more likely when the corpus is SCOTS. Finally, the additional function of speaker involvement is also more likely when the corpus is SCOTS. When looking at only 115 cases for formal texts, it was impossible to include either of the independent factors, as for both unexpected singularities were encountered in the Hessian matrix.

5.2.5 Future function in the BNC and SCOTS

There was too little data to conduct an analysis using multinomial logistic regression analysis. Additionally, this function is dependable on the tense, which causes multicollinearity. This makes it unsuitable for this type of analysis.

5.2.6 Preliminary conclusions: functions and context in SCOTS vs. the BNC

This section will provide the answers to question 1b and 1c. Starting with 1b, the results above show that level of formality added significantly to the models for verb type, tense, and basic function. The overall expectation, regardless of the dependent variable under investigation, was that the progressive would be used more in informal texts, as it can be a marker of informality. This could mean that a wider variety of verb types and tenses were used as well as a possible wider range of functions. The first dependent variable where the level of formality of the text mattered was verb type. Regardless of whether 300 cases or 115 cases per corpus for the formal texts were analysed, formal texts and formal/informal texts were more likely to contain progressives with stative verbs than informal texts. This is the case when comparing to the base line of the informal texts. However, this likelihood decreased when investigating 115 cases instead of 300. Looking at the results for tense, it is clear that the results are the same when analysing 115 cases or 300 cases. Both show that, when compared to the likelihood of future tense occurring, present and past tense are more likely to occur in formal/informal texts compared to informal texts. Looking at the basic function, only analysing 300 cases yielded significant results for the effect of level of formality. As can be seen above, when compared to the likelihood of a progressive having

both functions, the function continuousness is more likely to occur in formal texts and formal/informal texts. All the results above show that some variants of the dependent variables were more likely in formal and/or formal/informal texts, not in informal texts. This was not as expected, as the fact that the progressive is a marker of informality in Scottish English could suggest that the contexts and functions would be more varied for informal texts as well.

Moving on to question 1c, the results above show that corpus significantly added to the model for verb type and additional function. For verb type, it showed that both with 300 cases and 115 cases for formal texts per corpus, SCOTS was more likely to contain stative verbs than the BNC. However, the degree of likelihood differed between the two versions of the analysis. Regardless, it confirms the traditional claim that the progressive can occur with stative verbs in Scottish English more often than is the case in Standard English. Additionally, corpus was a significant factor for additional function, but only when looking at 300 cases per corpus for formal texts. As mentioned before, it was possible for the progressive to have no additional function. When compared to the likelihood of the progressive having no additional function, the progressive was more likely to have gradual change and development and speaker involvement in SCOTS. The additional function general validity was less likely in SCOTS. These differences between corpora were partly expected. As noted earlier, speaker involvement is a function often ascribed to the progressive in Scottish English only.

5.3 Context and functions: SCOTS 1989-1996 vs. SCOTS 2000-2005

To answer research question 2b and 2c, the data obtained from SCOTS for 1989-1996 was compared with the data from SCOTS from the later period (2000-2005). This was done per dependent variable. All results are presented in table 5. However, only the outcomes of statistical analysis will be discussed, because they explain the differences in the data. The tests used to ascertain whether differences were significant were the same as earlier, so either

a binary logistic regression analysis or a multinomial logistic regression analysis, depending on the number of levels of the dependent variable. This time the independent variables were not corpus and level of formality, but period and level of formality.

Another important thing to note is that there were two samples for the formal texts, one with 300 cases and one with 115 cases. In one of the multinomial logistic regression analyses only the 300 cases were included, in the other, only the 115 cases were included for the formal texts. This occurred for every dependent variable. Additionally, there were only 88 tokens for the informal texts for the later period of SCOTS. As it was not possible to increase this, this low number has been used. However, it could impact the analysis. For all tests, the threshold of significance was $p = .005$. As can be seen in table 5, some frequencies were quite low, which made it unsuitable for statistical analysis. This is especially true for future functions.

Table 5: Frequencies in percentages (absolute numbers) for the earlier and later periods of SCOTS

		Formal				Formal/informal		Informal	
		Earlier period (1989-1996; N = 115)	Later period (N = 115)	Earlier period (1980-1999; N=300)	Later period (N=300)	Earlier period	Later period	Earlier period	Later period
Tenses	Present	66.1 (76)	68.70 (79)	66 (198)	64.7 (194)	46 (138)	51.67 (155)	62.5 (55)	67.05 (59)
	Past	30.4 (35)	30.43 (35)	31 (93)	34.7 (104)	43 (129)	48 (144)	30.7 (27)	32.95 (29)
	Future	3.5 (4)	0.87 (1)	3 (9)	0.7 (2)	1 (3)	0.33 (1)	6.8 (6)	0
Verb type	Dynamic	98.3 (113)	98.3 (113)	99.33 (298)	99 (297)	298.67 (296)	99.33 (298)	87.5 (77)	96.59 (85)
	Stative	1.7 (2)	1.7 (2)	0.67 (2)	1 (3)	1.33 (4)	0.67 (2)	12.5 (11)	3.41 (3)
Basic function	Repeatedness	0	0	0	0	0	0.33 (1)	2.3 (2)	0
	Continuousness	73.91 (85)	75.65 (87)	71 (213)	72.3 (217)	90.33 (271)	85 (255)	33 (29)	84.1 (74)
	Both	26.09 (30)	24.35 (28)	29 (87)	27.7 (83)	9.67 (29)	14.67 (44)	64.8 (57)	15.9 (14)
		N = 115	N = 115	N = 300	N = 300	N = 300	N = 300	N = 88	N = 88
Additional functions	General validity	0	0.9 (1)	0.33 (1)	1 (3)	0	0	1.1 (1)	0
	Politeness/softening	0	0.9 (1)	0	0.33 (1)	1.67 (5)	1.67 (5)	0	0
	Emphasis/attitude	0.9 (1)	1.7 (2)	0.33 (1)	1 (3)	1.33 (4)	3.33 (10)	0	1.1 (1)
	Gradual change/development	7.8 (9)	13.9 (16)	7.67 (23)	10 (30)	2.33 (7)	5.33 (16)	4.5 (4)	8 (7)
	Old/new habits	0	0.9 (1)	0.33 (1)	1 (3)	1 (3)	0.33 (1)	17 (15)	3.4 (3)
	Framing	0	0.9 (1)	0	5 (1.67)	2.33 (7)	4 (12)	1.1 (1)	1.1 (1)
	Shock/disbelief	0	0	0	0.33 (1)	2.33 (7)	0.33 (1)	0	1.1 (1)
	Speaker involvement	0	0.9 (1)	0	2.3 (7)	2.33 (7)	6 (2)	1.1 (1)	2.3 (2)
Future function		N = 4	N = 1	N = 9	N = 2	N = 3	N = 1	N = 6	N = 0
	Ongoing future	0	0	33.33 (3)	50 (1)	0	0	33.33 (2)	0
	Routine near future	100 (4)	100 (1)	66.67 (6)	50 (1)	66.67 (2)	100 (1)	66.67 (4)	0
	Current ongoing future	0	0	0	0	33.33 (1)	0	0	0

5.3.1 Verb type in the earlier and later period in SCOTS

Binary logistic regression analysis was performed to ascertain the effects of corpus and level of formality on the likelihood that the progressive is used with a stative verb. When including 300 cases per corpus for the formal texts, the results were the following. The logistic regression model was not statistically significant ($\chi^2(4) = 3.075$, $p = .545$). The model without any independent variables explained 96.7% of the data and this is not increased by adding one or both of the independent variables. This means that neither corpus nor period significantly explain the variation in verb type. The same was true when including 115 cases per corpus for the formal texts instead ($\chi^2(4) = 1.646$, $p = .801$).

5.3.2 Tense in the earlier and later period in SCOTS

Multinomial logistic regression analysis was performed to ascertain the effects of period and level of formality on the tense of the progressive. When including 300 cases per corpus for the formal texts the model which included at least one of these factors fits significantly better than a model with no predictors (χ^2 (6) = 43.652, $p < .01$). The period was a significant factor (χ^2 (2) = 12.276, $p < .01$) as was the level of formality (χ^2 (4) = 26.998, $p < .01$). The analysis shows that, when compared to the reference category (future tense) the present tense is more likely if the level of formality is formal/informal, but it is less likely in the earlier period. The same is true for the past tense. The results when analysing 115 cases per corpus for the formal texts were the same as for the analysis of 300 cases (χ^2 (6) = 37.828, $p < .01$). The period was a significant factor (χ^2 (2) = 8.736, $p = .01$) as was the level of formality (χ^2 (4) = 24.661, $p < .01$).

5.3.3 Basic function in the earlier and later period in SCOTS

Multinomial logistic regression analysis was performed to ascertain the effects of period on the basic function of the progressive. Irrespective of whether the analysis included 300 or 115 cases per corpus for the formal texts, it was not possible to include level of formality as an independent factor, as unexpected singularities were encountered in the Hessian matrix. When analysing 300 cases per corpus for the formal texts, the results were the following. The model

with period as a factor fits significantly better than a model with no predictors (χ^2 (2) = 44.840, p <.01). This then means that the period was a significant factor. The analysis shows that, when compared to the reference category (both functions) the basic function is less likely to be continuousness in the earlier period. When looking at 115 cases per corpus instead the corpus was also a significant factor (χ^2 (2) = 58.782, p <.01). The results were the same as for the 300 cases.

5.3.4 Additional function in the earlier and later period in SCOTS

Similarly to Römer's (2005) investigation, most of the progressive did not have an additional function and only had a basic function (p. 95). Multinomial logistic regression analysis was performed to ascertain the effects of period on the additional function of the progressive. It was not possible to include level of formality as an independent factor, neither for 300 cases nor for 150 cases, as unexpected singularities were encountered in the Hessian matrix. When analysing 300 cases per corpus for the formal texts, the model which included period as a factor fits significantly better than a model with no predictors (χ^2 (8) = 52.148, p <.01). The analysis shows that, when compared to the reference category (no additional function) emphasis or attitude is less likely as an additional function in the earlier period compared to the later period. The same is true for the function gradual change and development. Conversely, the additional function old and new habits is more likely in the earlier period compared to the later period. Both framing and speaker involvement are less likely. When replacing the 300 cases with 115 cases, the results are as follows. The model which included period as a factor, fits significantly better than a model with no predictors (χ^2 (8) = 50.887, p <.01). The analysis shows that, when compared to the reference category, no additional function, emphasis or attitude is less likely as an additional function in the earlier period. The same is true for the function gradual change and development. Conversely, the additional function old and new habits is more likely in the earlier period. Framing is once again less likely in the earlier period.

5.3.5 Future function in the earlier and later period in SCOTS

Again, there was too little data to conduct an analysis using multinomial logistic regression analysis. Additionally, this function is dependable on the tense, which causes multicollinearity. This makes it unsuitable for this type of analysis. When looking at the data in table 5, it seems that the routine near future is the most frequent. However, it is unsure whether this is significantly true, due to the low numbers.

5.3.6 Preliminary conclusions: functions and context SCOTS (1989-1996) vs. SCOTS (2000-2005)

The answer to questions 2b and 2c are the following. The level of formality (question 2b) was a significant factor only in determining the tense of the progressive. The results were the same regardless of whether 115 or 300 cases were analysed per corpus for the formal texts. For both, the present tense is more likely than the future tense if the level of formality is formal/informal. The same is true for the past tense. As the hypothesis was that the progressive was a marker of informality in both periods, it could have been the case that the progressive was used in more contexts and with more functions in that text type. This is not the case. The period was a significant factor for tense, basic function, and additional function. Regardless of the number of progressives analysed for formal texts, both present and past tense were more likely in the earlier period than the present tense. This was not expected, as the expectation was that the contexts of the progressives would rise when comparing the later period to the earlier period. This could also have meant that the contexts in which the progressive could occur would significantly increase, but this is not the case. When looking at the results for basic function, the analysis shows that, regardless of the number of progressives analysed, continuousness is less likely than both functions as a basic function in the earlier period, when compared to the later period. This was not expected, as this would mean that the number of contexts for the progressive has increased. The final function for which the period was a predictor was the additional function. The results for 115 and 300

cases were slightly different. As mentioned above, the progressive did not have to have an additional function. In the earlier period emphasis and attitude, gradual change and development, framing and speaker involvement were less likely when analysing 300 cases. When analysing 115 cases, speaker involvement is no longer less likely. However, regardless of the number of cases analysed, the additional function old and new habits is more likely in the earlier period. These results mostly confirm the hypothesis. The reason for this confirmation is that, if the progressive is used more in the later period, it is possibly also used with more additional functions. These results show that this is the case for several additional functions.

6. Conclusion

Based on the data examined, the following conclusions can be drawn. First of all, the frequency of the progressive does not depend on the corpus or period. This means that the progressive is not significantly more frequent in Scottish English than in Standard English. Additionally, it shows that the frequency has not changed significantly in Scottish English. However, when comparing the frequencies in the two periods of SCOTS, the level of formality was a factor. As noted above, the model predicts that the frequency is highest for formal texts, followed by formal/informal texts and finally informal texts. This does not corroborate previous research, which suggests that the progressive is a marker of informality in Scottish English.

The other conclusions regard the functions of the progressive and the context in which it is used. When looking at the significant differences between Standard English and Scottish English, both verb type and additional function were different when looking at the corpus. For the additional functions, the data from this corpus showed that they also differed significantly per corpus. However, similarly to Römer's (2005) investigation, most of the progressive did not have an additional function and only had a basic function (p. 95). Both speaker

involvement and gradual change and development were more likely to occur in Scottish English. This was expected for the additional function speaker involvement, but not for the additional function gradual change and development. When looking at the differences in context in the two corpora, it becomes clear that stative verbs were more likely in SCOTS than in the BNC. This confirms the traditional claim that Scottish English allows for a wider range regarding the progressive.

When looking at the effect of level of formality, it becomes clear that the progressive is not used in more contexts and with more functions in informal texts than in formal or formal/informal texts. This is true when looking at the impact of level of formality when comparing the two varieties and when comparing the two periods of Scottish English. However, this could be tainted by the low number of progressives.

The last feature under investigation was whether there has been a change in Scottish English. Looking at the contexts and the functions, it seems that there have been various changes, but no clear overall pattern emerges. Some of the options of tense and basic function were both more likely to occur in the earlier period, whereas some additional functions were more likely to occur in the later period. As the idea was that the progressive is used more in later periods, the contexts and (optional) functions might have expanded as well. However, this does not have to be the case, as the relative frequencies might have shifted as well. The results show that the use of the progressive has increased on some points, but that there are also areas in which the variety of contexts and functions has decreased.

This investigation had several limitations. Most importantly, it focussed on written and not on spoken language. Possibly, a comparative investigation focussed on spoken language would reveal more differences between the varieties and the periods. Additionally, the comparisons were based on few data at times, due to the availability of the corpora. Perhaps the outcomes would be different with more tokens. Thirdly, the results regarding the

tenses may not be trustworthy, as it could be that one tense is used more often in the text in general, not just in the progressive. In a future study the overall rates of the tenses should also be considered. Finally, this study only considered Römer's (2005), Kortmann's (2006) and Wada's (2013) functions. It is important to note that the choice of possible functions possibly has an impact. Researchers use different terms for functions, which means that the functions themselves may differ slightly as well. So using other functions could impact the results.

One suggestion for further research would be to conduct a full analysis of all progressives in the corpus, along with a classification of functions based on the contexts of use for Scottish English instead of only relying on existing classification systems. Römer's (2005) study showed that this was worthwhile for Standard English and it may be the case for Scottish English as well. Another idea may be to focus not on written language but spoken language. A third possibility is to look at other periods and see whether there are more differences between Scottish English and Standard English regarding the progressive in the past. Lastly, it could be interesting to look at the progressive in another corpus of Scottish English. As SCOTS contains all of the varieties, this could have obscured variation which is present.

7. References

Anderson, J., Beavan, D. & Kay, C. (2007). SCOTS: Scottish corpus of texts and speech. In J. C. Beal, K. P. Corrigan & H. L. Moisl (Eds.), *Creating and digitizing language corpora: Synchronic databases* (pp 17-34). London, England: Palgrave Macmillan. doi: 10.1057/9780230223936

Beal, J. C. (2010). *An introduction to Regional Englishes: Dialect variation in England*. Edinburgh, England: Edinburgh University Press.

Burnard, L. (Eds.) (2007). *Reference guide for the British National Corpus (XML Edition)*. Oxford, England: Research Technologies Service at Oxford University Computing Service.

Chambers, J. K. (2004). Dynamic typology and vernacular universals. In W. Bisang, H. H. Hock & W. Winter (Eds.), *Dialectology meets typology: Dialect grammar from a cross-linguistic perspective* (pp. 127-145). Berlin, NH: Mouton de Gruyter.

Filppula, M., Klemola, J., & Paulasto, H. (2008). *English and Celtic in contact*. Abingdon, England: Routledge.

Douglas, F. M. (2003). The Scottish Corpus of Text and Speech: Problems of corpus design. *Literary and Linguistic Computing, 18*, 23-37. doi:10.1093/llc.18.1.23

Gachelin, J. (1997). The progressive and habitual aspects in non-standard Englishes. In E. W. Schneider (Eds.), *Englishes around the world: Studies in honour of Manfred Görlach. Volume 1: General studies, British Isles, North America.* (pp 33-46). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Grant, W., & Dixon, J. M. (1921). *Manual of modern Scots*. London, England: Cambridge University Press.

Kortmann, B. (2006). Syntactic variation in English: A global perspective. *The handbook of English linguistics* (pp. 602-624). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing. doi:10.1002/9780470753002.ch26

Kortmann, B. (2008). Synopsis: Morphological and syntactic variation in the British Isles. In B. Kortmann, & C. Upton (Eds.), *Varieties of English: The British Isles* (pp. 478-495). Berlin, NH: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kortmann, B. & Szmrecsanyi B. (2004). Global synopsis: Morphological and syntactic variation in English. In B. Kortmann, K. Burridge, R. Mesthrie, E. W. Schneider and C.

Upton (Eds.), *A Handbook of Varieties of English. Vol. 2: Morphology and Syntax* (pp. 1142-1202). Berlin, NH: Mouton de Gruyter.

Levin, M. (2013). The progressive verb in modern American English. In B. Aarts, J. Close, G. Leech & S. Wallis (Eds.), *The verb phrase in English: Investigating recent language change with corpora* (pp. 187-216). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Miller, J. (2008). Scottish English: Morphology and syntax. In B. Kortmann, & C. Upton (Eds.), *Varieties of English: The British Isles* (pp. 299-327). Berlin, NH: Mouton de Gruyter.

Moorcroft, C. (2006). *English: Revision guide*. London, England: Lonsdale Revision Guides.

Purves, D. (2002). *A Scots grammar: Scots grammar & usage*. Edinburgh, England: The Saltire Society.

Ramchand, G. C. (1993). Verbal nouns and event structure in Scottish Gaelic. *Semantics and Linguistic Theory*, *3*, 162-201. doi: https://doi.org/10.3765/salt.v3i0.3120

Römer, U. (2005). *Progressives, patterns, pedagogy: A corpus-driven approach to English progressive forms, functions, contexts and didactics*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Stuart-Smith, J. (2008). Scottish English: Phonology. In B. Kortmann, & C. Upton (Eds.), *Varieties of English: The British Isles* (pp. 48-70). Berlin, NH: Mouton de Gruyter.

8. Appendix A

This appendix contains three tables listing the text types and file names per level of formality for the BNC (period: 1990-1995). There is one table per level of formality.

Table 5: File names and text types for texts categorized as formal

Text types
Book: non-fiction, book: essays, Periodical, miscellaneous, miscellaneous: factsheet, miscellaneous: information bulletin, miscellaneous: leaflets, miscellaneous: newsletters, miscellaneous: reports & accounts, miscellaneous: annual report, miscellaneous: annual review, miscellaneous, annual report & accounts, miscellaneous: yearbook, miscellaneous: prospectus, miscellaneous: reference book, miscellaneous: regulations, miscellaneous: report & supplement
File names
A04, A05, A07, A0E, A0H, A0K, A0M, A0P, A0T, A0W, A0X, A11, A12, A1A, A1B, A5Y, A62, A66, A68, A6B, A6D, A6F, A6G, A6M, A7C, AC0, AC9, ACA, ACG, ACH, ACJ, ADB, ADC, ADE, ADP, AE4, ALK, ALM, ALU, ALY, AM7, AMA, AML, AMM, AMR, AMS, AN5, ANB, ANF, ANJ, ANK, ANR, ANT, AP6, APD, APE, APH, APP, APX, AR4, AR5, AR8, ARF, ARY, AS5, AS6, ASB, ASF, ASU, AT1, AT9, B06, B07, B08, B0K, B0R, B0Y, B12, B14, B1A, B1E, B1G, B1K, B1L, B1T, B21, B23, B26, B28, B2A, B2C, B2H, B2K, B2T, B2W, B2X, B30, B3A, B3B, B3C, BLX, BM6, BM9, BMH, BMJ, BN4, BN8, BNB, BNN, BP5, C8F, C8G, C8H, C8J, C8K, C90, C93, C9A, C9B, CAC, CAY, CB9, CBB, CBN, CCF, CCG, CCH, CCJ, CCL, CCR, CCV, CD3, CD4, CE1, CE4, CE8, CEG, CEJ, CF5, CF6, CF7, CF8, CF9, CFA, CFB, CFC, CFD, CFE, CFG, CFH, CFW, CG0, CG6, CG7, CG8, CG9, CGA, CGD, CGF, CGJ, CGL, CGY, CHL, CJ4, CJ5, CJ6, CJ7, CJ8, CJM, CJN, CK2, CKN, CKR, CL4, CL5, CL6, CLE, CLH, CLM, CLN, CLR, CLW, CM0, CM6, CM8, CM9, CMB, CMT, CMU, CRD, CRJ, CRK, CRM, CRT, CRY, CS0, CS1, CS2, E9N, E9P, E9R, E9S, E9T, E9U, E9W, E9X, EA0, EA1, EA2, EA6, EA7, EA9, EAJ, EAK, EAY, EB7, EB8, EB9, EBA, EBB, EBC, EBD, EBE, EBF, EBG, EBH, EBJ, EBK, EBM, EBP, EBY, EC0, EC1, ECD, ECE, ECY, ED5, EDD, EDF, EDH, EDK, EDL, EDY, EE1, EE2, EE6, EE8, EE9, EEA, EEB, EEC, EEE, EEF, EEH,

EEM, EEN, EEY, EF0, EF2, EF3, EF6, EF8, EF9, EFA, EVK, EVX, EW4, EWX, F9D, F9F, F9H, F9K, F9P, F9S, F9T, F9U, F9V, F9W, FA1, FA3, FA4, FA6, FA8, FA9, FAC, FAD, FAG, FAM, FAU, FAV, FAW, FAY, FB1, FB3, FB4, FB6, FB7, FBB, FBC, FBD, FBF, FBJ, FBK, FBP, FBS, FBT, FBU, FBV, FBW, FBX, FBY, FC0, FC1, FC2, FC3, FC4, FC5, FC6, FC7, FC8, FC9, FCA, FCB, FCC, FCD, FCE, FCF, FCG, FCH, FCJ, FCK, FCL, FCM, FCN, FCP, FCR, FCS, FCT, FCU, FCV, FCW, FCX, FCY, FD0, FD1, FD2, FD3, FD4, FD5, FD6, FD7, FD8, FD9, FDA, FDB, FDC, FDD, FDE, FDF, FDG, FDH, FDJ, FDK, FDL, FDM, FDN, FDP, FDR, FDS, FDT, FDU, FDV, FDW, FDX, FDY, FE0, FE1, FE2, FE3, FE5, FEJ, FEX, FNR, FP2, FP4, FP8, FP9, FPJ, FPW, FPY, FRL, FRN, FRT, FS6, FS7, FSA, FSS, FST, FSU, FSV, FSW, FTB, FTC, FTD, FTE, FTX, FTY, FYT, FYW, G08, G0G, G0H, G0R, G0T, G0U, G14, G1C, G1F, G1H, G1J, G1N, G20, G27, G28, G29, G2B, G2G, G2M, G38, G39, G3B, G3P, G3T, GSX, GSY, GT0, GT1, GT2, GT3, GT4, GT5, GT6, GT7, GT8, GT9, GTA, GTB, GTC, GTD, GTE, GTF, GTG, GTH, GU5, GU6, GUB, GUC, GV1, GVF, GVG, GVH, GVN, GVU, GW4, GWJ, GWK, GWL, GWM, GWN, GXF, H0K, H7T, H7X, H7Y, H8D, H8E, H8K, H8U, H91, H99, H9A, H9F, H9M, H9R, HAB, HAD, HAS, HAU, HBB, HBR, HBS, HBU, HBV, HCG, HCH, HCM, HCN, HCP, HCR, HGP, HGR, HGW, HH2, HH4, HH6, HHD, HHE, HHF, HHG, HHH, HHJ, HHK, HHL, HHM, HHN, HHP, HHR, HHS, HHT, HHU, HHV, HHW, HHX, HJ5, HK5, HKP, HKR, HKS, HKT, HKU, HKV, HKW, HKX, HKY, HL0, HL1, HL2, HL3, HL4, HL5, HL6, HL7, HL8, HL9, HLA, HLB, HLC, HLD, HLE, HLF, HLG, HLH, HLJ, HLK, HLL, HLM, HLN, HLP, HLR, HLS, HLT, HNL, HNM, HNV, HP3, HP7, HPT, HPU, HPV, HPW, HPX, HPY, HR0, HR1, HR3, HRB, HRD, HRE, HRF, HRG, HRH, HRJ, HRK, HRM, HRN, HRR, HRS, HRX, HS8, HSE, HSU, HTC, HTD, HTE, HTK, HTV, HU1, HU5, HU6, HU7, HW9, HWB, HWG, HWH, HWK, HWU, HWV, HWW, HWY, HX0, HX2, HX5, HXC, HXD, HXE, HXF, HXG, HXH, HXJ, HXK, HXL, HXM,

HXN, HXP, HXR, HXS, HXT, HXU, HXV, HXW, HXX, HXY, HY0, HY1, HY2, HY3, HY4, HY5, HY6, HY7, HY8, HY9, HYA, HYB, J0T, J0U, J0W, J11, J18, J1A, J1P, J1S, J1T, J1U, J1V, J1W, J28, J29, J2A, J2B, J30, J6N, J6P, J6R, J6S, J6T, J6U, J6V, J6W, J6X, J6Y, J70, J71, J72, J73, J74, J75, J76, J77, J78, J79, J7A, J7B, J7C, J7D, J7E, J7F, J7G, J7H, J7J, J7K, J7L, J7M, J7P, J7R, J7S, J7T, J7U, J7V, J7W, J7X, J7Y, J80, J81, J82, J83, J84, J85, J86, J87, J88, J89, JXL, K5N, K5P, K5R, K5S, K5T, K5U, K5V, K5W, K5X, K5Y, K8U, K8W, K8Y, K91, K92, K94

Table 6: File names and text types for texts categorized as formal/informal

Text types
Annual review, periodical, book: non-fiction, book: fiction, miscellaneous,
File names
A02, A03, A06, A08, A0B, A0D, A0F, A0L, A0N, A0R, A0U, A0V, A14, A64, A69, A6A, A6J, A6N, A6T, A6U, A74, A75, A77, A7D, A7F, A7H, A7J, AB4, AB9, ABA, ABC, ABD, ABE, ABF, ABG, ABH, ABJ, ABK, ABP, ABU, ABW, AC2, AC3, AC5, AC6, AC7, ACB, ACE, ACK, ACL, ACV, ACW, AD2, AD7, AD9, ADA, ADH, ADS, ADY, AE0, AE6, AE8, AE9, AEA, AEB, AH9, AHA, AHB, AHC, AHD, AHE, AHF, AHG, AHH, AHJ, AHK, AHL, AHM, AHN, AHP, AHR, AHS, AHT, AHU, AHV, AHW, AHX, AHY, AJ0, AJ1, AJ2, AJ3, AJ4, AJ5, AJ6, AJ7, AJ8, AJ9, AJA, AJB, AJC, AJD, AJE, AJF, AJG, AJH, AJJ, AJK, AJM, AJN, AJP, AJR, AJS, AJT, AJU, AJV, AJW, AJX, AJY, AK0, AK1, AK2, AK3, AK4, AK6, AK7, AK8, AK9, AKA, AKB, AKC, AKD, AKE, AKF, AKG, AKH, AKJ, AKK, AKL, AKM, AKN, AKP, AKR, AKS, AKT, AKU, AKV, AKW, AKX, AKY, AL0, AL1, AL2, AL3, AL4, AL5, AL6, ALJ, ALN, ALP, ALS, ALW, AM2, AM4, AM8, AM9, AMB, AMK, AMU, AN0, AN4, AN7, AN8, AN9, AND, ANL, ANU, AP7, APR, APS, APU, APW, AR2, ARG, ARK, ARX, AS0, AS3, AS7, ASD, ASE,

ASL, ASN, ASS, AT3, AT7, ATE, B01, B0M, B0W, B17, B1C, B1N, B1X, B20, B2B, B2F, B2N, B35, B38, B71, B72, B73, B74, B75, B76, B77, B78, B79, B7A, B7B, B7C, B7D, B7E, B7F, B7G, B7H, B7J, B7K, B7L, B7M, B7N, BMM, BMN, BMR, BMS, BMT, BMW, BN2, BN3, BN9, BNA, BNC, BNU, BP1, BP2, BP3, BP7, BPD, C86, C8E, C8L, C8N, C8X, C98, C9W, CA0, CA3, CA5, CA9, CAP, CAR, CAX, CB5, CBM, CBR, CC0, CCD, CCK, CCM, CCN, CCW, CD2, CDC, CDD, CDE, CDG, CDM, CDN, CDS, CE0, CE6, CE9, CEB, CEC, CEH, CEU, CEX, CEY, CFJ, CFX, CFY, CGE, CGT, CH0, CH9, CHG, CHR, CHT, CJA, CJB, CJC, CJH, CJJ, CJK, CK1, CK9, CKB, CKD, CKE, CKF, CKG, CKH, CKJ, CKK, CL0, CLD, CLL, CLU, CLV, CM1, CMD, CME, CMJ, CMK, CML, CMP, CN3, CN4, CNA, CR4, CR5, CR6, CR7, CR8, CR9, CRA, CRB, CRC, CRE, CRS, CRU, CS4, CS7, CS8, CS9, CSA, CSB, CSC, CSD, CSE, CSF, CSG, CSH, CSJ, CSK, CSL, CSM, CSN, CSP, CSS, CST, CSU, CSV, CSW, CSX, CSY, CT0, CT1, CT2, CT3, CT4, CT5, CT6, CT7, CT8, CT9, CTA, CTB, CTC, CTD, CTE, CTF, CTG, CTH, CTJ, CTK, CTL, CTM, CTN, CTP, CTR, CTS, CTT, CTU, CTV, CTY, CU0, CU1, EA4, EA5, EAW, EBR, EBS, EBT, EBU, EBV, EBW, EBX, EC4, EC7, ECB, ED2, EDJ, EDN, EDR, EDT, EER, EEV, EEW, EF1, EFT, F9C, F9J, F9M, F9R, F9X, FAB, FAJ, FAP, FAS, FAT, FB8, FBE, FBH, FBL, FBM, FEM, FNS, FNT, FNU, FNW, FNY, FP0, FP1, FP5, FP6, FP7, FPB, FPE, FPF, FPK, FPL, FPM, FPN, FPP, FPU, FPX, FR0, FR3, FR6, FR9, FRC, FRD, FRE, FRH, FRJ, FRK, FRS, FRU, FRX, FRY, FS0, FS1, FS2, FS3, FS5, FS8, FSB, FSC, FSE, FSF, FSJ, FSK, FSL, FSN, FSR, FT6, FTA, FYV, FYY, G01, G02, G03, G04, G09, G0A, G0E, G0L, G0M, G0N, G0P, G0S, G0Y, G10, G15, G16, G17, G1D, G1L, G1M, G1S, G1V, G1W, G1X, G1Y, G26, G2C, G2D, G2K, G2W, G32, G33, G37, GU9, GUE, GUK, GUL, GUM, GUU, GV6, GV7, GV8, GVL, GVM, GVP, GVT, GW0, GW2, GW9, GWB, GWF, GWH, H06, H45, H46, H7W, H84, H85, H89, H8A, H8B, H8F, H8G, H8H, H8J, H8S, H8T, H8X, H8Y, H90, H93, H94, H97, H98, H9C, H9D, H9E,

H9H, H9L, H9N, H9V, H9Y, HA0, HA2, HA4, HA5, HA6, HA7, HA9, HAC, HAK, HGD, HGE, HGF, HGJ, HGK, HGL, HGM, HGN, HGS, HGT, HGU, HGV, HGY, HH0, HH1, HH5, HH8, HHA, HHB, HHC, HJH, HNJ, HNK, HNR, HNS, HNU, HNX, HP1, HPA, HPB, HPC, HR4, HR7, HR8, HR9, HRA, HRC, HTG, HTH, HTJ, HTL, HTM, HTS, HTU, HTW, HTX, HTY, HU0, HU8, HWA, HWC, HWE, HWL, HWM, HWN, J10, J13, J17, J19, J1B, J1K, J1X, J1Y, JXS, JXT, JXU, JXV, JXW, JXX, JXY, JY0, JY1, JY2, JY3, JY4, JY5, JY6, JY7, JY8, JY9, JYA, JYB, JYC, JYD, JYE, JYF, K8T, K8V, K95, K97, KS9

Table 7: File names and text types for texts categorized as informal

Text types
Factsheet/newsletter, leaflets, periodical, book: non-fiction, miscellaneous, miscellaneous: advertisements
File names
A00, A01, A0C, A0G, A15, A16, A17, A19, A61, A63, A65, A6C, A6E, A6W, A6X, A70, A7L, A7N, A7P, AAY, AB3, AB6, ABR, ABS, ABV, ACM, ACN, ACP, ACR, ACX, ACY, ADG, ADL, ADM, ALH, ALV, AM0, AM5, AMC, AMD, AMT, AMW, AN1, AN2, ANP, ANX, AP0, APC, APK, APL, APT, AR7, AR9, ARD, ARE, ARM, AS1, ASA, ASH, ASJ, ASV, ATA, AYJ, AYK, B03, B04, B0H, B0U, B1R, B22, B24, B2Y, B39, BM0, BM4, BM5, BMB, BMC, BMD, BMF, BMK, BNH, BNK, BNP, BNS, BNT, BNV, BP4, BPB, BPE, BPF, BPG, BPH, BPJ, C87, C88, C89, C8A, C8B, C8P, C8U, C91, C92, C95, C96, C97, C9C, C9E, C9F, C9H, C9J, C9K, C9L, C9M, C9N, C9P, C9R, C9S, C9U, C9X, C9Y, CA1, CA2, CA7, CAD, CAE, CAF, CAG, CAH, CAJ, CAK, CAL, CAS, CAT, CAU, CB2, CB3, CB4, CB8, CBC, CBD, CBE, CBF, CBG, CBT, CBU, CBV, CBW, CBX, CBY, CCP, CCX, CCY, CD5, CD6, CDH, CDJ, CDK, CDX, CEF, CEK, CEL, CEM, CEN, CEP, CER, CES, CET, CFL, CG1, CG2, CG3, CG5, CGB, CGC, CGH, CGM,

CGN, CGP, CGU, CGV, CGW, CGX, CH1, CH2, CH3, CH5, CH6, CH7, CHA, CHB, CHE, CHH, CHJ, CHK, CHV, CHW, CJ9, CJD, CJE, CJP, CJR, CJS, CJU, CK3, CK4, CK5, CK6, CKA, CKL, CKM, CKT, CKU, CKV, CKW, CKX, CKY, CL7, CLG, CLK, CLT, CM4, CMC, CMM, CMW, CMX, CMY, CN0, CN1, CRP, CTX, E9Y, EB1, EB3, EB6, EBL, EBN, EC2, EC5, EC9, ECF, ECG, ECH, ECJ, ECL, ECM, ECT, ECU, ECX, ED1, ED3, ED4, ED6, ED7, EDG, EEJ, EEL, EF5, EFD, EFF, EFG, EFH, EVN, FBN, FBR, FT7, FT8, FT9, FYX, G21, G22, G23, G24, G25, G2E, G2F, G2L, G2S, G2T, G2Y, G30, G31, G34, G35, G36, G3C, H07, HAE, HAF, HC3, HC4, HRP, HWX, KS8