

minutes), this presentation examines selected syntactical patterns that are characteristic for their in-group speech. The focus is on the use of the ‘postfield’, i.e. the positioning of verb-free elements after the closure of the potential right verbal bracket:

- (1) *van VIERzehn jahre; (--)*
VIERzehn jahre; (-)
dann dann bin ik geARbeite(t) <<pp> **in de grub**>.

It can be shown that *Cité Duits* has developed particular constructions that rarely occur in spoken German or Dutch. Not only facultative and obligatory prepositional phrases, but also nominal phrases, certain particles and adverbs are placed after the right bracket. Secondly, despite the different mother tongues of the speakers, only slight individual variability can be observed.

Dirk Pijpops

RU Quantitative Lexicology and Variational Linguistics, University of Leuven

Second Language speakers and postnominal adjectival inflection in Dutch. A corpus research of the present-day situation in the Netherlands

In an inconspicuous corner of Dutch grammar, one may find adjectives receiving *-s* inflection (1). However, this *-s*, a remnant of the partitive genitive, may also disappear (2).

- (1) *wat zinnig-s*
‘something sensible’
(2) *iets wit*
‘something white’

Earlier research has revealed the precise intra- and extra-linguistic contexts in which this *-s* omission is taking place (Pijpops & Van de Velde 2014). What remains unclear however, is how second language speakers of Dutch handle this peculiar inflection. Do they generalize one variant, as often with prenominal adjectival inflection (Weerman 2003, Blom et al. 2008, Ruette & Van de Velde 2013: 468-471, Van de Velde & Weerman 2014: 117-119)? Or are they capable of picking up exactly when to place the *-s*? To answer these questions, we apply the regression-based methodology of Gries & Deshors (2014) to first and second language chatters of Dutch. We believe the results not only provide information on second language acquisition of this postnominal inflection, but also shed light on its current and future linguistic status.

Mara van der Ploeg, Femke Swarte & Charlotte Gooskens

Rijksuniversiteit Groningen

On the influence of age and level of education on intelligibility

Many factors influencing intelligibility have been uncovered in previous research (Bø, 1978; Gooskens, 2006; Jörgensen and Kärrlander, 2001). However, in intelligibility research, the effect of age has not been investigated as extensively. Apart from Vanhove’s (2014) finding of the effect of age on cognate guessing, almost no other studies have paid attention to this factor. Also, in intelligibility research, the effect of educational level on intelligibility is often neglected. Most studies only test either pre-university or university students.

This paper examines this potential effect of age and level of education on intelligibility. In contrast to Vanhove (2014), we looked at text intelligibility instead of cognate recognition. We tested 2780 Danish participants in a written and spoken cloze test in Dutch, English, German and Swedish, where they had to fill gaps in a text. The participants varied in age and educational background. We were not able to find an effect of age on intelligibility in our