

# Figures and Tables

 <https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.157.lof>

Pages xv–xviii of

**Exploring Functional-Cognitive Space**

**Christopher S. Butler and Francisco González-García**


[Studies in Language Companion Series, 157]

2014. xviii, 579 pp.

© John Benjamins Publishing Company

This electronic file may not be altered in any way. For any reuse of this material written permission should be obtained from the publishers or through the Copyright Clearance Center (for USA: [www.copyright.com](http://www.copyright.com)).

For further information, please contact [rights@benjamins.nl](mailto:rights@benjamins.nl) or consult our website at [benjamins.com/rights](http://benjamins.com/rights)



# Figures and tables

Figure 2.1.	Components, operations and levels of representation in FDG	32
Figure 2.2.	Components of the LSC for example (10)	37
Figure 2.3.	Constituent, operator and focus projections for example (10)	39
Figure 2.4.	The actor-undergoer hierarchy	41
Figure 2.5.	The Core-3 template	42
Figure 2.6.	The structure of the RPs <i>my sister</i> and <i>the head</i>	43
Figure 2.7.	A highly simplified version of the mood network for English	45
Figure 2.8.	Layers of functional structure in Sydney SFL	48
Figure 2.9.	Syntactic and semantic analysis of an example according to the Cardiff Grammar	50
Figure 2.10.	A simple classification using Isa links	63
Figure 2.11.	Multiple inheritance	63
Figure 2.12.	The word <i>pig</i> analysed at the phonological, morphological, syntactic and semantic levels	64
Figure 2.13.	Properties of <i>walked</i> in <i>I walked from Holborn</i>	65
Figure 2.14.	The sociolinguistics of JITTY	66
Figure 2.15.	A listemically licensed sign	84
Figure 2.16.	A constructionally licensed sign	84
Figure 2.17.	The English ditransitive construction (Goldberg 1995: 142)	92
Figure 2.18.	Words as bipolar constructions linking schematic representations in the domains of form and meaning in ECG (taken from Bergen & Chang 2013: 174)	98
Figure 2.19.	Overview of structures and processes involved in simulation-based language comprehension (taken from Bergen & Chang 2013: 185)	99
Figure 2.20.	The internal structure of the construction <i>Heather sings</i> in RCG (taken from Croft 2013: 225)	108
Figure 2.21.	The architecture of the Lexical Constructional Model	124
Figure 2.22.	The architecture of the PA (taken from Jackendoff 2010b: 3)	126
Figure 4.1.	Scatter plot for data in Table 4.1	169
Figure 4.2.	Scatter plot for data in Table 4.2	170
Figure 4.3.	Scatter plot for data in Table 4.3	171
Figure 4.4.	MDS analysis for data in Table 4.4	174
Figure 4.5.	MDS output for data on 16 European countries	175

Figure 4.6.	Scree plot for English towns data	176
Figure 4.7.	Dendrogram from hierarchical clustering of data on 16 European countries	178
Figure 4.8.	Scree plot for questionnaire data	187
Figure 4.9.	Two-dimensional solution for questionnaire data	188
Figure 4.10.	Three-dimensional solution for questionnaire data	188
Figure 4.11.	The three plots for analysis	189
Figure 4.12.	Two-dimensional MDS plot of questionnaire data omitting questionnaires EXT and PA	191
Figure 4.13.	Hierarchical clustering dendrogram for the questionnaire data	193
Figure 4.14.	Hierarchical clustering dendrogram for questionnaire data omitting questionnaires EXT and PA	195
Figure 11.1.	Scree plot for final ratings data	476
Figure 11.2.	Two-dimensional solution for final ratings data	476
Figure 11.3.	Three-dimensional solution for final ratings data	477
Figure 11.4.	The three plots for analysis	480
Figure 11.5.	Hierarchical clustering dendrogram for the final ratings data	481
Table 2.1.	Semantic units underlying syntactic units in LSC	38
Table 2.2.	Characterization of Aktionsart classes in terms of features	40
Table 2.3.	An inventory of constructions in English at varying degrees of complexity and abstraction (adapted from Goldberg 2003: 220)	89
Table 2.4.	English argument structure constructions (taken from Goldberg 1998: 207)	91
Table 2.5.	English light verbs and the constructional meanings they correspond to (Goldberg 1998: 207)	92
Table 2.6.	The syntax-lexicon continuum (Croft 2001: 17)	107
Table 3.1.	The questionnaire	148
Table 3.1.	(Continued)	150
Table 3.1.	(Continued)	152
Table 3.2.	Number of completed questionnaires received	154
Table 3.3.	Responses for individual questionnaires (1)	159
Table 3.4.	Responses for individual questionnaires (2)	160
Table 3.5.	Responses for individual questionnaires (3)	161
Table 3.6.	Responses for individual questionnaires (4)	162
Table 3.7.	Responses for individual questionnaires (5)	163
Table 3.8.	Responses for individual questionnaires (6)	164
Table 3.9.	Responses for individual questionnaires (7)	165
Table 3.10.	Responses for individual questionnaires (8)	166

Table 4.1.	Scores of learners on two tests: Version 1	168
Table 4.2.	Scores of learners on two tests: Version 2	169
Table 4.3.	Scores of learners on two tests: Version 3	170
Table 4.4.	Distances in miles between cities/towns in England	173
Table 4.5.	Data on 16 European countries (source of data: EUROSTAT agency, <a href="http://www.ec.europa.eu/eurostat">http://www.ec.europa.eu/eurostat</a> )	174
Table 4.6.	Significance of Kendall's tau-b correlation coefficients for pairs of questionnaires with Bonferroni correction (1)	179
Table 4.7.	Significance of Kendall's tau-b correlation coefficients for pairs of questionnaires with Bonferroni correction (2)	180
Table 4.8.	Significance of Kendall's tau-b correlation coefficients for pairs of questionnaires with Bonferroni correction (3)	181
Table 4.9.	Kendall's tau-b correlation coefficients for pairs of questionnaires (1)	183
Table 4.10.	Kendall's tau-b correlation coefficients for pairs of questionnaires (2)	184
Table 4.11.	Kendall's tau-b correlation coefficients for pairs of questionnaires (3)	185
Table 4.12.	Stress and goodness of fit statistics for questionnaire data	187
Table 4.13.	Values for each questionnaire on each dimension of the three-dimensional MDS	190
Table 5.1.	Dichotomized questionnaire ratings for items in the 'Communication and motivation' group	200
Table 5.2.	Final dichotomized ratings for items in the 'Communication and motivation' group	218
Table 6.1.	Dichotomized questionnaire ratings for items in the 'Coverage' group	220
Table 6.2.	Final dichotomized ratings for items in the 'Coverage' group	270
Table 7.1.	Dichotomized questionnaire ratings for items in the 'Database for description' group	272
Table 7.2.	Final dichotomized ratings for items in the 'Database for description' group	305
Table 8.1.	Dichotomized questionnaire ratings for items in the 'Explanation' group	308
Table 8.2.	Final dichotomized ratings for items in the 'Explanation' group	365
Table 9.1.	Dichotomized questionnaire ratings for items in the 'Form of the grammar' group (1)	368
Table 9.2.	Dichotomized questionnaire ratings for items in the 'Form of the grammar' group (2)	369

Table 9.3.	Final dichotomized ratings for items in the 'Form of the grammar' group	449
Table 10.1.	Dichotomized questionnaire ratings for items in the 'Applications' group	452
Table 10.2.	Final dichotomized ratings for items in the 'Applications' group	463
Table 11.1.	Final ratings for models, positive or negative, with blank cells for missing data (1)	466
Table 11.2.	Final ratings for models, positive or negative, with blank cells for missing data (2)	468
Table 11.3.	Contingency table for FDG and RRG	470
Table 11.4.	Significant correlations between pairs of models, with Bonferroni correction	472
Table 11.5.	Phi (= r) values for pairs of final ratings	473
Table 11.5.	(Continued)	474
Table 11.6.	Stress and goodness of fit statistics for final ratings data	477
Table 11.7.	Values for each model on each dimension of the three-dimensional plot	480
Table 12.1.	Items with at least 75% positive final ratings across models	486
Table 12.2.	Items with at least 75% negative final ratings across models	488
Table 12.3.	Comparison of (i) items with high homogeneity across models in 2006 study and (ii) results of present study	495