

Titles and abstracts of the talks at the workshop
**“Heritage languages: language contact-change-maintenance and loss in the
wave of new migration landscapes”**

University of Wuppertal, 4-6 October 2012

Day 1 (focus on grammatical changes, heritage languages, dialect leveling)

1) Acrisio Pires (University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, USA)

Bilingualism and gradual syntactic change

Bilingual language acquisition and bilingual competence have often been identified as showing different effects leading to instability in bilingual speakers’ competence in one or both languages at play, specifically when they are compared to monolinguals. Heritage language speakers have normally been identified as child learners of a language that is not the dominant language of the larger society. The competence of heritage speakers has very often been identified as showing deficits when they are compared to monolingual speakers, which have been identified in the literature as evidence of incomplete acquisition and/or attrition of the heritage language. I have instead attempted to analyze some of these effects as resulting from natural linguistic processes involving the interaction between language acquisition and change.

In this talk I expand the perspective on heritage language competence to discuss evidence regarding Bengali-English bilingualism, a situation in which the home language (Bengali) plays the role of primary language of the larger society, and the second language (English) play a more secondary role, despite having a prestige role in the community. I discuss evidence showing that both languages are subject to different effects in the morpho-syntactic domain, some of which I argue result from processes of interference. I analyze such effects as part of broader processes of morphosyntactic change and innovation.

2) Prof. Dr. Marina Chini (University of Pavia/Italy)

Some trends in language maintenance and shift among migrants in Italy

Since 1972 the number of migrant people coming to Italy has begun to exceed the number of people leaving Italy and, especially during and after the Eighties, migration to Italy became more and more important. At the end of that decade some Italian scholars, led by Anna Giacalone Ramat, began to study in a more systematic way the learner varieties of Italian, within the so-called Pavia Project (cf. Banfi 1993, Giacalone Ramat 2003). It was only at the beginning of the new millennium that some Italian scholars (mainly within the research project CNR-Agenzia 2000 "Le lingue straniere immigrate in Italia", led by Massimo Vedovelli) began to consider the whole linguistic repertoire of migrants in a more global way, with a look at some trends in the dynamics of language maintenance and shift in the host country (cf. some results in Bagna et al. 2003, 2004; Vedovelli 2004; Chini 2003, 2004, 2009, etc.).

In the proposed contribution we present some results of these recent studies, concerning in particular migrant communities living in the northern part of Italy (i.e. Chini 2003, 2004; Valentini 2009), as well as some insights about specific migrant communities or groups, their linguistic repertoire and their communicative strategies and ethnic varieties (cf. Ceccagno 2003; Vietti 2005, Guerini 2006).

References

- BAGNA C., MACHETTI S., VEDOVELLI M. (2003), *Italiano e lingue immigrate: verso un plurilinguismo consapevole o verso varietà di contatto?*, in VALENTINI ET AL. (eds.), pp. 201-222.
- BAGNA C., BARNI M., SIEBETCHEU R. (2004), *Toscane favelle. Lingue immigrate nella provincia di Siena*, Guerra, Perugia.
- BANFI E. (1993), *Italiano come L2*, in E. Banfi ed., *L'altra Europa linguistica. Varietà di apprendimento e interlingue nell'Europa contemporanea*, La Nuova Italia, Firenze, pp. 35-102.
- BOMBI R., FUSCO F. (eds.) (2004), *Città plurilingui. Lingue e culture a confronto in situazioni urbane*, Forum, Udine.
- DE BOT K., FASE W. (eds.) (1991), *Migrant languages in Western Europe*, "International Journal of the Sociology of Language" 90.
- CECCAGNO A. (2003), *Lingue e dialetti dei cinesi in Italia: percezioni, aspirazioni, ostacoli*, in E. Banfi (ed.), *Italiano/L2 di cinesi. Percorsi acquisizionali*, FrancoAngeli, Milano, pp. 123-150.
- CHINI M. (2003), *Rapporti fra italiano e lingue d'origine nel repertorio di immigrati in area lombarda: un sondaggio qualitativo*, in Valentini et al., pp. 223-246.
- CHINI M. (2011), *New linguistic minorities: repertoires, language maintenance and shift*. "International Journal of the Sociology of Language" 210, pp. 47-69
- CHINI M. (ed.) (2004), *Plurilinguismo e immigrazione in Italia. Un'indagine sociolinguistica a Pavia e Torino*, FrancoAngeli, Milano.
- CHINI M. (ed.) (2009), *Plurilinguismo e immigrazione nella società italiana. Repertori, usi linguistici e fenomeni di contatto*. "Studi Italiani di Linguistica Teorica e Applicata" XXXVIII, 1 [monogr. issue].
- GIACALONE RAMAT A. (ed.) (2003), *Verso l'italiano. Percorsi e strategie di acquisizione*. Carocci, Roma.
- GUERINI F. (2006), *Language alternation strategies in Multiungual Settings. A Case Study: Ghanaian Immigrants in Northern Italy*, Peter Lang, Bern.
- MASSARIELLO MERZAGORA G. (2004), *Le "nuove minoranze" a Verona. Un osservatorio sugli studenti immigrati*, in Bombi, Fusco (eds.), pp. 353-376.
- MIONI A.M. (1998), *Gli immigrati in Italia. Considerazioni linguistiche, sociolinguistiche e culturali*, in G. Bernini, P. Cuzzolin, P. Molinelli (eds.), *Ars linguistica*, Bulzoni, Roma, pp. 377-409.
- VALENTINI A. (2009), *La vitalità delle lingue immigrate: un'indagine a campione tra minori stranieri a Bergamo*, in Chini ed., pp. 89-106.
- VALENTINI A., MOLINELLI P., CUZZOLIN P., BERNINI G. (eds.) (2003), *Ecologia linguistica*, Bulzoni, Roma.
- VEDOVELLI M. (2004), *Italiano e lingue immigrate: comunità alloglotte nelle grandi aree urbane*, in Bombi, Fusco (eds.), pp. 587-612.
- VIETTI A. (2005), *Come gli immigrati cambiano l'italiano. L'italiano di peruviane come varietà etnica*, FrancoAngeli, Milano.

3) Anna-Lena Rumpf & Laura Di Venanzio (Bergische Universität Wuppertal)

Null and overt subjects in Italian and Spanish heritage speakers in Germany

Our DFG-funded research project "Subjects and Objects in Italian and Spanish as heritage languages in Germany" investigates null and overtly realized verbal arguments in the heritage languages of Italian and Spanish immigrants in Germany, in particular in Northrhine-Westfalia. The choice of Northrhine-Westfalia is motivated by the fact that it is the German country with the largest numbers of Italians (approx. 125,000 = 23.8% of the Italian population in Germany) and Spaniards (approx. 34,000) according to DeSTATIS (2007). With regard to the question of whether we are dealing with on-going language change or (incomplete) acquisition in the second generation (DFG-grant no. SCHM 2752/2-1), the project intends to show that language change provides an adequate answer.

We use spontaneous speech data collected within interview situations of approx. 45 minutes in the Romance language and 20 minutes in German, partly based on an ethno-linguistic questionnaire. Language- external, sociolinguistic variables as e.g., age and education as well as migration generation and length of contact with German were collected within this questionnaire. Language proficiency has

been investigated using a combination of multiple choice and cloze tests for both Romance languages and German.

In our study, we matched the Italian and Spanish groups with respect to migration generation and language skills in the respective Romance language. We analysed a total of 21,750 utterances by 30 Italian and 23 Spanish speakers. Each language group consists of a first and a second generation group of heritage speakers and a monolingual control group. We will show that Italian and Spanish heritage speakers behave in different ways regarding the total subject realizations and omissions, though both having a null subject background. Furthermore, analyzing subject realizations by grammatical person, Italian heritage speakers show different realization patterns only in the first generation compared to their monolingual controls, whereas Spanish heritage speakers mainly differ in the second generation.

4) Pablo Irizarri van Suchtelen (Radboud University Centre for Language Studies /International Max Planck Research School for Language Sciences, Nijmegen/Netherlands)

Dative constructions in Heritage Spanish and Moroccan Arabic in the Netherlands

The present study looks at two groups of heritage speakers in the Netherlands: Chileans and Moroccans. The first group has Spanish as L1, the second group Moroccan Arabic. Both groups have Dutch as L2 and consist of first generation (adult L2-onset) and second generation (early L2-onset) speakers.

Spanish and Moroccan Arabic are similar in the way datives are formed and the range of contexts in which they can be applied. Dutch is quite different in these respects. What happens to Spanish and Moroccan Arabic datives in the heritage situation, with forces such as attrition, incomplete acquisition and influence from Dutch?

Elicited production data revealed a marked effect of exposure to the heritage language itself. In both Spanish and Moroccan Arabic, the speakers with a history of low childhood exposure to their heritage language, seem to prefer to avoid constructions with dative clitics. In Spanish this leads to more nominal dative marking without (redundant) clitic doubling. In Moroccan Arabic it leads to less pronominalization, and instead more full NP reference.

Whereas it can be argued that the avoidance of cliticization is an effect of processing limitations in the L1, there was a tendency which may be attributable to cross-linguistic influence from the L2: for expressing psychological predicates (forgetting, having an idea, etc.), bilinguals used less dative constructions than the monolingual control group, and this effect was not limited to the low exposed speakers. I tentatively argue that this shift in preference could be related to cross-linguistic influence of lexical patterns in Dutch, where dative experiencers are rare and instead, transitive psychological predicates are the norm.

Apart from looking for explanations from the perspective of language acquisition and processing, I will consider what consequences the observed phenomena have for the broader linguistic system (e.g. increased explicitness in M. Arabic) and discuss what the findings can tell about possible scenarios of contact-induced language change.

5) Pelin Onar Valk (University of Tilburg, Netherlands)

Contact-induced change in subordination structures of Dutch-Turkish

While the Turkish immigrants in Western Europe orient themselves to the norms of Standard Turkish, their Turkish is also constantly being influenced by the European language they also speak. As a result of language contact, slowly but surely, new varieties of Turkish seem to be evolving, characterized by, on the one hand, the loss of certain features, and, on the other hand, the influx of words and structures

taken from the European languages. In this talk, I will focus on Dutch Turkish in the Netherlands, with an emphasis on my recent work, in which I specifically investigate and highlight changes in one empirical domain not investigated much before in the Dutch context; a domain which seems to be heavily affected by contact. This is the domain of *clause combinations*, specifically *subordination*.

Experimental research has been carried out on Dutch Turkish in the NL and on Turkish in Turkey. Turkish subordinate clauses are claimed to mostly be non-finite (Göksel & Kerslake, 2005). I found an abundance of finite subordination in Dutch Turkish at the places where a non-finite option had been possible, which suggests avoidance of non-finite subordination. In TR-Turkish data, a preference for non-finite options was clearly visible. Remarkably, I found zero instances of non-finite indirect *Reported Speech* (RS) in my Dutch Turkish spontaneous group recordings, although Turkish has both finite and non-finite options here, and TR-Turkish RS does make use of non-finite subordination. Language contact has apparently led to increased use of the finite RS construction, the option that is closest to the Dutch equivalent. Experimental research (using a *Sentence Repetition* task) confirmed the preference for non-finite constructions of Standard Turkish for monolinguals in Turkey, whereas the results reflected the opposite for bilinguals in the Netherlands. In discussing my current work, I will also deal with a methodological issue: virtually all work so far has been based on recordings of spontaneous speech. In my current project, I use a range of experimental techniques to answer questions regarding the degree to which we can say that changes suggested by the spontaneous speech data are really entrenched in people's linguistic competence (rather than reflecting superficial effects of momentary interference at the moment of speaking).

Based on my findings, I can claim that a contact-induced change is taking place in Dutch Turkish subordination structures. *Subordination* in Dutch Turkish is clearly different from *subordination* in TR-Turkish.

6) David Adger (Queen Mary's College, London)

Combinatorial Variability in situations of Reduced Input

The Combinatorial Variation approach to analysing situations of linguistic variability relies on two simple ideas. The first is that grammatical features can be uninterpretable and hence can be present or absent without having an impact on the meaning of an expression while simultaneously affecting morphophonological exponence. The second is that syntactic categories (possibly, as opposed to roots) are not subject to Blocking (the Subset Principle), and hence more than one category is compatible with particular syntactic contexts. These two assumptions, both well motivated elsewhere, predict that the syntactic system will generate multiple variants for particular syntactic slots. This models, fairly directly, intrapersonal variation: the grammar generates a Pool of Variants which the speaker selects from on the basis of processing and sociolinguistic factors. The model of Adger (2006), which focussed on morpheme level choices was extended in Adger (2010) to situations where the syntactic context spanned extended projections, allowing the system to model situations where the factors that influence choice are purely syntactic. This talk explores the consequences of this model for intra-personal variation in situations of 'imperfect' acquisition, especially during language death, exploring how syntactic as well as sociolinguistic conditioning of variable choice can be approached and detailing the challenges that such phenomena raise for the theory.

Day 2 (focus on incomplete acquisition in heritage languages, 2L1 and L2 acquisition)

1) Ianthi Tsimpli (University of Thessaloniki/Greece):

Syntax-discourse phenomena in heritage speakers and first language attriters: evidence from pronominal resolution

Pronominal resolution is a phenomenon which involves the interaction between grammar and discourse conditions. It is, in other words, a prototypical syntax-discourse phenomenon. Such phenomena have been shown to be vulnerable in language contact within the individual as well as in bilingual or monolingual development (Sorace 2004, Tsimpli 2007, Schmid 2009). This vulnerability is based on the assumption that phenomena related to the interfaces require the coordination of different types of information rendering the interpretational demands more complex and subject to preference rather than grammatical acceptability.

First language attriters and heritage speakers have been shown to differ from monolingual adult native speakers in various domains of linguistic performance (Montrul 2004). Since heritage speakers' grammars may involve incomplete acquisition of the first language, grammatical aspects of the L1 may have not developed at the appropriate level compared to monolingual age-matched peers (Montrul forth.). Incomplete acquisition may only affect early bilingualism as in the case of heritage speakers; L1 attriters, on the other hand, are expected to have reached a mature state of L1 development and any differences between their linguistic performance and monolingual non-attrited speakers is viewed as the result of an acquired transient or permanent change to a steady-state grammar.

Given that the main research questions in domain vulnerability are whether language knowledge or language use is affected, it is important to conduct investigations of linguistic phenomena using both offline and online methodology in order to establish whether any differences from monolinguals affect more or less implicit processes. Thus, pronominal resolution data from online and offline studies will be discussed with the aim of identifying similarities and differences in heritage and attrited speakers compared to each other and to monolingual groups.

2) Jeanine Treffers-Daller (Reading) and Reyhan Furman (MPI, Nijmegen)

Native-like selection among heritage speakers of Turkish in Germany

In this paper we focus on native-like selection (Pawley and Syder 1983) among Turkish heritage speakers in Germany. As is well-known speakers do not create all sentences completely from scratch but rather produce a large number of fixed expressions, such as *worst case scenario* and *I wouldn't worry about it if I were you* (Foster 2009). As Foster demonstrates, L2 learners struggle with the native-like use of such patterns, as they need not only acquire what constitutes a grammatical sequence but also what constitute natural primings (Hoey 2005) for a particular word. This is particularly difficult for learners who have limited access to the target language. As Doğruöz and Backus (2009) have shown, this is also problematic for Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands as they were found to produce collocations which are partly borrowed from the contact language Dutch.

The question we are trying to answer is to what extent heritage speakers of Turkish and returnees are able to produce native-like selections in Turkish. Both these groups have had limited input in Turkish in early childhood, but the returnees have received significantly more input since returning to Turkey. The latter are no longer significantly different from Turkish native speakers in their use of Turkish grammar (Treffers-Daller, Özsoy and Van Hout 2007) but their ability to produce native-like lexical selections has not yet been investigated. In the current study we compare the use of collocations and colligations in story telling of Turkish-German bilinguals in Germany and Turkey

with native speakers of Turkish with the aim to contribute to our understanding of native-like selection in heritage language contexts.

References

- Doğruöz, S. and Backus, A. (2009). Innovative constructions in Dutch Turkish: an assessment of ongoing contact-induced change. *Bilingualism, Language and Cognition* 12 (1), 41-64.
- Hoey, M. (2005). *Lexical Priming: A new theory of words and language*. Routledge.
- Foster, P. (2009). Lexical diversity and native-like selection: the bonus of studying abroad. In B. Richards, M.H. Daller, D. Malvern, P. Meara, J. Milton and J. Treffers-Daller (eds.). *Vocabulary Studies in First and Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 91-106). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pawley, A. and Syder, F. (1983). Two puzzles for linguistic theory: native-like selection and native-like fluency. In J. Richards and R. Schmidt (eds.) *Language and Communication* (pp. 191-226). London: Longman.

3) Monika S. Schmid (University of Groningen, Netherlands)

The role of age and continuity in L1 attrition and L2 acquisition

This paper will address the question of the long-term effects of exposure to a language for a limited period of time early in life. Some previous findings suggest that early exposure in childhood learners or overhearers can lead to benefits, such as a re-learning advantage, at a later age, provided there is some (albeit minimal) continuation of exposure. For speakers who experience a complete break in linguistic tradition, e.g. international adoptees, some studies have found complete L1 loss. Other researchers claim that adoptees do retain knowledge which makes it easier to re-learn in particular phonological aspects of the L1 at a later age.

Similarly controversial results have been obtained with respect to the L2 skills of such speakers, who are found to be indistinguishable from native speakers in the language of their adoptive parents in some studies, while others argue for a persisting deficit. This debate has important implications for the question of whether the learning of an L2 is impeded by the pre-existing knowledge of the L1 ('Impediment Hypothesis') or by maturational constraints (the 'Critical Period' hypothesis). The main difficulty in testing these two hypotheses is the fact that the maturational account assumes that a qualitative change takes place around puberty. However, adoption very rarely takes place above age 10.

The present study will provide a different perspective through an investigation of German Jews who escaped from Nazi Germany. Between 1938 and 1939, 10,000 children between the ages of 2 and 17 were brought to England by charity organisations and placed with English-speaking foster families (*Kindertransporte*). In the same period of time, an unreported number of children of the same age range escaped to English-speaking countries in the company of family members. While the historical and personal circumstances make any investigation of such speakers ethically extremely problematic, there are some data available which may be analysed and provide valuable insights into this question: Oral History interviews, which have been collected by many organisations and foundations of the past two decades.

This presentation will compare the skills in both L1 and L2 of survivors who fled from Germany as either family migrants or *Kindertransport* migrants by means of an analysis of complexity, fluency and accuracy in a corpus of autobiographical narrative interviews in both languages.

4) Doris Stolberg (University of Mannheim, Germany)

Pennsylvania German as a (historical) heritage language

In my presentation I discuss Pennsylvania German, a German variety spoken in the USA, from a heritage speaker perspective.

By way of migration, large numbers of German-speaking settlers arrived in Pennsylvania between c. 1700 and 1750. Pennsylvania German, as a variety in its own right, developed through levelling processes from L1 varieties of these migrants who came mainly from the southwestern region of the German speaking area. Pennsylvania German is still spoken today by specific religious groups (primarily Amish and Menonite groups) for many of whom it is an identity marker. My paper, however, focuses on those Pennsylvania Germans who are not part of these religious groups but have the same migration history. Due to their being closer to the cultural values of American mainstream society, they were integrated into mainstream society, and during the 20th century their use of Pennsylvania German was continually diminishing. A revival of this heritage language has occurred over the past c. three decades, including language courses offered at community colleges etc., where ethnic Pennsylvania Germans wish to (re-)learn the language of their grandparents.

In my presentation I will first discuss in which ways speakers of PG can be seen as heritage speakers. Secondly, I will present written data from four points in time between the 1860s and the 1990s and, based on linguistic analyses, show characteristic differences between the data sets that point towards a changed language contact situation for PG speakers. In the third part I will take a look at sociolinguistic and extralinguistic factors that influenced the role of PG and made their speakers heritage speakers much in the sense of migrant heritage speakers today, though delayed by 200 years. In conclusion I compare the two settings and suggest parallels that can introduce a long-term perspective into the current heritage speaker discussion.

5) Cristina Flores (University of Minho, Portugal)

Portuguese as a Heritage Language. A contribution to the heritage language acquisition debate.

Several studies on heritage bilingualism have reported that the linguistic competence of heritage speakers in their home language differs from the competence of monolingual speakers of the same age and social background (Montrul, 2008, Polinsky, 1997, Pires & Rothman, 2009, Silva-Corvalán, 1994). In contexts in which heritage bilingual speakers show deficiencies in their heritage grammar, some authors argue that the bilinguals have undergone incomplete acquisition or attrition (Montrul 2008) due to a limited exposure to their home language. In general, heritage speakers are early bilinguals who are exposed to their parental since birth, but the beginning of formal schooling in the majority language by the age of 5/6 leads to a significant shift in input.

The present talk aims at discussing the role of age and input in the development of a heritage language by discussing the results of two recent studies on the acquisition of European Portuguese (EP) as a heritage language by immigrant children who live in Germany (Santos & Flores, 2012; Flores & Barbosa, in press). These studies focus on two properties of EP, which contrast clearly concerning their age of acquisition. Santos & Flores (2012) analysed the knowledge of VP ellipsis, a property which has been used as evidence for early L1 acquisition of verb movement and sensitivity to the semantic and discourse constraints on ellipsis. Monolingual children acquiring European Portuguese produce adult-like VP ellipsis in the context of answers to yes-no questions when their MLU is around 2 or even below 2 in the context of answers to yes-no questions (Santos 2009). The results of the first study show that heritage children do not differ significantly from monolingual children in the use of VP ellipsis. In contrast to VP ellipsis, pronominal object clitic placement is one of the most intricate issues in the grammar of EP. Recent studies on the acquisition of clitics by

monolingual children (Lobo & Costa, in prep) have shown that clitic placement is acquired very late in EP (around age 6/7). Flores & Barbosa (in press) demonstrate that heritage children are able to acquire clitic placement, but at a delayed stage when compared to monolinguals (at the age at 10/11). The results of both studies indicate that structures, which tend to be acquired on later stages of L1 acquisition, may be affected by input shift, whereas early acquired properties tend to be fixed before the exposure to the home language begins to decrease considerably.

6) Naomi Nagy (University of Toronto, Canada)

Looking for contact-induced change in Heritage Languages

Toronto's Heritage Language Variation and Change Project is a collaboration designed to develop a multilingual corpus to allow inter-generational, cross-linguistic, and diatopic (*heritage* vs. *homeland* varieties) comparisons in order to develop generalizations about the types of variable features, structures or rules that are borrowed earlier and more often in contact contexts, using a consistent methodology across studies of different languages and variables. The project works in parallel with Hoffman & Walker's (2010) study of English spoken in Toronto's ethnic communities.

We investigate how social factors (language use, ethnic identity, and linguistic attitudes at the individual level, and demographics at the community level) relate to type and degree of language change by recording sociolinguistic interviews that include an Ethnic Orientation Questionnaire. Responses are coded to develop indices of language usage and attitudes. Multivariate analyses of linguistic variables incorporate these social factors along with relevant linguistic constraints. When complete, the corpus will contain conversational data from 40 speakers, spanning three generations since immigration, of a range of heritage languages: Cantonese, Faetar, Hungarian, Korean, Italian, Polish, Russian, Ukrainian. To date, >200 speakers have been recorded and transcribed. In this paper, outcomes for several variables will be contrasted.

One is subject pronoun presence ("pro-drop"). Multivariate regression analyses contrasting three generations of speakers, in Cantonese, Italian and Russian, show cross-generational stability both in rates of pronoun use and in the linguistic factors constraining the variation. Individuals' rates do not correlate strongly to any measures of Ethnic Orientation. This stability contrasts with reports on USA Spanish pro-drop (*cf. Otheguy et al. 2007*).

A second variable is Voice Onset Time (VOT) in voiceless stops. While bilinguals maintain phonetic distinctions in similar sounds in two languages, the languages influence each other such that there are distinctions from monolingual speech (Flege 1987). Acoustic measurements extracted from conversational speech and subjected to ANOVA show that the VOT of bilinguals in the HL drifts away from the monolingual short lag of Russian and Ukrainian, and the much longer lag of Cantonese, toward the long lag of English, while the Italian sample shows no such variability. Ethnic orientation correlates to VOT drift.

The contrast between inter-generational change for VOT and stability for pro-drop underscores the importance of examining multiple variables in multiple languages, and examining multiple facets of multilinguals' performance.

References

- Flege, J.E. 1987. The production of "new" and "similar" phones in a foreign language: Evidence for the effect of equivalence classification, *Journal of Phonetics* 15:47-65.
- Hoffman, M. & J. Walker. 2010. Ethnolects and the city: Ethnic orientation and linguistic variation in Toronto English. *LVC* 22:37-67 .
- Otheguy, R., A. Zentella, and D. Livert. 2007. Language and dialect contact in Spanish in New York: Toward the formation of a speech community. *Language* 83:770-802.

Day 3

1) Cristina Allemann-Ghionda (University of Cologne, Germany)

Intercultural and Diversity Education, Equal Opportunities, and the Role of Multilingualism

Intercultural education, a concept used in Europe since the mid-1970s (but which was in use in the United States from the late 1920s to the 1950s, later changed into « multicultural education »), is currently defined by many scholars as a comprehensive educational approach. Firstly, intercultural education is meant to address all students, and not only those who are seen as different from a given cultural or ethnic or linguistic majority or social group. Secondly, intercultural education is concerned not only about acknowledging cultural or ethnic or linguistic differences and integrating minorities or migrants, but also and above all about recognizing, respecting and including all facets of cultural and more generally defined diversity. Thirdly, it is difficult to conceive of implementing an education which is intercultural and inclusive of all forms of diversity in school systems which are not comprehensive, but which practice early selection and tracking. Indeed, empirical comparative data reveal that in many countries, certain social and ethnic groups do not have equal opportunities in education, even if intercultural education (or a similar concept) is declared a policy goal and is included in curricular guidelines, while other countries succeed better in compensating social inequality although the concept of intercultural education is not in use. The question then remains: How can intercultural education (or an education committed to an inclusive treatment of diversity) contribute to improved educational opportunities and higher achievement for all? In pursuing possible responses to this question, this presentation analyzes some structural and curricular conditions conducive to effective forms of intercultural or diversity education and especially focusses the issue of cultivating multilingualism in different settings as an indispensable way towards better educational achievement for all.

2) Dirk Scholten-Akoun/Anna Mashkovskaya/Daniel Tischmeyer (University of Essen-Duisburg, Germany)

Instruments for measurement of general and (specific) linguistic competence – students with migration background in focus

The goal of our project group is to provide information about test procedure for the measurement of general linguistic competence as well as identify the inquiry of concrete linguistic problems. The background variables – especially personal data about the language usage – from the test-batteries permit a differentiated consideration of the results and put the focus on students with German as a second language. Moreover the background variables contribute to the possibility of an exemplary consideration of the mistake profiles in connection with the investigation of the influence of the first language. During the workshop the test results of different language groups will be presented, however the groups with the combination of first and second language *italian/german* and *spanish/german* were very small and will be analyzed separately.

The c-test as a screening instrument belongs to the two-stage test design developed in our project for measurement of the linguistic competence of students, who are going to become teachers (of future teachers in their 1. semester). The test procedure belongs to the most intensely examined and evaluated test instruments in the past years (Grotjahn 1992, 1994, 1995, 1996, 2002, 2006; Coleman/Grotjahn/Raatz 2002). The test was first used for determination of a general linguistic competence of foreign language learners and then of second language (bilingual) learners (Baur/Meder 1994; Baur/Grotjahn/Spettmann 2006; Baur/Spettmann 2007; Baur/Spettmann 2008; Süßmilch 1985; Raatz/Klein-Braley 1992). New studies have shown that linguistic competence of adults in the first

language can also be measured by means of the c-test (Wockenfuß/Raatz 2006; Wockenfuß 2009; Baur/Mashkovskaya/Spettmann 2010). The measured global linguistic competence gives information about the necessity of a detailed analysis.

In addition to the c-test a complicated writing task was invented ("Reading to Write" – Flower in 1990). This task delivers detailed data of the linguistic problem fields of students and also some primary-points for supporting procedures.

3) Suzanne Aalberse (Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen, ERC Traces of Contact)

Comparing different Chinese heritage language communities in the Netherlands: a sociolinguistic and learning perspective

Although Chinese is almost always the first language for children of Chinese immigrants in the Netherlands it is not their primary language. Studies by Chau (2011) and Shi (2011) report a dominance in Dutch in all second generation speakers. Chen (2012) shows that Dutch is already a strong language in young Dutch-Chinese bilinguals who attend Dutch daycare starting at the age of 4 months. The question is how dominance in Dutch affects production in Chinese.

One effect of dominance in Dutch is less input and less use of Chinese. Structures that depend on frequency of the input such as the use of classifiers for nouns is strongly affected in some heritage speakers. Chau (2011) reports overuse of the most frequent classifier in Dutch-Cantonese and Shi (2011) reports on the same results for Dutch-Mandarin. Not all changes attested in heritage speakers can however be related to simplification due to reduced input. In some domains such as word order and aspect marking transfer from Dutch seems to be the best explanation for differences between groups.

The extent to which changes occur in heritage speakers is greatly variable. Chau (2011) shows that changes are strong in Chinese speakers in Venlo (a southern Dutch provincial town) and almost absent in speakers of Cantonese in Amsterdam. She relates these differences to the networks of the speakers and the activities associated with these networks. The Amsterdam Cantonese have many Cantonese friends with whom they share a like for Cantopop and Cantonese soaps whereas the Venlo-Cantonese only speak the heritage language with their parents. Shi (2011) shows that the age of onset of bilingualism is a second important factor in explaining differences between heritage speakers.