

---

**ARBEITSGRUPPE 14 | WORKSHOP 14**

Raum | Room: S 14, Seminargebäude

---

**Exploring novel and routine patterns in heritage language narratives**

**Mareike Keller<sup>1</sup>, Nadine Zürn<sup>1</sup>, Kalliopi Katsika<sup>2</sup> & Johanna Tausch<sup>1</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Universität Mannheim, <sup>2</sup>TU Kaiserslautern

m.keller@uni-mannheim.de, nzuern@mail.uni-mannheim.de,

katsika@sowi.uni-kl.de, jtausch@mail.uni-mannheim.de

The aim of this workshop is to explore how heritage speakers dynamically move between creative and routine language in narrations. Research on heritage speakers has led to varying conclusions regarding their language competence and performance. Oftentimes, what we now consider to be creative language use, was considered to be sub-standard, even erroneous. More recently however, researchers embrace the view that non-canonicity does not result from lack of proficiency but indicates linguistic reanalysis and the formation of a new system (Polinsky 2008: 161). While experimental and corpus studies show that heritage speakers may differ from both monolingual and L2 speakers, e.g. with respect to syntactic structure, realization of grammatical categories or the lexicon, emerging patterns fall within the spectrum of natural language design. Kopotev et al. (2020: 1) hypothesize that "heritage speakers deploy fewer probabilistic strategies in language production compared with native speakers and that their active knowledge of and access to ready-to-use multiword units are restricted compared with native speakers". Extending the idea of probabilistic strategies from the lexicon to other areas of linguistic investigation we invite contributions presenting heritage data, preferably narratives, which investigate the field between creativity and routine, for example (but not limited to) register sensitivity, discourse openings and closings, formulaic language and/or collocations. We want to discuss how we can use the relative role of canonic and creative means of expression to better understand and explain heritage language developments and general developments of languages in contact.

**References:** • Kopotev, Mikhail, Olesya Kisselev & Maria Polinsky. 2020. Collocations and Near-Native Competence: Lexical Strategies of Heritage Speakers of Russian. *International Journal of Bilingualism*. doi: 10.1177/1367006920921594 (accessed April 10 2022). • Polinsky, Maria. 2008. Heritage Language Narratives. In Donna M. Brinton, Olga Kagan & Susan Bauckus (eds.), *Heritage Language Education: A New Field Emerging*, 149-164. New York & London: Routledge.

---

## Managing creativity and routines: a new perspective on code-switching

---

**Jeanine Treffers-Daller**

*University of Reading*

j.c.treffers-daller@reading.ac.uk

It is often assumed that code-switching is very creative behaviour. This is certainly true of some forms of code-switching, but not all forms of code-switching are equally creative. As originality is widely seen as the key criterion for creativity, in this paper I will evaluate the originality of different code-switching patterns found in German-English, German-Turkish and Malay-English code-switching. Switches of bare nouns such as those in (1), where the Turkish noun *çatal* ‘knife’ has been inserted into a German sentence, are found very frequently across code-switching corpora from typologically different languages, so this code-switching routine would not qualify as original.

- (1) Wenn man so schneidet oder mit Ø çatal drüber geht  
*When you so cut or with knife over it goes*  
‘When you cut it like this or go over it with a knife’ (Treffers-Daller, 2020)

Switches of function words, by contrast, such as the Malay passive marker *kena* in (2), which appears in an English sentence, are much rarer in the literature, and would thus be more original.

- (2) He kena sabotage  
*He was-PASS sabotaged*  
‘He was sabotaged’ (Percillier, 2016)

However, the most original and creative form of code-switching is congruent lexicalization (Muysken, 2000). In this type of switching, the grammars and vocabularies of both languages interact: content and function words from both languages are inserted into a shared structure, as in (3).

- (3) Wir haben friends gemacht mit dem shopowner  
*We have friends made with the.DAT.SG knife*  
‘We made friends with the shopowner’ (Hofweber et al. 2016)

I will finish by drawing conclusions on the typological and psycho-social factors that contribute to originality in code-switching patterns, and look at differences between the creativity of switches in face-to-face versus online communication.

**References:** • Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech*. Cambridge: CUP • Hofweber, J. et al. (2016). Effects of dense code-switching on executive control. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism*, 6, 648-668 • Percillier, M. (2016). *World Englishes and Second Language Acquisition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins • Treffers-Daller, J. (2020). Turkish-German code-switching patterns revisited: What naturalistic data can(not) tell us. In N. Smith et al. (eds.) *Advances in Contact Linguistics: In honour of Pieter Muysken*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins

---

**Character maintenance in heritage Turkish. An inter-generational analysis of subject pro-drop in Turkish heritage language narratives**

---

**Stefanie Schröter**

*TU Dortmund*

stefanie.schroeter@tu-dortmund.de

This talk investigates the choice of referring expressions (REs) used to maintain subject characters in narratives of different generations of Turkish heritage speakers (HSs) in Germany. While Turkish is a pro-drop language, where subject characters are usually maintained with a null pronoun in pragmatically unmarked contexts, German is a non-pro-drop language that uses overt pronouns to maintain subject characters.

Previous studies on subject pro-drop in HLs that are spoken by speakers with a non-pro-drop majority language (ML) have reported mixed findings. While some studies have shown that HSs show higher frequencies of overt subject pronouns than monolingual control groups (Koban Koç 2016), others found no significant differences between HSs and monolinguals and/or first-generation speakers (Azar et al. 2020).

The narratives for the corpus analysis presented in this talk were elicited by the wordless picture book ‘Frog, Where are you?’ (Mayer 1969). The preliminary results reveal that the third-generation HSs used significantly more overt pronouns compared to second- and first-generation speakers. This finding indicates that the younger generation of HSs is more vulnerable to language change (due to ML transfer) than the older generations. Moreover, the third-generation speakers used a high number of lexical NPs to maintain subject characters and less word order variation than the older generations. Consider for instance the example in (1).

- (1) a. *Oğlan korku-yor gibi*  
Boy fear-PROG.3 like  
‘The boy seems to be afraid.’  
b. *Oğlan bir taş-ın üst-ün-de*  
Boy a stone-GEN top-3.sg.-LOC  
‘The boy is on a stone.’

In sum, the data indicates a trend towards more routine and less creative patterns among the narratives of the younger generation.

**References:** • Azar, Z., Özyürek, A., & Backus, A. (2020). Turkish-Dutch bilinguals maintain language-specific reference tracking strategies in elicited narratives. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 24(2), 376–409. • Koban Koç, D. (2016). Social variables and Turkish subject pronoun use in New York City: The effect of language contact. *Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics*, 52(3), 431–453. • Mayer, M. (1969). *Frog, Where are you?* New York: Dial Press.

---

## Does pro-drop in heritage languages influence null subject use in speakers' majority German?

---

**Borbála Sallai<sup>1</sup> & Onur Özsoy<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>University of Warwick, <sup>2</sup>Leibniz-Zentrum Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft  
Borbala.Sallai@warwick.ac.uk, oezsoy@leibniz-zas.de

German is routinely regarded as a language with optional topic drop in certain registers (Fries, 1988). However, the use of topic drop is often characterized as sub-standard. We predict that bilingual heritage speakers will apply topic drop more widely, and argue that the expansion in topic drop represents a creative extension of German grammar which points to reorganization at the pragmatics-syntax interface.

We focus on the influence that bilingual speakers' heritage Greek, Russian or Turkish might have on their majority German. Greek is a consistent pro-drop language where null subjects appear regardless of grammatical features. Russian is a partial pro-drop language or a non-pro-drop language with abundant subject ellipsis. Turkish is a topic pro-drop language that only requires overt subjects in unspecified contexts. German is a topic-drop language but it is sometimes utilized as a non-pro-drop language (Müller, 2006; Trutkowski, 2016).

In this area, little is known about the effect of the heritage language on the majority language. We derive the following research question and hypothesis for a corpus study on RUEG data (Wiese et al., 2021): Does Greek, Russian and Turkish heritage speakers' expression of (pro)nominal reference in German align with monolingual speakers' productions? We predict that heritage speakers show creative transfer effects by a wider use of topic-drop in German.

There are four participant groups (Greek-German-bilinguals n=48, Russian-German-bilinguals n=61, Turkish-German-bilinguals n=64, monolinguals n=64). We manually annotated a small subset of the full data (total tokens=455,208) with respect to subject realizations.

So far, we found that 5% of all subjects are topic-dropped. Currently our sample is too small to make any conclusions on a group-level regarding the hypothesis. We plan to present data from at least 10 speakers per group. Our findings might reveal how bilingual speakers apply a strategy that is available in the standard grammar and extend it creatively to form a new system of subject drop in German.

**References:** • Fries, N. (1988). Über das Null-Topik im Deutschen. *Sprache & Pragmatik* 3, 19–49. • Müller, G. (2006). Pro-drop and impoverishment. *Form, Structure, and Grammar. A Festschrift Presented to Günther Grewendorf on Occasion of his 60<sup>th</sup> Birthday*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 93-115. • Trutkowski, E. (2016). *Topic drop and null subjects in German*. Berlin: De Gruyter. • Wiese, H., Alexiadou, A., Allen, S., Bunk, O., Gagarina, N., Iefremenko, K., Jahns, E., Klotz, M., Krause, T., Labrenz, A., et al. (2021). RUEG Corpus. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5808870>

---

***Español aprendí con mi mamá, ella hablando conmigo normal: Linguistic Manoeuvres of Bilingual Heritage Speakers Between Attrition and Creativity***

---

**Johanna Wolf**

*Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München*

Wolf.Johanna@lmu.de

Following the definition of attrition by Pavlenko 2004, attrition is "a more or less permanent restructuring". In the case of heritage speakers who are constantly exploiting their multilingual potential, this is sometimes considered as a matter of simplification due to a presumed decline of linguistic competence. However, with regard to creative patterns, the question of an increase in complexity must also be raised.

For this contribution, the results of 7 bilingual speakers (German-Spanish and German-French, 2L1) were evaluated in a multidimensional, qualitatively designed setting (GJT, semi-structured interview, language test, language production test) and examined to see which forms of attrition could manifest and if tendencies for creative, innovative patterns might be evident. The extent to which linguistic routines remain stable will also be analysed. It is expected that frequent linguistic routine patterns of the L1s are stable and less prone to change (cf. Thomason 2010). The example ? *El coche de María es en el garaje*, however, shows that the routine pattern sp. *estar en* ("to be in") is susceptible to change in condition of language contact and the concept of the surrounding language ger. SEIN ("BE") is adopted by this speaker – the meaning of spatiality is fixed in the pattern {ESTAR + preposition} and would here never be changed with *ser* in Spanish only contexts, cf. eg. research results in the *Corpus del Español*. Thus, creative patterns are formed for the opposition *ser/estar* in Spanish, in which concepts are superimposed or exchanged.

By analysing these seven case studies, the article aims to describe and document some of the manoeuvres of bilingual heritage speakers and thus to contribute to the discussion on the complexity and reduction of the language competence and production of L1-speakers.

**References:** • Gülsen, Y.&Schmid, M. (2019). First language attrition and contact linguistics. In: Darquennes, J. (eds): *HSK: Language Contact Vol 1*. Boston: de Gruyter. • Pavlenko, A. (2004). L2 influence and L1 attrition in adult bilingualism. In: Schmid, M. et al. (eds.). *First language attrition: Interdisciplinary perspectives on methodological issues*. Vol. 28. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 47–59. • Polinsky, M. (2011). Reanalysis in adult heritage language: a case for attrition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 33, 305–328. • Polinsky, M. (2015). Heritage languages and their speakers: Opportunities and challenges for linguistics. *Zeitschrift für Fremdsprachenforschung*, 26(1), 7–27. • Scontras, G. & Fuchs, Z. & Polinsky, M. (2015). Heritage Language and Linguistic Theory. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 6. 10, 1-20.

---

## Creative and routine strategies in the use of multi word units in heritage speakers' narratives

---

**Inga Hennecke & Evelyn Wiesinger**

*Universität Tübingen*

inga.hennecke@uni-tuebingen.de, evelyn.wiesinger@uni-tuebingen.de

We aim at investigating code-switching and calquing within multi-word units (MWUs) in heritage data. MWUs are generally assumed to be more or less prefabricated or chunked units that can be stored and accessed by the speakers as a whole. In our presentation, we bring together usage-based psycholinguistics and Construction Grammar (e.g. Arnon & Snider 2010; Masini 2009) with cognitively oriented approaches to language contact and bilingualism (e.g. Backus 2015). We will argue that contact phenomena such as code-switching and calquing can be reinterpreted in terms of a continuum between creative and routine usage of MWUs. Example 1 shows an established N Prep N construction that is routinely used by monolingual and heritage speakers. Examples 2 and 3 show creatively filled slots that are typically found in heritage speakers (all examples from CESA):

- (1) El **Día de los Muertos** no lo celebran.  
*the day of the dead not it celebrate*  
 'The Day of the Dead, they do not celebrate it.'
- (2) para el **día de dar gracias** ella se ha dado cuenta (...)  
*for the day of give thanks she herself has realized*  
 'for Thanksgiving, she has realized...'
- (3) no tienen **agua del tap** (...)  
*no have water of.the tap*  
 'they do not have tap water'

We discuss narrative data from heritage speakers from CESA with a focus on nominal constructions. Our analysis highlights the importance of an intermediate level between lexical chunks and abstract constructions as well as gradual differences between lexical and grammatical MWUs. Moreover, it suggests that the use of MWUs by Spanish heritage speakers is not necessarily characterized by a lack of proficiency but provides further evidence for considering bilingual heritage speakers as part of the native language continuum (cf. Wiese et al. 2022).

**References:** • Arnon, I. & N. Snider (2010). More than words: Frequency effects for multi-word phrases. *Journal of Memory and Language* 62, 67–82. • Backus, A. (2015). A usage-based approach to code-switching. In G. Stell (ed.), *Code-Switching between structural and sociolinguistic perspectives*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 19–37. • Carvalho, A. (2012-2014). *Corpus del Español en el Sur de Arizona* (CESA). University of Arizona, <https://cesa.arizona.edu/>. • Masini, F. (2009). Phrasal lexemes, compounds and phrases: A constructionist perspective. *Word Structure* 2(2), 254–271. • Wiese, H. et al. (2022). Heritage speakers as part of the native language continuum. *Frontiers in Psychology* 12, 717973.

---

## Creative Lexical Strategies among Hebrew Heritage Speakers Dominant in English

---

Clara Fridman & Natalia Meir

Bar-Ilan University

clarafridman@gmail.com, natalia.meir@gmail.com

Recent trends in heritage language (HL) research highlight linguistic creativity among heritage speakers (HSs), who diverge from baseline speakers for whom this language is the dominant societal one<sup>1,2</sup>. To contribute to this new direction of enquiry, we present a lexical profile of a previously unstudied group of HSs: adult Hebrew HSs dominant in English. To assess lexical abilities, we collected MINT<sup>3</sup> tests in both English and Hebrew, along with Hebrew narratives based on Mercer Mayer's "Frog, Where Are You?"<sup>4</sup>, from 40 US-based participants (aged 18-44). We aimed to characterize the strategies HSs use to fill lexical gaps by assessing non-standard lexical responses and expressions at both the noun-naming and narrative levels, considering cross-linguistic influence, calques and borrowings, and non-target response patterns.

On average, participants reached 92% accuracy on the English MINT (Range: 80%-100%) and 56% accuracy on the Hebrew MINT (Range: 15%-82%), reflecting classic trends in HS lexical production<sup>5,6</sup>. Investigating non-target responses, we found that most participants using hypernyms produced the same responses, while participants using explanations produced completely unique ones. We additionally noted the use of child-like and antiquated terms, which diverge from the monolingual baseline.

Within narratives, various forms of code-switching, including lexical insertion, inner speech, and commentary, among others, suggest that English remains the framing language in the mental lexicon, even when performing a task fully in Hebrew. Calquing patterns show that, while certain phrases would not be produced by Hebrew-speaking monolinguals, they are logical and not entirely incomprehensible. We conclude that Hebrew HSs are clear, proficient, effective communicators who rely on their dominant language to bridge lexical gaps.

**References:** • 1. Rakhilina, E., Vyrenkova, A., & Polinsky, M. (2016). Linguistic creativity in heritage speakers. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics*, 1(1). • 2. Kopotev, M., Kisselev, O., & Polinsky, M. (2020). Collocations and near-native competence: Lexical strategies of heritage speakers of Russian. *International Journal of Bilingualism*. • 3. Gollan, T. H., Weissberger, G. H., Runqvist, E., Montoya, R. I., & Cera, C. M. (2012). Self-ratings of spoken language dominance: A Multilingual Naming Test (MINT) and preliminary norms for young and aging Spanish-English bilinguals. *Bilingualism: language and cognition*, 15(3), 594-615. • 4. Mayer, M. (1969). *Frog, where are you?*. New York: Dial Books for Young Readers. • 5. Montrul, S. A. (2008). *Incomplete acquisition in bilingualism: Re-examining the age factor*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing. • 6. Polinsky, M. (2018). *Heritage languages and their speakers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---

**Bilingualism, language management and linguistic creativity in Russian-Estonian sociolinguistic realities**

---

**Anastassia Zabrodskaja**

*Tallinn University*

anastassia.zabrodskaja@tlu.ee

The migration to the Baltic states was always both popular (in the search for a better quality of life in the Soviet “West”) and encouraged by Soviet authorities. The share of the Russian-speaking population is notable in Estonia: 29%. Estonian is a “medium-sized” national language that shares key domains with English as a global language. Family is a site where languages are managed: language practices constructed by family members are further negotiated with the larger society.

This paper primarily focuses on the language policies that bilingual Russian-Estonian families follow in relation to the maintenance of Russian as a heritage language, in order to identify social variables which either favour or hinder this process. A more concrete task is to search for commonalities and specifics of each family type within broad categories of the mainstream attitudes towards Russian as a heritage language. The aim of the paper is to analyse the sociolinguistic situation of the Russian language in Estonia and to examine the factors which have defined the maintenance of Russian as a heritage language. The paper also investigates translanguaging practices of Russian-Estonian families, including their perceptions of and attitudes towards their multilingual communication. The languages are used creatively to convey or negotiate meaning and identity.

This study is based on an in-depth analysis of a variety of sources, including qualitative sociological materials (semi-structured interviews and participant observations) and quantitative statistical and demographic data on self-reported language behaviour and language ideologies, revealing the “context” of community types. This paper presents results from ethnographic fieldwork studies conducted in different regions of Estonia, and thus offers important conclusions about sociolinguistic variation in heritage language maintenance and loss. It provides evidence of how social milieu and different sociolinguistic backgrounds may affect all processes related to heritage language transmission: management, maintenance, use and proficiency.



---

## Differences in processing strategies between native and heritage speakers of Korean and the role of written language

---

**Yoolim Kim**

*Wellesley College*

ykim6@wellesley.edu

This research explores the ways heritage speakers of Korean navigate creative and routine uses of language in written form. Korean is particularly well-suited for such an investigation given the complexities of its multi-scriptal lexicon, which comprises two sub-lexicons, one which includes words of Sino-Korean origin, and the other which consists of native Korean words. Due to the Sinitic origin, Sino-Korean words can be written using both Korean Hangul and borrowed classical Chinese characters called Hanja. Hangul may dominate written Korean, but the influence of Hanja is clearly deeply entrenched in the composition of the lexicon. Thus, although Hanja maintains relatively low visibility in written Korean (relative to Hangul), its influence is undeniable to native and heritage speakers, alike. Hanja is especially important as it enables creative use of language; Sino-Korean has a high frequency of homophones, each with a different meaning, that can combine to form creative compounds. The asymmetry between the visual orthographic representation of words in print (Hangul) and the orthographic information that is potentially encoded as part of the lexical information stored in the mental lexicon (both Hanja and Hangul) presents a dynamic testbed for how creative uses of language is processed in the brain, and how such patterns may differ between native and heritage speakers. Previous studies indicate native speakers' ability to intuit whether a Korean word is Sino-Korean or not, and suggest that native speakers actively rely on the contributions of Hanja during Sino-Korean processing. However, it remains unclear whether heritage speakers of Korean demonstrate similar processing patterns. Specifically, to what extent are heritage learners of Korean sensitive to the contributions of Hanja during processing, and how such sensitivities are reflected in their creative uses of language which is potentially informed by contributions of script. This research invites further questions regarding the types of strategies that are employed by heritage speakers in canonic and non-canonic language use, and the ways in which they may depart from those used by native speakers. Through a study using lexical decision with semanto-orthographic priming, which provides a window into what is activated during processing, preliminary results indicate that heritage speakers are especially sensitive to the effects of Hanja, even outperforming native speakers on the task.

**References:** • Polinsky, M. (2015). Heritage languages and their speakers: State of the field, challenges, perspectives for future work, and methodologies. *Zeitschrift fuer Fremdsprachwissenschaft* 26, 7-27. • Yi, K. (2003). The effects of word type on word recognition in Korean. *Korean Journal of Cognitive and Biological Psychology* 15, 479-498.

---

## An empirical study on the lexical Interlingua interferences among the bilingual Albanian emigrants

---

**Edlira Gugu<sup>1</sup>, Ema Kristo<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>University of Elbasan, Albania, <sup>2</sup>University of Tirana, Albania  
edlira.gugu@uniel.edu.al , ema\_kristo@yahoo.co.uk

The focus of this article is German-Albanian interference at the lexical-semantic and morph-syntactic level among Albanians who immigrated to Germany after the 90s. Its aim is to document the situation of the use of the Albanian mother tongue among heritage speakers of Albanian in Germany.

The issues presented in the article are:

- What language's competences do heritage speakers master?
- In which linguistic plan are obstacles and uncertainties, and interferences?
- Is language interference an obstacle to the use of the mother tongue?
- What linguistic structure of the mother tongue has been preserved as a routine and what has been assimilated or creatively transformed?

The paper will support the hypothesis:

- a. The most numerous interferences affect the morphological aspect, where the differences between the two languages are most numerous (e.g. gender's category).
- b. The differences that exist in the verbal system between the German and Albanian languages are an inevitable source of linguistic interference which leads to the construction of sentences in Albanian language. This is illustrated in example (1), which shows an adaptation of the construction of the past tense in Albanian to the perfect tense in German.

- (1) Albanian: Unë kam **geblejt** një libër të vogël.  
English [I have bought a small book]  
German [ Ich habe ein Buch **gekauft**.]

- c. There is linguistic interference in the lexical-semantic aspect where certain words acquire a new meaning.

The differences and similarities between these languages are reflected in the consciousness of Albanian speakers, where dominance belongs to the elements of the German language, while the mother tongue (Albanian) stays in a fragile position. We conducted group and individual interviews, questionnaires and video recordings in communities of Albanian immigrants in Germany.

**References:** • Kielhöfer, B. & Jonekeit, S. (1998). *Zweitsprachige Kindererziehung*, 10. Auflage, Stauffenburg Verlag: Tübingen • Klein, W. (1992). *Zweitspracherwerb: Eine Einführung*, Athenäum Studienbuch: Königstein

---

## Syntactic and prosodic expression of information status by heritage speakers of Russian

---

**Yulia Zuban**

*Universität Stuttgart*

yulia.zuban@ifla.uni-stuttgart.de

Phenomena at the interface between syntax and discourse are predicted to have an increased variability under language contact (Interface Hypothesis, Sorace & Serratrice, 2009). The current study addresses referent introduction by heritage speakers (HSs) of Russian in the US and monolingual speakers of Russian.

Standard Russian is an SVO language in neutral contexts, however, word order is discourse driven. In a typical or routine scenario, *given* referents precede *new* ones (Sirotnina, 2003). If *new* referents precede the *given* ones, such scenario will be viewed as creative. Although word order and information status (IS) in heritage Russian received a great deal of attention, the role of intonation remains unclear.

I will present the semi-spontaneous spoken and written data elicited according to the RUEG method (Wiese, 2020). 23 most frequent referents were annotated for their IS (RefLex scheme by Riester & Baumann 2017). Intonation was annotated applying a combined phonetic and auditory approach.

The results of the study show that both HSs and monolinguals produce *new* referents creatively, (example 1 by a HS, original writing is kept), but HSs do so more frequently than monolinguals across different word orders ( $W = 500$ ,  $p = 0.003$ ) and in SVO utterances separately ( $W = 550$ ,  $p = 0.03$ ).

- (1) mad'ček igral s mjačom i sabaka pobežala za mjačom  
S<sub>new</sub> O<sub>given</sub>  
 boy played with ball and dog ran after ball  
 'A boy was playing with a ball and a dog ran after the ball.'  
 (cf. Mal'čik igral s mjačom, i za mjačom pobežala sobaka)  
O<sub>given</sub> S<sub>new</sub>

Next, the pitch accent type on the new creative subjects in SVO utterances was examined. It was found that both speaker groups mostly produced rising accents followed by H\* accents. These results can be taken as a sign of a new strategy of discourse reorganization by HSs in which prosody plays an important role.

**References:** • Riester, A. & S. Baumann. (2017). The RefLex Scheme – Annotation Guidelines. *SinSpeC: Working Papers of the SFB 732 4*. • Sirotnina, I. (2003). *Porjadok slov v russkom jazyke [Word order in Russian]*. Moscow: Editorial, URSS. • Sorace A, Serratrice L. (2009). Internal and external interfaces in bilingual language development: Beyond structural overlap. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 13,195–210. • Wiese, H. (2020). Language Situations: A method for capturing variation within speakers' repertoires. In Yoshiyuki Asahi (Ed.), *Methods in Dialectology* XVI. Frankfurt a. M.: Peter Lang.

---

## The relevance of collocational ties for heritage speakers

---

**Mareike Keller & Nadine Zürn**

*Universität Mannheim*

m.keller@uni-mannheim.de, nadine.zuern@uni-mannheim.de

This paper discusses collocational ties in Heritage German in comparison with Majority and Monolingual German. Traditionally, studies of collocational competence in language learners and multilingual speakers investigate collocations as they are listed in monolingual dictionaries and measure how many of them are produced in the expected form. More variable collocations are excluded a priori (e.g. Zyzik 2021). However, many collocations show substantial variance, even within monolingual speaker communities (Steyer 2009).

Building on this potential for synchronic variance, we present a corpus study focusing on verb-noun combinations like *eine Zeugenaussage machen* (*give a witness statement*), to elucidate subtle characteristics of lexical competence ("native-like selection", Pawley & Syder 1983; Treffers-Daller et al. 2016) and novel lexicalization strategies ("linguistic creativity", Rakhilina et al. 2016) in heritage speakers (HSs). Our analysis is based on the German section of the RUEG corpus (Wiese et al. 2020), in which each speaker re-tells the same event eight times in different settings. Compared to monolingual speakers of German, we find that the HS produce fewer canonical collocations overall but with a higher degree of morphological complexity, explicitness and transparency of expression. The latter ties in with the claim that bilinguals may realize a target concept without using the expected target word (Barbosa et al. 2017), and that HSs prefer semantically transparent structures over idiomatic ones (Rakhilina et al., 2016). We want to discuss to what extent the move from routine, idiomatic collocations to creative combinations might thus not reflect a lack of idiomatic competence but a reasonable choice in terms of communicative goals.

**References:** • Barbosa, P., Nicoladis, E., & Keith, M. (2017). Bilingual children's lexical strategies in a narrative task. *Journal of Child Language*, 44(4), 829-849. • Pawley, A. & Syder, F.H. (1983). Two puzzles for linguistic theory: nativelike selection and nativelike fluency. In J.C. Richards & R.W. Schmidt (eds.). *Language and Communication*. New York: 191–226. • Rakhilina, E., Vyrenkova, A. & Polinsky, M. (2016). Linguistic Creativity in Heritage Speakers. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 1(1): 1-29. • Steyer, K. (2009). *Zwischen theoretischer Modellierung und praxisnaher Anwendung. Zur Korpusgesteuerten Beschreibung usueller Wortverbindungen*. In C. M. Blanco (Ed.), *Theorie und Praxis der idiomatischen Wörterbücher* (pp. 119-145). Berlin: De Gruyter. • Treffers-Daller, J., Daller, M., Furman, R., & Rothman, J. (2016). Ultimate attainment in the use of collocations among heritage speakers of Turkish in Germany and Turkish-German returnees. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 19(3), 504-519. • Wiese et al. (2021). *RUEG Corpus* (Version 0.4.0) [DE]. Zenodo. • Zyzik, E. (2021). How Many Collocations do Heritage Speakers Know? The Effects of Linguistic and Individual Variables. *Spanish as a Heritage Language* 1(1), 67-98.