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Language Contact
Véronique & Tracy
Language contact data enhance our insight into

- the degree of coactivation, competition in speakers of different ages

- what is under the control of the individual (awareness continuum) vs. how much is automatic

- role of properties of the languages involved, (areas where on-line interaction can be expected: cognates, homophony, structural overlap, „grey zones“ …)

- individual speaker profiles (attitudes, attrition, neutralizations strategies, planning problems, etc.)
LC in children

• does not hamper development (speeding up/bootstrapping and slowdown possible, Müller et al. 2007, Bernhardini & Schlyter 2003, Döpke 2000, Hulk 2000 ...)

• MAY lead to intensive mixing
  – depending on languages involved
  – „relief strategy“ (Meisel 1989 and others)
  – placeholder functions

• early control over language choice
Consistency of language choice  (Adam)

%  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>9Dt</th>
<th>9Engl.</th>
<th>15Dt</th>
<th>15Engl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dt.</td>
<td>3;10</td>
<td>4;2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- **Dt.**
- **Engl.**
- **Mix**
Particularly interesting: ASYNCHRONY

Evidence for:

- separation, independent development
- maturation and general cognitive development are not enough to explain differences
- where relative complexity/lack of transparency matters
- resourcefulness in filling gaps
Asynchrony (Adam 3;6)
(Predominant source of English: father, environment: G)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>das hat die Laura gemacht</td>
<td>də train go that way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= that has the L. Made</td>
<td>and də fish going like that\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Laura did that'</td>
<td>what doing [zɛə]/ (=there)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: How did that happen?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: ich mein stuhl kaputt gemacht hab</td>
<td><a href="=there's">ɛəs</a> two cars broken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= I my chair broken made have</td>
<td>dəFAlling də DOWN də ice cream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'because] I broke my chair'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why asynchronic development?

• unbalanced input/“time on task“ difference?
• system-internal complexity?

**English** (as opposed to German)

• little overt evidence for agreement
  
  *I run, you run, he runs, we/you/they run*
  
• obscure evidence for layers above VP
  
  *We’ve found him, they’d tell me*

*Who in this room would swear that I pronounced an auxiliary / modal?*
Moreover:
Ambiguity, lack of transparence

She has been sick

She's .....  
  
She is being funny

She is sick
What else matters, beyond relative complexity
As in adults: structural parallels and "grey zones" facilitate (provoke?) mixing

who  [dəs]  a clown train
was  that
[dəs]  a clown train

now  it dark
with [di] feets  better
Ø  nice
Coactivation, coproduction & repair

A. 5;4

I found that but I ... I see ... see ...

of it's ... if ... of ... ob das  schmeckt

whether that  tastes well

What does the naive observer see/hear?
What does the linguist recognize?
Sequence of utterances:

1. die dolly einstræppen
2. die dolly eintræp
3. das einstrap in ... die Puppe
4. die einstrap in ... die dolly
5. die Mama helf mir tæp it in
6. Mama tæp it in ... die dolly
NO! Early perfectionism

1. die dolly einstræppen

2. die dolly eintræp

3. das einstrap in .. die Puppe

4. die einstrap in ... die dolly

5. die Mama helf mir tæp it in

6. Mama tæp it in ... die dolly
Early explicit metalinguistic comments
Hannah 2;7

H. Ich hab ein Zug gebaut in Kita.
   I have a train built in kindergarten (I’ve built a train ….)

M. And did they say ‘clever Hannah?’

   no, good …
So, there is within individual heads, a lot of space for (peaceful) coexistence!

Laura, 4;0, bilingual