

# *Terminology matters II!: early bilinguals show cross-linguistic influence but they are not attriters*

Article

Accepted Version

Kupisch, T., Bayram, F. and Rothman, J. (2017) Terminology matters II!: early bilinguals show cross-linguistic influence but they are not attriters. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism*, 7 (6). pp. 719-724. ISSN 1879-9264 doi: 10.1075/lab.00012.kup Available at <https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/72049/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

To link to this article DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/lab.00012.kup>

Publisher: John Benjamins

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

[www.reading.ac.uk/centaur](http://www.reading.ac.uk/centaur)

**CentAUR**

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

## **Terminology matters II!**

### **Early bilinguals show cross-linguistic influence but are not attriters**

Tanja Kupisch<sup>1,2</sup> Fatih Bayram<sup>3</sup> and Jason Rothman<sup>2,4</sup>

University of Konstanz<sup>1</sup>, UiT The Arctic University of Norway<sup>2</sup>, University of Ordu<sup>3</sup>, University  
of Reading<sup>4</sup>

Schmid and Köpke (2017; henceforth S&K) propose a unified theory of attrition, intended to provide explanatory coverage for both L1-to-L2 and L2-to-L1 effects. To be sure, this is an intriguing idea and to the extent it can be defended on both epistemological and empirical grounds, it is very welcome. The fact that S&K do not marginalize the bi-directionality of cross-linguistic influence (CLI) is to be commended. However, in doing so, S&K claim that “attrition effects begin as soon as L1 development sets in” (p. 7), that “online/transient and representational/permanent effects [are] developmental stages on the same continuum”, and that “every bilingual is an attriter” (p. 7). In this commentary, we focus on these three statements, whose generalizability –in our view– is hard to justify, especially in consideration of research on early developing (childhood) bilinguals (EBs) and their outcomes, i.e., some adult Heritage Speakers (HSs). To avoid potential confusion, we wish to clarify that by EBs, we refer to both simultaneous and sequential child HSs, although our arguments could also be made independently for the two subtypes.

To be fair, it is not quite clear whether S&K use the term “bilingual” to refer to *late* bilinguals exclusively, but the following suggests that they do not: In section 5, S&K discuss data from EBs with regard to potential Age-of-Onset (AoO) effects, pointing out that EBs are more susceptible to L2-to-L1 influence than late onset bilinguals (p. 33), that many of them share more characteristics with late L2ers than with monolinguals (p. 33), and that, for most individuals, susceptibility to L1 attrition *decreases* with a higher AoO of bilingualism (p. 34). This would mean

that, conversely, the younger you are, the more likely your languages will affect each other. Therefore, a possible, though perhaps unintended, reading of the paper is that every bilingual, including EBs, is an attriter. Awaiting S&K's clarification as to which groups qualify (or not) as bilinguals, and thus potential attriters, we maintain notwithstanding that although CLI is an undeniable phenomenon in bilingual speech there is no empirical basis for claiming that EBs are attriters.

### **Acquisition outcomes of early bilinguals**

To start, although it is true that adult HS competence and especially performance/production tend to deviate from monolingual baselines (e.g., Montrul, 2016 for review), it is at least premature, if not oversimplified, to claim that many HSs share more characteristics with typical adult second language learners (L2ers) than with post-pubescent bilingual (attriters). In the first place, such a general statement would be difficult to properly quantify. On balance, there is significant context missing from S&K's claim that seems to run in disaccord with the implied age factor for L1 outcome competence in adult bilinguals (i.e., HSs compared to 1<sup>st</sup> generation L1 attriters). For example, Kupisch and Rothman (2016) review a growing number of studies showing adult HS competence outcomes that are indistinguishable from monolinguals when the HSs are highly educated in their mother tongue (L1) and for which numerous L2 studies have shown significant differences for adult L2 acquisition. Bayram, Rothman, Iverson, Kupisch, Miller, Puig-Mayenco and Westergaard (2017) offer supportive results, testing Turkish HSs growing up in Germany with various levels of literacy in Turkish. Across four levels of L1 literacy exposure, their results reveal a significantly increased likelihood that HSs will be more monolingual-like as a factor of increased level of literacy exposure/competence. Montrul, Mason, Armstrong and Krebs (2017) tested Spanish monolinguals, HSs and typical L2 learners on an experiment of grammatical gender

assignment and agreement with nonce words in a pseudo-artificial Spanish grammar. None of the groups differed in their handling of grammatical gender agreement with nonce words, suggesting that when no group has specific previous knowledge that could be helpful the path of learning is indistinguishable. Taken together, these studies show that when all groups acquire their target languages under more fairly comparable conditions, specifically access to literacy or nullifying previous linguistic experience, so-called “differences” between the groups sharply decline. Thus, it is not clear that HSs are in fact more like L2ers whereas post-puberty bilinguals (“attriters” in S&K’s sense) are more like monolinguals. And so, the semblance of similarity between HSs and L2ers, on the one hand, and late bilinguals and monolinguals on the other (when the languages in the pairings are the same) is likely more indicative of dominance than anything else.

### **Not all instances of CLI are the same and CLI is not random**

Our second point relates to typologies of CLI. Research on EBs showed a long time ago that developing EBs do not pass through a stage of language “(con)fusion”. Indeed, there have been studies on EBs whose two languages could have influenced each other *but did not* (e.g., Paradis & Genesee, 1996). In many other studies, the existence of CLI cannot be denied, but instead of concluding that CLI supports the (old) idea of a unitary, fused system, scholars have tried to define the exact conditions under which CLI obtains (see, e.g., Serratrice 2013, Kehoe 2015 for overviews). Subsequent work has shown that CLI does not occur randomly but under well-defined, predictable conditions, including at interfaces, with partial structural overlap, computational complexity and markedness. Crucially, CLI does not necessarily result from direct L2 or dominant language influence alone (e.g., Pérez-Leroux et al., 2009). Moreover, not all manifestations of CLI are the same. CLI can be *quantitative* or *qualitative*. Quantitative influence would mean that bilinguals are faster (e.g., Kupisch 2007) or slower (e.g., Müller & Hulk 2001) compared to

monolinguals, but –provided sufficient input- they pass through the same stages in the same order, making the same type of developmental errors. Qualitative CLI is less frequent, but there seem to be some clear cases. Schlyter (1993) provided evidence of Swedish-French bilinguals producing V3 structures in Swedish, and Hulk (2000) of a Dutch-French girl placing clitic object pronouns in French after the verb. Both are phenomena typical of L2ers, absent from monolingual speech. Some German-Spanish children transfer long lag VOT from German to Spanish, where this category does not exist (Kehoe et al., 2004), or they face problems acquiring spirantization in Spanish, as spirantization is not a rule in German (Lleó, forthcoming). Given these findings from EB development, it does not seem reasonable to collapse together the various manifestations of CLI (and relate them to “attrition”). Taking previous work into account, we might find that those phenomena that are subject to qualitative CLI (in the above sense) are also more vulnerable in late L2ers who cease to use their L1.

### **CLI is typical of early bilinguals but not every early bilingual is an attriter**

S&K do not deny the possibility of bidirectional CLI, but they do equate CLI with attrition, which becomes problematic once findings on EBs are further taken into account. Many EBs show bidirectional CLI and should thus, following S&K, be attriters in both languages. However, there are numerous EBs whose mature grammars do not seem to differ from those of (so-called) monolinguals. Admittedly, in the absence of longitudinal studies we do not know definitively whether the *same* children that show CLI during childhood will end up with deviant mature grammars. Nevertheless, we can discuss what is plausible based on available evidence, specifically including data from bilingual speakers in their majority language. In a series of studies, Kupisch and colleagues have investigated adult bilinguals with respect to properties that typically undergo CLI during development. These studies took into account both of the bilinguals’ languages and

compared majority and minority language in different countries, keeping the language combinations constant. The speakers in these studies almost always behaved monolingual-like when performing in their majority language, some even when speaking their minority language, in regards to phenomena such as adjective placement, gender marking, global accent, VOT and gemination. Surely, we cannot exclude that, coincidentally, all the speakers in these studies had been resistant to CLI when they were children. However, given what we know about EB development, this is highly unlikely. Some bilinguals were even more conservative than monolinguals, overstressing contrasts between their two language and overcorrecting to match the requirements of the standard language (e.g., Barton, 2015). Such behavior is arguably related to the speakers' bilingual exposure, but labelling these speakers as “attriters” would seem extremely counterintuitive. In short, given that some bilinguals wind up with monolingual-like mature grammars in adulthood, including for properties that are known to be vulnerable to CLI during EB development, it seems hard to justify that every bilingual is an attriter.

### **Concluding remarks**

Differences between monolinguals and bilinguals should be the default expectation for a plethora of reasons, but not all differences are the same. We would like to reconfirm our position and its consequences: even though most, if not all bilinguals will demonstrate at least some differences from monolinguals not all such differences should be captured under the term of attrition and certainly not all bilinguals are attriters. Despite wonderful insights this article brings to the fore, we fear that suggesting all bilinguals are attriters and that effectively all differences between bilinguals and monolinguals reflect attrition (at some level) inadvertently runs the risk of rendering the very notion of attrition functionally useless. Bona fide attrition—a demonstrable change in state of grammatical competence/representation over time—is a real phenomenon that is poorly

understood to date. Equating (essentially) all differences to an already vaguely defined term does little—in our view—to move the research agenda on attrition forward. Precision of terminology is important for theory-internal and outward-facing reasons; our only goal in offering this dissenting view of S&K's perspective on what counts as attrition and who counts as an attriter is to enter into a dialogue about the implications this has, potentially beyond what the authors intended.

## References

- Barton, D. (2015). *Generische Nominalphrasen bei deutsch-französischer Zweisprachigkeit: Zur Verwendung des Definitartikels bei erwachsenen Herkunftssprechern*. PhD dissertation, University of Hamburg.
- Bayram, F., Rothman, J., Iverson, M., Kupisch, T., Miller, D., Puig Mayenco E., Westergaard, M. (in press, 2017). Differences in use without deficiencies in competence: Passives in the Turkish and German of Turkish heritage speakers in Germany. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*
- Hulk, A. (2000). L'acquisition des pronoms clitiques français par un enfant bilingue français-néerlandais. *The Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 45(1-2), 97–117.
- Kehoe, M. (2015). Cross-linguistic interaction: A retrospective and prospective view. In E. Babatsouli & D. Ingram (eds), *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Monolingual and Bilingual Speech 2015* (pp.141-167). Chania: Institute of Monolingual and Bilingual Speech. URL: <http://ismbs.eu/publications>
- Kehoe, M., Lleó, C., & Rakow, M. (2004). Voice onset time in bilingual German-Spanish children. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 7(1), 71–88.



- Kupisch, T. (2007). Determiners in bilingual German-Italian children: What they tell us about the relation between language influence and language dominance. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 10(1), 57–78.
- Kupisch, T., & Rothman, J. (2016). Terminology matters! Why difference is not incompleteness and how early child bilinguals are heritage speakers. *International Journal of Bilingualism*.
- Lleó, C. (forthcoming). Aspects of the Phonology of Spanish as a Heritage Language. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*.
- Müller, N., & Hulk, A. (2001). Crosslinguistic influence in bilingual language acquisition: Italian and French as recipient languages. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 4(1), 1–21.
- Montrul, S. (2016). *The acquisition of heritage languages*. Cambridge University Press.
- Montrul, S., Mason, S., Armstrong, A. and Krebs, C. (2017) Input cues for the acquisition of gender marking and agreement in Spanish. Paper presented at Generative Approaches to Second Language Acquisition (GASLA 14). University of Southampton, Southampton (UK), 7-9 April 2017.
- Paradis, J., & Genesee, F. (1996). Syntactic acquisition in bilingual children. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 18(01), 1-25.
- Pérez-Leroux, A., Roberge, Y., & Pirvulescu, M. (2009). Bilingualism as a window into the language faculty: The acquisition of objects in French-speaking children in bilingual and monolingual contexts. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 12(1), 97–112.
- Schlyter, S. (1993). The weaker language in bilingual Swedish–French children. In K. Hyltenstam, & A. Viberg (eds), *Progression and regression in language: Sociocultural, neuropsychological and linguistic perspectives* (pp. 289-308). Cambridge: CUP.
- Schmid, M., & Köpcke, B. (2017). The relevance of first language attrition to theories of bilingual development. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism*, 7.

Serratrice, L. (2013). Cross-linguistic influence in bilingual development: Determinants and mechanisms. *Linguistic approaches to bilingualism*, 3(1), 3-25.

*Authors' Addresses*

Tanja Kupisch

Department of Linguistics

University of Konstanz

D-78457 Konstanz

GERMANY

Jason Rothman

School of Psychology

and Clinical Language Sciences

University of Reading

Reading - UK

RG6 7BE

Fatih Bayram

Dept. of English

Lang. and Literature

University of Ordu

52200 - Ordu

TURKEY

[tanja.kupisch@uni-hamburg.ca](mailto:tanja.kupisch@uni-hamburg.ca)

[j.rothman@reading.ac.uk](mailto:j.rothman@reading.ac.uk)

[fthbyrm@gmail.com](mailto:fthbyrm@gmail.com)