

Macroplanning in narratives: Data from early bilinguals

Monique Flecken
University of Heidelberg

Structure of learner varieties meeting, Paris, March 2009

Determining early bilinguals' linguistic proficiency?

Very advanced level of proficiency:
Early age of acquisition
High amount of input/exposure

Complex task:
Construction of a narrative

Narrative Competence:

Acquisition of linguistic means

+

Integration of acquired means in complex linguistic context

→ **Language-specific** planning principles drive information structure in texts

Language specific macro-planning principles

Driven by grammaticalized categories:

- word order constraints (V2 vs. SVO)
- grammaticalized temporal-aspectual categories
 - Differences in information selection and structure, reference management (introduction, maintenance)

Advancing the story line / Narrative progression:

German: Temporal shift (right boundary of preceding event/then)

English: Deictic organizing principle; shift over left boundary of preceding event (allows integration ongoing events; no right boundary)

Evidence from advanced L2 users

Carroll & v. Stutterheim (2003); Carroll & Lambert (2003;2006); v.Stutterheim & Lambert (2005), etc.

→ *“It is hard to manage clusters of form-function relations that span different domains (time,space,entities) and follow language-specific patterns in determining information structure”* (Carroll et al. 2000)

An example: L1Ger - L2Eng (Carroll&Lambert 2006)

L1 German: High status accorded to protagonist - Ellipsis in maintaining reference to the protagonist as subject	54.2%
--	-------

L1 English: Ellipsis only licensed when tight semantic (causal) link between events	16.4%
---	-------

L1GerL2Eng: Ellipsis	30.4%
----------------------	-------

Method & Participants

Retelling of short silent film Quest

Clayman confronted with inanimate entities



“Monolingual” Dutch speakers (N=19)

Marianne Starren, Suzan v. Ierland

“Monolingual” German speakers (N=19)

Mary C., Christiane v. S., Monique L.

Early Dutch – German bilinguals (N=10; within-subject design)

- Bilingual education
- Mainly “one parent – one language”
- Onset of acq.: 0-3yrs

Results: Monolingual speakers

Similarities Dutch/German:

- Narrative progression on the basis of temporal shift
- Inanimate entities as subjects in main clauses infrequent (entail no shift)

Differences Dutch/German:

- **Reference introduction and maintenance**

“Paper world”- introduction of sheet of paper in dynamic role:

	L1 German (N=19)	L1 Dutch (N=19)
Prot.centered	<p>10</p> <p><i>Er kriegt ein Blatt Papier ins Gesicht</i> <i>Er wird von einem Blatt Papier umgeschmissen</i></p>	<p>5</p> <p><i>Hij krijgt een blaadje in z'n gezicht</i> <i>Hij wordt omver gewaaid (door een blaadje)</i></p>
Entity centered: a)Inan as subject b)Empty subjects es/er	<p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>9</p> <p>4: <i>Een blad papier gooit hem omver</i> 5: <i>Er vliegt een blad papier tegen hem aan</i></p>

Results: Monolingual speakers

Reference maintenance (protagonist = subject in mcl):

Z = 13.45, P < .05

Zero anaphora/ellipsis

	L1 German	L1 Dutch
Zero Anaphora (main cl)	979/1806 54.21%	152/650 23.38%

001 ... und dieses Lebewesen fällt
vom Himmel runter

002 und \emptyset platscht auf dem Boden

003 und \emptyset rappelt sich hoch

004 und \emptyset steht dann langsam auf
diesen Blättern

(Carroll & Lambert, 2003;2006)

001 het mannetje schrikt van de apparaten

002 en \emptyset rent weg

003 opeens struikelt **hij**

004 en valt \emptyset op een rooster

001 **hij** zit op een bouwwerkplaats

002 **hij** raakt ervan in paniek

003 en **hij** rent weg

004 daarbij valt **hij**

Results: Bilingual speakers

Reference introduction (inanimate entities):

	Bilingual German (N=10)	Bilingual Dutch (N=10)
Prot.centered	<p>5</p> <p>4: <i>Er kriegt ein Blatt Papier ins Gesicht</i></p> <p>1: <i>Er wird von einem Blatt Papier umgeschmissen</i></p>	<p>4</p> <p>4: <i>Hij krijgt een blaadje in z'n gezicht</i></p>
Entity centered:	4	6
a) Inan as subject	3	4
b) Empty subjects <i>es/er</i>	1	2

Variety of options available in both languages used
-> no real preference, In contrast to monolinguals

Results: Bilingual speakers

BILGER>BILDUT, P<.05

MONO>BIL, P<.05

Reference maintenance (protagonist = subject in mcl): Zero anaphora/Ellipsis

L1 German	Bilingual German	L1 Dutch	Bilingual Dutch
979/1806 54.21%	101/313 32.27%	152/650 23.38%	38/353 10.76%

Ellipsis and temporal shift in bilingual narratives:

001...**und dann** steht er auf
002 **und dann** hört er einen
Tropfen
003 **und dann** fängt er an so im
Sand zu graben
004 und zu suchen ... (vp00)

001...**und dann** hört er wieder ein
Tröpfeln
002 **und dann** denkt er
003 dass es von oben kommt
004 aber **dann** sieht er eine Pfütze
005 **und dann** fängt er an zu
graben (vp10)

Results: Bilingual speakers ctd.

001... je zag weer een poppetje in
een landschap

002 en hij staat dan op

003 en ø begint een beetje te lopen

004 **en dan** komt hij ineens op een
torentje van stenen terecht

005 **en dan** ziet hij weer een plekje
met water

006 **en dan** probeert **hij** van die
stenen toren *van af te komen ...

(vp20)

001... hij komt in een wereld van
papier terecht

002 hij hoort het druppelen weer

003 **en dan** ziet hij opeens een
plasje water

004 **en dan** begint **hij** weer te
graven

005 **en dan** wordt **hij** weer
meegesleurd

(vp10)

Comparison with L1 acquisition

Halm (2008): The development of narrative competence in L1 German 7-14 year old children

→ 12-13 year olds: Children maintain explicit reference to temporal shift up to 12/13 years

- 001 ...aber in dem Moment
- 002 wo er die Hände hochhebt
- 003 kommen/fallen keine Tropfen mehr vom Himmel
- 004 **und dann** betastet er die Lache
- 005 **und dann** reißt das Papier auf
- 006 **und dann** fällt er runter

Discussion

Predominance of temporal shifter “(and) then” interferes with reference maintenance patterns in bilingual Dutch & German

Bilingual German: Explicit reference to “und dann” often interferes with possibility for ellipsis

Bilingual Dutch: Predominance of explicit “en dan”; less room for condition for ellipsis (=causal links between events)

→ Resembles stages in monolingual L1 acquisition

Discussion ctd.

1. Possibility: Delay in bilingual acquisition?

Vp01: 46 yrs

Vp13: **16 yrs**

Vp14: **16 yrs**

Vp02: **16 yrs**

Vp20: 18 yrs

Vp00: 19 yrs

Vp10: **16 yrs**

Vp21: 17 yrs

Vp12: **16 yrs**

Vp05: **16 yrs**

2. Possibility: Part of the endstate?

Represents Dutch-German Bilingual-specific pattern:

Typologically close languages – compromise = **economical solution?**

- Analysis of information structure, given its complexity, offers a good basis for investigating advanced L2/bilingual proficiency/dominance
- Dutch \neq German, the task to the Dutch-German bilingual is very difficult and subtle

Many thanks to Mary Carroll & Christiane v. Stutterheim

and....

Thank you!

flecken@idf.uni-heidelberg.de