

Juliana Goschler, Till Woerfel, Anatol Stefanowitsch,
Heike Wiese and Christoph Schroeder

Beyond conflation patterns: The encoding of motion events in Kiezdeutsch¹

Abstract: In the domain of motion event encoding, many of the world’s languages fall into one of two types: verb-framed (the path is encoded in the verb) or satellite-framed (the path is encoded outside the verb in a prefix, particle or adverbial while the verb contains information about the manner of movement). A number of studies have investigated the language usage of bilingual speakers or language learners to find evidence of a transfer of the typological pattern of the dominant/native language to the non-dominant/foreign language. These studies have largely failed to show evidence of a straightforward transfer, although more subtle effects on usage have occasionally been observed. In this paper, we report the results of a corpus study comparing two groups of speakers of the urban German ethnolect “Kiezdeutsch”: one with a monolingual German background and one with a bilingual Turkish-German background. We find no significant differences in their preference for path or manner verbs, which is consistent with other studies. However, in comparison with the monolingual German group, the Turkish-German group prefer semantically light motion verbs and they avoid the combination of manner verbs with path satellites. This is consistent with the fact that the analogous construction is ungrammatical in verb-framed languages like Turkish. In other words, we find variation within “Kiezdeutsch” that can be explained by a transfer of usage preferences from the background language.

Keywords: motion events, contact varieties, transfer, German, Turkish

Juliana Goschler: Universität Oldenburg. E-mail: juliana.goschler@uni-oldenburg.de

Till Woerfel: Ludwigs-Maximilians-Universität München

Anatol Stefanowitsch: Freie Universität Berlin

Heike Wiese: Universität Potsdam

Christoph Schroeder: Universität Potsdam

¹ The fourth author gratefully acknowledges financial support from the German Research Foundation (DFG), Special Research Area 632, “Information Structure”, Project B6, “Kiezdeutsch”.

1 Introduction

The typological distinction between verb-framed and satellite-framed languages (V- and S-languages for short) in the domain of motion encoding has been researched extensively, and there is a wide agreement on the influence of the dominant grammatical patterns of a language on usage preferences (cf., e.g., the summary in Slobin 2004). These preferences can be seen in first language acquisition from very early on, and it has been shown that child language mirrors adult language use even in very subtle syntactic differences in this semantic domain (Allen et al. 2007). Recently, a number of studies have investigated the question of whether these preferences are also reflected in the interlanguage of foreign and second language learners (Bernini et al. 2006; Brown and Gullberg 2010, 2011; Cadierno 2004; Cadierno and Ruiz 2006; Cadierno 2008; Reshöft 2010; Schmiedtová et al. 2011) and in the usage patterns of multilingual speakers (Daller et al. 2011; Goschler 2009; Hohenstein et al. 2006; Ochsenbauer and Engemann 2011; Özcalışkan and Slobin 2000; Schroeder 2009; Woerfel 2011). Most of this research has focused on the use of manner-of-motion vs. path encoding verbs; the reported effects are at best very weak and it remains unclear whether transfer from the L1 is involved or whether the observed differences are due to more general characteristics of learner language (cf. e.g. Goschler 2009). However, when looking more closely into the use of specific constructions, some stable differences between L1- and L2-speakers and mono- and bilinguals can be observed (see also Goschler 2010).

In this paper, we investigate this issue on the basis of a corpus of *Kiezdeutsch*, a variety of German spoken by adolescents with a wide range of linguistic backgrounds in multiethnic urban areas. Specifically, we are interested in the following three questions:

1. How are motion events encoded in *Kiezdeutsch*?
2. Are there systematic differences between monolingual speakers of German (an S-language) and bilingual speakers of German and Turkish (a V-language)?
3. Can differences between these two groups of *Kiezdeutsch* speakers be explained by an influence of Turkish?

Comparing monolingual (German) and bilingual (Turkish-German) speakers of *Kiezdeutsch*, we will show that there are subtle, but stable differences in the usage of certain constructions, and that these differences can be explained by a typologically motivated influence of Turkish.

2 The typology of motion event encoding

The typological parameter that classifies the languages of the world as S-languages or V-languages has been exhaustively described by Talmy (1985, 1991), inspiring a wealth of research in this domain. The parameter concerns differences in the linguistic packaging of motion events: S-languages prefer to express the path of motion (PATH) outside of the verb root in a so-called “satellite” – hence the term satellite-framed languages. Satellites include elements like prefixes (for example, in Russian, cf. [1]) and verb particles (for example, in German, cf. [2]):

(1) Russian

Ona (v) besh-ala v dom.
 3SG:FEM (in)run-PST.3SG:FEM in house:ACC
 ‘She ran into the house.’

(2) German

Sie rannt-e ins Haus hinein.
 3SG:FEM run:PST-3SG in-DEF house:ACC DEICTIC-in
 ‘She ran into the house.’

Typically, the path of motion can be further elaborated in one or more prepositional phrases, as in (1), where the particle *hinein* encodes the general PATH of the motion event and the prepositional phrase *ins Haus* supplies a reference point for the PATH.

V-languages, on the other hand, typically encode information about the PATH of motion in the verb root and supply reference points in the form of oblique arguments or adjuncts. Manner of motion is often omitted. If it is explicitly mentioned, it is typically encoded in converbs or gerunds, for example, in Turkish (cf. [3]) (for a more thorough description of Turkish see also Schroeder 2009, 2012), and in the Romance languages (cf. [4], [5]):

(3) Turkish

Koş-arak ev-e gir-di.
 run-KONV house-DAT enter-PST: 3SG
 ‘S/he ran into the house.’ (lit.: ‘S/he entered the house running.’)

(4) Spanish

Entr-ò en la casa corr-iendo.
 enter-PST: 3SG in DEF:FEM house run-PTCPL
 ‘S/he ran into the house.’ (lit.: ‘S/he entered the house running.’)

(5) French

Elle est entr-ée dans la maison en cour-ant.
 She be: 3SG enter-PST in DEF:FEM house in run-PTCPL
 ‘She ran into the house.’ (lit.: ‘She entered the house running.’)

The distinction between S- and V-languages is not an absolute one – many languages seem to use both patterns under certain circumstances (cf. Berthele 2004, 2006 on Germanic and Romance varieties; Kopecka 2009, in press, on French). However, most languages have a clear preference for one or the other type of encoding. This preference has a number of correlates in language structure: the verb lexicon of S-languages is typically relatively large, and it contains a high proportion of verbs encoding the MANNER of motion. In contrast, the verb lexicon of V-languages is more restricted, consisting of a relatively small number of PATH verbs, as well as a relatively small number of MANNER verbs that cannot occur as main predicates. Grammatically, speakers of V-languages are forced to encode every part of a complex path in a separate verb phrase, while speakers of S-languages can simply stack a number of satellites and adpositional phrases within a single verb phrase headed by a MANNER verb. Thus, speakers of S-languages often include more complex paths in their descriptions of a single motion event than speakers of V-languages. Another grammatical difference is that in some V-languages, for example Turkish, semantically strong MANNER verbs cannot be freely combined with telic PATH elements. Thus, the Turkish example (cf. [7]) is grammatically incorrect, and the interpretation of the Spanish (cf. [8]) and French example (cf. [9]) does not include a boundary crossing, as it is interpreted as ‘dancing in the direction to the house’/‘dancing in(side) the house’:

(7) Turkish (Schroeder 2009: 186)

**Ev-e sek-ti.*
 house-DAT jump-PST:3SG
 ‘S/he jumped into the house.’

(8) Spanish

?*Salt-ó a la casa.*
 jump-PST:3SG in the house
 ‘S/he jumped into the house.’

(9) French

?*Elle a saut-é dans la maison.*
 She have:3SG jump-PST into the house
 ‘She jumped into the house.’

A grammatical and semantically correct utterance corresponding to examples (7)–(9) in the sense of ‘She jumped into the house’ would require a construction including a path verb and a converb/gerund (see examples [3]–[5]).

The avoidance of combinations of strong MANNER verbs with telic PATH information appears to be a more general trend, but it seems that it is generally only grammaticalized in V-languages (cf. Aske 1989; Beavers et al. 2010: 341–342; Goschler 2011).

This has been shown to have a strong and stable influence on the usage of speakers (Slobin 2004), but it remains unclear whether these influences are strong and long-lasting enough to be reflected in the language use of L2 learners, or how they shape language use of multilingual speakers. It is possible that multilingual speakers, including L2 learners, internalize both patterns and use them according to the type of the respective language, but it is equally possible that one pattern becomes dominant and is used across languages regardless of type, or that the different patterns converge. Previous studies suggest that language learners transfer at least some aspects of the typological pattern of their L1 to the L2 (Cadierno 2004, 2008, Cadierno and Ruiz 2006; Hohenstein et al. 2006; Özcalışkan and Slobin 2000; Reshöft 2010), or from the L2 to the L1 (Brown and Gullberg 2010, 2011). In the case of multilingual speakers, there is also some evidence for such a transfer (cf. Schroeder 2009 for German-Turkish bilinguals), with the direction of transfer depending on the linguistic environment of the speakers (Daller et al. 2011) and with crosslinguistic interactions and their directionality guided by language internal factors (Ochsenbauer and Engemann 2011). But not all studies find such effects (Goschler 2009). Furthermore, it has been shown that the preference for one or the other lexicalization pattern can vary heavily across speech communities of within one language, for example between the Muotathal dialect of Swiss-German and standard German (Berthele 2004) or Romanch and standard French (Berthele 2006). Thus, the conditions under which patterns will converge under the influence of one or more background languages are far from clear and the interplay of different aspects of motion-event encoding seem to be more complex than previously assumed. It is therefore necessary to further investigate how, when and under what circumstances transfer or pattern-convergence might occur. A closer look at the use of the German variety *Kiezdeutsch* and the preferences in encoding motion by speakers with different linguistic backgrounds might shed some light on the question to what extent the different languages of bi- and multilingual speakers influence each other, and what kinds of patterns emerge in varieties between S- and V-languages.

3 Kiezdeutsch: a new German dialect from multilingual contexts

“Kiezdeutsch” (lit. ‘(neighbour)hood German’) is a spoken variety that has emerged among young people in multiethnic and multilingual urban areas of Germany. While a salient proportion of its speakers are Turkish-German bilinguals (see also Schroeder 2007 on the linguistic background of young Turkish-German bilinguals in Germany), *Kiezdeutsch* is not a Turkish ethnolect of German, but is used across ethnic and linguistic backgrounds, both by bilingual (Turkish-/Kurdish-/Arabic-/...-German) speakers and by monolingual German speakers, indicating the status of a multiethnolect (cf. Clyne 2000; Quist 2008; Wiese 2009, 2012; Freywald et al. 2011). A number of converging linguistic features at different grammatical and lexical levels have been reported for this language use in the literature, such as the integration of lexical items and pragmatic formulas from migrant languages (discourse particles such as *lan* ‘man, guy’, *moruk* ‘old man’; introductory and closing remarks such as *hadi* ‘Come on!’ (all from Turkish), affirmative particles such as *wallah* ‘indeed’ (from Arabic)), the coronalization of the palatal fricative [ç] to [j], the use of [s] in initial position instead of [z]; variation in the inflectional system affecting gender, case, and number morphology; bare NPs in certain contexts where standard varieties of German require determiners and/or prepositions; predicative constructions without a copula; and deviations from the standard German verb-second word order in declaratives (cf. Keim and Androutsopoulos 2000; Auer 2003; Kallmeyer and Keim 2003; Dirim and Auer 2004; Kern and Selting 2006; Wiese 2009, 2012, 2012; Freywald et al. 2011). The systematic occurrence of such features suggests that *Kiezdeutsch* is a new, multiethnic dialect of German with characteristics that differ from standard German but that are not plausibly analyzed as mere grammatical reductions of standard German. Instead, *Kiezdeutsch* elaborates existing grammatical patterns and creates new ones by drawing on system-internal dynamics of German and the interaction of different grammatical subsystems. Given its wealth of multilingual speakers, additional motivation for linguistic characteristics of *Kiezdeutsch* can also come from external sources, specifically, from the linguistic patterns of its various background languages. The multilingual context of *Kiezdeutsch* makes it a dialect that is particularly open to linguistic innovation; it supports looser grammatical restrictions and a higher degree of linguistic variability (cf. e.g. Wiese 2006, 2009, 2012). This means that there is variation across speakers and communication situations. It might also mean that there could be subtle differences in usage-patterns between speakers with different additional languages (apart from German) in their linguistic repertoire.

4 Data and method

Our investigation is based on a corpus of approx. 20 hours of self-recorded, informal, spoken conversations of eight monolingual (German) and five bilingual (German-Turkish) speakers of *Kiezdeutsch* aged between 14 and 17 years. The data are a subset drawn from a larger corpus² of *Kiezdeutsch* currently under construction at the University of Potsdam (Wiese et al. 2008–).

All motion events were extracted from this data set and annotated for the linguistic background of the speakers (monolingual German or bilingual German-Turkish), the type of verb (PATH, MANNER, or GENERIC motion)³ and the presence of PATH satellites⁴ (with/without). The data were then submitted to a series of statistical tests to determine usage differences across the two groups of speakers.

5 Results

First, we tested whether bilingual Turkish-German and monolingual German speakers differ in their preference for the use of PATH and MANNER verbs. Such differences would be expected, since, as discussed above, Turkish is a verb-framed and German a satellite-framed language. If Turkish-German speakers transfer the preferred lexicalization pattern of Turkish to *Kiezdeutsch*, they should have a general preference for PATH verbs over MANNER verbs.

There are significant differences in the use of motion verbs across the two groups ($\chi^2 = 20.2448$, $df = 2$, $p < 0.001$, ***), but, as Table 1 shows, these are not due to a difference in the preference for PATH verbs (this is in line with a previous study, which has also failed to find such a preference, cf. Goschler 2009). Instead, we find a significant preference for GENERIC motion verbs over MANNER verbs for Turkish-German compared to monolingual German speakers; however, it must be

2 The main corpus contains approx. 48h of audio material (228,000 token). For further information see <http://www.kiezdeutschkorpus.de>.

3 Verbs conflating MOTION and MANNER and used to express self-contained forward motion were classified as MANNER verbs (we found *fahren*, *fliegen*, *latschen*, *laufen*, *rennen*, *steigen*, *tanzen*, *rutschen*) verbs conflating MOTION and PATH and used to express self-contained forward motion were classified as PATH verbs (*fallen*, *verpissen*). The two verb types *kommen* ‘to come’ and *gehen* ‘to go’ were classified as GENERIC motion verbs.

4 Prepositional phrases are not considered satellites in Talmy’s typology. This has been criticized by various scholars (Beavers et al. 2010: 337–339). In line with this critique we included prepositional phrases contained in the verb phrase as satellites in the analysis.

Table 1: Use of motion verbs in Kiezdeutsch by German and Turkish-German speakers

	German		Turkish-German		Total
	observed	expected	observed	expected	
MANNER verbs	166	(139.59)	49	(75.41)	215
GENERIC motion verbs	292	(317.48)	197	(171.52)	489
PATH verbs	14	(14.93)	9	(8.17)	23
Total	372		255		627

pointed out here that the effect is almost entirely due to the more frequent use of *kommen* ('come') and *gehen* ('go') by the bilingual speakers.

Two explanations are theoretically possible. One could simply assume that the bilinguals in our corpus preferred these verbs because they know fewer German MANNER verbs than the monolinguals, thus slightly overusing these "all-purpose" GENERIC motion verbs, which are the two most frequent motion verbs in German generally (a sort of "deficiency" view, that, while not really plausible, cannot be excluded *a priori* either). The other explanation would be that there is indeed a typologically-motivated influence of Turkish: Turkish-German bilinguals might use *kommen* and *gehen* analogously to the way in which they use Turkish PATH verbs, thus interpreting these GENERIC motion verbs slightly different from German monolinguals who treat them according to the dominant German pattern as MANNER verbs. This kind of extension from GENERIC to PATH semantics has also been suggested by Schroeder (2009).

But as discussed above, the preferred lexicalization pattern of a language is not just expressed in differences in the usage of certain motion verbs. Another characteristic is the higher number of PATH satellites in the form of PATH-encoding particles and prepositional phrases in S-languages such as German, and the relative absence of PATH satellites in V-languages. In most V-languages, MANNER verbs are mostly used as converbs or gerunds to add information to the description of the PATH, or as bare verbs in clauses only encoding the manner of motion. The typical S-language construction consisting of a MANNER verb with a PATH satellite is avoided, often it is even ungrammatical. The combination of MANNER verbs with one or more PATH satellite is perfectly acceptable in German, but mostly ungrammatical in Turkish. If Turkish-German speakers activate this feature in their usage of *Kiezdeutsch*, they should avoid PATH satellites with MANNER verbs. This prediction is borne out by our data (see Table 2).

Bilingual Turkish-German speakers use significantly fewer MANNER verbs with PATH satellites than monolingual German speakers ($\chi^2 = 6.0054$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.05$, *). Again, this is broadly compatible with a typologically motivated

Table 2: Use of MANNER verbs with external PATH constituents

	German		Turkish-German		Total
	observed	expected	observed	expected	
MANNER verb w/o PATH satellite	42	(49.46)	23	(15.54)	65
MANNER verb with PATH satellite	114	(106.54)	26	(33.46)	140
Total	156		49		205

convergence of usage preferences, although, again, an alternative interpretation would be that Turkish-German bilinguals have a general preference for simple constructions with few constituents over more complex constructions – in this case verb-only phrases versus verb phrases containing additional particles or prepositional phrases.

We tested this by looking at the combination of GENERIC motion verbs with PATH satellites: If the effect is due to a general preference for simpler constructions, it should be found across all semantic verb types. But this is not the case: there is no difference between Turkish-German and German speakers of *Kiezdeutsch* ($\chi^2 = 0$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.998$, n.s., see Table 3). This excludes the possibility of an explanation in terms of linguistic deficiency and supports the idea of a typologically-motivated convergence of patterns.

In addition to the individual contingency tests reported above, we performed a configural frequency analysis (cf. von Eye 1990, 2002; cf. also Stefanowitsch and Gries 2008), including all three variables simultaneously – Languages (German/Turkish-German), Verb Type (MANNER/GENERIC), and path satellite (with/without). A configural frequency analysis is essentially a multi-dimensional contingency test that allows us to determine for each intersection of the three variables, i.e. for each combination of values, whether it is more frequent than expected (this is referred to as a “type”) or less frequent than expected (this is referred to as an “anti-type”) and whether the difference from the expected is significant.

Table 3: Use of generic MOTION verbs with PATH-constituents

	German		Turkish-German		Total
	observed	expected	observed	expected	
GENERIC motion w/o PATH satellite	107	(107.48)	73	(72.52)	180
GENERIC motion with PATH satellite	185	(184.52)	124	(124.48)	309
Total	292		197		489

Table 4: Use of verbs with PATH-constituents (Analysis of configuration frequencies)

L1	Verb type	PATH satellite	Obs. freq.	Exp. freq.	Type/ antitype	p-value (χ^2)
German	MANNER	with	142	102.52	+	0.0000965, ***
Turkish	MANNER	with	30	55.07	-	0.0007306, ***
Turkish	GENERIC	w/o	61	45.63	+	0.0228914, n.s.
German	MANNER	w/o	24	37.35	-	0.0289096, n.s.
German	GENERIC	with	208	233.17	-	0.0992416, n.s.
Turkish	GENERIC	with	136	125.24	+	0.3363818, n.s.
Turkish	MANNER	w/o	19	20.06	+	0.8124843, n.s.
German	GENERIC	w/o	84	84.95	-	0.9175123, n.s.

The analysis confirms the results reported above (see Table 4, $\chi^2 = 40.27174$, $df = 4$, $p < 0.001$, ***).

There is only one significant type and one significant anti-type, and these show that the effects reported above are due exclusively to the fact that bilingual Turkish-German speakers avoid the combination of MANNER verbs with PATH satellites, while monolingual German speakers actually prefer this combination.

One problem with our analysis is, of course, that it is based on a small set of data produced by a very small number of subjects: as described above, these consist of only five bilingual German-Turkish speakers and eight monolingual German speakers of *Kiezdeutsch*. Moreover, the number of motion clauses produced by each subject differs drastically, ranging from 7 to 124 for the monolingual German speakers (with an average of 50) and from 23 to 105 for the bilingual German-Turkish speakers (with an average of 49).

This means that pooling the data and treating each utterance as an independent data point, as is customary in corpus linguistics, holds the very real danger that the differences found between the groups may be due to an individual speaker. In order to exclude this possibility, we repeated the configural frequency analysis thirteen times, each time leaving out one of the speakers. The results show that the reported effect is not due to an individual speaker: every analysis yielded an overall significant effect, with chi-square values ranging from 32.70 ($\chi^2 = 32.70$, $df = 4$, $p < 0.001$, ***) to 45.07 ($\chi^2 = 45.07$, $df = 4$, $p < 0.001$, ***), and each analysis yielded the same significant type and antitype reported above.

This is certainly not an ideal methodological solution – a more obvious answer to the problem would be to expand the data set. However, such an expansion is currently not possible, as our analysis is already based on the entirety of the material so far transcribed. Given that small corpora are currently the norm rather than the exception in multilingualism research, we believe that the proce-

ture followed here is a simple, yet justifiable interim solution until larger spoken corpora of multilingual speakers (such as the full version of the *Kiezdeutsch-Korpus*) become available.

6 Discussion

The differences between the usage preferences of monolingual German and bilingual Turkish-German speakers of *Kiezdeutsch* yield a mixed picture. We tested two typologically motivated hypotheses: First, that bilingual Turkish-German *Kiezdeutsch* speakers would use a higher proportion of PATH verbs than monolingual German *Kiezdeutsch* speakers; second, that bilingual German-Turkish *Kiezdeutsch* speakers would avoid the combination of semantically heavy MANNER verbs with PATH satellites.

The first of these hypotheses was rejected: There is no difference in the use of PATH verbs between the two groups of speakers, although there is a difference in the use of GENERIC motion and MANNER verbs, with bilingual Turkish-German speakers preferring GENERIC motion verbs (such as *kommen* and *gehen*). This is in line with earlier research (cf. Goschler 2009). A potential explanation is that even if bilingual Turkish-German speakers theoretically have a preference for PATH verbs, German and *Kiezdeutsch* do not offer a sufficient number of commonly-used PATH verbs for them to choose from (see also Bernini et al. 2006).

It is clear that a convergence of patterns from both languages is only possible if the target language offers structures and lexical material analogous to the source language: in the case of German PATH verbs this is not the case. Only a handful of such verbs exist in German (such as *betreten* ‘enter walking’, *überqueren* ‘cross’, and *verlassen* ‘leave’). In order to conclusively determine whether or not there is a typologically-motivated pattern-convergence in the domain of motion-verb selection, it would be necessary to look at a target language that allows more variation in this respect: for example, English is dominantly an S-language, but its motion-verb lexicon also contains a substantial number of PATH verbs borrowed from Latin and French over a period of several hundred years (Stefanowitsch 2013); similarly, Italian is dominantly a V-language, but it also has a number of MANNER verbs that may be used as main predicates and can be combined with certain PATH-encoding constituents (Iacobini and Masini 2006), although these combinations seem to be lexically restricted and often idiomatic in nature (Zubizaretta 2007; Zubizaretta and Oh 2007).

The second hypothesis was confirmed, in line with earlier work by Schroeder (2009): the combination of MANNER verbs with PATH satellites is significantly less frequent than expected in the utterances of bilingual Turkish-German *Kiez-*

deutsch speakers, providing evidence for a typologically motivated convergence of two different motion-encoding patterns, namely satellite- and verb-framed.

Thus, the encoding of motion events in *Kiezdeutsch* is influenced by more than one language in the case of bilingual speakers, but only at the constructional level. In light of the possibility just discussed, this is not surprising: German allows the combination of MANNER verbs with PATH satellites, but this is not obligatory. With GENERIC motion verbs such as *kommen* und *gehen*, German and Turkish offer very similar possibilities of semantic packaging at the clause level. This offers the possibility to bilingual speakers to use *Kiezdeutsch* in accordance with usage patterns present in both of their languages. The possibility of a general reduced complexity on the level of constructions was ruled out by comparing MANNER verbs to GENERIC motion verbs, where there is no difference whatsoever between monolingual German and bilingual Turkish-German speakers of *Kiezdeutsch*. Thus, it seems likely that typologically motivated convergence of patterns occurs in the language use of bilinguals and possibly also near-native speakers of a second language.

It is especially interesting in this respect that even though *Kiezdeutsch* is a variety of German spoken by young people with varying linguistic background, at least partly used as a sociolect meant to create a group identity, usage patterns show differences between monolingual and bilingual speakers in the domain investigated here. As differences in the encoding of motion events are presumably too subtle to be the consciously accessible (in contrast to, for example, lexical borrowings), we are likely dealing with a genuine sociolinguistic marker distinguishing two subgroups of *Kiezdeutsch* speakers, rather than with a linguistic stereotype intended to signal subgroup identities.

Despite the promising results reported here, some problems remain: First, the database is rather small. Even though we excluded the possibility that idiosyncratic linguistic preferences of a single speaker biased the data, the procedure of pooling speakers and treating each utterance as an independent data point remains problematic, and future research must be based on larger and more balanced corpora than are currently available, to enable us, among other things, to treat utterances produced by the same speaker as repeated measures. Second, in order to argue conclusively for a typologically motivated convergence of usage patterns, it will be necessary to replicate the study with bilingual speakers whose languages are typologically similar (like Russian-German or Turkish-French speakers with a comparable social background). This would allow us to distinguish more clearly between typologically motivated transfer and pattern-convergence and the eclectic transfer of individual structures or other general features of learner languages and contact varieties.

7 Conclusions

We have shown that Turkish-German bilinguals differ in their encoding of motion events from monolingual Germans when speaking *Kiezdeutsch*. We found a highly significant correlation between monolingual and bilingual speakers and preferred constructions in *Kiezdeutsch*: bilingual Turkish-German speakers avoid the combination of manner verbs with path satellites – the analogous construction being ungrammatical in Turkish – while monolingual German speakers do not. This difference is not due to a general preference for less complex constructions, as it is found only with semantically rich MANNER verbs, but not with GENERIC motion verbs like *gehen* ‘go’ and *kommen* ‘come’. Thus, there is variation in the encoding of motion events that cannot be plausibly explained in terms of a potentially reduced complexity of learner or contact varieties, but which can be explained straightforwardly as a convergence of usage patterns of two different languages. This variation does not occur at the level of verb selection, but more specifically at the level of constructional preferences. This might be due to the fact that *Kiezdeutsch* – like standard German – does not offer suitable lexical material in the form of a sufficiently large PATH-verb lexicon that would allow speakers to switch to a verb-framed pattern. In contrast, the typical construction types of German can easily be avoided and replaced by patterns similar to those preferred in Turkish.

References

- Allen, Shanley, Aslı Özyürek, Sotaro Kita, Amanda Brown, Reyhan Furman, Tomoko Ishizuka & Mihoko Fujii. 2006. Language-specific and universal influences in children’s syntactic packaging of Manner and Path: A comparison of English, Japanese, and Turkish. *Cognition* 102(1). 16–48.
- Androutsopoulos, Jannis. 2001. *From the Streets to the Screens and Back Again: On the Mediated Diffusion of Ethnolectal Patterns in Contemporary German* (Series A, No. 522). Essen: LAUD.
- Aske, John. 1989. Path predicates in English and Spanish: A closer look. *Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, Berkeley, CA. 1–14.
- Auer, Peter. 2003. ‘Türkenslang’: Ein jugendsprachlicher Ethnolekt des Deutschen und seine Transformationen. In Annelies Häcki Buhofer (ed.), *Spracherwerb und Lebensalter*, 255–264. Tübingen: Francke.
- Beavers, John, Beth Levin & Shiao Wei Tham. 2010. The typology of motion events revisited. *Journal of Linguistics* 46(2). 331–377.
- Berthele, Rafael. 2004. Wenn viele Wege aus dem Fenster führen – Konzeptuelle Variation im Bereich von Bewegungseignissen. *Linguistik Online* 20(3). 73–91.

- Berthele, Rafael. 2006. *Ort und Weg. Die sprachliche Raumreferenz in Varietäten des Deutschen, Rätoromanischen und Französischen*. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter.
- Bernini, Guiliano, Lorenzo Spreafico & Ada Valentini. 2006. Acquiring motion verbs in a second language: The case of Italian L2. *Linguistica e Filologia* 23. 7–26.
- Brown, Amanda & Marianne Gullberg. 2010. Changes in encoding of path of motion in a first language during acquisition of a second language. *Cognitive Linguistics* 21(1). 263–286.
- Brown, Amanda & Marianne Gullberg. 2011. Bidirectional cross-linguistic influence in event conceptualization? Expressions of path among Japanese learners of English. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 14(1). 79–94.
- Cadierno, Teresa. 2004. Expressing motion events in a second language. In Michel Achard & Susanne Niemeier (eds.), *Cognitive Linguistics, Second Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Teaching*, 13–50. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter.
- Cadierno, Teresa. 2008. Learning to talk about motion in a foreign language. In Peter Robinson & Nick C. Ellis (eds.), *Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics and Second Language Acquisition*, 239–275. London: Routledge.
- Cadierno, Teresa & Lucas Ruiz. 2006. Motion events in Spanish L2 acquisition. *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 4(1). 183–216.
- Clyne, Michael. 2000. Lingua franca and ethnolects in Europe and beyond. *Sociolinguistica* 14. 83–89.
- Daller, Michael H., Jeanine Treffers-Daller & Reyhan Furman. 2011. Transfer of conceptualization patterns in bilinguals: The construal of motion events in Turkish and German. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 14(1). 95–119.
- Dirim, İnci & Peter Auer. 2004. *Türkisch sprechen nicht nur die Türken. Über die Unschärfe- beziehung zwischen Sprache und Ethnie in Deutschland*. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter.
- Freywald, Ulrike, Katharina Mayr, Tiner Özçelik & Heike Wiese. 2011. Kiezdeutsch as a multiethnolect. In Friederike Kern & Margret Selting (eds.), *Ethnic Styles of Speaking in European Metropolitan Areas*, 45–73. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Goschler, Juliana. 2009. Typologische und konstruktionselle Einflüsse bei der Kodierung von Bewegungsereignissen in der Zweitsprache. In Said Sahel & Ralf Vogel (eds.), *Proceedings of the 10. Norddeutsches Linguistisches Kolloquium*. Bielefeld: eCollections.
- Goschler, Juliana. 2010. Kausalbeziehungen in den Erzählungen türkisch-deutscher bilingualer Sprecher. In Ulrich Mehlem & Said Sahel (eds.), *Erwerb schriftsprachlicher Kompetenzen im DaZ-Kontext: Diagnose und Förderung*, 163–183. Freiburg: Fillibach.
- Goschler, Juliana. 2011. Geräuschverben mit direktonaler Erweiterung: Syntax, Semantik und Gebrauch. In Alexander Lasch & Alexander Ziem (eds.), *Konstruktionsgrammatik III: Von der Theorie zur Anwendung*, 27–42. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Hohenstein, Jill M., Ann Eisenberg & Letitia Naigles. 2006. Is he floating across or crossing afloat? Crosslinguistic influence of L1 and L2 in Spanish-English bilingual adults. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 9. 249–261.
- Iacobini, Claudio & Francesca Masini. 2006. The emergence of verb-particle constructions in Italian: locative and actional meanings. *Morphology* 16. 155–188.
- Kallmeyer, Werner & Inken Keim. 2003. Linguistic variation and the construction of social identity in a German-Turkish setting. In Jannis Androutsopoulos (ed.), *Discourse Constructions of Youth Identities*, 29–46. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Keim, Inken & Jannis Androutsopoulos. 2000. *Hey Lan, isch geb dir konkret Handy. Deutsch-türkische Mischsprache und Deutsch mit ausländischem Akzent: Wie Sprechweisen der Straße durch die Medien populär werden*. Mannheim: IDS.

- Kern, Friederike & Margret Selting. 2006. Einheitenkonstruktion im Türkendeutschen: Grammatische und prosodische Aspekte. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 25. 239–272.
- Kopecka, Anetta. 2009. Continuity and change in the representation of motion events in French. In Jiansheng Guo, Elena Lieven, Nancy Budwig, Susan Ervin-Tripp, Kei Nakamura & Seyda Özçaliskan (eds.), *Crosslinguistic Approaches to the Psychology of Language: Research in the Tradition of Dan Isaac Slobin*, 415–426. New York & London: Psychology Press.
- Kopecka, Anetta. in press. From a satellite- to a verb-framed pattern: A typological shift in French. In Hubert Cuyckens, Willem de Moulder & Tanja Mortelmans (eds.), *Variation and Change in Adpositions of Movement*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Ochsenbauer, Anne-Katharina & Helen Engemann. 2011. The impact of typological factors in monolingual and bilingual first language acquisition: Caused motion expressions in English and French. In Dominique Bassano & Maya Hickmann (eds.), *Grammaticalization and First Language Acquisition – Crosslinguistic Perspectives / Grammaticalisation et acquisition des langues premières – perspectives interlangues*, Special issue of *Language, Interaction and Acquisition* 2(1), 101–128. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Özcalışkan, Şeyda & Dan I. Slobin. 2000. Expression of manner of movement in monolingual and bilingual adult narratives: Turkish vs. English. In Asli Göksel & Celia Kerlake (eds.), *Studies in Turkish and Turkic Languages*, 253–262. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Quist, Pia. 2008. Sociolinguistic approaches to multiethnolect: Language variety and stylistic practice. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 12. 43–61.
- Reshöft, Nina. 2010. Das Erlernen von Lexikalisierungsmustern in der Fremdsprache Englisch. In Esther Ruigendijk, Thomas Stolz & Jürgen Trabant (eds.), *Linguistik im Nordwesten (Diversitas Linguarum)*, 1–16. Bochum: Brockmeyer.
- Schmiedtová, Barbara, Christiane von Stutterheim & Mary Carroll. 2011. Language-specific Patterns in Event Construal of Advanced Second Language Speakers. In Aneta Pavlenko (ed.), *Thinking and Speaking in Two Languages*, 66–107. Bristol et al: Multilingual Matters.
- Schroeder, Christoph. 2007. Sprache und Integration. *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte* 22–23. 6–12.
- Schroeder, Christoph. 2009. *gehen, laufen, torkeln*: Eine typologisch gegründete Hypothese für den Schriftspracherwerb in der Zweitsprache Deutsch mit Erstsprache Türkisch. In Karen Schramm & Christoph Schroeder (eds.), *Empirische Zugänge zu Sprachförderung und Spracherwerb in Deutsch als Zweitsprache*, 185–201. Münster & New York: Waxmann.
- Schroeder, Christoph. 2012. Ereignisinterne Adjunkte in einem typologisch orientierten Sprachvergleich Deutsch-Türkisch. In Lutz Gunkel & Gisela Zifonun (eds.), *Deutsch im Sprachvergleich. Grammatische Kontraste und Konvergenzen* (Jahrbuch des Instituts für deutsche Sprache 2011), 239–272. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Slobin, Dan I. 2004. The many ways to search for a frog. Linguistic typology and the expression of motion events. In Sven Strömquist & Ludo Verhoeven (eds.), *Relating Events in Narrative: Typological and Contextual Perspectives*, 219–257. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Stefanowitsch, Anatol. 2013. English PATH verbs and constructions in a diachronic perspective. In Juliana Goschler & Anatol Stefanowitsch (eds.), *Motion Events: Variation and Change*, 223–244. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Stefanowitsch, Anatol & Stefan Th. Gries. 2008. Channel and constructional meaning: A collostructional case study. In Gitte Kristiansen & René Dirven (eds.), *Cognitive Sociolinguistics: Language Variation, Cultural Models, Social Systems*, 129–152. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Talmy, Leonard. 1985. Lexicalization patterns: semantic structure in lexical forms. In Timothy Shopen (ed), *Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon. Volume III of Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, 57–149. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Talmy, Leonard. 1991. Path to realization: A typology of event conflation. *Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 17. 480–519.
- von Eye, Alexander. 1990. *Introduction to Configural Frequency Analysis: The Search for Types and Antitypes in Cross-Classifications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- von Eye, Alexander. 2002. *Configural Frequency Analysis: Methods, Models, and Applications*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Wiese, Heike. 2006. “Ich mach dich Messer”: Grammaticale Produktivität in Kiez-Sprache. *Linguistische Berichte* 207. 245–273.
- Wiese, Heike. 2009. Grammatical innovation in multiethnic urban Europe: new linguistic practices among adolescents. *Lingua* 119. 782–806.
- Wiese, Heike, Ulrike Freywald, Sören Schalowski & Katharina Mayr. 2008–. Kiezdeutsch Korpus. A corpus of spontaneous speech in multiethnic neighbourhoods, based on self-recordings of adolescents from Berlin-Kreuzberg (main corpus), complemented by a corresponding sample of adolescents’ self-recordings from a monoethnic neighbourhood with comparable socio-economic indicators (complementary corpus).
- Wiese, Heike. 2012. *Kiezdeutsch. Ein neuer Dialekt entsteht*. München: C.H. Beck Verlag.
- Woerfel, Till. 2011. *Wie sich Menschen bewegen. Sprache und Raum zwischen Grammatik und Kognition – Eine typologische Hypothese am Beispiel der multiethnolektalen Kontaktvarietät Kiezdeutsch*. Postdam: Universität Potsdam MA thesis (Magisterarbeit).
- Zubizarreta, Maria Luisa. 2007. A compositional analysis of manner-of-motion verbs in Italian. In José Camacho, Nydia Flores-Ferrán, Liliana Sánchez, Viviane Déprez & Maria José Cabrera (eds.), *Romance Linguistics 2006*, 319–335. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Zubizarreta, Maria Luisa & Eunjeong Oh. 2007. *On the Syntactic Composition of Manner and Motion*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.