

Do processing resource limitations shape heritage language grammars?

Claudia Felser

University of Potsdam, Germany

Commentary

Cite this article: Felser C (2020). Do processing resource limitations shape heritage language grammars? *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 23, 23–24. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728919000397>

Received: 27 May 2019

Revised: 4 June 2019

Accepted: 9 June 2019

First published online: 3 July 2019

Address for correspondence: Claudia Felser,
E-mail: felser@uni-potsdam.de

Understanding the mechanisms that contribute to shaping heritage language grammars is crucial for developing a model that is well grounded both empirically and theoretically, and from which testable predictions can be derived. Polinsky and Scontras (Polinsky & Scontras, 2019) deserve praise for moving the field closer to developing such a model by identifying two possible triggers for heritage language grammars' divergence from their baseline varieties: reduced input and economy of online resources. In this brief commentary I will focus on the latter of these.

The hypothesis that grammars are shaped by processing economy constraints or computational resource limitations is increasingly gaining support (e.g., Christiansen & Chater, 2008; Gibson, Futrell, Piantadosi, Dautriche, Mahowald, Bergen & Levy, 2019; Hawkins, 2004; Fedzechkina, Chu & Jaeger, 2018). Extending this hypothesis to heritage language grammars, Polinsky and Scontras discuss how online resource limitations might be partly responsible for three typical features of heritage language grammars: the avoidance of ambiguity, resistance to irregularity, and structural reduction. Although considering how computational resource limitations might shape heritage language speakers' competence grammars is undoubtedly intriguing, empirical evidence from processing studies that supports the assumptions underlying the authors' hypothesis is currently lacking.

First, there is at present little evidence for the authors' assumption that producing or comprehending a heritage language is computationally more costly than processing a non-heritage native language. Although heritage language speakers may be less fluent readers than monolingual speakers due to reduced exposure to written heritage language input, limited literacy instruction or a smaller vocabulary, even speakers with intermediate heritage language proficiency do not necessarily show a general slow-down in reading-based experiments, or otherwise divergent processing patterns (e.g., Jegerski, 2018). We need more evidence from real-time processing studies to see whether the above assumption does indeed hold true. Individual differences in cognitive capacities (such as working memory) might be expected to affect heritage language speakers' performance such that high-capacity heritage language speakers should be less likely to show evidence of an economy-driven reduction in grammatical variability compared to low-capacity speakers.

Neither do we know whether heritage language speakers process their dominant language more efficiently than their non-dominant heritage language. To find out whether this is the case, heritage language speakers would need to be tested in parallel processing tasks in both of their languages. As Polinsky and Scontras point out in their article, doing so would also allow researchers to test whether divergent performance in a heritage language results from transfer from the dominant language. Using online processing measures can furthermore help reveal divergence that is undetectable in offline tasks, as has previously been demonstrated in second language processing research (e.g., Boxell & Felser, 2017; Felser & Cunnings, 2012).


There is likewise no evidence that maintaining two grammars in parallel should create a particular challenge for heritage language speakers. Across the globe, bilingualism or multilingualism is extremely common, and there is no reason to think that maintaining two or more grammars threatens to exhaust an individuals' representational capacities or processing resources. Even if it did, it is not transparent why heritage language speakers should resort to restructuring their native language grammar so as to free up processing resources; rather than to restructuring the dominant language grammar to the same end, or indeed restructuring both grammars. Again, testing heritage language speakers in both of their languages can be useful as it might reveal not only parallel acquisition or maintenance (Kupisch, Belikova, Özçelik, Stangen & White, 2017) but also parallel restructuring effects (Felser & Arslan, 2019).

Finally, considering the reduction of ambiguity in heritage language grammars, it is not obvious why online resource limitations should lead to a grammatical system that avoids ambiguity. Ambiguity has been argued to aid processing efficiency by allowing speakers to re-use the same linguistic forms for different communicative purposes (Piantadosi, Tily & Gibson, 2012). Research on real-time language comprehension has shown that comprehenders usually disambiguate ambiguous input within a matter of milliseconds and without any measurable effort or conscious deliberation. There is often a clear preference for one of the available form-to-interpretation mappings, and this preference may be subject to cross-linguistic variation. Results from processing studies show that heritage-language-specific ambiguity resolution

© The Author(s) 2019. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

preferences can be maintained even if the dominant language shows different resolution biases (Jegerski, 2018, Knospe, 2019). Dispreferred mappings – such as inverse scope readings – may indeed be more difficult to compute than preferred mappings, but they will also be less frequently attested in heritage language learners' input and so may be more likely to be lost.

To conclude, Polinsky and Scontras's hypothesis about heritage language grammars being partly shaped by online resource limitations should encourage more researchers to include real-time processing measures in their repertoire of test instruments. One challenge for future research will be to tease apart the roles of processing economy constraints and linguistic experience in triggering the restructuring of heritage language grammars.

Author ORCID.  Claudia Felser, 0000-0001-9424-0950.

References

- Boxell O and Felser C** (2017) Sensitivity to parasitic gaps inside subject islands in native and non-native sentence processing. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* **20**, 494–511.
- Christiansen MH and Chater N** (2008) Language as shaped by the brain. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* **31**, 489–558.
- Fedzechkina M, Chu B and Jaeger TF** (2018) Human information processing shapes language change. *Psychological Science* **29**, 72–82.
- Felser C and Arslan S** (2019) Inappropriate choice of definites in Turkish heritage speakers of German. *Heritage Language Journal* **16**, 22–43.
- Felser C and Cunnings I** (2012) Processing reflexives in English as a second language: The role of structural and discourse-level constraints. *Applied Psycholinguistics* **33**, 571–603.
- Gibson E, Futrell R, Piantadosi S, Dautriche I, Mahowald K, Bergen L and Levy RP** (2019) How efficiency shapes human language. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* **23**, 389–407.
- Hawkins JA** (2004) *Efficiency and complexity in grammars*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jegerski J** (2018) Sentence processing in Spanish as a heritage language: Relative clause attachment in early bilinguals. *Language Learning* **68**, 598–634.
- Knospe G-M** (2019) *Processing of pronouns and reflexives in Turkish-German bilinguals*. PhD thesis, University of Potsdam.
- Kupisch T, Belikova A, Özçelik Ö, Stangen I and White L** (2017) On complete acquisition in heritage speakers: The definiteness effect in German-Turkish bilinguals. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism* **7**, 1–32.
- Piantadosi ST, Tily H and Gibson E** (2012) The communicative function of ambiguity in language. *Cognition* **122**, 280–291.
- Polinsky M and Scontras G** (2019) Understanding heritage languages. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728919000245>