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What’s constructional tolerance?
John sneezed
John all over his laptop
John a mighty sneeze
John his cat soaking wet
John the napkin off the table
Is constructional tolerance similar across different languages?
Bob yelled himself hoarse.

He blinked the sweat out of his eyes.

Snake legs it to freedom

There was cat all over the road.

Verbing weirds language.

etc, etc
French appears to be less ‘constructional’
*Jean éternua la serviette de la table.

(1) Paint sprayed into the air.
   FR: De la peinture *gicla* dans l’air.
(2) He sprayed paint on the wall.
   FR: Il *projeta* de la peinture sur le mur.
(3) He sprayed the wall with paint.
   FR: Il *aspergea* le mur de peinture.
How can you test for differences in constructional tolerance?
“Die Helfer wühlen sich durch den Schutt”
“Die Ratte nagt sich in die Speisekammer”
“Die Pflanze wächst sich ins Fenster”
Experiment design
four construction types

• ditransitive
  – Der Vater schenkt ihm eine Bohrmaschine.
  – Der Professor denkt uns eine Erklärung.

• caused motion
  – Die Retter brachten den Mann in eine Klinik.
  – Das Kind trinkt den Saft in den Bauch.

• the conative construction
  – Der Spieler tritt nach dem Ball.
  – Der Gärtner gießt nach der Pflanze.

• the ‘reflexive way’ construction
  – Die Helfer wühlen sich durch den Schutt.
  – Die Pflanze wächst sich ins Fenster.
three groups

• 44 Germans (control group)
  – 20 F, 20 M
  – mean age = ~22
  – mean vocabulary score = 239.2

• 35 native speakers of English
  – 20 F, 20 M
  – mean age = ~22
  – mean vocabulary score = 239.2

• 30 native speakers of French
  – 20 F, 10 M
  – mean age = ~21.5
  – mean vocabulary score = 320.5
the task

• Where on the color bar does this sentence belong?

• “Die Ratte nagt sich in die Speisekammer.”
ratings across four constructions

- german.refway
- french.refway
- english.refway
- german.ditransitive
- french.ditransitive
- english.ditransitive
- german.conative
- french.conative
- english.conative
- german.causedmotion
- french.causedmotion
- english.causedmotion
lmer( rating ~ language*construction + (1|stimulus) + (1|subject) )

ratings across four constructions

- german.refway
- french.refway
- english.refway
- german.ditransitive
- french.ditransitive
- english.ditransitive
- german.conative
- french.conative
- english.conative
- german.causedmotion
- french.causedmotion
- english.causedmotion

very good ---- good ---- neutral ---- bad ---- very bad
very good ---- good ---- neutral ---- bad ---- very bad
lmer( rating ~ (language + construction + vocscore)^2 + (1|stimulus) + (1|subject) )

- **conative**
  - proficiency as measured by vocabulary score

- **reflexive way**
  - proficiency as measured by vocabulary score

- **ditransitive**
  - proficiency as measured by vocabulary score

- **caused motion**
  - proficiency as measured by vocabulary score
Summing up our results
L2 learners are conservative
constructional tolerance

- a constructionally prolific L1 does not lead to constructional tolerance in general
- different groups are tolerant towards different constructions
  - French speakers accept creative ditransititives
  - English speakers accept creative reflexives
the role of proficiency

• L2 learners do not become more tolerant with increased proficiency
• tendency towards conservatism
  – reflexive way construction
  – caused-motion construction
• steady state
  – conative construction
  – ditransitive construction
Constructions across Grammars

• part of L2 learning:
  – establishing correspondences between constructions in L1 and L2

• a beginner’s strategy? an expert’s strategy?
  – increased proficiency ≠ increased tolerance

• the role of individual constructions:
  – L2 is acquired against the backdrop of individual L1 constructions, not large-scale characteristics of the L1
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