

©2016

Joseph Agbenyegah

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

THE ACQUISITION OF L2 PRONOMINAL REFERENCE BY EWE SPEAKERS OF
L2 SPANISH

By

JOSEPH AGBENYEGAH

A dissertation submitted to the
Graduate School-New Brunswick
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Graduate Program in Spanish

Written under the direction of Professor José Camacho

And approved by

New Brunswick, New Jersey

October 2016

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

THE ACQUISITION OF L2 PRONOMINAL REFERENCE BY EWE SPEAKERS OF

L2 SPANISH

JOSEPH AGBENYEGAH

Dissertation Director:

Professor José Camacho

This dissertation investigates a multi-faceted approach to the acquisition of the null and overt subjects as well as the generic interpretation of third person plural morpheme on predicates as a result of the crosslinguistic influence of the Ewe logophoric pronoun by native speakers. A logophoric pronoun refers back to the subject of a verb of saying. It tests the validity of the Interface Hypothesis (Sorace, 2006), which proposes that connections between central and peripheral linguistic modules (**syntax, semantics, phonology, morphology, pragmatics etc.**) are the locus of residual optionality. Residual optionality refers to the alternation between target-like and non-target-like behaviors in terms of production.

91 participants from the University of Ghana and a control group from Rutgers University were selected and administered tests spanning the categories under investigation. Results showed that Ewe speaking L2 learners of Spanish were able to interpret the logophoric pronoun (subject of the immediate clause) as co-reference with the null subject in embedded clauses with short distance and in constructions involving the Overt Pronoun Constraint. However, they could not express genericity in Spanish nor were

they able to interpret the use of the logophoric pronoun as co-referent with the clausal subject constructions due the different structural differences between Ewe and Spanish.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

My most profound gratitude goes to my advisor, professor José Camacho for his valuable and indefatigable guidance and feedback during this process. I would also like to thank the other members of my dissertation committee: professor Liliana Sanchez and professor Jennifer Austin for always making themselves available to speak with me whenever I needed clarifications on comments about the various phases of the dissertation. My heartfelt thanks go out to professor Tomas Stephen who supported me tremendously when I had to go to Ghana to collect data for my dissertation at the University of Ghana. Without their support, my first pilot study would not have taken place. To the students of the University of Ghana who willingly participated in my pilot study I say thank you. You were ready to respond to my invitation to meet with me on campus especially during vacations.

I would also like to express my gratitude to Professor Nuria Sagarra from the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at Rutgers University. She was always ready to help me with my statistical inquiries and provided valuable feedback for interpreting and furthering this research. I appreciate the efforts of all the Spanish native speakers who availed themselves when I needed them for this research. They also deserve my thanks for offering first-hand grammatical judgments for this research.

To my friends and colleague teaching assistants, I say thank you. You were always there listening to me, always making me smile and guiding me when things became tougher. I would never forget the tremendous assistance that Anukware Selase Adzima and Joel Feinberg rendered to ensure that the dissertation conforms to the standard required by Rutgers University. They made valuable comments and suggestions which helped a long

way to fine tune the content and the scope of the dissertation. Finally, I want to thank my family. Above all, I want to thank my wife Mrs. Evelyn Agbenyegah for her valuable and persistent prayers from far away Ghana. I will always cherish her support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION | ii |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENT | iv |
| LIST OF TABLES | ix |
| CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1. Aim/Scope of the Dissertation | 1 |
| 1.2. Rationale for the Dissertation | 3 |
| 1.3. Organization of the Dissertation | 4 |
| CHAPTER 2: THE SYNTAX OF EWE-LIKE (OVERT SUBJECT) AND SPANISH-LIKE (NULL SUBJECT) LANGUAGES | 5 |
| 2.1. The Pronominal Agreement Hypothesis and the Plural Morpheme | 7 |
| 2.2. The Null/Overt Pronoun Contrast | 10 |
| 2.3. Plural Morphology and Genericity | 15 |
| 2.4. Issues of Syntactic and Morphological Genericity: Implications for L2 Acquisition | 16 |
| CHAPTER 3: THE LOGOPHORIC SYSTEM IN EWE: PRONOMINAL REFERENCE MECHANISMS IN EWE | 20 |
| 3.1. Logophorics in Embedded Clauses - Short Distance Reference | 23 |
| 3.2. Logophorics and Long Distance Co-Reference | 24 |
| 3.3. Logophorics in Adjunct/Purpose Clauses | 26 |
| 3.4. Logophoric Interpretation: Genericity in Ewe | 27 |
| 3.5. Logophorics and Clausal Subjects | 31 |
| CHAPTER 4: LITERATURE REVIEW | 34 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 4.1. Issues on the Interface Hypothesis | 34 |
| 4.2. Previous Works on L2 Acquisition of Null Subjects | 36 |
| 4.3. Null Subjects at Syntax/Pragmatics Interface | 39 |
| CHAPTER 5: ACQUISITION OF NULL SUBJECTS BY EWE SPEAKERS | 43 |
| 5.1. Implications for L2 Acquisition | 43 |
| 5. 2. Hypotheses and Research Questions | 44 |
| CHAPTER 6: DATA COLLECTION, STATISTICAL ANALYSES, AND | |
| PARTICIPANTS | 46 |
| 6.1. Participants | 46 |
| 6.2. Materials and Experiments | 47 |
| 6.2.1. Experimental Tasks | 48 |
| 6.2.1.1. GJT 1 Subject Antecedenthood | 48 |
| 6.2.1.2. GJT 2 Sentential Subject Constructions | 49 |
| 6.2.1.3. GJT 3 Overt Pronoun Constraint effect | 50 |
| 6.2.2. Procedure | 51 |
| CHAPTER 7: RESULTS | 52 |
| 7.1. Results for GJT1 (Subject Antecedenthood)..... | 52 |
| 7.1.1. Short Distance Antecedents..... | 52 |
| 7.1.2. Long Distance Antecedents | 55 |
| 7.1.2.1. Null Subjects | 55 |
| 7.1.2.2. Overt Subjects | 56 |
| 7.1.3. Plurals | 57 |
| 7.1.3.1. Null Pronouns | 58 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| 7.1.3.1. Overt Subjects | 59 |
| 7.2. GJT2 Results for Sentential Subjects | 60 |
| 7.2.2. Overt Subjects..... | 61 |
| 7.3. GJT3 Results for Overt Pronoun Constraint | 63 |
| 7.3.1. Null Subjects..... | 63 |
| 7.3.2. Overt Subjects..... | 64 |
| CHAPTER 8: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS | 66 |
| CHAPTER 9: OTHER PERSPECTIVES ON THE INTERFACE HYPOTHESIS..... | 75 |
| REFERENCES | 80 |
| APPENDICES | 89 |
| Appendix A: Use of the Logophoric Pronoun in Immediate Clauses, and Morphological Genericity Constructions | 89 |
| Appendix B: Transfer of the Logophoric Pronoun in Clausal Subject Constructions .. | 96 |
| Appendix C: Transfer of the Logophoric Pronoun in Overt Pronoun Constructions . | 103 |
| Appendix C: Transfer of the Logophoric Pronoun in Overt Pronoun Constructions . | 110 |
| Appendix D: Participant Profile | 118 |
| Appendix E Biographical Questionnaire..... | 118 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1. Logophoric and Non-logophoric Pronouns in Ewe | 20 |
| Table 2: Summary of the Different Conditions | 50 |
| Table 3: Descriptive statistics: Antecedent of Null and Overt Subjects in the Immediate Clause (Logophoric Constructions) | 53 |
| Table 4: Descriptive Statistics: Antecedent of Null Subjects in the Immediate Clause ... | 53 |
| Table 5: Descriptive Statistics: Antecedent of Overt Subjects in the Immediate Clause . | 54 |
| Table 6: Descriptive Statistics: Subject Antecedent in a Long Distance Clause - Null and Overt Subject Pronouns | 55 |
| Table 7: Descriptive Statistics: Subject Antecedent in a Long Distance Clause - Null Subjects | 56 |
| Table 8: Descriptive Statistics: Subject Antecedent in a Long Distance Clause - Overt Subject Pronouns | 57 |
| Table 9: Descriptive Statistics: Morphological Genericity - Null and Overt Subject Pronouns | 58 |
| Table 10: Descriptive Statistics: - Morphological Genericity - Null Subject Pronouns... | 59 |
| Table 11: Descriptive Statistics: Morphological Genericity - Overt Subject Pronouns ... | 59 |
| Table 12: Clausal Subjects: Null and Overt Subject Pronouns | 60 |
| Table 13: Clausal Subjects: Null Subject Pronouns | 61 |
| Table 14. Descriptive Statistics: Clausal Subjects- Overt Subject Pronouns | 62 |
| Table 15 Descriptive Statistics: Overt Pronoun Constraint- Null and Overt Subject Pronouns | 63 |
| Table 16 Descriptive Statistics: Overt Pronoun Constraint - Null Subject Pronoun | 64 |

Table 17 Descriptive Statistics: Overt Pronoun Constraint - Overt Subject Pronouns..... 64

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The question of how L1 grammar transfers to subsequent languages and what specific domains lend themselves to easy acquisition sits at the core of linguistic research within the field of second language acquisition (SLA). Language transfer (also known as L1 interference, linguistic interference, and crosslinguistic influence) refers to speakers or writers applying knowledge from one language to another language. It is the transfer of linguistic features between languages in the speech repertoire of a bilingual or multilingual individual, whether from first to second, second to first or many other relationships. It can occur in any situation when someone does not have a native-level command of a language. SLA theories couched in terms of transfer have run along two main extremes: at one extreme, L2 acquisition is claimed to suffer global impairment due to the limited nature of interlanguages (e.g., Bley-Vroman, Clahsen, & Muysken, 1989). At the other extreme, full access to L2 grammar is claimed to be possible under the constraints of Universal Grammar (UG). Assuming that Universal Grammar is available to L2 learners, L2 acquisition should be parallel to L1 acquisition.

For some researchers, all the features available in L1 can be a basis, be it overt or covert, for the acquisition of L2 (e.g. Duffield & White, 1999; Schwartz & Sprouse, 1996; White, 1989 & 2003; Slabakova, 2006).

1.1. Aim/Scope of the Dissertation

The motivation for this dissertation stems from my many years of teaching experience involving students of my mother tongue (Ewe) who have arduous difficulties differentiating certain linguistic phenomena in their first language (L1) from apparently similar and ambiguous features from their second language, especially in Spanish. This led

me to focus on the acquisition of a number of syntactic and morphological features in Spanish by Ewe-speakers within Generative linguistics. It is the aim of this dissertation to shed light on interfaces in L2 speakers end state grammar, a view advanced by Sorace and Filiaci (2006) known as the Interface Hypothesis. Specifically, it will address the Syntax-pragmatic-Interface Hypothesis (SPH) and the Syntax-Morphology-Interface Hypothesis (SMH) in order to assess their applicability in the transfer of Ewe logophoric pronouns to Spanish referential dependency contexts. Logophoric pronouns refer to those referential expressions that occur in indirect discourse environments and exclusively refer to the agent of a reported speech/thought (Clements, 1974, see ch. 3). The SPH interface refers to the interactions between syntactic structures and their resultant pragmatic interpretations also known as an external interface. The SMH interface is a theory of how syntax interacts with the morphological component and focuses on the interrelation between the derivation of words and derivation of syntactic structures. This is thought to be an internal interface, namely an interface between two core language modules Sorace and Filiaci (2006). From a theoretical point of view, the dissertation addresses the SPH and the SMH hypotheses in order to test the claim that transfer occurs easily at the grammar internal interface, i.e., at the interface between syntax and semantics or syntax and morphology, regardless of language pairing and of the linguistic phenomenon under investigation.

My views are that even though the syntax-pragmatics interface is an external interface, L2 acquisition processes involving this interface could not always predictably be considered as problematic as they are held to be by Sorace and Filiaci (2006). More specifically, I will explore to what extent L2 acquisition is possible at any given interface given that Ewe logophoric pronouns exhibit properties which are different from the

Spanish referential expressions. In sum, the aim of this dissertation is to add to our knowledge of Spanish referential expressions within the context of the Ewe logophoric pronoun, the SPH and SMH by examining to what extent the logophoric pronoun crosslinguistically influences the selection of Spanish referential constructions by Ewe speakers.

1.2. Rationale for the Dissertation

This dissertation contributes to the literature on interfaces in L2 grammars in several ways. First, logophoric pronouns constitute a domain to test the interface hypothesis since L2 acquisition is known to draw heavily on a previous language especially in the domain of the syntax of the first language (cf. Dulay, Burt, & Krashen, 1982). It is against this background that we expect that the Ewe logophoric pronoun should play crucial roles in the acquisition of Spanish L2 referential expressions. That is, since the dissertation involves an internal interface (e.g., syntax and morphology) and an external interface (syntax and pragmatics) we expect different acquisition patterns in the native speakers and L2 learners.

Second, since Ewe is a non-null subject language, the dissertation attempts to investigate the role of the overt logophoric pronoun in the acquisition of both the null and the overt subjects in Spanish. Finally, this dissertation will provide information for future researchers who wish to study the Interface hypothesis within linguistic modules yet to be researched with the aim of adopting more pragmatic approaches to the pedagogical grammar of Second Language Acquisition (SLA).

1.3. Organization of the Dissertation

This dissertation is divided into nine chapters and an appendix section. Chapter 2 will look at the parametric differences of Ewe-like and Spanish-like languages with respect to the Pronominal Agreement hypothesis. It will also examine the overt/null subject contrast in Spanish. Plural morphology and genericity will also be looked at. The third chapter will describe in detail the logophoric pronouns in various contexts. Chapter 4 will be dedicated to a detailed review of the literature including research done on the Interface Hypothesis within Universal Grammar (UG), licensing and processing null subjects and verbal morphology and null subjects at syntax-pragmatics interface.

Chapter 5 is dedicated to the discussion of the logophoric pronouns as clitics, the acquisition of the null subjects by Ewe speakers and its implications for L2 acquisition. In chapter 6, we look at the profile of the participants and the methodology used for data collection. While chapter 7 talks about the test results, chapter 8 is dedicated to a statistical discussion of the results and their implications for linguistic theory. Chapter 9 concludes the dissertation and proposes an alternative perspective on the Interface hypothesis.

CHAPTER 2: THE SYNTAX OF EWE-LIKE (OVERT SUBJECT) AND SPANISH-LIKE (NULL SUBJECT) LANGUAGES

The null subject parameter distinguishes between Spanish-like and Ewe-like languages: the first type allows for null subjects in finite clauses, the second type requires overt subjects in those contexts (e.g., Chomsky, 1981; Hyams, 1986; Jaeggli & Safir, 1989; Rizzi, 1982 & 1986; Alexiadou & Agnostopoulou, 1998, among many others), as seen in (1): Ewe lacks inflectional forms and null subjects.

(1a) Kofi dzo

Kofi leave PAST

Kofi left

(1b) E-dzo

3rd Person Sing leave PAST

He left

(1c) *dzo

He left

(1d) Mie-dzo

1st Pers Plural leave PAST

We left

In (1a) *kofi* is the subject of the sentence and this is obligatory. The subject can be an overt pronoun as in (1b) but not *pro* as in (1c). In (1d) the plural pronoun does not bring about any corresponding verbal inflection.

Spanish, on the other hand, allows for null subjects and has overt morphology, as seen in (2):

(2a) Kofi salió

Kofi left.3ps

(2b) Salió

Left.3ps.

This difference has been related to the concept of Extended Projection Principle (EPP) which is the structural requirement that clauses must have subjects. Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998) posit that the EPP requirement is fulfilled by verbal Inflection in languages like Greek or Spanish but not in English-type languages, where the EPP must be satisfied by an overt pronominal or subject.

One formal explanation for the contrast suggests that Spanish and English differ in terms of D(efiniteness) feature in T, according to Roberts (2004 & 2007). The D feature on T in Spanish allows the rich verbal morphology to licence *pro* unlike in English which lacks a D feature on T so it uses an overt pronominal subject (Roberts, 2004 & 2007; Holmberg, 2005). The scenario is completely different in Ewe which lacks verbal agreement and has obligatorily overt subjects. Contrary to the observation that only phase heads (i.e., C and v) have phi-features Chomsky (2005), the Ewe C does not transmit its unvalued phi-features to T which is always neutral as seen in (24) and (25) where T does not agree with the subject. I propose that the bare verbal category which occurs with T is not specified for inflection, person or number in Ewe, even though the nominal category in the Spec of vP has *phi* features that are specified for person and number.

Unlike English and Spanish, Ewe has logophoric pronouns that obligatorily corefer with the subject of the matrix clause (under certain verbs, see below). Regardless of these surface differences in both languages, native speakers of Ewe canonically choose the

subject of the main clause as the antecedent of the logophor much in the same way as do native Spanish speakers for the null pronoun. I will illustrate this in chapter 3.

2.1. The Pronominal Agreement Hypothesis and the Plural Morpheme

The Pronominal Agreement Hypothesis was proposed by Hale (1983), Jelinek (1984), and Borer (1986) to explain the role of verbal morphology in licensing the EPP. According to them, verbal morphology can be assigned Theta roles. These ideas are summarized in (1) as follows:

(1a) Pronominal Agreement Hypothesis. AGR/INFL verbal morphology may license the
EPP

(1b) Morphological affixes can receive theta roles.

The first principle (1a) prioritizes the role of morphological affixes in determining the subject of a sentence. This means that morphological affixes override the role of nominal subjects since the morphological affixes assume Theta roles in order to satisfy the EPP.

Since inflection carries referential properties, there is no need for *pro* and so the plural morpheme should carry not only plural referential properties but also generic interpretation.

The examples in (2a-c) confirm that the theta role is assigned to the morphology, not to the overt subject. Thus, in (2a) the subject includes the speaker among the set of students, whereas in (2b) it includes the addressees, but not the speaker. Example (2c) necessarily excludes the speaker, but it can be interpreted either as an equivalent of the 2nd person plural (in which case it includes the addressees), or as a true 2nd person plural, and in this interpretation it will also exclude the addressees. In a nutshell, when you have an

overt DP and inflection, the referential properties of each do not necessarily match the other.

(2a) Los estudiantes tene-mos mala memoria. (Spanish)

The students have-1.P L poor memory

‘We students have bad memory.’

(2b) Los estudiantes ten-eis mala memoria.

The students have-2.P L bad memory

‘The students have bad memory.’

(2c) Los estudiantes tien-en mala memoria.

The students have-3.P L bad memory

‘The students have bad memory.’

(2d) Kofi dice que los estudiantes tien-en mala memoria.

Kofi says that the students have-3.P L bad memory

‘Kofi says the students /students have bad memory.’

(2e) Tienen mala memoria

The scenario becomes a bit different in (2d) where a single NP occurs at the sentence initial position. In (2d) Kofi can be a part of the group of students having a bad memory. Again in (2d), the morphological affix **-n** can be assigned a Theta role with or without referring to the singular NP in the matrix clause. Verbal inflection has the upper hand in terms of referential properties in constructions where regardless of the plural DP as the subject of the 1st, 2nd or 3rd person verb, the subject’s reference is interpreted depending on the values of inflection as exemplified by Jelinek (1984) and Ordóñez and Treviño (1999). In

(2e), the non-anaphoric third person pronoun encode an arbitrary interpretation so it does not specifically refer to anyone.

This situation however does not exist in Ewe, which has poor verbal morphology. In this language the pronominal inflection determines the referent of the predicate which is invariable in all cases as seen in (3).

(3) *Mie deviawo mie dzo*

I(1.PL) children-Det I(1.PL) go

‘We children have gone’

In example (3) above the resumptive strong pronoun *mie* is what is used as the reference point and not the predicate.

This dissertation intends to address the issue of arbitrary *pro* in the third person plural of Spanish verbs in light of the syntax/morphology interface.¹ The aim is to examine how Ewe speakers transfer the overt logophoric pronoun to Spanish constructions involving the non-anaphoric third person plural null category *pro*. In Spanish a bound morpheme on the root of verbs is essential in shaping their morphology and their consequent pragmatic interpretations. These morphemes are realized either as *-an* on verbs normally ending with *-ar* or as *-en* on verbs ending with *-er* or *-ir*. To the best of my knowledge no previous work has been done on the use of the non-anaphoric third person *pro* within the context of the syntax/pragmatic/morphology interface. Again, in subordinate contexts, the third person non-anaphoric plural morpheme is non-referential and provides an arbitrary interpretation but the overt pronoun is referential.

¹ Although I assume that the argumental properties of the subject are expressed by morphology, for the sake of presentation, I will continue to talk about *pro*.

2.2. The Null/Overt Pronoun Contrast

The null/overt pronoun contrast in Spanish poses a huge dilemma to second language learners owing to the fact that Spanish has a rich verbal inflection that receives a thematic role. So to talk about an overt pronominal subject in Spanish might induce one to think of a reduplication of the subject. However, influential research has established clear differences between the distribution of the null and the overt pronominal subjects in Spanish (see Camacho, 2006, 2010, 2011, & 2014; Montalbetti, 1984; Larson & Luján, 1989). We shall discuss the features of the null pronouns and the overt pronouns and contrast them later. In the literature, the null pronoun is considered a weak pronoun (Cardinaletti, 1997). As such, *pro* cannot be coordinated as seen in (4)²

(4) *Juan/ella y estudian en la universidad

Juan/she and study at the university

‘Juan/ ella y él estudian en la Universidad’

Weak pronouns cannot acquire their referential meaning via deictic means (pointing). In (5), the null pronoun cannot refer to a person just by merely pointing at the person.

(5) Viene

She/he/it comes

Ella /él viene

Null pronouns cannot be modified so (6a) is interpreted differently from (6b).

(6a) #Solo saben la respuesta. (Spanish)

*Solo saben la respuesta

They only know the answer

² The features of weak pronouns are identical with *pro*. However, the version of Cardinaletti and Starke (1999) that weak pronouns must occupy a dedicated position is not evidenced in the case of *pro*.

(6b) Solo ellas saben la respuesta.

only they, FEM know the answer

‘Only they know the answer.’

Pro can appear in impersonal clauses, so that (7a) can be interpreted impersonally but the overt counterpart can only have a referential reading, as in (7b).

(7a) *Pro* me vendieron un aguacate dañado.

pro CL sold.3.PL an avocado damaged

‘I was sold a damaged avocado.’

(7b) Ellos me vendieron un aguacate dañado.³

They CL sold.3.PL an avocado damaged

‘They sold me a damaged avocado.’ Camacho (2013)

Again, the contrast between null and overt pronouns is seen with respect to the Overt Pronoun Constraint (OPC). The Overt Pronoun Constraint (OPC), which was originally proposed by Montalbetti (1984) and later studied by Carminatti (2002) and Alonso-Ovalle (2000), generally states that in pro-drop or null argument languages that allow an overt/null pronominal alternation, an overt pronominal cannot take a quantified antecedent. The example in (8a) illustrates this.

(8a) Todo estudiante_i cree que *pro*_i es inteligente. Spanish

every student thinks that *pro* is intelligent

‘Every student_i thinks that he_i is intelligent.’

(8b) Todo estudiante_i cree que *él*_j es inteligente. Spanish

every student thinks that 3PS is intelligent

³ This sentence is used with a referential interpretation; as in “los merolicos me vendieron un avocado dañado.”

‘Every student_i thinks that he_i is intelligent.

The example in (8a) shows a binding relationship between the quantifier and the variable null subject pronoun. However, in (8b) the overt pronoun in Spanish cannot refer to the quantifier antecedent.

Another instance of the overt/null contrast is seen in cases of backwards anaphora in temporal clauses. Larson and Luján (1989) point out that an overt pronoun cannot be coreferential with the main-clause subject in (9a), but its null counterpart can in (9b) in Spanish.

(9a) Cuando él_{*i/j} trabaja, Juan_i no bebe. (Spanish)

When he work.3.SG Juan not drink.3.SG

‘When he (someone else) works, Juan doesn’t drink

(9b) Cuando *pro*_{i/j} trabaja, Juan_i no bebe.

When *pro* work.3.SG Juan not drink.3.SG

‘When he works, Juan doesn’t drink.’

(from Larson and Luján, 1989, p. 1, ex. 1)

Other areas worth mentioning about the null/overt contrast have to do with reference saliency which is a cardinal term encoding aspects such as focus, switch reference and pragmatic weight. Saliency is a general term used to explain how speakers decide when to use a pronoun to refer to something, and when to use a fuller form, like a name or description and the cognitive status of *in focus*. Gundel, Hedberg, & Zacharski (1993) state that the “in focus” status goes hand in hand with the unstressed pronouns and zero (i.e. null pronouns) to express the intended and most salient referent, a view called the antecedent saliency and “aboutness hypothesis” (Bosch, 1983).

A slightly different use of the term “focus” refers to whether information about an NP is new (presupposed) or it is stressed and for that matter contrasted with the null subject (Lambrecht, 1994) for it to be overt. The above observations have led to a formulation of the so-called pragmatic rules on null subjects by Blackwell (2003) as follows:

Rule #1: “Salient Referent” Blackwell (2003)

‘Use a null subject whenever the intended referent is in focus, i.e., the attention of both speech participants can be assumed to be focused on it because of its salience at a given point in the discourse such that the subject reference can be inferred, taking into account factors including the context, the mutual knowledge of the interlocutors, the lexical semantics, and verb morphology.’ On the other hand, the overt pronoun is used in the contexts of switch focus in which speakers show markedness in their usual expressions (by using the overt subject) which have referential meanings other than the null subject. Markedness refers to what is more complex and uncommon in use (Blackwell 2003). A focus switch involves the use of an overt subject expression as seen in example (10).

(10) Kofi dice que *él* puede hablar con el presidente

From the example in (10) *él* could be interpreted as a focus shift marker to shift attention from Kofi to another NP. In fact, switch focus of attention can occur in the contexts of null subjects, in very restricted instances of verb morphology as seen in example (11)

(11) Dice que puedo hablar con el presidente

In example (11), the null subject in the matrix clause clearly refers to a different referent of the null subject in the embedded clause, because of the distinct verbal morphologies hence a switch focus can be said to have occurred. A second rule related to the switch reference phenomenon is stated as follows:

Rule #2: “Switch focus” Blackwell (2003):

‘Use an unstressed overt subject to switch the focus of attention from one referent to another, to indicate a change in subject and topic, and to refer to a referent other than the one that would be implied by the use of a null subject.’

In the area of pragmatics, saliency is understood in terms of *pragmatic weight*, which refers to what “motivates speakers to use the overt pronoun to emphasize the relevance and the personal nature of the utterance” (Davidson, 1996). According to Davidson, “topicalization comes into play with the overt SPs occurring at sentence initial positions.” Building on this, I propose that the subject NPs can also be used as topics which are then “resumed” in the embedded clauses to signal pragmatic interpretations. While rule # 2 may essentially deal with discourse situations, example (10) contains the overt pronominal in an embedded clause. This mechanism does not overrule rule #2. The following example (12) illustrates this.

(12) Maria dice que ella puede hablar con el presidente

‘Mary says that she can speak to the president’

In example (12), the overt SP in the embedded clause is anaphorically used for the matrix subject NP which occurs as a topic. In this construction, one can say that the overt NP is bound by the matrix subject and does not necessarily signal referential meaning.

Rule #3: “Pragmatic weight” Blackwell (2003):

“Use the overt post-verbal SP to add pragmatic weight to your utterance, to take a firmer stance, to express a greater stake in, or emotional commitment to your assertion or to express that your utterance is highly relevant.” This is seen in example (13).

(13a) ¿Quién fue el que rompió la puerta?

‘Who was it that broke the door?’

(13b) Fue él. was.3.SG he ‘It was him.’

(13c) # Fue. was.3.SG

‘(S/he) was.’

Note that even though the above rule seems to apply mostly to utterances, it can as well be suitable for written expressions as well in which case gestures and deictic factors play a vital role. We shall not delve much into this since this dissertation was limited to written tests. This claim goes in tandem with the observation made by Davidson (1996) that speakers often use verbs of opinion, belief, and claiming (*creer, pensar, decir*) as well as knowledge (*saber*), when they want to add pragmatic weight to their utterances.

2.3. Plural Morphology and Genericity

In Cabredo’s (2003) analysis, the third person plural can occur in antecedentless contexts where the plural inflection is considered non-anaphoric. The plural inflection is used to refer to humans so it has the interpretation of human subject as seen in (14).

(14a) Aquí ladran en la mañana. (Sp)

“Here, (they = people) bark in the morning.”

(14b) Te van a atacar.

“(They = people) are going to attack you.”

Secondly, she characterizes the antecedentless third person pronoun as excluding speaker and hearer as pointed out by, e.g., Suñer (1983) for Spanish, Kitagawa and Lehrer (1990) for English *they*, and Kleiber (1994) for French *ils*. This property crucially distinguishes 3pl arbitrary interpretation from the impersonal uses of the 2nd person as

English *you*, Spanish *pro*_{2sg}/ *tú*, that do not exclude the speaker (Hernanz, 1990; Kitagawa and Lehrer 1990).

2.4. Issues of Syntactic and Morphological Genericity: Implications for L2 Acquisition

Genericity, apart from being expressed through morphology, can also be overtly expressed by means of impersonal pronouns, e.g. *man* in Mainland Scandinavian, *on* in French. The typology of genericity as described in French by Egerland (2003a, 2003b) where he classifies the impersonals into three categories namely the generic, the arbitrary, and the specific reading are illustrated in (15).

(15) On doit travailler jusqu'à l'âge de 65 ans.

‘ON must work until the age of 65 years.’ (generic)

(16) On a travaillé pendant deux mois pour résoudre le problème.

‘ON has worked two months to solve the problem.’ (arbitrary)

(17) Hier soir on a été congédié.

‘Yesterday evening ON was fired.’ (specific) (from Egerland, 2003b).

In (15) the impersonal subject *on* corresponds to ‘people in general’. In (16) *on* refers to a non-specific group of individuals, close to ‘some people’, unspecified ‘they’, or ‘someone’. In (17), on the other hand, *on* refers to the speaker or a group including the speaker, and may be regarded as an equivalent to ‘we’.

This dissertation will examine how logophoric pronouns are interpreted as co-reference with the third person plural morpheme in Spanish. In Spanish, the third person plural morpheme plays both pragmatic and syntactic roles and this invariably leads to ambiguous interpretations by both the native speakers and the Ewe speakers. The

connection between the Ewe logophoric pronoun and the Spanish third person plural morpheme is illustrated in (18).

(18a) Kofi_i be yè_i ate nu afo nu kple dukplɔa

Kofi say LOG- able thing beat mouth with president

‘Kofi_i said that he_i can speak to the president’

‘Kofi dijo que se puede hablar con el presidente’

(18b) Kofi_i be a_i */j-te nu afo nu kple dukplɔla

Kofi say 3PS he- able thing beat mouth with president

‘Kofi_i said that he_i can speak to the president’

‘Kofi dijo que él puede hablar con el presidente’

(18c) Kofi_i be woi */ɪ ate nu afo nu kple dukplɔla

Kofi say 3PP - able thing beat mouth with president

Kofi_i dice que pued-en_i hablar con el presidente

Kofi says 3PS that 3PP Speak with the president

‘Kofi says he/she/one can speak to the president’

In (18a) the logophoric pronoun is bound by the matrix subject *Kofi*. In (18b) however, the Ewe overt pronoun *a* refers to another person and not the matrix subject. This construction involves the third person pronoun and it is rendered in Spanish with the overt pronoun. In (18c) the plural morpheme points to people in general or to a non-specific group of people including the matrix subject.

This is different from the properties of the logophoric pronoun. This personal observation is partially at variance with the argument advanced by Egerland (2003b) to the effect that arbitrariness is contingent on phi-underspecification, that is only those

impersonal pronouns which are underspecified for phi-features can have an arbitrary reading, whereas those that carry a full set of phi-features only allow for a generic interpretation. This means that the logophoric pronoun plays a ‘narrow’ role compared to the Spanish third person plural morpheme. In other words, while in Ewe the logophoric strictly points to the subject, the third person plural morpheme plays a non-anaphoric role as well as a generic role with reference to the matrix subject. The generic use of the plural morpheme *can* include a matrix antecedent. The implication for learners is that, if Ewe speakers are unable to process the grammatical role of the plural morpheme, then it could be interpreted as serving the same purpose as a null subject. On the other hand, if the lexical *se* is assigned any syntactic or pragmatic role, then it could be interpreted as a pronominal or a marker of genericity.

Again, although the example in (18c) provides an obligatory reference thanks to the inflectional morphology, the third person plural morpheme of verbs can play the function of genericity and a referential element (the plural subject in the subordinate clause points to a group of subjects) or refer back to the subject in the main clause. This is why I propose that, the L2 learners will encounter difficulties relating the generic morphology to the appropriate subject antecedent.

Similarly, I argue that Ewe-speaking learners of L2 Spanish will encounter difficulties with respect to the use of the null subject pronoun in Spanish clausal subject constructions as they transfer their knowledge of the logophoric pronoun. This is because clausal subject constructions and the logophoric pronoun constructions do not have the same syntax: the antecedent occurs after the null or the overt subject in Spanish whereas the logophoric pronoun always refers back to the matrix subject. This is at variance with

the Full Transfer/Access Hypothesis which claims that the learner's L1 grammar constitutes the initial stage of L2 acquisition (full transfer) and that L2 learners have full access to Universal Grammar at all times (full access).

To summarize, chapter 2 outlines briefly the syntax of Ewe-like and Spanish-like languages followed by the Pronominal Agreement hypothesis which postulates that verbal morphology is crucial in determining the subjects of sentences. I also examined the differences between null and overt pronouns. Finally, the role of plural morphology in generic interpretation was examined, as well.

CHAPTER 3: THE LOGOPHORIC SYSTEM IN EWE: PRONOMINAL REFERENCE MECHANISMS IN EWE

In the Ewe language of Ghana, the special form of pronoun, *yè*, which is a logophoric pronoun, refers to those referential expressions that occur in indirect discourse environments and exclusively refer to the agent of reported speech/thought. The following table (1) presents the 3rd person logophoric and non-logophoric pronouns in Ewe.

Table 1. Logophoric and Non-logophoric Pronouns in Ewe

| | Logophoric | Non-logophoric |
|---------------------------------|------------|----------------|
| 3 rd person singular | Ye | E, wò |
| 3 rd person plural | Yewo | Wo |

The pronoun *yè*, (as indicated in table 1) is only used when the antecedent is a *logophoric antecedent*, that is, a speaker, believer or experiencer (and in some cases, in Ewe at least, also a hearer). The use of this pronoun insures reference to the matrix logophoric antecedent, as in (19) from Clements (1975, p. 156). Ewe logophors are sensitive to the verbal context in which they are embedded. These logophors normally occur in clauses embedded under verbs of saying, thinking, knowing, perceiving, or showing emotion. Example (19a) shows that the logophor embedded in a clause with a verb of saying co-refers to the subject of the matrix clause.

In (19b) the 3rd person singular (non-logophoric) pronoun *e* cannot co-refer with Kofi, it could refer to another person who is not mentioned in the sentence. In other words, the referent of the 3rd person singular pronoun *e* is not indicated in the sentence. In (19c), the normal pronoun in the 3rd person singular *wò* and not *ye* co-refers with Kofi since the matrix predicate *du nu* ‘eat’ is not a logophoric-licensing verb. In (19d), the predicate in

the first part of the conjoined construction is not a logophoric-licensing one so the logophor is not allowed in Ewe.

(19a) Kofi_i be yè_i dzo

Kofi say log-leave

‘Kofi_i said that he_i left.’

Kofi dijo que partió

(19b) Kofi_i be e_i* dzo.

Kofi say 3sg-leave

‘Kofi_i said that he_j /she_j left (Clements 1975:42).

Kofi dijo que él partió

(19c) Kofi_i du nu eye wò_i /ye* dzo.

Kofi eat PAST thing and 3RD PERSON/LOG left

‘Kofi_i ate and he_i left

Kofi comió y él partió

(19d) Kofi_i du nu eye wò_i /ye* dzo.

Kofi eat PAST thing and 3RD PERSON/LOG left

‘Kofi_i ate and he_i left

Kofi comió y él partió

The singular logophoric can be pluralized but it can refer to a singular subject antecedent contained in the reference of the plural. This is exemplified in (20).

(20) Kofi_i be yè wo_i dzo

Kofi say LOG PL-leave

‘Kofi said that they left.’

In (20), the logophoric plural pronoun *yewo* occurs in the embedded clause. It refers to Kofi and someone else or many people. Note that without the logophoric pronoun, the sentence is still grammatical since it refers to a group of people excluding Kofi. The illustration is seen in (21).

(21) Kofi be wo dzo

Kofi say₃ PL leave

‘Kofi said that they left.’

Note that the subject of the higher clause always binds the third person singular pronoun *wò*. The Ewe logophor is also used under psychological verbs as seen in (22). Ewe also allows logophors in purpose clauses, as in (23). This shows that in Ewe a logophor can be licensed in other contexts apart from the logophoric predicate contexts involving verbs of saying, knowing, thinking, perception, dreaming etc.

(22) Ama_i se veve be yèi dzo le afeame

Ama feels PAST pain that LOG leave PAST PREP from house

‘Ama_i was sad that she_i left the house’.

‘Ama estaba triste que salió de la casa’

(23) Ama_i tso agbale be yèi axle

Ama take PAST book that LOG read

‘Ama took a book to read’

‘Ama cogió un libro para leer’

I hypothesize that the logophoric system is relevant for acquisition of the Spanish null and overt subjects because Ewe and Spanish differ in terms of the referential properties of the null and the overt pronoun. While Spanish uses a null subject to refer to the matrix

subject in embedded clauses, Ewe has only an obligatory pronoun that specifically co-refers to with the matrix subject. I expect the logophoric to be interpreted as co-reference with the null subject because the Spanish native speakers canonically interpret the null subject as co-referent with the matrix subject. So the Ewe speakers are expected to behave in a similar manner. Another difference between both languages is that the overt pronoun in Spanish could refer to an entity not mentioned in the matrix clause.

We shall look at some of the properties of the logophoric pronoun in Ewe. The previous examples (19a) and (23) have shown that the referential properties of logophors hold when they are embedded within certain verbal phrases, mainly verbs of saying, knowing, thinking, perceiving and/or showing emotion. In section 3.1, we shall discuss the use of the logophorics in embedded clauses.

3.1. Logophorics in Embedded Clauses - Short Distance Reference

Ewe logophorics occur as subjects of the clausal complements or embedded clauses. In the context of locality, they are said to have short distance reference to the subject antecedent, especially if the embedded clause has only one higher clause containing the matrix subject. In example (19a) repeated in (24) the logophor is the subject of the embedded clause. This is distinct from (25) where the third person plural pronoun *wo* is the subject of the embedded clause, but it has a disjoint reference with the matrix subject.

(24) Kofi_i be yèi dzo

Kofi say log-leave

‘Kofi_i said that he_i left.’

‘Kofi dijo que partió’

(25) Kofi be wo dzo

‘Kofi say 3 PL- leave’

‘Kofi said that they left’

3.2. Logophorics and Long Distance Co-Reference

Another property of the Ewe logophor is that it establishes reference across clauses. In Ewe, if the logophor is embedded within more than one verb of saying, thinking, or another verb that licenses logophors, then the logophor can optionally refer to either of the higher subjects. The example in (26) shows that the logophor can refer to either Lucia's perception or Elizabeth's thinking.

(26) Lucia_i kpɔ be Elizabeth_j bu be ye i / j nya nu

Lucia see that Elizabeth think that LOG know thing

Lucia saw that Elizabeth thinks that she is clever

‘Lucia vio que Elizabeth pensaba que es inteligente’

The observable difference between the two languages is that while the Ewe logophor can refer to either Lucia or Elizabeth, the null pronoun in the Spanish sentence obviously refers to Elizabeth.

Similarly, in Ewe constructions where an NP is used in the lowest clause, co-reference is possible with any of the higher NPs as exemplified in (27)

(27) Lucia_i kpɔ be Elizabeth_i bu be Martha_i be ye I nya nu

Lucia see that Elizabeth think that Martha say LOG know thing

‘Lucia saw that Elizabeth thinks that Martha says that she is clever’

‘Lucia vio que Elizabeth pensaba que Martha dice que es inteligente’

Long distance reference or anaphora has been observed for a large number of human languages. Long distance anaphora allows elements such as reflexives to be bound across the subject of an intervening clause. Languages such as Icelandic, in (28) and Mandarin Chinese, in (29) show these effects. In (28), the reflexive element *sig* can be bound by any of the higher subjects (Maling 1984:213).

(28) Jón segir að María telji að Haraldur vilji að Billi heimsæki sig

John says that Maria believes that Harold wants that Billy visit REFL

‘John says that Maria believes that Harold wants Billy to visit him’ (Maling, 1984, p. 213).

The example in (29) shows that in Mandarin Chinese, the reflexive element *ziji* can be bound by *Zhangsan* across the intervening subject *Lisi*.

(29) Zhangsani renwei Lisi hai-le zijii

Zhangsan thought Lisi hurt-ASP self

‘Zhangsan thought that Lisi hurt himself’ (Harbert, 1995, p. 194; from Huang & Tang, 1991).

This is not to suggest that logophorics are like long distance anaphors. Logophorics refer to the matrix subject in immediate clauses as we see in the case of null subjects, therefore null subjects will be the ideal co-reference with the logophors. Moreover, even though logophorics occur as long distance anaphors in Ewe, they have ambiguous references that can be the subject of immediate clauses or the superordinate clauses, as seen in (26).

3.3. Logophorics in Adjunct/Purpose Clauses

Logophorics can appear in adverbial clauses of purpose, time, reason, concession, contrast, result etc. that are attached to verbs of saying complements. In such cases, the logophoric can appear as the subject of the adjunct clause (headed by the purpose marker **be**) and as the subject of the embedded clause. Example (30) shows that the logophoric predicate licenses the logophoric pronoun obligatorily in the dependent purpose clause.

(30) Kofi_i be [yè_i dzo [be yea_i de afeme kaba]]

Kofi say LOG leave so that LOG reach home early

‘Kofi said he left in order to arrive home early’

As seen in (30), the embedded purpose clause *be yea de afeme kaba* modifies ‘leave’ and it is in turn embedded under the clause *Kofi be yedzo*. The logophor in the embedded clause is repeated since it refers to the matrix subject whose purpose for leaving is explained in the embedded clause.

The higher logophoric pronoun in (30) can be dispensed with together with the predicate of saying and the sentence will still be grammatical, as seen in (31).

(31) Kofi_i dzo be yea_i de afeme kaba

Kofi leaves so that LOG reach home early

‘Kofi left in order to reach home early’

In (31), the matrix clause does not contain the logophoric but the embedded clause does. This is typical of purpose clauses in which the logophoric co-refers to the matrix subject even without a logophoric predicate. In this case, nothing about Kofi is being reported. Rather, it is Kofi’s motive for leaving which is being explained. A similar phenomenon

occurs with other embedded clauses of contrast in which the logophoric pronoun is repeated to co-refer to the matrix subject as exemplified in (32).

(32) Kofi_i be yè_i de suku gake yei me kpɔ dɔ o

Kofi say LOG go school but LOG NEG see job NEG

‘Kofi said he has been to school but he is jobless’

Example (32) illustrates the fact that logophoric pronouns can be repeated in embedded contrastive clauses. So in the adverbial clause of contrast, *gake ye me-kpɔ dɔ*, the logophor is repeated not to emphasize the activity undertaken by Kofi but to serve as a pointer to Kofi and also to show the logical contrast that obtains in the main clause as compared to the embedded clause. The logophoric pronoun is used in Ewe as well in adjunct constructions, as seen in (33).

(33) Kwasi i bu be yè_i bu passport esime yè_i do afeame

Kwasi think that LOG lose PAST- passport later LOG reach PAST- home.

‘Kwasi_i thought he_i lost the passport after he_i arrived home’

As seen here (33) the logophor occurs again in a subordinate context (adverbial clause of time) with the verb of thinking. It should be noted that even though adjunct/purpose clauses are inextricably linked to logophorics, they are not an essential part of this dissertation. However, discussing them is relevant to the overall concept of logophorics. Future research would address purpose clauses in relation to *PRO*.

3.4. Logophoric Interpretation: Genericity in Ewe

Logophorics are semantically and syntactically distinct from generics in Ewe. In Ewe, nominal *ame* ‘one, man, he, she’ is used to express genericity as seen in (34a). In this regard, it can be said that generic constructions do not necessarily exclude the matrix

subject. The matrix subject could be part of the generic referent. In this case, it cannot exclusively mean *only ame*, with the meaning that ‘Kofi says that only he can speak to the president’. In (34b) we see a different generic interpretation than in (34a). In (34b) the plural morpheme *wo* converts *ame* to *amewo* (people). However, the determiner *a* in *ameawo* gives it a specific interpretation as “the people.” The plural nominal *ameawo* is therefore not a generic marker and its referent excludes the matrix subject, so (34b) is ungrammatical only when the matrix subject is included. On the other hand, (34c) is grammatical because the matrix subject is not included as part of the referent of *ameawo*, the people.

In (34d), the third person plural pronoun “wo” is used to refer to a specific group of persons interpreted as “they.” It cannot include the matrix subject. Therefore, the matrix subject has a disjoint reference to the third person plural pronoun.

(34a) Kofi_i be ame_i /ate nu afo nu kple dukplola

Kofi say man-GEN-able thing beat mouth with president

‘Kofi_i says that he_i / one can speak to the president’

‘Kofi dice que /uno/ se puede hablar con el presidente’

(34b) *Kofi_i be ameawo_i ate nu afo nu kple dukplola

Kofi say people able thing beat mouth with president

‘Kofi said that the people can speak to the president’

‘Kofi dice que la gente puede hablar con el presidente’

(34c) Kofi_i be amewo_j ate nu afo nu kple dukplola

Kofi say people able thing beat mouth with president

‘Kofi said that the people can speak to the president’

‘Kofi dice que la gente puede hablar con el presidente’

(34d) Kofi_i be wo_i */J ate nu afo nu kple dukplola

Kofi say 3PP able thing beat mouth with president

‘Kofi_i says that they can speak to the president’

‘Kofi dice que pueden hablar con el presidente’

(34e) ‘Kofi dice que pueden hablar con el presidente’

(34f) Kofi_i be yè_i ate nu afo un kple dukplaa

Kofi say LOG- able thing beat mouth with president

‘Kofi_i said that he_i can speak to the president’

‘Kofi dijo que él puede hablar con el presidente’

In (34a), *ame* is used to express genericity. Although *ame* can refer to the subject of the superordinate clause ‘Kofi’ in this construction, the matrix subject is part of the pronominal referent, and it cannot exclusively refer to Kofi. If *ame* is modified by *only* it cannot be interpreted to refer to only Kofi. *Ame* can also be interpreted as an indefinite pronoun such as *someone* to provide an arbitrary interpretation.⁴ The Spanish version is rendered with the null subject pronoun. Furthermore, just as *ame* does not refer exclusively to Kofi in Ewe, Spanish generics prefer the use of the indefinite pronoun.

The example in (34d) does not offer a generic interpretation because of the plural determiner. In (34d), *Wo* is a plural marker that points to a specific group of persons. More importantly, it cannot be used to express genericity, and is therefore not anaphoric with respect to the subject of the superordinate clause i.e kofi. The Spanish version is rendered with the null subject plural pronoun, among other options. Note that the only pronoun that

⁴ In a construction such as “ame le afima” (someone is there).

can exclusively co-refer with Kofi is the logophoric singular pronoun *ye* thanks to the logophoric-licensing verb, which is *say*. The third person plural *wo* can never refer to Kofi but to other people excluding Kofi, as seen in (34d). Furthermore, the bound morpheme **en** in (34e) adjoined to the predicate makes the predicate generic. It is clear that the bound morpheme changes the morphology of the predicate. Spanish has a way of expressing genericity by using a verbal inflectional morphology in the third person plural, as in (34e). In (34f), the logophoric pronoun does not express genericity. Thus, while Ewe has an independent morpheme for genericity, Spanish provides a morphologically bound plural morpheme that adjoins to the verb. The examples in (34g) and (34h) further illustrate the point about genericity.

(34g) *Ame wo be yea_i te nu afo nu kple dukplɔla

Person/man 3PP say LOG able thing beat mouth with president

‘People said that he can speak to the president’

‘La gente dijo que ella puede hablar con el presidente’

(34h) Ame-ade_i be yea_i te nu afo nu kple dukplɔla

Man IND says LOG able thing beat mouth with president

‘Man said that he can speak to the president’

‘La gente dice que él puede hablar con el presidente’

The example in (34f) is ungrammatical because the plural generic ‘people’ does not match the singular logophoric pronoun. In (34g), when *ame* is modified by an indefinite pronoun, the logophor can match it so that it will be interpreted as *somebody*. However, *ame* in (34h) which traditionally has a generic denotation cannot serve as an antecedent for the logophoric pronoun.

It should be observed that many consistent pro-drop languages, like Spanish and Italian, lack the generic impersonal *pro* in singular, in (35) where *pro* is not impersonal but rather points to an abstract subject antecedent with phi features.

(35) *En la clase (pro) habla inglés

In the class speaks English

This dissertation will examine whether the logophoric pronoun is ideal for expressing genericity in Spanish within the framework of the syntax/morphology interface. The relation between the logophoric pronoun and the third person plural morpheme has been illustrated in examples (34e) and (34f). The acquisition of the null/overt pronoun has been discussed in section 2.3.

3.5. Logophorics and Clausal Subjects

Finally, this work aims at examining how a change in word order and structure impacts the use of the referential dependencies in L2 Spanish. Clausal subject constructions in Ewe entail logophoric environments and they can have consequences for L2 Spanish. In Ewe, there is normally an expletive subject, which requires extraposition in the complement clause, as seen in example (36a). The Ewe language does not normally permit clausal subject constructions in which a whole clause can function as a subject followed by a complement as in (36b):

(36a) E- dzo dzi na Maria novia_i be ye_i kpɔ ga

EXP born heart PREP for Maria cousin that LOG-he sees money

‘It pleases Maria’s cousin that she is rich’

‘Le gusta a la prima de María que sea rica’

(36b) *Be ye kpɔ ga doa dzidzɔ na Maria novia

That LOG sees money gives happiness to Maria cousin

‘That she is rich pleases Maria’s cousin’

‘Que sea_i rica le gusta a la prima_i de María’

In (36a), it can be seen that *e* in Ewe is indeed the subject here, and that it is equivalent to the complement, which is also in a certain sense the subject. In fact, in this case complement is to be understood as a clause functioning as a noun.

Ewe requires extraposition, a mechanism that prevents subject complement clauses from assuming the normal subject position preceding the verb. In addition, the logophor co-refers to *the cousin of Mary*. It is not obligatory in this case so it can be replaced by the normal pronoun (e, he, she, another person) to carry another semantic interpretation. Note that Spanish uses both extraposition and clausal subjects in the counterparts of (36a), as seen in (37a), and (36b), as seen in (37b), respectively.

(37a) Le gusta a la prima de María que sea rica

‘It pleases Maria’s cousin that she is rich’

(37b) Que sea_i rica le gusta a la prima_i de María

‘That she is rich pleases Maria’s cousin’

This means that while Spanish, as an inflected language, allows for sufficient freedom in word order, Ewe has a restricted use of word order.

To summarize, this section deals with the acquisition of the clausal null subjects in Spanish by Ewe speakers. We discussed the two most crucial phenomena that have learning implications for the L1 speakers. The first one is that there are no clausal subjects in Ewe as we have them in Spanish. Secondly, the NP in the possession constructions have different references in Ewe than in Spanish. Whereas in Ewe, the second NP is co-referent

with the matrix subject in logophoric constructions, it is the reverse that holds in Spanish. Transfer of knowledge of logophoric pronoun in Spanish clausal constructions was predicted to be problematic.

CHAPTER 4: LITERATURE REVIEW

4.1. Issues on the Interface Hypothesis

The past few decades, most researchers have attempted to investigate the interactions between linguistic modules with a view to ascertain which of the modules pose more problems to L2 acquirers. This quest for research into different modules and how their various pairings affect L1 transfer has come to be known as the Interface Hypothesis. Interfaces are hierarchical connections and interactions between linguistic modules (syntax, semantics, phonology, morphology, pragmatics, etc.) at various levels (cf. Jackendoff, 2002, for a general proposal on interfaces; Ramchand & Reiss, 2007, for a summary; and Sorace, 2006, for issues related to interfaces in L2 acquisition).

The Interface Hypothesis is a linguistic theory that posits that interface properties that involve syntax and other cognitive domains such as discourse may trigger residual optionality at the end-state. Residual optionality refers to the alternation between target-like and non-target-like behaviors in terms of production and comprehension. The Interface Hypothesis (IH), proposed by researchers (e.g., Sorace, 2006; Sorace & Serratrice, 2009; Sorace, 2011), is a theory that seeks to account for patterns of non-convergence and residual optionality found at very advanced stages of adult second (L2) acquisition. The IH originally held that language structures involving an interface between syntax and other cognitive domains are less likely to be acquired completely than structures that do not involve this interface.

The IH assumes that different interfaces pose different levels of difficulties in learning second language properties. It predicts that properties involving sub-modules of language (internal interface) can be acquired relatively easier than those relating to cognitive domains (external interface) that are external to the core computational system.

Thus it was argued that processing difficulties in external interface domains might trigger residual optionality at the end-state grammar of the L2 learner. The Interface hypothesis has been classified into two aspects: the external interface and the internal interface. The external interface where the syntax interfaces with other cognitive domains (e.g. syntax/discourse, syntax/phonology, syntax/pragmatics) is relatively more difficult to acquire than the internal interface (e.g., Sorace, 2000, 2004, & 2005; Sorace & Filiaci, 2006; Valenzuela, 2006).

The internal interface, on the other hand, involving grammar-internal modules such as syntax/morphology and syntax/semantics, is easier to acquire because they belong to the same domain (e.g., Sorace, 2006; Sorace & Serratrice, 2009; Sorace, 2011). However, studies have shown that contrary to the generally held view that the external interface conditioned properties can eventually be acquired (Montrul & Rodríguez-Louro, 2006), so more plausible explanations for non-convergence of L2 grammar at the syntax-pragmatics level is interference that eventually makes pragmatic features difficult to identify (Montrul, 2004; Valenzuela, 2006) or processing difficulties (Sorace & Filiaci, 2006).

Sorace and Serratrice (2009) offer further explanations as to the non-convergence of L2 grammar: underspecification in representation of grammatical knowledge, crosslinguistic influence (transfer) in representation or parsing, processing limitations (either inefficient incremental access to linguistic knowledge or coordination of information), quality and quantity of input received in bilingual grammars, or even difficulties stemming from bilingualism itself as it relates to executive control of two languages in real time (199-200). They further ascribe these non-convergent behaviors to processing limitations (or processing cost) pertaining to discrete modules that require

integration of knowledge of syntax with knowledge of a different syntactic module from an external source. The syntax–discourse interface requires coordination of syntactic knowledge and external domains, whereas the syntax/semantics interface requires the integration of knowledge internal to language.

Another explanation proposed by Paradis and Navarro (2003) has to do with the quality of input. According to them, when the input has non-native-like features it is more akin to grammar- external input than grammar-internal input. Sorace and Serratrice (2009) further maintain that advanced stages of L2 acquisition and early stages of L1 attrition potentially suffer incomplete mastery of L2. They predict that L2 acquisition is bound to suffer incomplete mastery or “permanent optionality” (i.e., non-convergence at the near-native level) not only at the discourse–syntax interface but also at the syntax-pragmatics interface.

Building on this claim, Slabakova and White (2009) propose an extension of optionality to cover non-native-like behaviors. The Bottleneck Hypothesis by Slabakova (2008), considered as a variant of the Interface Vulnerability Hypothesis, posits that adults experience learning difficulties deriving from acquisition of functional morphology as opposed to the unproblematic syntax-pragmatics interface. Another point of view maintains that functional syntax-morphology is eventually acquired at the near-native level (see Dekydsprotter & Sprouse, 1997; Dekydstpotter et al., 2001). Next we discuss the literature on L2 acquisition of null subjects.

4.2. Previous Works on L2 Acquisition of Null Subjects

Studies have been conducted on null subjects leading to the formulation of the Null-Subject Parameter (e.g., Chomsky, 1981; Hyams, 1986; Jaeggli & Safir, 1989; Rizzi, 1982

& 1986; Alexiadou & Agnostopoulou, 1998 among many others) and its pragmatic and processing conditions (e.g., Alonso-Ovalle & D’Introno, 2000; Fernández-Soriano, 1989 & 1993; Luján, 1987 & 1999; Montalbetti, 1984; Picallo, 1994 & 1998; Rigau, 1986 & 1988; Rizzi, 1997). My dissertation deals with acquisition of linguistic phenomena, specifically null subjects in L2 Spanish by L1 Ewe speakers.

The study of the acquisition of null and non-null subject properties has received substantial attention in recent years due to the dynamic nature of the process within the context of different language pairing and transfer directionality. Transfer directionality relates to transfer or crosslinguistic influence of a linguistic phenomenon. For example, it could refer to transfer from a non-null subject language to a null subject language and vice-versa. This work aims to examine transfer of the logophoric pronoun from Ewe, a non-null subject language to Spanish as a null subject language.

There has been much empirical evidence with regard to the transfer of non-null properties from L1 to L2. In a pioneering study involving one group of L2 learners of Spanish (with English as L1) and another group of L2 learners of English (with Spanish as L1) to test the Null Subject Parameter (NSP), Phinney (1987) demonstrated that L2 learners of Spanish showed more accuracy in their choice of the null subjects than the L2 learners of English did in choosing the overt subject. Almoguera and Lagunas (1993) and Tsimpli and Roussou (1991) studied cases where the L1 differs from the L2 with respect to [+/- null subject] value.

Al-Kasey and Pérez-Leroux (1998) focused on English-speaking learners of Spanish in the context of focused interpretation. The results suggested that the second language learning of the properties of null pronouns is not determined so much by

frequency of the input as by the grammatical status of the rule determining pronoun interpretation. Liceras (1988, 1989, & 1996) investigated the acquisition of null subjects in the Spanish Interlanguage of English and French students whose L1 is [-null subject]. The results indicated that the parametric setting is not as stable in interlanguages as they are in native languages. Similarly, this dissertation intends to assess the general acquisition abilities of Ewe speakers who are not considered as near-native speakers but rather to examine how their interlanguage affects the acquisition of their L2 in various contexts.

Liceras and Díaz (1998 & 1999) concentrated on the acquisition of Spanish by learners whose L1 belongs to [-null subject]/ [-null topic] (English, French) or [+null subject]/ [+null topic] (Greek, Italian) languages. Results show that the learners are able to produce null subjects in L2 Spanish showing that they acquire the [+null subject] value of this language. On the other hand, White (1985) and Bini (1993) focused on cases where L1 (English) and L2 (Spanish) exhibit different parametric value. It was discovered that the intermediate L2 students inappropriately use pronominal subjects in optional contexts in which subject omission is the more natural or acceptable option in Spanish.

In addition to potential differences in the syntactic representation of null and overt subjects, other factors such as processing and discourse properties need to be considered. In a study on the processing of null and overt pronouns by near-native speakers of Italian whose L1 was English, Sorace and Filiaci (2006) showed how the near-natives demonstrated a clear processing strategy as they distinguished between null and overt pronouns even though it was not entirely native-like. This led the authors to propose the lack of processing resources to consistently and fully apply their native-like syntactic and discourse knowledge of pro-drop.

To summarize, we started by discussing the acquisition of the null subjects by English-speaking L2 learners of Spanish. We concluded that L2 learners of Spanish display accuracy in their choice of the null subjects, suggesting that acquisition of the syntactic properties of null subjects by non-null subject speakers is unproblematic. Next, we discussed processing strategies involving the acquisition of the null/overt subjects by L2 native speakers of Italian with English as L1. We arrived at the conclusion that non-native-like performance is possibly attributable to a lack of processing strategies. Finally, we addressed the acquisition of null anaphora by English-speaking learners of Spanish with focused interpretation. The results suggested that the second language learning of the properties of null pronouns is not determined so much by frequency of the input as by the grammatical status of the rule determining pronoun interpretation. Next I discuss the licensing and processing of null subjects with verbal morphology.

4.3. Null Subjects at Syntax/Pragmatics Interface

Syntax/pragmatics interfaces determine the use of deictic (or indexical) expressions, including pronominal subjects. The system of interaction between pragmatics and syntax has at least three components: a module of pragmatics, a module of grammar and a set of mapping rules arranging how information of the pragmatic component is linked to information of the grammar component (Bos, Hollebrandse, & Sleeman, 2004). The traditional categories of deixis are person, place, and time. Ewe logophors have a syntactic role as well as deictic use that is restricted to the matrix subject. The overt subject in Spanish is also a syntactic category and it encodes deictic reference. However, the crucial difference is that the syntax-pragmatics interpretation in logophorics is restricted to subject antecedents of verbs of saying, whereas in Spanish null subjects alternate with overt ones.

The focus of this dissertation is the use of the overt and the null subject in L2 Spanish as syntactic constituents for pragmatic expressions. Specifically, this dissertation addresses the learning implication of the interaction between the pragmatic and the syntactic features of the overt subject in L2 Spanish for the Ewe speakers. We shall address this issue in detail later in chapter 5.

Bos, Hollebrandse and Sleeman (2004) used the Null Subject Parameter, which has pragmatic consequences for Second Language Acquisition of Spanish interlanguage by Greek speakers. Their study was based on studies made on L2 acquisition of null subjects (Al Kasey & Pérez-Leroux, 1998; Licerias, 1988, 1989, & 1996; Licerias & Díaz, 1998 & 1999; Almoguera & Lagunas, 1993; Tsimpli & Roussou, 1991; White, 1985; Bini, 1993) and the influence of the L1 (Schwartz & Sprouse, 1996; Licerias, 1988 & 1993). Results show that the Greek students are able to produce null subjects in L2 Spanish showing that they acquire the [+null subject] value of this language. However, the intermediate students do not appropriately use pronominal subjects in optional contexts in which subject omission is the more natural or acceptable option in Spanish and Greek (see intermediate heritage speakers in Montrul (2004), and Spanish learners of Italian in Bini (1993) for similar results). They express the subject in order to reinforce verbal morphology. As time goes by, this behavior disappears because the advanced informants do not overuse pronominal subjects.

Thus the competence level positively affects the appropriate use of null/overt subjects. The students who inappropriately use subjects seem to transfer the pragmatic knowledge from their L1. Given that this work intends to investigate the effect of interfaces

in L2 acquisition, I will first review the pertinent literature on the syntax/ pragmatics interface.

In a study conducted by Rothman (2008) aimed at testing whether or not a target-deviant behavior with respect to the distribution of the null/overt subjects in L2 Spanish stems from a syntactic deficiency or from a syntax-pragmatics interface, Rothman discovered an overuse and underuse of overt subjects depending on context (see also Montrul & Rodríguez-Louro, 2006; Rothman, 2007 & 2008). His data indicate that certain categories (syntax-semantics) of interfaces are not problematic (see also Iverson, Kempchinsky, & Rothman, 2007; Borgonovo, Bruhn de Garavito, & Prévost, 2007) and that non-target-like distribution of null and overt referential subjects can be interpreted as a result of crosslinguistic influence from a null subject to a non-null subject grammar and vice-versa.

In another study, Rothman (2008) compared three experimental groups: (i) a native control group, (ii) a group of intermediate English adult L2 learners of Spanish and (iii) a high advanced group of English-speaking adult L2 learners of Spanish. The tests were conducted for both syntactic knowledge of null subject licensing as well as knowledge of pragmatic pronominal distributional conditions via proper use of the Overt Pronouns Constraint (OPC) (Montalbetti, 1984). It was discovered that the natives and the advanced L2 learners performed quite similarly by highly using the overt referential subject pronouns in binding environments as well as null subjects in non-contrastive focus environments.

The advanced L2 and native control groups consistently judged sentences with overt referential pronoun subjects without contrastive focus and null subjects used with contrastive focus contexts as pragmatically anomalous. Conversely, the intermediate L2

learners had difficulty selecting the null and the overt subject in pragmatic conditions. This shows their inability to match the overt subject to focus and topic elements in pragmatic situations.

Other studies based on the syntax pragmatics interface reveal that L2 learners are inconsistent in selecting referents for morphemes or inflectional tense morphology (Lardiere, 2007) or omission of an overt lexical item (White, 2003), or the use of the infinitive instead of verbal inflection for singular person (Prévost & White, 2000a) but accurate in relating syntactic properties with functional categories and projections. Lardiere (1998 & 2007), Choi and Lardiere (2006), Lardiere (2009), and Umeda (2008) explain non-native performance on indefinites in L2 Korean and Japanese in terms of failure to reconfigure features. The syntax/morphology interface has been accounted for in various hypotheses.

CHAPTER 5: ACQUISITION OF NULL SUBJECTS BY EWE SPEAKERS

In this section, we shall discuss the implications that the various linguistic phenomena raised above have for Ewe speakers who are L2 Spanish learners. Recall that Ewe speakers obligatorily co-refer the logophoric pronoun with the matrix subject, as seen in (39a). Similarly, native Spanish speakers prefer choosing the matrix subject as the antecedent of the null subject pronoun as shown in (39b):

(39a) Kofi_i be yè_i dzo

Kofi say log-leave

‘Kofi_i said that he_i left.’

(39b) Kofi dijo que *pro* partió

Kofi said that *pro* left.3ps

‘Kofi_i said that he_i left.’

In the example above (39b) the null subject in the embedded clause occurs with a finite verb that has morphological information. This is typical of *pro* in Spanish. By contrast, the Ewe logophor encodes singular number and person features which do not enter into agreement with the poor verbal morphology as seen in (40):

(40) Kwasi_i be yè_i du nu emegbe yè_i do go le afeame

Kwasi say LOG eat thing later LOG leave PAST PREP from house

‘Kwasi_i said he_i left the house after he_i had eaten’.

5.1. Implications for L2 Acquisition

I argue that Ewe speaking learners of L2 Spanish will interpret the logophoric pronoun as co-referent with null subject in Spanish. This predicts that they will overproduce overt subjects in contexts where null subjects are expected. This is because

the logophoric pronoun and the null subject do not have the same distribution. As stated earlier, the Overt Pronoun Constraint (OPC), which was originally proposed by Montalbetti (1984) generally states that in pro-drop or null argument languages which allow an overt/null pronominal alternation, an overt pronominal cannot take a quantified antecedent.

Furthermore, because Ewe sentential subject clauses have a rigid word order (and logophoricity is optional in that context), they will encounter difficulties with respect to the use of the null subject pronoun in Spanish clausal subject constructions as they transfer their knowledge of the logophoric pronoun and word order properties. The argument runs contrary to the version of the Full Access Hypothesis which predicts that L2 learners transfer a full set of syntactic properties of their L1 to their L2. In this regard there is bound to be a learnability problem. We also defined the Interface hypothesis (Sorace, 2006; Sorace & Serratrice, 2009; Sorace, 2011) as a second language acquisition theory that posits that interface properties that involve syntax and other cognitive domains such as discourse may trigger residual optionality at the end-state. Residual optionality refers to the alternation between target-like and non-target-like behaviors in terms of production and comprehension. Thus, interfaces involving internal modules such as syntax/semantics or syntax/morphology are easier to acquire, whereas external interfaces involving syntax/phonology, or syntax/pragmatics are more difficult to acquire.

5. 2. Hypotheses and Research Questions

In light of the above discussions, this dissertation is motivated by the following research questions:

1. Do logophoric pronouns in Ewe influence the semantic interpretation of null subjects in Spanish?
2. Does the logophoric pronoun influence generic interpretations in Spanish third person plural constructions with the morpheme (-n)?
3. To what extent are the clausal subject constructions influential in determining transfer of logophoric pronouns?
4. Is the quantifier antecedent of the Overt Pronoun Constraint determined by knowledge of the logophoric pronoun?

Thus, this dissertation hypothesizes that:

1. The Ewe logophoric pronoun is interpreted as playing the same role as the Spanish null embedded subject so L2 Spanish speakers should select external subjects as antecedents of the null pronouns in embedded contexts.
2. The logophoric pronoun cannot be interpreted as co-referent with the Spanish third person plural morpheme in expressing genericity.
3. The crosslinguistic influence of the logophoric pronoun in clausal subject constructions in Spanish would lead to a dual learnability problem of reconciling the structural parametric difference of both languages and retrieving the antecedent of the null subject for the L2 learners.
4. The quantifier antecedent of the Overt Pronoun Constraint is determined by knowledge of the logophoric pronoun.

CHAPTER 6: DATA COLLECTION, STATISTICAL ANALYSES, AND PARTICIPANTS

This chapter is concerned with the procedure related to data collection and statistical analyses as well as recruitment of participants.

6.1. Participants

This experimental study recruited 91 students from the University of Ghana between ages 16 and 20 years (average 18) who have acquired Ewe as their mother tongue. They have also studied English as the official language used as the medium of instruction and have also studied Spanish as a foreign language for three to four years. However, Ewe is the dominant language acquired since birth and it is used very often not only at home with parents and friends but also in formal settings. They were 70 female students and 20 male students selected from different class levels at the end of the second semester. All the voluntary participants were remunerated. None of the participants who had studied abroad or who showed near-native proficiency or who knew another romance language were selected. Out of the total score of 30, the DELE scores recorded by the Ewe speakers range between 17 and 23 points. The tests were restricted to general knowledge of lexical items since their program is largely based on grammar and vocabulary.

This L2 group was compared with the Spanish L1 group as we shall see later. The control group consists of 20 native Spanish speakers (two males and 18 females) aged 32-36 years who were selected from Rutgers University. They are English-Spanish bilinguals but are native speakers of Spanish and most of them were born in Puerto Rico, Mexico, Chile and Costa Rica and have lived between three to four years in the United States (see

Appendix D). Even though there was no formal certification of proficiency, many years of basic and high school education in their country of origin per their responses during an oral interview is clear indication of proficiency in Spanish.

Ghana has a rich cultural diversity characterized by a multiplicity of local languages otherwise known as mother tongues or first languages (L1) among which we count Ewe, a major dialect of the Gbe subgroup of the (New) Kwa branch of Niger-Congo spoken in some West African countries such as Ghana, Togo, Benin and Nigeria. Educated people in Ghana speak local languages in addition to English as the official language. Because of its geographical location close to neighboring French-Speaking countries such as the Ivory Coast, Togo and Burkina Faso, there is always an influx of many French-speaking nationals in Ghana. French is studied in schools and universities throughout Ghana. Spanish learning is also being given much attention in accordance with the position of UNESCO which stipulates that economic growth is at the service of social and linguistic growth. This explains why Spanish language is an integral part of the Ghanaian society.

6.2. Materials and Experiments

Participants were asked to complete 3 written grammaticality judgment tasks (GJT) which are fully described below and included in the appendices, a Spanish test (DELE) used to determine their general proficiency level. The total possible score for the DELE proficiency test was 30. There was also a biographical questionnaire.

6.2.1. Experimental Tasks

In all the test items, the core objective was to test the transfer of the Ewe logophor in Spanish constructions involving the conditions stated in the dissertation. Instructions for all the tasks were provided in Spanish for both the L2 learners and the native speakers. Answers provided for all the instruments were randomized in such a way that the overt counterparts of each condition do not have the answer options in the same order as the null counterparts.

6.2.1.1. GJT 1 Subject Antecedenthood

The first GJT task (see APPENDIX A) included 24 questions and 8 distractors. It aimed at testing the hypothesis predicting that the Ewe logophoric pronoun is interpreted as co-referent with the Spanish null embedded subjects, and as such L2 Spanish speakers should select external subjects (subjects of the matrix clause) as antecedents of selected predicates (for example, ‘decir,’ ‘reiterar,’ ‘sonar’ and ‘afirmar’) that license logophoric pronouns in embedded clauses in Ewe. In other words, Ewe speakers will process the null subjects in Spanish as their overt logophoric pronoun. I shall explain the reasons later. Sentences with null and overt subjects were set with a view to examining whether participants were able to appropriately use the null or overt subjects in relation to the subject antecedent in the matrix clause. 6 items tested short distance antecedent constructions (i.e. with the potential antecedent in the immediate clause), 3 with overt and 3 with null pronouns as shown in (41) and (42), respectively.

(41) kofi dice que él puede hablar con el presidente

‘Kofi_i says that he_{i/J} can speak to the president’

(42) kofi dice que *pro* puede hablar con el presidente

‘Kofi_i said that he_i can speak to the president’

The constituents of the test items are labeled as follows. (1) Kofi = external subject, (2) el presidente = prepositional complement (3) = others excluding external subject (4) = others including external subject. There were also 6 question items testing long-distance antecedents, half with null and half with overt pronouns, as illustrated in (43) and (44), respectively.

(43) Kofi vio que Mensah dice que pensaba que saldría.

(44) Kofi vio que Mensah dice que él pensaba que saldría.

The constituents of the test items are labeled as follows (1) kofi = Subject 1, (2) Mensa = Subject 2 (3) = other options, (4) = other person

Finally, 6 questions tested the use of morphology in conveying the idea of genericity (3 constructions with null subjects, paralleling the overt counterpart), as seen in (45) and (46), respectively.

(45) Manuel declara que pueden leer la noticia sobre el administrador

(46) Manuel declara que ellos pueden leer la noticia sobre el administrador.

6.2.1.2. GJT 2 Sentential Subject Constructions

Possible transfer of the logophoric pronoun in clausal subject constructions in Spanish was tested in GJT 2. 16 test items and 16 distractors were included in this task. (see Appendix B). Samples of the items with null and overt subjects are presented in (47) and (48) as follows:

(47) Que sea rica le gusta a la prima de María

(48) Que ella sea rica le gusta a la prima de María

6.2.1.3. GJT 3 Overt Pronoun Constraint effect

Finally, 16 test items on the binding effects of the Overt Pronoun Constraint were set alongside 16 fillers (see APPENDIX C). Examples (49) and (50) illustrate the test items containing their null and overt counterparts.

(49) Todo el mundo confirma que puede asistir a la reunión del jefe

(50) Todo el mundo confirma que él puede asistir a la reunión del jefe

A biographical questionnaire was administered to the Ewe speakers (see APPENDIX E) eliciting information about the participants' age, knowledge of other languages and length of exposure to Spanish. No pretests were administered to the Ewe speakers who responded to the questions under strict supervision. Below is the table (2) that summarizes the different conditions.

Table 2: Summary of the Different Conditions

| Condition/type | Number of items |
|---|-----------------|
| Antecedent of null subjects in the immediate clause | 3 |
| Antecedent of overt subjects in the immediate clause | 3 |
| Subject antecedent in a long distance clause - null subject pronouns | 3 |
| Subject antecedent in a long distance clause - overt subject pronouns | 3 |
| Morphological genericity-null subjects | 3 |
| Morphological genericity-overt subjects | 3 |
| Clausal subjects- null subjects | 8 |
| Clausal subjects- overt subjects | 8 |
| Overt Pronoun Constraints-null subjects | 8 |
| Overt Pronoun Constraint-Overt Subjects | 8 |

6.2.2. Procedure

Prior to the test, data was collected from the participants at the University of Ghana. The tests were administered at the University of Ghana. Participants were not allowed access to computer; rather they had to use pencil or pen to answer all the questions provided on the question paper. The researcher spelled out a set of guidelines for the participants to follow at the start of the test. The guidelines had to do with skipping seemingly difficult or ambiguous questions and drawing the researcher's attention to them later. The researcher was present at all times to offer assistance and clarify instructions pertaining to the questions whilst avoiding the need to offer explanations that may give a clue to the answers. Participants were forbidden from explaining questions among themselves.

CHAPTER 7: RESULTS

The purpose of this dissertation is to determine to what extent the concept of logophoricity in Ewe is transferable to specific contexts in Spanish as a second language. The dissertation also attempts to test the validity of the Interface Hypothesis involving intricate permutation modules in Ewe and Spanish. Consequently, a series of independent sample t-tests were conducted on all the four major tests. Each of the items has a null subject (*pro*) and a parallel construction with an overt NP. This chapter answers the research questions for each of the four conditions.

7.1. Results for GJT1 (Subject Antecedenthood)

7.1.1. Short Distance Antecedents

Table 3 reports the combined results of the tests on the choice of null and the overt subjects in the immediate clause. The constructions involving the choice of the null subject in the immediate clause (short distance) are meant to test the direct transfer of the logophoric pronoun. The results of the tests on the choice of the overt subject are meant for comparative analysis with the rate of transfer of the logophoric pronoun.

Table 4 reports the results of the tests on the choice of null subjects in the immediate clause. The constructions involving the choice of the null subject in the immediate clause (short distance) are meant to test the direct transfer of the logophoric pronoun. It is relevant to separate the short distance constructions from the long distance ones to enable us to have a clear-cut idea of the participants' ability to transfer the use of the logophoric pronoun in the immediate clauses compared to the long distance constructions involving more referential options.

Table 3: Descriptive statistics: Antecedent of Null and Overt Subjects in the Immediate Clause (Logophoric Constructions)

| Null | | | | | Overt | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------|----|------|----------------|------------|----|------|----------------|
| Antecedent | Lang group | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Lang group | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| External subject | Spanish | 20 | .96 | .09 | Spanish | 20 | .00 | .00 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .83 | .29 | Ewe | 91 | .05 | .17 |
| Prepositional complement | Spanish | 20 | .00 | .00 | Spanish | 20 | .00 | .00 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .00 | .00 | Ewe | 91 | .00 | .00 |
| Others excluding external subject | Spanish | 20 | .00 | .00 | Spanish | 20 | 1.00 | .00 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .12 | .21 | Ewe | 91 | .95 | .17 |
| Others including external subject | Spanish | 20 | .04 | .09 | Spanish | 20 | .00 | .00 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .05 | .18 | Ewe | 91 | .00 | .00 |

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics: Antecedent of Null Subjects in the Immediate Clause

| Antecedent | Lang group | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|-----------------------------------|------------|----|------|----------------|
| External subject | Spanish | 20 | .96 | .09 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .83 | .29 |
| Prepositional complement | Spanish | 20 | .00 | .00 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .00 | .00 |
| Others excluding external subject | Spanish | 20 | .00 | .00 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .12 | .21 |
| Others including external subject | Spanish | 20 | .04 | .09 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .05 | .18 |

The results from an independent sample t-test conducted to determine the performance of both language groups in short distance subject antecedent constructions in Table 3, indicate that the Spanish native speakers preferred overwhelmingly the **external subject** as the antecedent of the embedded null subject (96%). On the other hand, they selected the overt subject (0%) of the time. The Ewe speakers trailed the L1 speakers in

the selection of the null subject antecedent also by a slightly lower margin (83%), indicating a significant difference between the two groups as shown in $t(109) = 1.99$, $p < 0.001$. None of the groups selected the prepositional complement as the referent for the null subject or the overt subject (0% in all cases). However, the Ewe speakers selected **others excluding the external subject** (12%) of the time whereas the Spanish speakers did not select it at all for the null subject antecedent.

By contrast, **others excluding the external subject** was selected 100% of the time for the overt subject by the native Spanish speakers whereas the Ewe speakers chose it (95%) of the time (see table 5). Finally, whereas the Spanish speakers interpret the null embedded subject pronoun as co-referent with **others including the external subject** (4%) of the time, the Ewe speakers selected it (5%) of the time. The overt subject was selected 0% of the time by both groups. The independent sample t-test conducted on short distance subject antecedent constructions indicate a significant difference between the two groups as shown in $t(109) = -1.407$ $p < 0.001$.

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics: Antecedent of Overt Subjects in the Immediate Clause

| Antecedent | Lang group | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|-----------------------------------|------------|----|------|----------------|
| External subject | Spanish | 20 | .00 | .00 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .05 | .17 |
| Prepositional complement | Spanish | 20 | .00 | .00 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .00 | .00 |
| Others excluding external subject | Spanish | 20 | 1.00 | .00 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .95 | .17 |
| Others including internal subject | Spanish | 20 | .00 | .00 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .00 | .00 |

This suggests that the overt pronoun is not used to refer to the matrix subject in Spanish just as an overt non-logophoric pronoun does not refer to the matrix subject. So it is clear that the Ewe speakers interpret the referential properties of the overt pronoun as consistent with Spanish contexts.

7.1.2. Long Distance Antecedents

Table 6 presents the combined results of the tests on the choice of long distance null and overt subject antecedents. Again, the results could help in the comparative analysis of those arrived at in the constructions involving subjects of the immediate clause

Table 6: Descriptive Statistics: Subject Antecedent in a Long Distance Clause - Null and Overt Subject Pronouns

| Null subjects | | | | | Overt subjects | | |
|---------------|------------|----|------|----------------|----------------|------|---------------|
| Antecedent | Lang group | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | N | Mean | Std Deviation |
| Subject1 | Spanish | 20 | .20 | .41 | 20 | .25 | .41 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .31 | .34 | 91 | .29 | .45 |
| Subject 2 | Spanish | 20 | .80 | .41 | 20 | .00 | .00 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .69 | .34 | 91 | .00 | .00 |
| Other options | Spanish | 20 | .00 | .00 | 20 | .00 | .00 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .00 | .00 | 91 | .00 | .00 |
| Other person | Spanish | 20 | .00 | .00 | 20 | .75 | .41 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .00 | .00 | 91 | .71 | .45 |

7.1.2.1. Null Subjects

In Table 7 we see the results of the tests on the choice of null subject antecedent in a long distance clause. The results aid in comparative analysis of the choice of the subject antecedent in the immediate clause and that of the subject antecedent in a long distance clause in order to understand the first hypothesis. Results from the independent sample t-

test show that the Spanish natives and the Ewe speakers scored (20%) and (31%), respectively, for **Subject 1** (distant antecedent), recording a non-significant difference of $t(109) = -1.295$ $p < 0.69$. However, (80%) and (66%) were recorded respectively for the Spanish natives and the Ewe speakers in the selection of **Subject 2** (closest possible antecedent), indicating a non-significant difference of $t(109) = 1.82$, $p < 0.99$. **Other options** and **other person** were not selected as the antecedent for the long distance null subject pronouns.

Table 7: Descriptive Statistics: Subject Antecedent in a Long Distance Clause - Null Subjects

| Antecedent | Lang group | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---------------|------------|----|------|----------------|
| Subject1 | Spanish | 20 | .20 | .41 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .31 | .34 |
| Subject 2 | Spanish | 20 | .80 | .41 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .69 | .34 |
| Other options | Spanish | 20 | .00 | .00 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .00 | .00 |
| Other person | Spanish | 20 | .00 | .00 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .00 | .00 |

7.1.2.2. Overt Subjects

In Table 8, we see the results of the tests on the choice of overt subject antecedent in a long distance clause. The results aid in comparative analysis of the choice of the subject antecedent in the immediate clause and that of the subject antecedent in a long distance clause in order to understand the first hypothesis.

An independent sample t-test conducted on **subject antecedents in a long distance clause with overt subject pronouns** indicates 25% and 29% selection rate of **Subject 1**

(distant antecedent) by Spanish natives and Ewe speakers, respectively, as the antecedent for the embedded overt pronoun.

Table 8: Descriptive Statistics: Subject Antecedent in a Long Distance Clause - Overt Subject Pronouns

| Antecedent | lang_group | N | Mean | Std Deviation |
|---------------|------------|----|------|---------------|
| subject1 | Spanish | 20 | .25 | .41 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .29 | .45 |
| subject 2 | Spanish | 20 | .00 | .00 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .00 | .00 |
| other options | Spanish | 20 | .00 | .00 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .00 | .00 |
| Other person | Spanish | 20 | .75 | .41 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .71 | .45 |

There is no significant difference between the two groups as revealed by $t(109) = -.33$ $P < 0.16$. Neither **Subject 2 (closest possible antecedent)** nor **Other options** was selected by any of the groups. **Other person** was selected 75% of the time by the Spanish natives whereas the Ewe speakers scored 71%. This suggests that in Ewe, either the closer or the farther antecedent would have to be chosen. This explains the selection pattern of the subject antecedent in both groups.

7.1.3. Plurals

Table 9 presents the combined results of the tests on the choice of null and overt subject antecedents on morphological genericity.

Table 9: Descriptive Statistics: Morphological Genericity - Null and Overt Subject Pronouns

| Null subjects | | | | | Overt subjects | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------|----|------|----------------|----------------|------|----------------|
| Antecedent | Lang group | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| External subject | Spanish | 20 | .00 | .00 | 20 | .00 | .00 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .00 | .00 | 91 | .00 | .00 |
| Prepositional complement | Spanish | 20 | .00 | .00 | 20 | .00 | .00 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .00 | .00 | 91 | .00 | .00 |
| Others excluding external subject | Spanish | 20 | .35 | .40 | 20 | .35 | .40 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .54 | .48 | 91 | .54 | .48 |
| Others including external subject | Spanish | 20 | .65 | .40 | 20 | .65 | .40 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .46 | .48 | 91 | .46 | .48 |

7.1.3.1. Null Pronouns

Table 10 presents the results of the choice of the subject in constructions involving morphological genericity. The results address the hypothesis that the logophoric pronoun cannot be interpreted as co-referent with the Spanish third person plural morpheme in expressing genericity in null subject pronoun contexts. The results from an independent sample t-test conducted to determine the performance of both groups in constructions where verbal morphology is interpreted generically show that the Spanish native speakers and the Ewe speakers did not select the **external subject** or the **prepositional complement** as the antecedent of the null embedded subject. However, the Ewe speakers selected **other subjects excluding the external subject** 35% of the time whereas their Spanish counterparts selected it 54% of the time. Finally, the Spanish speakers interpret the null embedded subject pronoun as co-referent with **others including the external subject** 65% of the time but the Ewe speakers scored 46% on it. There was a significant difference between both groups as indicated by $t(109) = -1.63, p < 0.001$.

Table 10: Descriptive Statistics: - Morphological Genericity - Null Subject Pronouns

| Antecedent | Lang group | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|-----------------------------------|------------|----|------|----------------|
| External subject | Spanish | 20 | .00 | .00 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .00 | .00 |
| Prepositional complement | Spanish | 20 | .00 | .00 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .00 | .00 |
| Others excluding external subject | Spanish | 20 | .35 | .40 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .54 | .48 |
| Others including external subject | Spanish | 20 | .65 | .40 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .46 | .48 |

7.1.3.1. Overt Subjects

Table 11 presents the results of the choice of the subject antecedent in constructions involving morphological genericity. The results address the hypothesis that the logophoric pronoun cannot be interpreted as co-referent with the Spanish third person plural morpheme in expressing genericity in overt subject contexts.

Table 11: Descriptive Statistics: Morphological Genericity - Overt Subject Pronouns

| Antecedent | Lang group | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|-----------------------------------|------------|----|------|----------------|
| External subject | Spanish | 20 | .02 | .06 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .00 | .00 |
| Prepositional complement | Spanish | 20 | .00 | .00 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .00 | .00 |
| Others excluding external subject | Spanish | 20 | .64 | .45 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .23 | .42 |
| Others including external subject | Spanish | 20 | .24 | .40 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .78 | .42 |

An independent sample t-test run on constructions involving generically interpreted verbal morphology reveals 2% and 0% selection rate of the **external subject**

as the antecedent for the embedded overt pronoun by Spanish natives and Ewe speakers respectively. The statistical analysis reveals a significant difference between the two groups: $t(109) 2.97, p < 0.001$. **Prepositional complement** was not selected by any of the groups. **Others excluding external subject** was selected 64% of the time by the Spanish natives but the Ewe speakers scored 23%. Finally, the Spanish natives chose **others including the external subject** 24% of the time compared with the Ewe speakers who selected it 78% of the time. These results suggest that the concept of morphological genericity offers ambiguous interpretations which does not allow for a clear idea about what the subject of the plural morpheme should be in null or overt contexts.

7.2. GJT2 Results for Sentential Subjects

Table 12 presents the combined results of the tests on the choice of null and overt subject antecedents in clausal subject constructions.

Table 12: Clausal Subjects: Null and Overt Subject Pronouns

| Null subjects | | | | | Overt subjects | | |
|--------------------------|------------|----|------|----------------|----------------|------|----------------|
| Antecedent | Lang group | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| Nobody | Spanish | 20 | .00 | .00 | 20 | .00 | .00 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .00 | .00 | 90 | .00 | .00 |
| Direct object | Spanish | 20 | .98 | .08 | 20 | .05 | .13 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .58 | .50 | 91 | .24 | .28 |
| Prepositional complement | Spanish | 20 | .00 | .00 | 20 | .00 | .00 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .00 | .03 | 91 | .26 | .35 |
| Other | Spanish | 20 | .03 | .08 | 20 | .95 | .13 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .42 | .50 | 91 | .49 | .42 |

7.2.1. Null Subjects

Table 13 shows the subset of results from table 12 for null subjects. An independent sample t-test revealed that the Spanish and the Ewe speakers did not select **nobody** or **prepositional complement** whereas they selected the **direct object** 98% and 58% of the time, respectively. With respect to difference in performance, the results of the independent sample t-test yielded a significant difference between both groups: $t(109) = 3.592$, $p < 0.001$. With regard to **other**, 3% and 42% was recorded for the Spanish speakers and the Ewe speakers, respectively.

Table 13: Clausal Subjects: Null Subject Pronouns

| Antecedent | Lang group | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--------------------------|------------|----|------|----------------|
| Nobody | Spanish | 20 | .00 | .00 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .00 | .00 |
| Direct object | Spanish | 20 | .98 | .08 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .58 | .50 |
| Prepositional complement | Spanish | 20 | .00 | .00 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .00 | .03 |
| Other | Spanish | 20 | .03 | .08 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .42 | .50 |

7.2.2. Overt Subjects

In Table 14, we see the results of the tests conducted on the choice of the subject antecedent in clausal subject constructions with overt subject pronouns. The results address the hypothesis that the crosslinguistic influence of the logophoric pronoun in clausal subject constructions in Spanish would lead to a dual learnability problem of reconciling the structural parametric difference of both languages and retrieving the antecedent of the null subject for the L2 learners.

Table 14. Descriptive Statistics: Clausal Subjects- Overt Subject Pronouns

| Antecedent | Lang group | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--------------------------|------------|----|------|----------------|
| Nobody | Spanish | 20 | .00 | .00 |
| | Ewe | 90 | .00 | .00 |
| Direct object | Spanish | 20 | .05 | .13 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .24 | .28 |
| Prepositional complement | Spanish | 20 | .00 | .00 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .26 | .35 |
| Other | Spanish | 20 | .95 | .13 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .49 | .42 |

The Spanish speakers and the Ewe native speakers did not select **nobody** as the antecedent for the overt subject in clausal subject constructions in an independent sample t-test. The Spanish speakers selected **the direct object**, with a score of 5% while the Ewe speakers selected it with a score of 24% showing a significant difference of $t(109) = -2.99$ $p < 0.051$ between the groups. This means that the L2 speakers are generally not close to native-like competence in this area. The Spanish speakers did not select prepositional complement but the Ewe speakers selected it with a percentage rate of 26%. **Other** was selected as antecedent for the overt pronoun by the Spanish speakers with figure of (95%) compared with the Ewe speakers (49%).

This suggests that the clausal subject constructions present learnability problems in overt subject constructions because the choice of the appropriate subject antecedent of the direct object in overt pronoun constructions is inconsistent.

7.3. GJT3 Results for Overt Pronoun Constraint

In Table 15, we see the combined results of the tests on the choice of null and overt subject antecedents Overt Pronoun Constraint constructions.

Table 15: Descriptive Statistics: Overt Pronoun Constraint- Null and Overt Subject Pronouns

| Null subjects | | | | | Overt subjects | | |
|--------------------------|------------|----|------|----------------|----------------|------|----------------|
| Antecedent | Lang group | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| Nobody | Spanish | 20 | .00 | .00 | 20 | .00 | .00 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .00 | .00 | 91 | .00 | .00 |
| Distributive | Spanish | 20 | .93 | .18 | 20 | .10 | .31 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .85 | .34 | 91 | .26 | .38 |
| Prepositional complement | Spanish | 20 | .00 | .00 | 20 | .00 | .00 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .05 | .23 | 91 | .04 | .11 |
| Other | Spanish | 20 | .08 | .18 | 20 | .90 | .31 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .09 | .27 | 91 | .70 | .37 |

7.3.1. Null Subjects

Table 16 below deals with the results of the tests on the choice of the subject in Overt Pronoun Constructions by Ewe speakers in null subject pronoun contexts. It is aimed at testing whether the quantifier antecedent of the Overt Pronoun Constraint is determined by knowledge of the logophoric pronoun.

An independent sample t-test conducted to determine the performance of both groups in Overt Pronoun Constraint constructions in embedded null subject pronoun contexts indicated that neither Spanish native speakers nor the Ewe speakers selected **nobody**. Both groups selected **distributive**, scoring 93% and 85% respectively, and the difference between the groups is significant: $t(109) = .899, p < 0.04$. The Spanish speakers rejected the **prepositional complement**, but the Ewe speakers scored 5%. Spanish and

Ewe speakers scored 8% and 9% respectively in selecting **other** yielding a non-significant difference between the two groups as seen in $t(109) = -2.47, p < .429$.

Table 16: Descriptive Statistics: Overt Pronoun Constraint - Null Subject Pronoun

| Antecedent | Lang group | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--------------------------|------------|----|------|----------------|
| Nobody | Spanish | 20 | .00 | .00 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .00 | .00 |
| Distributive | Spanish | 20 | .93 | .18 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .85 | .34 |
| Prepositional complement | Spanish | 20 | .00 | .00 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .05 | .23 |
| Other | Spanish | 20 | .08 | .18 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .09 | .27 |

7.3.2. Overt Subjects

Table 17 presents the results of the tests on the choice of the subject in Overt Pronoun Constructions by Ewe speakers in overt subject pronoun contexts. It addresses the hypothesis that the quantifier antecedent of the Overt Pronoun Constraint is determined by knowledge of the logophoric pronoun.

Table 17: Descriptive Statistics: Overt Pronoun Constraint - Overt Subject Pronouns

| Antecedent | Lang group | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--------------------------|------------|----|------|----------------|
| Nobody | Spanish | 20 | .00 | .00 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .00 | .00 |
| Distributive | Spanish | 20 | .10 | .31 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .26 | .38 |
| Prepositional complement | Spanish | 20 | .00 | .00 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .04 | .11 |
| Other | Spanish | 20 | .90 | .31 |
| | Ewe | 91 | .70 | .37 |

In Table 17, neither the Spanish speakers nor the Ewe speakers selected **nobody** as the antecedent for the embedded overt subject. The Spanish and Ewe speakers overwhelmingly selected **other** (90% and 70% respectively), whereas Spanish speakers only selected **distributive** (10%) as against the Ewe speakers who scored 26%. These differences between the two groups were statistically significant ($t(109)=2.20$ $p < 0.001$).

To summarize, the general trend of the Ewe speakers showed that the logophoric pronoun can easily be interpreted as co-referent with the Spanish null pronoun having an antecedent in the immediate clause though in a direction which is not very close to that of the Spanish speakers. The same situation applies to Overt Pronoun Constraint constructions with both null and overt pronouns. When it comes to choose of the subject antecedent in long distance clauses, the Ewe speakers did not show a clear mastery of the crosslinguistic influence of the logophoric pronoun compared with the Spanish monolinguals. The choice of the subject antecedent in the generically induced verbal morphology interpretations proved more problematic for the L2 learners than for the L1 learners. The clausal subject constructions proved problematic for the Ewe speakers unlike the monolinguals.

CHAPTER 8: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

As indicated in the preceding chapters, this dissertation investigates how the knowledge of logophoricity in Ewe is interpreted as co-referent with diverse contexts in Spanish. The dissertation formulated four hypotheses repeated as follows:

1. The Ewe logophoric pronoun is interpreted as co-referent to the Spanish null embedded subject so L2 Spanish speakers should select subjects as antecedents of null pronouns in embedded contexts.
2. The logophoric pronoun cannot be interpreted as co-referent with the Spanish third person plural morpheme in expressing genericity.
3. The crosslinguistic influence of the logophoric pronoun in clausal subject constructions in Spanish would lead to a dual learnability problem of reconciling the structural parametric difference of both languages and retrieving the antecedent of the null subject for the L2 learners.
4. The quantifier antecedent of the Overt Pronoun Constraint is determined by knowledge of the logophoric pronoun.

The dissertation examines the results in light of the research questions with a view to confirming or rejecting the hypotheses. Each of the four research questions is addressed in a separate section after which general conclusions are drawn on the performance of the participants. The first research question is: “Do logophoric pronouns in Ewe influence the Semantic interpretation of the null subjects in Spanish?”

From the statistical results obtained in an independent sample t-test on the subject antecedent in adjacent clause construction, (see Table 3 in chapter 7) it is evident that the external subject which is the canonical antecedent of the null subject has been selected with

a relatively high percentage by the Ewe speakers (83%) compared with that of the native Spanish speakers (96%). Even though the result is not as overwhelming as expected, I argue that the Ewe speakers have demonstrated that other factors yet to be investigated (such as proficiency in Spanish) can enhance their performance. In Ewe, the logophoric pronoun exclusively refers to the subject antecedent, i.e., the external subject. In light of the results the response to the question veers in the affirmative, meaning the logophoric pronoun plays a crucial role in the semantic interpretation of the null subject in Spanish. One could advance the argument that the overt nature of the logophoric pronoun should not converge on the L2 semantic interpretation of the null subject. However, it should be noted that the canonical semantic interpretation of the antecedent of the logophoric pronoun by native speakers should similarly favor the canonical semantic interpretation of the subject antecedent of the syntactic null subject even in L2 intermediate learners. Hence this result could be interpreted to mean that the L2 speakers have acquired the ability to semantically interpret the null subjects in Spanish (with the involvement and influence from Ewe). This is a confirmation of the first hypothesis that states that the Ewe logophoric pronoun is interpreted as co-referent with the Spanish null embedded subject so L2 Spanish speakers should select subjects as antecedents of null pronouns in embedded contexts.

We have seen that an independent sample t-test conducted on **subject antecedents in a long distance clause with null subject pronouns** as shown in Table 7 indicates (25%) and (29%) selection rate of **Subject 1 (distant antecedent)** by Spanish natives and Ewe speakers respectively as the antecedent for the embedded overt pronoun. There is no significant difference between the two groups as revealed by $t(109) = -.33, p < 0.16$. Neither **Subject 2 (closest possible antecedent)** nor **Other options** was selected by any

of the groups. **Other person** was selected 75% of the time by the Spanish natives whereas the Ewe speakers scored 71%. Ewe speakers preferred the distant antecedent to the closest possible antecedent, albeit at low percentage. This result suggests that in Ewe either the closer or the farther antecedent would have to be chosen. In Ewe, the choice of the antecedent could vacillate between the two subjects but it is not clear why the first subject was preferred. Consequently, we can conclude that whereas the logophoric pronoun plays a positive role in the semantic interpretation of the null pronoun whose antecedent is in the immediate clause, it does not facilitate the semantic interpretation of the closest possible antecedent in long distance clauses since either the close or the farther antecedent would have to be chosen. This is a further confirmation of the first hypothesis. The Ewe logophoric pronoun is interpreted as co-referent with the Spanish null embedded subject, so L2 Spanish speakers should select subjects as antecedents of null pronouns in embedded contexts.

The second research question is “Does the logophoric pronoun influence generic interpretations in Spanish third person plural constructions with the morpheme (-n)?” As noted above in section 3.4., in Ewe nominal *ame* ‘person’ is used to express genericity. In this regard, it can be said that in Ewe, generic constructions do not necessarily exclude the matrix subject. The matrix subject could be part of the generic referent. On the contrary, *ye* is not used to express genericity. Its antecedent is the matrix subject.

From the results obtained in the statistical analysis of the selection of the antecedent in verbal morphology constructions with null subjects, the dissertation arrived at a unified account as follows: we assume that the plural arbitrary interpretation involves a semantic operator (generic). That is why 65% of monolinguals responded “other including the

external subject” and 35% of them responded “other excluding the external subject” whereas 46% of the Ewe speakers responded **others including the external subject** and 54% of them selected **others excluding the external subject**. In other words, like native Spanish speakers, the Ewe speakers did not choose the external subject as the null subject antecedent (0.%). This could be interpreted to mean in the case of the L2 participants, the plural morpheme (-n) affixed to the verb induces an outright rejection of the **external subject** as the sole antecedent since it is a singular NP. Also it could be due to the fact that the logophoric pronoun **ye** (singular) or **yewo** (plural) do not command verbal inflectional morphology. Therefore, the affixation of the plural verbal morpheme possibly leads to the selection of the two plural antecedents hence the choice of **others excluding external subject** (54%) and **others including external subject** (46%). The former figure does not suggest any notable crosslinguistic influence of the plural logophor **yewo** which refers to **others including the external subject** on the plural morpheme. Even in the latter case, if we assume that the plural logophor was rather crosslinguistically interpreted as co-referent with the plural morpheme, then it is not clear why selection of **others including the external subject** recorded a relatively lower figure. That is, assuming the speakers only think of the plural logophor, then a much higher figure should be expected in terms of **others including external subject**.

Another plausible explanation for this result could be because of the fact that the overt plural morphology in Spanish with a null subject is pragmatically and syntactically distinct from the logophor in arbitrary interpretations. So the notion of syntax-pragmatic or syntax morphology interface needs further research as to what elements constitute each of them. In overt subject contexts the **external subject** was not selected. This perhaps is

attributable to the “double marker of plurality- the plural verbal morphology and the plural DP “ellos”. These two nominal categories further explain an increase in the selection of **others including external subject** (78%) as the overt subject antecedent. Note that even though the logophoric pronoun and the overt plural subject pronoun **ellos** in Spanish occur at the same syntactic positions, the mismatch in agreement morphology in both languages, coupled with the overt plural subject in Spanish could be the possible reason why learners displayed difficulties by overwhelmingly selecting **others including external subject**. The equivalent subject pronoun for **ellos** is **wo** (they, excluding the external subject) in Ewe.

The syntax-morphology interface between the logophoric pronoun and the plural morpheme or the different syntactic position of the logophoric pronoun (assuming the Ewe speakers use **yewo** which refers to a plural subject) and the plural subject morpheme in Spanish make it all the more difficult to more appropriately select the antecedent.

Note that *yewo* does not provide arbitrary reading nor does it have a generic interpretation, but it does include the speaker and a group of people. However the plural morpheme in Spanish provides arbitrary reading, excluding the speaker and the addressee as explained by Jaeggli, (1986) in (51).

I) specific existential reading (temporally anchored):

(51a). Tocan a la puerta.

“(They) knock.3pl at the door.” (=someone is knocking...)

(II) vague existential reading (not temporally anchored):

(51b) Han encontrado una motocicleta en el patio.

“(They) have.3pl found a motorbike in the courtyard.”

(III) inferred existential reading (inferred from a result):

(51c). Aquí han comido mariscos.

“Here, (they) have.3pl eaten seafood.” (=someone)

(IV) corporate reading (predicates with a designated subject- subcase of existential reading): (Kärde (1943))

(51d). Volvieron a aumentar el IVA.

“(They) raised the VAT again.”

(51e). Planean convocar elecciones.

“(They) plan.3pl to call elections.”

(V) universal reading (licensed by a locative):

(51f). En España hablan español.

“In Spain, (they) speak.3pl Spanish.”

The second hypothesis predicts that the logophoric pronoun cannot be interpreted as co-referent with the Spanish third person plural morpheme in expressing genericity. It is important to note that the third person plural can be arbitrarily restricted to the speaker and a group of people. The logophoric plural *yewo* always includes the speaker and another group of people. Therefore, the first possibility in Spanish does not apply in Ewe. Thus this analysis for French sentences holds for the English versions either in main clauses or embedded clauses.

Another dimension to this analysis is that in Spanish the interpretation of the feature [plural] with the 3pl arbitrary readings does not necessarily impose a plural interpretation: the existential readings do not imply a plurality (see e.g., Suñer (1983) for Spanish, Cinque (1988) for Italian).

The dissertation concludes from the preceding analyses that the Spanish third person plural morpheme (-n) with a null subject antecedent is not a critical determinant in expressing genericity. Thus our hypothesis that the logophoric pronoun cannot be interpreted as co-referent to the Spanish third person plural morpheme in expressing genericity is confirmed. Future research could be carried out if we assume that genericity should not only include a singular subject antecedent in order to explain why the Ewe speakers are presumably interpreting the plural logophor as co-referent to the singular NP antecedent in addition to another set of individuals encoded in the plural verbal morphology in Spanish. The dissertation does not intend to examine the possible generic interpretation of plural nominal antecedents like *Kofi y Augustina dicen que pueden hablar con el president*, or *Los chicos dicen que pueden hablar con el presidente*.

The third hypothesis states that the crosslinguistic influence of the logophoric pronoun in clausal subject constructions in Spanish would lead to a dual learnability problem of reconciling the structural parametric difference of both languages and retrieving the antecedent of the null subject for the L2 learners. The confirmation of this hypothesis was derived from the statistical results that indicate that Ewe speakers selected the direct object (58%) of the time as opposed to the monolinguals (96%) in clausal subject constructions with null subjects. As indicated earlier, the word order in clausal subject constructions in Spanish is the reverse of what obtains in equivalent constructions in logophoric contexts. Therefore, the Ewe speakers interpreted the relational “possessed nominal” as co-referent with the “possessor nominal” in Spanish. The possessed nominal is categorized as the direct object in Spanish. For example, in “*que sea inteligente le agrada a la hermana de Kofi*”, *la hermana* is the direct object and-the possessed nominal.

Kofi is the possessor. In Ewe, “*hermana de Kofi*” is translated as *kofi novia* with each member of the NP encoding the same semantic features in both languages.

We have noted that clausal subject constructions in Spanish do not have the same structural order in Ewe (see the example in section 3.5 for further illustrations). The above discussion is conclusive evidence that referential antecedents of null and overt subjects in clausal subject constructions cannot be determined by the crosslinguistic influence of the logophoric pronoun in view of the structural and syntactic mismatch that exist between the two languages

In the case of the overt subject, the Ewe speakers did not show much improvement even in their selection of **other**, which is the appropriate response as demonstrated in the overwhelming performance by the native speakers. This leads to the confirmation of the hypotheses that the crosslinguistic influence of the logophoric pronoun in clausal subject constructions in Spanish would lead to a dual learnability problem of reconciling the structural parametric difference of both languages and retrieving the antecedent of the null subject for the L2 learners.

Finally, the fourth hypothesis states that the quantifier antecedent of the Overt Pronoun Constraint is determined by knowledge of the logophoric pronoun. According to the statistical analysis, the Ewe speakers overwhelmingly selected **distributive** (85%) compared with the monolinguals (93%) which is the quantifier antecedent (**todo el mundo**) of the null subject in Spanish. **Todo el mundo** is the equivalent of **amesiame** in Ewe referring unambiguously to every member of a group. It is therefore evident that there are no learnability difficulties in the crosslinguistic influence of the logophoric pronoun in Spanish constructions. L2 learners have no difficulty with the acquisition of binding

properties of the null pronoun. On the other hand, the learnability problem is that only the null version of the construction should be bound, and direct crosslinguistic influence would predict that speakers would select the distributive reading with overt pronouns as well.

The logophoric pronoun as noted earlier exclusively refers to the external subject which in this construction is labeled as **distributive** with respect to the quantifier antecedent. This suggests that knowledge of the logophoric pronoun determines the selection of the quantifier antecedent in Spanish. In the constructions with overt subjects, the Ewe speakers performed with a 70% score in choosing **other**, compared with the monolinguals (90%) as the antecedent. It is interesting to note that the L2 learners, despite the influence of L1 Ewe, did not treat the overt pronoun in Spanish as being identical to the overt logophoric pronoun. This is not unexpected, given the assumption that the null pronoun is like the logophoric, so they seem to have acquired the overt/null distinction in this particular area.

All these results confirm the universality of the Overt Pronoun Constraint, not only among monolingual native speakers of a null subject language but also among those who learn it as a second language. I therefore conclude that the fourth hypothesis is confirmed; namely, that the quantifier antecedent of the Overt Pronoun Constraint is determined by knowledge of the logophoric pronoun. Next, I discuss the relevance of the results in light of the interface hypotheses.

CHAPTER 9: OTHER PERSPECTIVES ON THE INTERFACE HYPOTHESIS

The Interface Hypothesis (IH), proposed by researchers (e.g., Sorace, 2006; Sorace & Serratrice, 2009; Sorace, 2011) is a theory that seeks to account for patterns of non-convergence and residual optionality found at very advanced stages of adult second (L2) acquisition. The IH originally proposed that language structures involving an interface between syntax and other cognitive domains are less likely to be acquired completely than structures that do not involve this interface. The IH assumes that different interfaces pose different levels of difficulties in learning second language properties. It predicts that properties involving sub-modules of language (internal interface) can be acquired relatively easier than those relating to cognitive domains (external interface), external to core computational system. Interface permutations exist with the Ewe logophor and its antecedent, although in a more restricted sense. The interaction between the logophor and the null pronoun in Spanish is akin to syntax semantic or pragmatic interface.

The first hypothesis states that the Ewe logophoric pronoun is interpreted as co-referent with the Spanish null embedded subject so L2 Spanish speakers should select subjects as antecedents null pronouns in embedded contexts. The results obtained confirmed the hypothesis that the Ewe logophoric pronoun is interpreted as co-referent with the Spanish null embedded subject, so L2 Spanish speakers should select subjects as antecedents of null pronouns in embedded contexts. This is because the Spanish native speakers selected the **external subject** as the antecedent of the embedded null subject (96%). The Ewe speakers trailed the L1 speakers in the selection of the null subject antecedent also by a slightly lower margin (83%). The plausible explanation for this is due to the canonical association of the logophor to the matrix subject, a phenomenon which has

been interpreted as co-referent to the Spanish context. The result (83%) shows that the Ewe speakers are getting close to the Spanish setting as predicted by the syntax/semantics interface.

The second hypothesis predicts that the logophoric pronoun cannot be interpreted as co-referent with the Spanish third person plural morpheme in expressing genericity. The performance of both groups in constructions where verbal morphology is interpreted generically show that the Spanish native speakers and the Ewe speakers did not select the **external subject** or the **prepositional complement** as the antecedent of the null embedded subject. However, the Ewe speakers selected **other subjects excluding the external subject** 35% of the time whereas their Spanish counterparts selected 54% of the time. Finally, the Spanish speakers interpreted the null embedded subject pronoun as co-referent with **others including the external subject** 65% of the time but the Ewe speakers scored 46% on it. The results confirm the hypothesis because while the logophor specifically refers to the matrix subject, the third person plural morpheme not only expresses genericity but also includes and excludes the matrix subject. So the ambiguous interpretation of the third person plural morpheme is what informed the general selection pattern by the Ewe speakers. Again it is not clear whether it is the singular or the plural overt logophoric which triggers the selection of the antecedent of the null or the overt subject in Spanish. This situation is made more complex by the mismatch that exists between the syntactic positions of the logophor and the plural morpheme in Spanish. It is not clear whether it is a syntax-morphology interface, pragmatic-syntax interface or pragmatic-morphology interface that is playing a role in the non-target L2 acquisition. If we consider the interaction between the logophor and the third person plural as the syntax/morphology interface then our

hypothesis is confirmed: the logophoric pronoun cannot be interpreted as co-referent with the Spanish third person plural morpheme in expressing genericity. In light of the hypothesis, the syntax/morphology interface has not been confirmed for various reasons including the inability to determine whether the given grammatical properties involved belong to one interface or the other.

The third hypothesis states that the crosslinguistic influence of the logophoric pronoun in clausal subject constructions in Spanish would lead to a dual learnability problem of reconciling the structural parametric difference of both languages and retrieving the antecedent of the null subject for the L2 learners. This hypothesis is confirmed (in light of the syntax/pragmatic interface) by the statistical results that indicate that Ewe speakers selected the direct object (58%) of the time as opposed to the monolinguals (96%) in clausal subject constructions with null subjects. We can explain this in light of what was indicated earlier, namely that the word order in clausal subject constructions in Spanish is the reverse of what obtains in equivalent constructions in logophoric contexts. Therefore, the Ewe speakers interpreted the relational “possessed nominal” as co-referent with the “possessor nominal” in Spanish. The possessed nominal is categorized as the direct object in Spanish. The interaction between the logophoric constructions and the clausal subject constructions can be likened to the syntax/pragmatic interface which is known to present learnability problems. The third hypothesis is therefore confirmed in light of the syntax/pragmatics interface.

Finally, the fourth hypothesis states that the quantifier antecedent of the Overt Pronoun Constraint is determined by knowledge of the logophoric pronoun. According to the statistical analysis, the Ewe speakers overwhelmingly selected **distributive** (85%)

compared with the monolinguals (93%) which is the quantifier antecedent (**todo el mundo**) of the null subject in Spanish. **Todo el mundo** is the equivalent of **amesiame** in Ewe referring unambiguously to every member of a group. It is therefore evident that there are no learnability difficulties in the crosslinguistic influence of the logophoric pronoun in Spanish constructions. L2 learners have no difficulty with the acquisition of binding properties of the null pronoun because the binding properties of the logophor are interpreted as co-referent with the Spanish context. The Overt Pronoun Constraint can be construed as the interaction between syntax and semantics. (syntax/semantics interface described as an internal interface) which favors learning. In light of the fourth hypothesis the syntax/semantics interface is confirmed.

In light of the implication of my study for theories of L2 acquisition, the dissertation concludes that the concept of interface is too broad and may not be used to capture how challenging L2 acquisition is in a wide variety of language pairings. For example, the prediction made by the Interface Hypothesis does not always hold in light of our study. As noted already, the syntax/morphological Interface that is assumed to favor learning is not consistent with our results. It is not clear which interfaces are involved in the acquisition of the morphological genericity, making acquisition difficult. This supports the position of White (2011) and Montrul (2011). They claim that it is sometimes difficult to determine whether a given grammatical property belongs to one interface or the other and that difficulty on some grammatical property could not be due to the alleged interface involved. On syntax morphology interface, the Ewe speakers selected **other subjects excluding the external subject** 35% of the time whereas their Spanish counterparts selected 54% of the time. Spanish speakers selected the reference for the null embedded subject pronoun as

others including the external subject 65% of the time but the Ewe speakers scored 46% on it. All these results are at variance with the Interface hypothesis as proposed by Sorace (2006). Again, other Second Language Acquisition theories need revision to accommodate learning difficulties.

I suggest a practical modification of the Interface Hypothesis to Parametrized Interface Hypothesis to address interfaces that fall within comparable linguistic modules. For example, it is only languages like Ewe and Spanish that can yield similar results from the same interfaces. Specifically, any language that exhibits the same logophoric properties like Ewe can be compared with another romance language with similar null/overt subject properties like Spanish. While acknowledging the fact that all romance languages do not have the same syntax in all domains, I believe domains that are similar and comparable to the domains tested in our study could be the best candidates for testing the Interface Hypothesis. This would go a long way to narrow the broad scope of the hypothesis to a micro level for its predictions to be valid. However, further research is needed to determine what grammatical categories fall under a particular interface in order to assess problems associated with L2 acquisition.

REFERENCES

- Al Kasey, T. & Pérez-Leroux, A.T. (1998). Second language acquisition of Spanish null subjects. In S. Flynn, G. Martohardjono & W. O'Neil (Eds), *The Generative Study of Second Language Acquisition*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Alexiadou, A., & Agnostopoulou, E. (1998). Parametrizing AGR: word order, V-movement and EPP-checking. *Natural Language and Linguistic Science* 16. 491–539.
- Almoguera R., Lagunas, C. (1993). El parámetro pro-drop en el español no nativo. In J.M. Liceras (Ed.). *La lingüística y el análisis de los sistemas no nativos*. Ottawa: Dovehouse.
- Alonso-Ovalle, L. & D’Introno, F. (2000). Full and null pronouns in Spanish: the zero pronoun hypothesis. In: Campos, H., et al. (Eds.). *Hispanic Linguistics at the Turn of the Millennium*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Alonso-Ovalle, L. (2000). Is the ‘Arbitrary Interpretation’ a Semantic Epiphenomenon? UMass Working Papers in Linguistics 21.
- Bini, M. (1993). La adquisición del italiano: más allá de las propiedades sintácticas del parámetro pro- drop. In J.M Liceras (Ed), *La lingüística y el análisis de los sistemas nativos*. Ottawa: Dovehouse.
- Blackwell, S. E. (2003). *Implicatures in discourse: The case of Spanish NP anaphora*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bley-Vroman, R. (1989). ‘What is the logical problem of foreign language learning? in S. Gass & J. Schachter (eds.) *Linguistic perspectives on second language acquisition*. New York, NY: CUP.

- Bos P., Hollebrandse, B., & Sleeman, P. (2004). The pragmatics-syntax and the semantics-syntax interface in acquisition. *IRAL*, 42, 101–110.
- Cabredo Hofherr, P. (1999). ‘Arbitrary pro and the theory of pro’.
- Camacho, J. (2006). Do subjects have a place in Spanish? In Montreuil, J.P., Nishida, C. (eds.), *New Perspectives in Romance Linguistics*. Philadelphia, PA: Benjamin.
- Camacho, J. (2010). The null subject parameter revisited: Spanish and Portuguese in discourse. Paper presented at the IV the Romania Nova Workshop. Campos de Jordao
- Camacho, J. (2011). Chinese-type pro in romance-type null- subject language. *Lingua* 121. 987-1008
- Camacho, J. (2013). *Null Subjects*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carminati, M. N. (2002). *The Processing of Italian Subject Pronouns*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst. Amherst, MA: GLSA publications.
- Clahsen, H. & Muysken, P. (1989). The UG paradox in L2 acquisition. *Second Language Research* 5, 1-29.
- Clements, G. (1975). The logophoric pronoun in Ewe: Its role in discourse. *Journal of West African Languages* 10, 141-177.
- Creton, H., & Wubbels, T. (1984). *Ordeproblem bij beginnende leraren* [Discipline problems of beginning teachers]. Utrecht, The Netherlands: W.C.C.
- Culy, C. (1994). Logophoric pronouns and point of view. *Linguistics* 35, 845–859.
- de Garavito, B. & Joyce, L. S. (1999a). The *se* construction in Spanish and near-native

- competence. *Spanish Applied Linguistics*, 3, 247-295.
- de Garavito, B. & Joyce, L. S. (1999b). *The syntax of Spanish multifunctional clitics and near-native competence*. Ph.D. dissertation. McGill University.
- Dekydtspotter, L., & Sprouse, R. (2001). Mental design and (second) language epistemology: adjectival restrictions of wh-quantifiers and tense in English- French interlanguage. *Second Language Research* 17, 1–35.
- Dekydtspotter, L., Sprouse, R., & Anderson, B. (1997). The interpretive interface in L2 acquisition: the process-result distinction in English-French interlanguage grammars. *Language Acquisition* 6, 297–332
- Dekydtspotter, L., Sprouse, R. & Swanson, K. (2001a). Reflexes of mental architecture in second-language acquisition: the interpretation of combien extractions in English-French interlanguage. *Language Acquisition* 9, 175–227.
- Dekydtspotter, L., Sprouse, R. & Thyre, R. (2001b). The interpretation of quantification at a distance in English-French interlanguage: domain specificity and second-language acquisition. *Language Acquisition* 8, 265–320.
- Dekydtspotter, L. & Sprouse, R. A. (2001). Mental Design and (second) language epistemology: Adjectival restrictions of wh-quantifiers and tense in English-French interlanguage. *Second Language Research*, 17, 1-35.
- Dekydtspotter, L. & Hathorn, J. (2005). Quelque chose de remarquable in English-French acquisition: mandatory, informationally encapsulated computations in second language interpretation. *Second Language Research* 21, 291–323.
- Dulay, H., Burt, M. & Krashen, S. (1982). *Language Two*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Fernández-Soriano, O. (1989). Strong pronouns in null subject languages and the Avoid Pronoun Principle. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 11*, 228–239.
- Fernández-Soriano, O. (1993). La visión paramétrica del lenguaje: más sobre los sujetos y objetos nulos. In: Licerias, J.M. (Ed.). *La lingüística y el análisis de los sistemas no nativos*. Ottawa: Dovehouse.
- Gundel, J. K., Hedberg, N., & Zacharski, R. (1993). Cognitive status and the form of referring expressions in discourse. *Language*, 69, 274-307.
- Hernanz, M. L. (1990). En torno a los sujetos arbitrarios de segunda persona del singular. In Garza, B. and Demonte, V. (eds). *Estudios lingüísticos de España y de México*. Ciudad de México: Colegio de México, UNAM.
- Hulk, A. & Muller, N. (2000). Bilingual first language acquisition and the Interface between syntax and Pragmatics. *Bilingual: Language and Cognition 3*: 227-44
- Hyams, N. (1986). *Language Acquisition and the Theory of Parameters*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Jaeggli, O. & Safir, K. (1989). The null subject parameter and parametric theory. In: Jaeggli, O. & Safir, K. (Eds.). *The Null Subject Parameter*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Jegerski, J. VanPatten B. & Keating, G. (2011). Cross-linguistic variation and the acquisition of pronominal reference in L2 Spanish. *Second language Research 27*, 481- 507.
- Kanno, K. (1999). Acquisition of verb gapping in Japanese by Mandarin and English speakers. In Kazue Kanno (Ed.). *The acquisition of Japanese as a second language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Kempchinski, P. (2004). Romance Se as an aspectual element. *Contemporary Approaches to Romance Linguistics: Selected Papers from the 33rd Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages*. (Ed.). Auger, J. et al. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Lardiere, D. (2006). Establishing ultimate attainment in a particular second language grammar. In: Zhao Hong, H., Odlin, T. (Eds.). *Studies of Fossilization in Second Language Acquisition*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Lujan, M. (1987). Los pronombres implícitos y explícitos del español. *Revista Argentina de Lingüística* 3, 19–54.
- Luján, M. (1999). Expresión y omisión del pronombre personal. In: Bosque, I., Demonte, V. (Eds.), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.
- Lekakou, M. (2004). Middles as disposition ascriptions. In Meier, C. & Weisberger, M. (Eds.). *Proceedings Sinn und Bedentrung 8*. Konstanz: Universität Konstanz.
- Lekakou, M. (2003). Greek passives on the middle interpretation. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Greek Linguistics*. London: University College.
- Liceras, J. M. (1988). Syntax and stylistics: more on the pro-drop parameter. In Pankhurst, J., Sharwood-Smithand, M. & van Buren, P. (Eds), *Learnability and Second Languages*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Liceras, J. M. (1989). On some properties of the pro-drop parameter: looking for missing subjects in non-native Spanish. In Gass, S. & Schachter, J. (Eds). *Linguistic perspectives in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

- Liceras, J. M. (1993). *La lingüística y el análisis de los sistemas no nativos*. Ottawa: Dovenhouse.
- Liceras J. M. (1996). *La adquisición de las lenguas segundas y la gramática universal*. Madrid: Síntesis.
- Liceras, J. M. & Díaz, L. (1998). On the nature of the relationship between morphology and syntax: f- features and null/overt pronouns in the Spanish interlanguage of speakers of Indo-European and Oriental languages. In M.L Beck (Ed) *Morphology and its interfaces in second language knowledge*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Liceras, J. M. & Díaz, L. (1999). Topic-drop versus pro-drop: null subjects and pronominal subjects in the Spanish L2 of Chinese, English, French, German, Japanese and Korean speakers. *Second Language Research*, 15, 1–40.
- Montalbetti, M. (1984). After Binding: On the interpretation of pronouns. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Montrul, S. (2004). Subject and object expression in Spanish heritage speakers: a case of morphosyntactic convergence. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 7:2, 125–142.
- Montrul, S. & Rodríguez-Louro, C. (2006). Beyond the syntax of the Null Subject Parameter: A look at the discourse-pragmatic distribution of null and overt subjects by L2 learners of Spanish. In Vincent Torrens & Linda Escobar (eds.), *The acquisition of syntax in Romance Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
- Montrul, S. (2011). Interfaces and incomplete acquisition. *Lingua*, 212:4, 591-604.
- Paradis, J. & Navarro, S. (2003). Subject realization and crosslinguistic interference in the bilingual acquisition of Spanish and English: what is the role of input? *Journal*

of Child Language, 30, 1–23.

- Pérez-Leroux, A. T. & Glass, W. (1997). OPC effects on the L2 acquisition of Spanish. In: Pérez-Leroux, A. T. & Glass, W. (Eds.). *Contemporary Perspectives on the Acquisition of Spanish, Volume 1: Developing Grammars*. Somerville: Cascadilla Press.
- Pérez-Leroux, A. T. & Glass, W. (1999). Null anaphora in Spanish second language acquisition: probabilistic versus generative approaches. *Second Language Research*, 15, 220–249.
- Pérez-Leroux, A. T. (1998). The acquisition of mood selection in Spanish relative clauses. *Journal of Child Language*, 25, 585–604.
- Phinney, M. (1987). The pro-drop parameter in second language acquisition. In *Parameter Setting*. Roeper, T. and William, E. (Eds.). Dordrecht: Riedel.
- Picallo, M. C. (1994). Catalan possessive pronouns: the avoid pronoun principle revisited. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 12, 259–299.
- Picallo, M. C. (1998). On the extended projection principle and null expletive subjects. *Probus*, 10, 219–241.
- Rigau, G. (1986). Some remarks on the nature of strong pronouns in null subject languages. In: Bordelois, I., Contreras, H. & Zagona, K. (Eds.). *Generative Studies in Spanish Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Rigau, G. (1988). Strong pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 19, 503–51
- Rizzi, L. (1982). *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Roman, J. (2007). How pragmatically odd! interface delays and pronominal subject distribution in L2 Spanish. Manuscript.

- Schwartz, B. & Sprouse, R. (1996). L2 cognitive states and the full transfer/full access model. *Second Language Research*, 12, 40–72.
- Schreiber, T. & Sprouse, R. A. (1998). Knowledge of topicalization and scrambling in English-German interlanguage. *McGill Working Papers in Linguistics*, 13, 162–171.
- Slabakova, R. (2006). Learnability in the L2 acquisition of semantics: a bidirectional study of a semantic parameter. *Second Language Research*, 22, 498–523.
- Slabakova, R. (2008). *Meaning in the Second Language*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Sorace, A. (2011). Pinning down the concept of “interface” in bilingualism. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism*, 1:1-33.
- Sorace, A. & Serratrice, L. (2009). Internal and external interfaces in bilingual language development: Beyond structural overlap. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 13:2, 195–210.
- Sorace, A. & Filiaci, F. (2006). Anaphora resolution in near-native speakers of Italian. *Second Language Research*, 22, 339-368.
- Sorace, A. & Serratrice, L. (2009). Internal and external interfaces in bilingual language development: revisiting the processing vs. representation distinction. *The International Journal of Bilingualism*, 13(2): 195-210
- Suñer, M. (1983). Proarb, *Linguistic Inquiry* 14, 188–191.
- Toth, P. D. (1998). *Linguistic and pedagogical perspectives on acquiring second-language morpho-syntax: A look of Spanish* Se. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Pittsburgh.
- Tsimpli, I. & Roussou, A. (1991). Parameter resetting in L2? *UCL Working papers in*

Linguistics, 3, 149–169.

- Tsimpli, I.-M. & Sorace, A. (2006). Differentiating interfaces: L2 performance in syntax–semantics and syntax–discourse phenomena. In: Bamman, D., Magnitskai T., Zaller, C. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 30th Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- White, L. (1986). Implications of parametric variation for adult second language acquisition: An investigation of the Pro-drop parameter. In *Experimental Approaches to Second Language Acquisition*, V. J. Cook (ed.). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- White, L. (1989). *Universal Grammar and Second Language Acquisition*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- White, L. (2009). Grammatical theory, interfaces and L2 knowledge. In: Ritchie, W., Bhatia, T.K. (Eds.), *The New Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*. Bingley, UK: Emerald Press.
- White L. (1988). Islands Effects in Second Language Acquisition. In S. Flynn and W. O’Neil (Eds) *Linguistic theory in second language acquisition*. Dordrecht: Kluw
- White, L. (2011). Second language acquisition at the interfaces. *Lingua*, 121(4), 577-590.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Use of the Logophoric Pronoun in Immediate Clauses, and Morphological Genericity Constructions

En las siguientes oraciones diga cuál(es) de los nombres de las personas mencionadas puede(n) considerarse como referente de la palabra subrayada.

1. María vio que Eliza pensaba que saldría

- A. Preferentemente Eliza
- B. Preferentemente María
- C. Todas las otras opciones
- D. Otra persona

2. Juan insiste que puede hablar con el presidente.

- A. Otras personas sin Juan
- B. El presidente
- C. Juan
- D. Otras personas incluyendo a Juan

3. Manuel declara que pueden leer la noticia sobre el administrador

- A. El administrador
- B. Otras personas incluyendo a Manuel
- C. Otras personas sin Manuel
- D. Manuel

4. El ama de casa prepara de comer mientras su esposo lee el periódico.

- A. Ama de casa
- B. Su esposo

C. Nadie

D. Otra persona

5. Andrea vio que Regina aseveraba que ella emigraría a Ghana

A. Preferentemente Regina

B. Preferentemente Andrea

C. Todas las otras opciones

D. Otra persona

6. El director vio al colega del alumno que se negó a pagar la matrícula

A. El director

B. El colega

C. Otra persona

D. Preferentemente el alumno

7. Manuel dice que ellos pueden leer la noticia sobre el administrador

A. El administrador

B. Otras personas sin Manuel

C. Manuel

D. Otras personas incluyendo a Manuel

8. Andrea vio que Regina aseveraba que emigraría a Ghana

A. Otra persona

B. Preferentemente Regina

C. Preferentemente Andrea

D. Todas las otras opciones

9. Juan insiste que él puede hablar con el presidente.

A. Otras personas sin Juan

B. El presidente

C. Juan

D. Otras personas incluyendo a Juan

10 Manuel declara que puede leer la noticia sobre el administrador

A. Otras personas sin Manuel

B. Manuel

C. El administrador

D. Otras personas incluyendo a Manuel

11. El camarero del restaurante le pregunta a Rosa si está de dieta

A. Rosa

B. Otra persona

C. El camarero

D. Nadie

12. María vio que Eliza pensaba que ella saldría

A. Todas las otras opciones

B. Preferentemente Eliza

C. Preferentemente María

C. Otra persona

13. Lucía vió que María confirmaba que volvería

A. Preferentemente Lucía

B. Todas las otras opciones

C. Otra persona

D. Preferentemente María

14. Manuel declara que ellos pueden leer la noticia sobre el administrador

A. Otras personas incluyendo a Manuel

B. El administrador

C. Manuel

D. Otras personas sin Manuel

15. Nuestro profesor Nicolás invita a ver la película de Guillermo

A. Nadie

B. Nicolás

C. Otra persona

D. Guillermo

16. Juan insiste que se puede hablar con el presidente.

A. Juan

B. El presidente

C. Otras personas sin Juan

D. Otras personas incluyendo a Juan

17. Juan que él puede hablar con el presidente.

A. Otras personas sin Juan

B. El presidente

C. Juan

D. Otras personas incluyendo a Juan

18. Juan dice que puede hablar con el presidente.

A. Otras personas sin Juan

B. El presidente

C. Juan

D. Otras personas incluyendo a Juan

19. Manuel insiste que ellos pueden leer la noticia sobre el administrador

A. Otras personas incluyendo a Manuel

B. El administrador

C. Manuel

D. Otras personas sin Manuel

20. Juan insiste que se puede hablar con el presidente.

A. Juan

B. El presidente

C. Otras personas sin Juan

D. Otras personas incluyendo a Juan

21. Lucía vio que María confirmaba que ella volvería

A. Preferentemente Lucía

B. Todas las otras opciones

C. Otra persona

D. Preferentemente María

23. Manuel declara que pueden leer la noticia sobre del administrador

A. El administrador

B. Otras personas incluyendo a Manuel

C. Otras personas sin Manuel

D. Manuel

23. Juan insiste que se puede hablar con el presidente.

- A. Juan
- B. El presidente
- C. Otras personas sin Juan
- D. Otras personas incluyendo a Juan

24. Mateo quiere cuidar a su hermano para asegurarse de su salud

- A Su hermano
- B Mateo
- C Nadie
- D Cualquier persona

25. Juan insiste que se puede hablar con el presidente.

- A. Juan
- B. El presidente
- C. Otras personas sin Juan
- D. Otras personas incluyendo a Juan

26. Roberto dice que Juan no está dispuesto a hacer la tarea

- A. Preferentemente Roberto
- B. Preferentemente Juan
- C. Otra persona
- D. Todas las otras opciones

27. Manuel insiste que pueden leer la noticia sobre del administrador

- A. El administrador
- B. Otras personas incluyendo a Manuel

C. Otras personas sin Manuel

D. Manuel

28. La profesora ayudó a la estudiante mientras ella caminaba en la calle Grande.

A. Preferentemente la profesora

B. Preferentemente el estudiante

C. Otra persona

D. Todas las otras opciones

29. Juan confirma que se puede hablar con el presidente.

A. El presidente

B. Juan

C. Otras personas sin Juan

D. Otras personas incluyendo a Juan

30. Mi hermano dice que es imprescindible lavar las ropas de su tío

A. Nadie

B. Cualquier persona

C. Mi hermano

D. Su tío.

31. Juan confirma que se puede hablar con el presidente.

A. El presidente

B. Juan

C. Otras personas sin Juan

D. Otras personas incluyendo a Juan

32. Catalina sueña que Juana reafirma que abril la odia

- A. Preferentemente Catalina
- B. Preferentemente Juana
- C. Otra persona
- D. Todas las otras opciones

Appendix B: Transfer of the Logophoric Pronoun in Clausal Subject Constructions

En las siguientes oraciones diga cuál(es) de las opciones de A-D puede(n) considerarse como referente de la palabra subrayada.

1. Que sea extrovertida le agrada a la vecina de Manuela

- A. Otra persona
- B. La vecina
- C. Nadie
- D. Manuela

2. Sara y Daniela dicen ser amigas de Emma pero no lo cree

- A. Sara y Daniela
- B. Emma
- C. Otra persona
- D. Nadie

3. Todo el mundo reitera que puede romper las reglas del jefe

- A. Nadie
- B. Cada miembro del grupo
- C. El jefe
- D. Otra persona

4. Mucha gente, excepto el profesor, confirma que tiene que llegar temprano para la reunión

A. Cada miembro del grupo

B. El profesor

C. Otras personas

D. Nadie

5. Que ella sea rica le gusta a la prima de María

A. Otra persona

B. María

C. Nadie

D. La prima

6. El muchacho dice a su primo que él necesita una mujer que lo ame

A. El muchacho

B. Su primo

C. Nadie

D. Una mujer

7. Todo el mundo reitera que él puede construir la casa del abogado

A. Cada miembro del grupo

B. El abogado.

C. Nadie

D. Otra persona

8. Algunas personas en la clase, salvo Kofi reiteran su razón por llegar tarde

A. Algunas personas incluyendo a Kofi

B. Nadie

C. Otra persona

D. Algunas personas excluyendo a Kofi

9. Que esté preocupada le deprime a la prima de Josefina

A. Nadie

B. Otra persona

C. Josefina

D. La prima

10. ¿Con quién, dice mi hermana nosotros podemos vivir en paz si todo el mundo declara la guerra?

A. Mi hermano

B. Todo el mundo

C. Otras personas

D. Todo el mundo

11. Todo el mundo reitera que puede construir la casa del abogado

A. Cada miembro del grupo

B. El abogado.

C. Nadie

D. Otra persona

12. Un alumno del maestro que aprende el español le informa a su clase que está cansado de continuar

A. Cada miembro del grupo

B. Un alumno

C. El maestro

D. Otro miembro del grupo

13. Que ella esté preocupada le deprime a la prima de Josefina

A. Otra persona

B. Nadie

C. La prima

D. Josefina

14. Un maestro le advirtió a su niña que el examen del profesor sería duro

A. Profesor

B. Su niña

C. Un Maestro

D. Nadie

15. Que ella sea educada le anima a la hermana de María

A. Otra persona

B. Nadie

C. La hermana

D. María

16. Mi hermano conoce a un vecino del profesor a quien no le gusta divertirse

A. El vecino del profesor

B. Otra persona

C. Mi hermano

D. Nadie

17. Que sea rica le gusta a la prima de María

A. Otra persona

B. María

C. Nadie

D. La prima

18. Martha no iría al cine del vecino a menos que la acompañe su novio

A. El vecino

B. Otra persona

C. Su novio

D. Martha

19. Todo el mundo reitera que él puede romper las reglas del jefe

A. Nadie

B. Cada miembro del grupo

C. El jefe

D. Otra persona

20. La asociación de lingüistas dice que las palabras para denominar plantas se derivan del latín

A. Cada miembro del grupo

B. Nadie

C. Los lingüistas

D. Otra persona

21. Que ella sea extrovertida le agrada a la vecina de Manuela

A. Otra persona

B. La vecina

C. Nadie

D. Manuela

22. Él dice a su amigo que no le haga decir a su mujer ninguna de las cosas que su esposo aborrece

A. Su esposo

B. Su amigo

C. Su mujer

D. Otra persona

23. Todo el mundo confirma que él puede asistir a la reunión del jefe

A. Cada miembro del grupo

B. Nadie

C. Otra persona

D. El jefe

24. Según los profesores abundan en muchas lenguas palabras para referirse al universo

A. Palabras

B. Otra persona

C. Muchas lenguas

D. Los profesores

25. Todo el mundo confirma que puede participar en el seminario del invitado

A. Invitado

B. Nadie

C. Otra persona

D. Cada miembro del grupo

26. El muchacho le explicó a su amigo cómo él ha aprendido el español tan bien.

A. Su amigo

B. Otra persona

C. El muchacho

D. Nadie

27. Todo el mundo confirma que puede asistir a la reunión del jefe

A. Cada miembro del grupo

B. Nadie

C. Otra persona

D. El jefe

28. El cambio transformativo en la península ibérica del desarrollo del latín fue la desaparición del sistema morfológico

A. El cambio transformativo

B. Cada miembro del grupo

C. El sistema morfológico

D. Península ibérica

29. Que sea educada le anima a la compañera de María

A. Nadie

B. Otra persona

C. La compañera

D. María

30. Pablo, junto con su hermano tiró los lentes de su padre al mar

A. Su padre

B. Pablo

C. Su hermano y Pablo

D. Otra persona

31. Todo el mundo confirma que él puede participar en el seminario del invitado

A. Otra persona

B. Cada miembro del grupo

C. Invitado

D. Nadie

32. Angelina y Lucía se miran durante la reunión en la casa de Martha

A. Cada participante de la reunión

B. Otras personas

C. Martha

D. Angelina y Lucia

Appendix C: Transfer of the Logophoric Pronoun in Overt Pronoun Constructions

En las siguientes oraciones diga cuál(es) de las opciones de A-D puede(n) considerarse como referente de la palabra subrayada.

1. Que sea extrovertida le agrada a la vecina de Manuela

A. Otra persona

B. La vecina

C. Nadie

D. Manuela

2. Sara y Daniela se dicen ser amigas de Emma pero no lo cree

A. Todas las otras opciones

B. Preferentemente Daniela

C. Preferentemente Emma

D. Preferentemente Sara

3. Que ella sea extrovertida le agrada a la vecina de Manuela

A. Otra persona

B. El vecino

C. Nadie

D. Manuel

4. El muchacho explicó a su novia cómo ha aprendido el español tan bien con José

A. Su novia

B. José

C. El muchacho

D. Nadie

5. Que ella sea rica le gusta a la prima de María

A. Otra persona

B. María

C. Nadie

D. La prima

6. No iré al cine a menos que la película sea una comedia

A. Una comedia

B. La película

C. Yo

D. El cine

7. Que sea rica le gusta a la prima de María

A. Otra persona

B. María

C. Nadie

D. La amiga

8. El muchacho necesitaba una mujer que lo amara

A. El muchacho

B. Cualquier persona

C. Nadie

D. Una mujer

9. Que sea simpático le fascina a la amiga de Gabriela

A. Nadie

B. Gabriela

C. Otra persona

D. La amiga

10. La novia de Enrique se alegró mucho cuando recibió su premio

A. La novia

B. Cualquier persona

C. Nadie

D. Enrique

11. Que ella sea simpática le fascina a la amiga de Gabriela

A. Nadie

B. Gabriela

C. Otra persona

D. La amiga

12. No le haga decir a su mujer ninguna de las cosas que su esposo aborrece

A. Su esposo

B. Nadie

C. Su mujer

D. Cualquier persona

13. Que sea sincera le intriga a la abogada de Magdalena

A. Otra persona

B. Nadie

C. La abogada

D. Magdalena

14. Cuando regresó, la madre de José no quiso viajar más

A. La madre

B. José

C. Nadie

D. Cualquier persona

15. Que ella sea sincera le intriga a la abogada de Magdalena

A. Otra persona

B. Nadie

C. La abogada

D. Magdalena

16. La llegada del supertelescopio de Javier causó mucha alegría

A. Javier

B. Supertelescopio

C. Nadie

D. La llegada

17. Que sea egoísta le indigna a la compañera de Juana

A. Nadie

B. Otra persona

C. Juana

D. La compañera

18. El capitán del Titatic ordena que el crucero vaya a toda velocidad

A. El capitán

B. Cualquier persona

C. El crucero

D. Nadie

19. Que ella sea egoísta le indigna a la compañera de Juana

A. Nadie

B. Otra persona

C. Juana

D. La compañera

20. Tom salta sobre el sofá para declarar su amor a su novia

A Su novia

B. Tom

C. Nadie

D. Cualquier persona

21. Que ella sea famosa le encanta a la hermana de Carolina

A. Nadie

B. Carolina

C. Otra persona

D. La hermana

22. ¿Con quién nosotros podemos vivir en paz si todo el mundo declara la guerra?

A. Cualquier persona

B. Nosotros

C. Nadie

D. Cada persona

23. Que sea famosa le encanta a la hermana de Carolina

A. Nadie

B. Carolina

C. Otra persona

D. La hermana

24. Lo que atrae la atención del padre hacia su hijo es el amor

A Su hijo

B. El padre

C. Nadie

D. El amor

25. Que ella sea educada le anima a la hermana de María

A. Otra persona

B. Nadie

C. La hermana

D. María

26. El camarero le pregunta a Rosa si está de dieta

A. Rosa

B. Otra persona

C. El camarero

D. Nadie

27. Que sea educada le anima a la compañera de María

A. Nadie

B. Otra persona

C. Juana

D. María

28. Mi hermano conoce a un vecino del profesor a quien no le gusta divertirse

A. El profesor

B. Un vecino

C. Mi hermano

D. Nadie

29. Que ella sea preocupada le deprime a la prima de Josefina

A. Otra persona

B. Nadie

C. La prima

D. Josefina

30. Pablo, junto con sus hermanos tiró los lentes de sus padres al mar

- A. Sus padres
- B. Solo pablo
- C. Pablo y sus hermanos
- D. Solo sus hermanos

31. Que sea preocupada le deprime a la prima de Josefina

- A. Nadie
- B. Otra persona
- C. Josefina
- D. prima

32. Un maestro le advirtió a su niña que su examen sería duro

- A. Cualquier persona
- B. Su niña
- C. Un Maestro
- D. Nadie

Appendix C: Transfer of the Logophoric Pronoun in Overt Pronoun Constructions

En las siguientes oraciones diga cuál(es) de las opciones de A-D puede(n) considerarse como referente de la palabra subrayada.

1. Todo el mundo confirma que puede asistir a la reunión del jefe

- A. Cada miembro del grupo
- B. Nadie
- C. Otra persona

D. El jefe

2. El cambio transformativo en el desarrollo del latín fue la desaparición del sistema morfológico

A. El cambio

B. El latín

C. El sistema morfológico

D. El desarrollo

3. Todo el mundo confirma que él puede asistir a la reunión del jefe

A. Cada miembro del grupo

B. Nadie

C. Otra persona

D. El jefe

4. Abundan en muchas lenguas palabras eufemísticas para referirse a las vicisitudes de la vida

A. Muchas lenguas

B. Palabras

C. Las vicisitudes

D. Ninguno de estos

5. Todo el mundo piensa que puede hablar durante el aniversario del primo.

A. El Primo

B. Nadie

C. Otra persona

D. Cada miembro del grupo

6. Los nombres usados para denominar plantas y animales se derivan del latín
- A. Plantas y animales
 - B. El latín
 - C. Los nombres
 - D. Ninguno de éstos
7. Todo el mundo piensa que él puede hablar durante el aniversario del primo.
- A. El Primo
 - B. Nadie
 - C. Otra persona
 - D. Cada miembro del grupo
8. Angelina y Lucia se dicen ser amigas de Martha pero no lo cree
- A. Todas las otras opciones
 - B. Angelina y Lucia
 - C. Preferentemente Martha
 - D. Preferentemente Angelina
9. Todo el mundo dice que puede denunciar el crimen del administrador
- A. El administrador
 - B. Cada miembro del grupo
 - C. Nadie
 - D. Otra persona
10. Además de tomar y adaptar palabras de otras lenguas el español posee otros rasgos.
- A. El español
 - B. Otras lenguas

C. Lenguas modernas

D. Cualquier lengua

11. Todo el mundo dice que él puede denunciar el crimen del administrador

A. El administrador

B. Cada miembro del grupo

C. Nadie

D. Otra persona

12. Puerto Rico, como Estado Libre Asociado, ha mantenido lazos con los Estados Unidos.

A. Los Estados Unidos

B. Estado Libre Asociado

C. Puerto Rico

D. Cualquier país.

13. Todo el mundo confirma que puede participar en el seminario del invitado

A. Invitado

B. Nadie

C. Otra persona

D. Cada miembro del grupo

14. Hay diversos elementos estructurales que se parecen en el vasco y el español

A. Diversos elementos

B. El vasco

C. El español

D. El español y el vasco

15. Todo el mundo confirma que él puede participar en el seminario del invitado

A. Invitado

B. Nadie

C. Otra persona

D. Cada miembro del grupo

16. El otro día mi abuelo preguntó si puede el español considerarse más importante que el inglés.

A. Mi abuelo

B. El español

C. El inglés

D. Nada

17. Todo el mundo dice que él puede pintar el cuadro del dueño.

A. Otra persona

B. Nadie

C. Cada miembro del grupo

D. Dueño

18. Para mucha gente, la importancia que tiene una mujer merece reconocimiento

A. La importancia

B. Mucha gente

C. Nadie

D. Cualquier persona

19. Todo el mundo dice que puede pintar el cuadro del dueño.

A. Otra persona

B. Nadie

C. Cada miembro del grupo

D. El dueño

20. A los espectadores les gusta ver a los atletas entrenándose antes del comienzo del juego

A. Los espectadores

B. Los atletas

C. Cualquier persona

D. Nadie

21. Todo el mundo piensa que puede arreglar el equipo del profesor

A. Cada miembro del grupo

B. Nadie

C. Otra persona

D. El profesor

22. Construir una casa, dice el trabajador exige la colaboración de todo

A. Todas las otras opciones

B. Construir una casa

C. Todo

D. El trabajador

23. Todo el mundo piensa que él puede arreglar el equipo del profesor

A. Cada miembro del grupo

B. Nadie

C. Otra persona

D. El profesor

24. El profesor no oyó hablar a su alumno de la enfermedad de su colega

- A. Su colega
- B. Preferentemente su alumno
- C. Preferentemente el profesor
- D. Nadie

25. Todo el mundo reitera que puede romper las reglas del jefe

- A. Nadie
- B. Cada miembro del grupo
- C. El jefe
- D. Otra persona

26. Mucha gente, excepto el profesor confirma que tiene que llegar temprano para la reunión

- A. Cada miembro del grupo
- B. El profesor
- C. Otra persona
- D. Nadie

27. Todo el mundo reitera que él puede romper las reglas del jefe

- A. Nadie
- B. Cada miembro del grupo
- C. El jefe
- D. Otra persona

28. Poca gente, inclusive Kofi reitera que justificar su razón por llegar tarde.

- A. Nadie
- B. Cada miembro del grupo

C. Otra persona

D. Kofi

29. Todo el mundo reitera que él puede construir la casa del abogado

A. Cada miembro del grupo

B. El abogado.

C. Nadie

D. Otra persona

30. Un amigo que está aprendiendo el español le informa a su primo que está cansado de seguir

A. Su primo

B. Un amigo

C. Nadie

D. Otra persona

31. Todo el mundo reitera que puede construir la casa del abogado

A. Cada miembro del grupo

B. El abogado.

C. Nadie

D. Otra persona

32. Algunas personas, salvo Kofi reiteran su razón por llegar tarde

A. Cada miembro del grupo

B. Nadie

C. Otra persona

D. Kofi

Appendix D: Participant Profile

| Ewe (L2 learners) | Spanish (L1 speakers) | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| Mother tongue | Yes | Yes |
| Official language | No | Yes |
| Multiplicity of local languages | Yes | No |
| Years resident in US | - | 3-4 |
| Number of participants | 91 | 20 |
| Average age | 18 | 32 |
| Country of origin | Ghana | Puerto Rico, Mexico, Chile |
| Place of survey | Ghana | US |

Appendix E: Biographical Questionnaire

Name: _____ Age: _____

E-mail: _____ Phone: _____

ID number: _____

Is Ewe your native language? _____

Other than Ewe, what other language do you speak at home? _____

Are you able to read and write Ewe? Y/N

Are you taking other language classes apart from Spanish? Y/N _____

What is your proficiency level in Spanish? -beginner, intermediary, proficiency

For how long have you been learning Spanish at the University? _____

Have you taken Spanish classes (grammar, conversation, and writing)? Y/N

If yes, for how long? _____

Have you studied abroad? Y/N

If yes, where? _____ For how long? _____

Are you learning Spanish out of interest or it was imposed on you?
