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Abstract

At advanced levels of proficiency L2 learners can achieve native-like competence (e.g., Kanno, 1997; Pérez-Leroux & Glass, 1997, 1999). However, other studies report that learners only achieve near-native competence and show representational deficits despite long immersion in the L2 (Hawkins, 2000; Sorace, 1993). Interestingly, these claims derive from different types of property within Universal Grammar (UG). The former studies focus on universal principles, whereas the latter investigate properties which UG allows to vary (within limits) and attribute lack of native-like competence to L1 influence on the L2. An interesting question is whether this is the expected pattern in SLA: that advanced L2 speakers will always show native-like competence where principles are involved, but persistently fossilise on language-specific differences.

In this study a principle and a language-specific property in the acquisition of non-native Spanish are considered. In particular, I investigate two pronominal constraints: the Overt Pronoun Constraint (OPC) (Montalbetti, 1984, 1986) and the Contrastive Focus Constraint (CFC).

An experiment was designed to compare sensitivity to both constructions in advanced learners of Spanish (Greek natives and English natives). Results suggest that both non-native groups’ behaviour towards OPC constructions is not different from Spanish native speakers, whereas only English natives differ from Spanish natives in CFC constructions. If the OPC is a principle of UG, as has been claimed, this supports the prediction that advanced learners can achieve native-like competence on properties which differ from the L1 but derive from universal principles of grammar design. By contrast, the problems which English, but not Greek, speakers have with the CFC support the claim that language-specific properties are potential targets for fossilisation.

* Earlier versions of this paper were presented at the University of Cambridge Looking at Language Acquisition II Workshop (May 2001), Fourth Durham Postgraduate Conference in Theoretical and Applied Linguistics (June 2001) and Eurosla 11 (September 2001). I would like to thank the audiences for their insightful comments. My gratitude also goes to Roger Hawkins for his advice, to all the Spanish teachers and institutions in Athens who voluntarily helped during the fieldwork, to a DWPL anonymous reviewer for their comments and to Ms Castillo for her help. This research was partially funded by the ESRC, award no. R00429934281. Fieldwork expenses were partially funded by the award University of Essex Bloomfield Memorial Travel Grant.
1. Introduction

Recent Second Language Acquisition (SLA) studies report that highly proficient L2 learners do not necessarily achieve near-native competence even with long immersion in the target language. That is, post-childhood end-state grammars are characterised by optionality (Parodi, 2001), incomplete/divergent representations (Sorace, 1993), fossilised steady-states (Lardiere, 1998) and persistent selective fossilisation (Franceschina, 2001; Hawkins, 2000, 2001).

There are, however, other studies showing that L2 learners can construct native-like representations of constructions which are underdetermined by the L2 input and which are not instantiated in their L1, posing a typical poverty-of-the-stimulus problem for the learner (e.g., Kanno, 1997, 1998; Marsden, 1998; Pérez-Leroux & Glass, 1997, 1999).

In this paper I discuss a case where both kinds of phenomena turn out to be displayed: overt and null pronouns in non-native Spanish. First, I will describe the distribution of overt and null pronominal subjects in Spanish and how it is constrained by the phenomena under investigation (the OPC and the CFC). Then, SLA studies dealing with these phenomena will be reviewed. Finally, I report on an experimental study conducted to ascertain learners’ different knowledge of the two phenomena in L2 and L3 Spanish. The aim of this study is, therefore, to trace the source of such divergence in learners’ knowledge.

2. Distribution of overt/null pronouns in Spanish

It is well known that in null-subject languages like Spanish and Greek, overt pronominal subjects (e.g., él ‘he’, ella ‘she’; aftos ‘he’, afi ‘she’) can be either overtly realised, (1a) and (2a), or optionally dropped, (1b) and (2b). However, non null-subject languages permit only overt pronouns (3a) in finite clauses.\(^2\)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Él/ella tiene poco dinero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>pro tiene poco dinero</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Aftos/afti ehei liga lefta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>pro ehei liga lefta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>He/she has little money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>* pro has little money</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It seems reasonable to assume *a priori* that overt and null pronouns are in free alternation in null-subject languages. However, there are two constraints on pronominal subjects, namely, the Overt Pronoun Constraint and the Contrastive Focus Constraint.

\(^2\) As an anonymous DWPL points out, null subjects are occasionally permitted in English. Indeed, English null pronouns may sporadically occur in ‘diary contexts’ in matrix clauses (Haegeman, 1990), but they are certainly not permitted in embedded clauses (Nuñez del Prado et al., 1994). In Spanish, null subjects are permitted both in matrix and subordinate clauses.
2.1. Overt Pronoun Constraint (OPC)

In null-subject languages, an overt pronoun in an embedded clause cannot be bound by a quantified expression in a main clause whenever the alternation overt/null pronoun is possible. This restriction is known as the Overt Pronoun Constraint (OPC) (Montalbetti, 1984, 1986).

Consider (4a) and (4b), where the overt pronoun él/aftos ‘he’ and the null pronoun pro could be in free alternation. The OPC, however, disallows él/aftos to take the quantified determiner phrase (QDP) cada estudiante o kathe mathitis ‘each student’ as a possible antecedent. Only pro can act as a bound variable here. In this case, the previous context biases an interpretation where the QDP and the subject of the following embedded clause are coreferential. Note that in (4b) the QDP each student can indeed bind the overt pronoun he as there is no overt/null alternation in English (i.e., pro is not allowed in English).

(4) **Context:** The government has published a report about students’ financial situation. The report concludes that...
   a. cada estudiante dice *él/*pro que tiene poco dinero.  (Spanish)
   b. o kathe mathitis lei *aftos/*pro ehi liga lefta.  (Greek)
   c. each student says that he/*pro has little money.  (English)

The strong claim about the OPC is that it seems to be a universal invariant for the following reasons:

(i) Similar effects can be found in other pro-drop Romance languages like Portuguese, Italian, Greek (Montalbetti, 1984, 1986) and in typologically unrelated languages like Chinese (Xu, 1986) and Japanese and Korean (Kanno, 1997).

(ii) In learnability theory, the OPC represents a typical case of a poverty of the stimulus phenomenon, since the ungrammatical construction [*QDP ... overt,] is not present in the Spanish input (neither in L1 acquisition nor in L2 acquisition). Input in the form of positive evidence alone does not contain ungrammatical expressions. Therefore, OPC knowledge must be part of UG principles (see Pérez-Leroux & Glass, 1997, for discussion).

(iii) OPC constructions are never explained in textbooks (Kanno, 1997; Marsden, 1998, 2001; Pérez-Leroux & Glass, 1997, 1999). Therefore, instruction can be discarded as the source of knowledge of OPC.

2.2. Contrastive Focus Constraint (CFC)

In contrast to (4), the context in (5) biases an interpretation where the overt pronoun él/aftos ‘he’ is correferential with one of the discourse referents (Mr López or Ms García), and not with the QDP (cada estudiante o kathe mathitis).
Although there is a potential alternation here between an overt pronoun and pro, contrastive focus environments in Spanish (and Greek) require an overt pronoun (Pérez-Leroux & Glass, 1997). Furthermore, because one of the referential antecedents, Mr López, is specified for [+masculine] and the other, Ms García, is specified for [-masculine], the overt pronoun él/afto ‘he’ or ella/afti ‘she’ is required, depending on whether we want to focus on Mr López or Ms García. A null pronoun pro would cause ambiguity since it can be specified for either [+masculine] simultaneously and, therefore, neither of the discourse referents can be contrastively focused.

3. A review of native-like competence in L2 end-states: the role of UG and L1

It has been known for some time that English learners of Spanish can acquire the overt/null pronoun alternation from the earliest stages of acquisition (e.g., Al-Kasey & Pérez-Leroux, 1998; Liceras, 1989, 1997; Lozano, forthcoming; Phinney, 1987). However, it is still debatable whether learners’ knowledge of the overt/null distribution is similar to the knowledge of Spanish natives.

Pérez-Leroux & Glass (1997) investigated adult acquisition of the distribution of overt/null pronominal subjects in L2 Spanish by natives of English. Subjects had had a minimum of 7 years of exposure to Spanish and were considered very advanced (n=12) or near natives (n=4). A control group (n=18) of Spanish natives also participated in the study. Two tests were administered to subjects, (i) OPC environments and (ii) CFC environments. In the OPC condition, 4 sentences biased for a [QDP...NULL] joint interpretation and the other 4 for a [QDP...OVERT] disjoint interpretation.

The joint-interpretation results indicate that learners used significantly more null subjects (88%) than overt subjects (0%), as the OPC predicts. The disjoint-interpretation results indicate that learners used significantly more overt subjects than in the joint-condition story (34% vs. 0%). Pérez-Leroux & Glass (1997:159) conclude that ‘these results indicate a sensitivity to OPC effects in the grammar of highly fluent L2 speakers of Spanish.’

Crucially, OPC effects are not instantiated in English (since English does not allow null pronouns), hence the impossibility of assuming language transfer.

Since the possibility that lower proficiency-level learners may not be sensitive to the OPC cannot be excluded, Pérez-Leroux & Glass (1999) replicated their 1997 experiment with learners of elementary, intermediate and advanced proficiency levels. Results confirmed their previous (1997) findings. This supports the claim that ‘the OPC is operative at all stages in the acquisition of Spanish.’ (Pérez-Leroux & Glass, 1999:235).

In CFC contexts (Pérez-Leroux & Glass, 1997), results show that both groups’ grammatical usage of overt pronouns (36% natives, 20% learners) is lower than the ungrammatical use of null pronouns (54% natives, 61% learners). The authors acknowledge that ‘these percentages […] fall short from the idealized intuition that the target response was
unequivocally the overt pronoun.’ (Pérez-Leroux & Glass, 1997:159). Thus, this last result does not settle the issue of whether L1 influence on language-specific constructions like the CFC can cause fossilisation in end-state grammars since neither natives nor learners behave according to the theory.³

It has been also reported that English learners of Japanese also obey the OPC (Kanno, 1997, 1998; Marsden, 1998). This has been taken as further evidence that learners’ knowledge derives from UG.

4. Questions and hypotheses

In the light of the studies reviewed, two main questions arise: will L2 speakers be sensitive to instantiations of UG principles (like the OPC) in L2s, however their L1 might differ from the L2? On the other hand, where language-specific pronominal constructions differ between the L1 and the L2 (like the CFC), will this be a potential source of fossilisation?

Consider the language configuration in (6). These learners are native speakers of English learning L2 Spanish. The OPC is part of UG and is operational in Spanish, though not in English. Since the OPC is a principle of UG (Montalbetti, 1984, 1986), then these learners are expected to obey it, even though it is not instantiated in their L1 (Kanno, 1997, 1998; Marsden, 1998; Pérez-Leroux & Glass, 1997, 1999). Hence L1 transfer can be safely discarded.

(6)  UG L1 English L2 Spanish

[OPC] [ ] [OPC]

native-like

Consider the additional scenario in (7). These learners are native speakers of Greek who have previously learnt L2 English and are learning L3 Spanish. As the OPC is operative in Greek, they are expected to obey it. If that is the case, it could be assumed that OPC knowledge derives from either UG or L1 Greek.

(7)  UG L1 Greek L2 English L3 Spanish

[OPC] [OPC] [ ] [OPC]

native-like

If both groups, (6) and (7), behave alike, it can be safely assumed that UG (and not the L1) is the privileged source of transfer in non-native OPC contexts. Hypothesis 1 (8) makes a specific prediction from the generalisations in (6) and (7).

³ As we will see in section 6, this unwanted effect can be avoided by using an identical design for OPC contexts and CFC contexts (a factorial design), as opposed to using a translation task for the OPC and a answering task for the CFC, as Pérez-Leroux & Glass (1997) did.
Hypothesis 1: if knowledge of the OPC is constrained by UG, learners will show sensitivity to it despite their L1s.

One recent proposal for fossilisation in end-states, Persistent Selective Fossilisation (PSF), has been put forward by Hawkins (2000). In post-childhood L2 learning, certain features seem to cause PSF in learners even after long immersion in the L2. The source of such deficits can be traced back to the learner’s L1. If a given feature, [F], is instantiated in the learners’ L1 and L2, their knowledge of [F] in the L2 will be native-like. However, if [F] is instantiated in the learner’s L2 but not in their L1, this will lead to representational deficits and near-native competence.

Consider now the case of language-specific constructions like the CFC. In (9), pro is a category instantiated in Spanish but not in English. Even though the features [+masc] and [–masc] are present in some categories in English, they are certainly not present in pro since English does not allow pro.

Hypothesis 2: if a given non-native category (e.g., pro) is absent in the learners’ L1, they will tend to select the least restrictive set of features for that category in their non-native language.

---

Even though the features [+masc] and [–masc] are present in some categories in English, they are certainly not present in pro since English does not allow pro.

Hawkins (2000) and Hawkins & Chan (1997) propose that under-representation deficits are due to [–interpretable] features. We will not discuss the issue of (un)interpretability of features in this study.
5. Subjects

As shown in Table 1, three groups participated in this study. The control group (Spanish natives) served as a baseline to compare the learners’ results against. The experimental groups (learners) consisted of Greek natives and English natives. The Spanish control group consisted of peninsular Spanish natives (mainland Spain) and South-American Spanish-speaking natives (Argentina, Mexico and Venezuela). The English native group consisted of British English native speakers. These were undergraduates at the University of Essex (UK), where they were tested. The Greek native group consisted of Greek natives studying Spanish at several institutions in Athens (University of Athens, Estudio Español and Centro de Lengua Española). Only learners with a proficiency level of =80% (advanced) were included in the study.

Table 1: Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Language configuration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish natives</td>
<td>n=9</td>
<td>L1 Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English natives</td>
<td>n=19</td>
<td>L1 English L2 Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek natives</td>
<td>n=20</td>
<td>L1 Greek L2 English L3 Spanish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Method

An acceptability judgement test (AJT) was used. Subjects had to judge whether a given sentence was more or less acceptable (as opposed to grammatical). Each stimulus consisted of a contextualising sentence (12) and two target sentences, (12a) and (12b). Each target sentence was accompanied by a 5-point Likert rating scale. Value +2 corresponded to completely acceptable and value –2 completely unacceptable.

(12) El señor López y la señora García trabajan en la universidad y en una famosa editorial. No obstante…
    (a) cada estudiante dice que él tiene poco dinero. –2 –1 0 +1 +2
    (b) cada estudiante dice que tiene poco dinero. –2 –1 0 +1 +2

‘Mr López and Ms García work at the university and at a famous publishers. However…’
‘each student says that he has little money’
‘each student says that has little money’

Note that OPC and CFC constructions are operative in L1 Greek but not in L1 English. These cross-linguistic differences enabled us to test the role of UG and L1 transfer in non-native Spanish acquisition.

The Spanish placement test used was the University of Wisconsin Placement Test, Form 96M (University of Wisconsin, 1998). An extra placement test in English, the Oxford Placement test (Allan, 1992), was administered to Greek natives. The threshold was =80.

Note that if the contextualising sentence is not provided, both target sentences (a and b) are grammatical in adult Spanish. Therefore, in order to bias towards one interpretation (overt or null pronoun in the embedded clause), a context is needed.
The AJT test consisted of twelve target sentences (6 OPC, 6 CFC) and twelve distractors. Two training stimuli were placed at the beginning of the test plus two stimuli at the end were used to control for tiredness effects on learners.

Target stimuli were constructed following a factorial design (Table 2) to ensure that subjects were not reacting to OPC or CFC constructions randomly. While an overt pronoun is ungrammatical in OPC cases, it is grammatical in CFC cases. In this way, it was ensured that subjects were not rejecting overt pronouns in all contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Test design (target stimuli)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>indices (joint=OPC/disjoint=CFC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronoun (overt/null)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*QDP&lt;sub&gt;i&lt;/sub&gt;...OVERT&lt;sub&gt;i&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QDP&lt;sub&gt;i&lt;/sub&gt;...NULL&lt;sub&gt;i&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The type of pronominal subject in the embedded clause was either an overt third person pronoun (50% of the time él ‘he’ and 50% ella ‘she’), or a null pronoun pro. The type of binding between the matrix QDP and the subordinate overt/null pronominal subject was of two types: joint coreference (OPC constructions) and disjoint coreference (CFC constructions).

Three universal quantifiers were used for each condition, namely, todo el mundo ‘everybody’, cada X ‘each X’ and ningún X ‘no X’. Each of these appeared twice in each condition.

In order to avoid extraneous variables, several measures were taken. Presentational effects were avoided by using (i) overt pronouns 50% of the time in the a sentence, and 50% of the time in the b sentence and (ii) two versions of the test with the same sentences but different sequential order. Sentences were also randomised in each version of the test, following Cowart’s (1997) ‘blocking’ procedure. Vocabulary was also controlled, including beginners’ vocabulary only (González et al., 1995) so that learners could clearly understand the sentences. The target sentence length was also controlled. It never exceeded nine words.

The completed and usable tests were finally coded in the statistical package Excel (version 97) and analysed in SPSS (version 9.0).

### 7. Results

Before analysing the data with the help of inferential statistics, we checked whether our subjects’ sample was normally distributed. The one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test showed that our sample did not differ statistically from the Normal distribution (p=0.05 for each group in each condition). Thus, it can be safely assumed that our sample was normally distributed.

#### 7.1. OPC results

As the error bar chat in Figure 1 shows, there are two constructions in the OPC condition—the grammatical construction [QDP<sub>i</sub> ... NULL<sub>i</sub>] where the quantified expression
is bound by a null pronoun, and the ungrammatical condition [*QDP₁ … OVERT₁] where the quantified expression is bound by an overt pronoun. The Y axis scale represents the mean acceptance rate for each group in the Likert scale (from −2 to +2).

Figure 1: OPC results: acceptance rates of overt/null pronoun

The error bar chart (Figure 1) clearly shows that each group discriminates between the ungrammatical construction (overt pronoun) and the grammatical construction (null pronoun). A paired-samples t-test confirmed this. Each pair (grammatical vs. ungrammatical construction) is statistically significant for each group (p < 0.01 for each comparison). This suggests that Spanish natives as well as learners discriminate between the grammatical and the ungrammatical constructions, since all groups disfavour an overt pronoun interpretation (hence the negative values) and prefer a null pronoun interpretation (positive values), as Table 3 shows. This is what the OPC theory predicts.

Table 3: Mean acceptance rates of overt/null pronouns in OPC contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>overt</td>
<td>−0.15</td>
<td>−0.82</td>
<td>−0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>null</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Between-group comparisons (one-way ANOVA with post-hoc Tukey HSD tests) were performed. Each group of learners was compared against the Spanish native performance. Results revealed the following:
For the grammatical construction (null pronoun), there are no significant differences between each group of learners and the Spanish natives ($F(2,45)=0.395, p=0.68$).

For the ungrammatical construction (overt pronoun), there are significant differences ($F(2,45)=4.059, p=0.02$). Post-hoc tests reveal that there is a difference between English and Greek natives ($p=0.02$). However, we are only interested in comparing learners against the Spanish native norm. Further comparisons show that each group of learners is not different from Spanish natives.

English = Spanish ($p=0.169$)
Greek = Spanish ($p=0.942$)

All these between-group comparisons indicate that the English speakers and the Greek speakers do not differ from Spanish natives. This suggests that learners are sensitive to the OPC.

7.2. CFC results

Figure 2 shows the acceptance rates of overt/null pronouns for the CFC condition. As can be observed, the overt pronoun construction, $[QDP_i \ldots \text{OVERT}_j]$, is now grammatical, whereas the null pronoun construction, $[*QDP_i \ldots \text{NULL}_j]$, is ungrammatical.

![CFC results: acceptance rates of overt/null pronoun](image)

Within-group comparisons for each group (paired samples t-test) reveals that each pair (grammatical vs. ungrammatical construction) is statistically significant for each group.
Similarly to what occurred in the OPC condition, natives as well as learners distinguish between the grammatical and ungrammatical CFC constructions with degrees of acceptance above and below zero respectively (see Table 4).

Table 4: Mean acceptance rates of overt/null pronouns in CFC contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>overt</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>null</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
<td>-1.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with the results in the OPC condition, between-group comparisons were performed (one-way ANOVA with post-hoc Tukey HSD comparisons). Each group of learners was compared against the Spanish natives’ performance. Comparisons revealed the following:

(i) In the grammatical construction, (overt pronoun), there were no significant differences between groups \((F(2,45)=0.806, p=0.45)\). The same occurred in the OPC condition.

(ii) In the ungrammatical construction, (null pronoun), there was a significant difference \((F(2,45)=7.047, p<0.01)\). Post-hoc revealed a significant difference between English-Spanish but no significant difference between Greek-Spanish:

- English \(\neq\) Spanish \((p=0.025)\)
- Greek \(=\) Spanish \((p=1.000)\)

8. Discussion

The OPC results are compatible with previous findings (Kanno, 1997, 1998; Marsden, 1998; Pérez-Leroux & Glass, 1997, 1999). Greek speakers behave like Spanish natives, discriminating between grammatical and ungrammatical OPC constructions. Since such constructions are operative in Greek, it could be argued that Greek speakers’ knowledge of the OPC derives from their L1. But, crucially, English learners also behave like Spanish natives, even though the OPC is not operative in English. In short, both groups of learners show knowledge of the OPC to the same statistical extent as Spanish natives do.

Recall that OPC constructions are (i) never explained in textbooks and (ii) they represent a typical poverty of stimulus phenomenon. The most viable explanation seems to be to propose that L2/L3 learners’ knowledge of OPC phenomena is constrained by a principle of UG, as predicted in (8).

The CFC results are similar to the OPC results but they differ in one vital respect. Greek learners behave similarly to Spanish natives in both the grammatical and the ungrammatical conditions. This is predicted in (11) since (i) *pro* is an existent category in their Greek L1 and (ii) the feature specification of *pro* is identical in Greek and Spanish. In short, Greek natives will not show any representational deficits. English speakers also behave similarly to Spanish natives in the grammatical condition, but not in the ungrammatical one. Even though English natives correctly reject ungrammatical *pro* in CFC contexts, their rejection rates are significantly weaker than those of the Spanish natives (i.e., they accept more *pro* than Spanish natives in contexts where its interpretation is infelicitous).

In native Spanish, CFC contexts require one of the two referents (either *Mr López* or *Ms García*) to be focused contrastively, hence the need for an overt pronoun specified for
[±masc] or [–masc]. A null pronoun pro, however, causes ambiguity because it can be simultaneously interpreted as [±masc]. As (11) predicted, English natives’ low rejection of ungrammatical pro suggests that their grammatical knowledge allows an option with the least restrictively specified set of features, namely [±masc].

There is some circumstantial evidence to support the claim that such lack of restrictiveness could be due to pronominal feature specification in their L1. Examples (13)-(15) were gathered from different sources and all of them correspond to adult English grammars.

(13) The speaker, in the sample seems to make particular mistakes in this part of their utterances. (Linguistics exam, 10/7/01)
(14) Complete the appropriate sections of the report form and pass it on to your supervisor, for their comments. (Official letter, 12/6/01)
(15) Everyone knows it, don’t they? (Southern English radio station, 21/6/01)

The referential DPs the speaker (13) and your supervisor (14), and the quantified DP everyone (15) are, in principle, specified for [±masc] since the sex of the referent in the discourse is unknown. Likewise, the corresponding pronouns their (13)-(14) and they (15) are specified for [±masc], which is the least restrictive option. Certainly, the use of he or she would restrict the choice of antecedent to [+masc] or [–masc] respectively.

These observations are purely circumstantial and need further research to corroborate whether the use of a [±masc] pronoun like they, instead of a more restrictive pronoun like [+masc] he or [–masc] she, is part of adult English grammars.

While the conclusions presented here are an attempt to argue that both UG and the L1 can be the source of knowledge in adult language learning, their validity is certainly subject to methodological limitations. Only interpretational tasks were used, which says nothing of the learners’ production of pronominal subjects. There are, however, production data on OPC and CFC constructions, which also support the claim that UG constrains the interpretation of pronominal subjects in OPC contexts (Pérez-Leroux & Glass, 1997).

9. Conclusion

The present study examined the interpretation of overt and null pronouns in OPC and CFC contexts by learners of Spanish as an L2 and L3. OPC constructions are determined by universal principles, whereas CFC constructions are determined by language-specific features. Results suggest that learners of Spanish obey the OPC despite both their L1 and their L2 configuration. Thus, the universality of the OPC does not cause representational deficits or fossilisation at end-states. However, learners’ knowledge of the CFC is conditioned by their L1, which can cause persistent fossilisation if L1 features do not match L2/L3 features.

By themselves, these conclusions are relatively modest; particularly, the CFC results as it has been known for several decades that the L1 is the privileged source of transfer in

---

9 The economy principle (Chomsky, 1995) requires representations to be minimal, with no superfluous symbols. It is plausible to propose that the grammar of English advanced learners of Spanish is constrained by this general principle in CFC constructions.
SLA. But our proposal goes beyond this well-known fact. We maintain that UG constrains L2 and L3 adult grammars with respect to principles like the OPC. However, knowledge of CFC constructions is influenced by the learners’ L1. In light of these considerations, it seems reasonable to conclude that the L1 is the key to representational deficits at advanced levels of proficiency.
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