

Fossilization of English as an L2 non-native constructions at the syntax-discourse interface in Romance L1 speakers

Fosilización de construcciones no nativas del inglés como L2 en la interfaz sintaxis-discurso en hablantes de L1 románica

Marciano Escutia López

Universidad Complutense de Madrid

mescutia@ucm.es

ABSTRACT

This study examines and compares the English as a foreign language production of two groups of speakers with respect to certain manifestations of the expression of the subject in discourse. One of the groups consists of 12 advanced EFL university English majors living in Spain, the other of 9 adult Romance speakers having lived in an English speaking country for several decades. The hypothesis is tested that subject inversion with unaccusative verbs and pronominal subject omission when identified in discourse constitute fossilization phenomena as verified by their perseverance in the second group of learners despite their long and rich exposure to the L2 and their frequent interaction in it.

Keywords: English as a second/foreign language, (non) null subject language, fossilization, syntax/discourse interface, adult language learning

RESUMEN

Este estudio examina y compara la producción del inglés como lengua extranjera de dos grupos de hablantes con respecto a algunas manifestaciones de la expresión del sujeto en el discurso. El primero es de 12 alumnos españoles avanzados de inglés como lengua extranjera al final de su licenciatura en Filología Inglesa, y el segundo de 9 hablantes adultos de lenguas románicas residentes en países de habla inglesa durante décadas. Se intenta comprobar la hipótesis de que la inversión verbo-sujeto con verbos inacusativos y la omisión de los sujetos pronominales identificados por el discurso en la lengua nativa constituyen elementos de fosilización si su pervivencia se mantiene en el grupo segundo, a pesar de su larga y abundante exposición a la L2 y su frecuente interacción en la misma.

Palabras clave: inglés como lengua extranjera/segunda, lenguas de sujeto nulo, fosilización, interfaz sintaxis/discurso, aprendizaje adulto de la lengua

1. INTRODUCTION

The goal of this paper is to make the case for the fossilization of certain non-native constructions of English as a second and foreign language (EL2, EFL, respectively). (2They are related here to the expression of the subject by adult advanced Spanish learners (mainly) as well as by other Romance language speakers. In order to do that, we will first describe the concept of fossilization in L2 very briefly and concisely, its conditions and possible causes. Then we will refer to some studies on fossilization about both the EFL of advanced romance language students and of a romance language as a FL by advanced English speaking students. Both are related to very similar manifestations of fossilization dealt with here. Next, our data and hypotheses will be presented, comprising written and spoken EFL/EL2 production of advanced adult romance speakers from both tutored and untutored milieus, some living in Spain and others who have been living in an English-speaking country for a long time but all of them having really started learning and/or being exposed to the language in post-adolescence. They are presented to witness to our general hypothesis that the kind of items referred to are true examples of fossilization. Finally, our data will be discussed and some very brief comments will be made regarding how they may impinge on the learning and teaching of the overt manifestations of the subject in EFL.

Neither the linguistic features, the psycholinguistic mechanisms nor other kinds of factors involved in L2 learning will be the central issue here since our interest is purely factual, in the product, very concretely oriented and not directly concerned with the specifics of the process. Our aim is not so much to look at the L2 knowledge of the learners as to point to some particular linguistic elements and discourse constructions as candidates for fossilization. We look at the English of advanced L1 Romance-speaking adult learners and compare the linguistic production of two samples of them, one from last year L1 Spanish college English majors and the other from learners who have had many more years of exposure and practice in the L2. The non-native constructions pointed out will be referred to specific manifestations of an underlying linguistic description and some comments will bear on the characteristics of the linguistic product and its acquisition.

This is a qualitative study so a quantitative analysis will not be carried out of the possible contexts of actual native or non-native-like items with respect to a particular construction from the production of these L2 learners (E2Ls). (2We just want to verify that the types of items presented occur normally in the linguistic production of both groups in order to highlight such "inconsistency" between native and non-native-like constructions present in the L2 production. Furthermore, it is not our concern here whether these non-native constructions only affect the level of externalization of the language or if they concern the underlying L2 competence.

2. WHAT IS FOSSILIZATION

Selinker (1972) first called fossilization one of the features of L2 production whereby a particular kind of (non-native) error¹ seems to persevere without wholly disappearing except in highly monitored tasks. This pervasive property of interlanguage (IL), or transitional system of the L2 created by the learner, does not appear to be permeable, at least in production, to either tutored or untutored abundant input, a fact which he ascribed to neurological factors hindering the complete and permanent learning of certain structures of the L2.

Lightbown (1985) characterized it as the natural end of many aspects of the grammar of adult L2 learners and Zobl (1980) hypothesized that fossilization is the result of crosslinguistic influence in IL creation, which delays learning. Gass (1997) in her Input-Output model of L2L mentions that fossilization occurs when input does not succeed in restructuring the L2 learner's linguistic system.

Summarizing with Savillle-Troike (2006), the term fossilization for L2Ls refers to the fact that many of them will stop their IL development in some areas before reaching target language norms. She points out as key factors in the process age, social identity, communicative need and lack of motivation.

Han (2004, 2013) in her state-of-the art reviews on the topic and gathering information from abundant studies and other summaries like Lightbown (2000, 2003) and Han & Odlin (2006), states that in order to properly talk about fossilization certain preconditions have to be met, like having the appropriate motivation to learn the language and getting both abundant exposure and enough interactional practice. She also remarks that fossilization is a local and selective phenomenon, affecting only certain individual elements of the grammar, not the whole of it; that it truly becomes evident when the L2Ls use the language to express their own meanings; and that L1 transfer is the major influence encompassing it along with age-related maturational constraints. She also notes that fossilization belongs in adult L2 learning rather than children's, and that the following forces conspire towards facilitating it: (a) the variable nature of the target structure (for example, an L2 apparently displaying optionality between both presence or absence of S-V inversion or null subjects); (b) non-robust input, because of a dearth of frequent contact with L2 native speakers and real discourse; (c) crosslinguistic influence from an L1 unmarked usage, which may happen, for example, when the L2 fossilizable structure has a wider distribution than in the L1 (again, for example, the apparently optional presence of S-V inversion or null subjects in L2 Spanish with respect to L1 English. (2Finally, she defends that fossilization ought to be studied longitudinally in order to verify a well-established lack of progress in those linguistic features supposed to have stopped in their development. All these are the elements of her Selective Fossilization Hypothesis (2009. (2Thus, her notion about the phenomenon could be summarized as a stable want of control of a second language (feature) despite constant exposure to robust input.

In terms of the psycholinguistic factors involved in the process, Long (2003) adds that the fossilization of a particular feature occurs because of lack of sensitivity to noticing the difference between the L2 input and output. This, in turn, he notes, is proportional to the perceptual saliency of the construction itself.

3. FOSSILIZATION IN ENGLISH L1/L2 AND ROMANCE L1/L2 LEARNING

The types of items discussed here are constructions found in the interaction of a Romance L1 with EFL/EL2. They could be said to belong to what Sorace (2004) calls "soft syntax" or grammatical aspects at the syntax-discourse interface, as these are L2Ls' non-native constructions occurring within a text, either written (as in the case of our group of advanced college students) or oral (as in the interviews and lectures of our group of adults having lived many years in an English-speaking country. (2She explains that they are not purely formal non-native constructions, are intrinsically very hard to acquire and appear late developmentally (Sorace & Keller 2005. (2This is so because of discourse aspects, which might only be factored in if there has been a lot of rich environmental L2 input exposure. Furthermore, adult L2Ls most probably behave here differently from child

acquirers because, unlike the latter, whose knowledge of the correspondences between grammatical forms and their functions is acquired without cross-linguistic influence, adult L2Ls might be experiencing a competition of other factors as well, mainly related to their L1 (Sorace 2004, 2005).

We will examine briefly some of the research that has been carried out in L2L with respect to the expression of the subject. Though we distinguish between those studies that have concentrated on the (external) syntax-discourse interface level from those that have done so on the (internal) syntax-semantics one, things are not so clear-cut. It may be simply a matter of where they have placed the weight of the linguistic computation giving rise to the non-native constructions of their studies.

3.1 Research at the syntax-discourse interface level

Research in this area, at the level of the externalization of grammar and its interaction with pragmatic-discourse factors in production, points to attrition in the knowledge of the L2 relation between morpho-syntactic properties and discourse pragmatics or form-meaning-function (FMF) mapping (Lardiere 2006, Montrul & Bowles 2009, Sorace & Serratrice 2009, Han 2011; Han & Lew 2012. (2 Besides, some of that research concludes that fossilization may extend also to some structures at the internal syntax-semantics interface (Montrul & Bowles 2009, Sorace & Serratrice 2009. (2

One of the phenomena that has been studied in Spanish L2 by L1 English speakers is unaccusativity, which will also figure here in our own data. This is the property of certain intransitive verbs whose internal NP theme argument is the syntactic surface subject requiring inversion in Spanish according to contextual conditions. On the other hand, in standard English, inversion requires the preverbal subject slot to be filled with the pleonastic pronoun *there*², e. g. *Why did you send for more food? Because **there** came **many more people** in the end* (rather formal)/***many more people** came in the end* vs (Spa) *porque (∅) vino **mucha más gente** al final*/?*porque **mucha más gente** vino al final*. The interrogation marks show that though in Spanish S-V inversion might seem to be optional in contextless syntactic terms, when the subject represents new information in focus, inversion is required with such verbs³. Despite the fact that advanced adult L2Ls of Spanish know rather early that both preverbal and postverbal subjects are syntactically possible in Spanish they do not use them properly in discourse (cf., for example, Liceras 1989; Liceras & Díaz 1999; Al Kasey and Pérez-Leroux 1998; Hertel 2003; Lozano 2002, 2006; Montrul and Rodríguez Louro 2006; Dominguez, L. & Arche, M. J. 2014. (2 In the case of tutored contexts, this is an aspect hardly practiced in class. The corresponding construction is, thus, amenable to fossilization, or as Sorace (2005) calls it, "residual optionality", in the sense that some specific manifestation of it is implicitly considered optional and there might lie the lack of ultimate attainment in proficiency.

Another area that has been the subject of studies about fossilization is the distribution of null and overt subjects in romance languages: pronoun subjects may be null in null-subject languages when referring to something already mentioned or understood in context; overt ones are used when they refer to new participants in the predication or for contrast with others (Fernández-Soriano 1991)⁴. Advanced adult L2 learners from non-null subject L1s soon learn that both null and overt subjects are possible in Spanish, but they find it difficult to use them appropriately in discourse production, ruled as they are by those FMF properties of the syntax-discourse interface (see, for example, Pérez-Leroux and Glass 1999; Liceras and Díaz 1999; Lozano 2003, 2006, 2009; Hertel 2003; Montrul 2005, 2006; Sorace and Filiaci 2006; Belletti, Bennati and Sorace 2007, Pladevall 2013. (2

Sorace (2005) found that near-native speakers of Italian overgeneralize overt subject pronouns and preverbal subjects to contexts which would require null subjects and postverbal subjects in native Italian. Obviously, these advanced speakers do not lack syntactic knowledge and when they use null pronouns and postverbal subjects, they do so correctly, that is, they have acquired a null subject grammar as shown in context-free grammatical tasks. Again, it seems that the appropriate FMF mapping conditions for the use of overt and preverbal subjects have not been learned as they present optionality effects in their use. These may be due to the lack of specification of the interface features [topic-shift] and [focus], as Sorace points out, which prevent the speakers from interpreting overt subjects as shifted topics foci.

There is also research about residual optionality changes in the pronominal system of native Italian speakers who have had very extensive exposure to English (Sorace 2000; Tsimpli, Sorace, Heycock and Filiaci, 2004). (2Its results seem to show that these speakers display a similar pattern of optionality as the English near-native speakers of Italian, since they appear to extend overt subjects and preverbal subjects to contexts requiring a null subject or a postverbal subject, both in production and in comprehension tasks. Thus, there is an overlap between the end-state knowledge of English near native speakers of Italian and the native knowledge of Italian near-native speakers of English with respect to null/overt subjects and pre/postverbal subjects. In both cases, the speakers' grammar specifications licensing null subjects are in place but the syntax-discourse mapping rules on pronominal subjects are affected by attrition. However, this occurs for different reasons: in the case of the former group probably due to the lack of robust L2 data in their environment and in the latter, just the opposite, because of the length of their exposure to such robust input of contextualized native English, which has ended up permeating the L1 with some of its interface conditions.

3.2 Research at the syntactic competence level

Although the studies reviewed so far restrict fossilization to the syntax-discourse interface leaving syntactic knowledge intact, other studies suggest that this attrition might also affect syntactic competence as well. These are studies that have used both oral or written production tasks and grammaticality judgements, which might seem to be more directed to the learners' purely syntactic knowledge since no context is provided.

Lardiere (2007) presented a native speaker of Chinese, Patty, who had lived as an adult in the USA for more than 20 years, with two grammaticality judgement tasks on English adverb placement 18 months apart. She found that Patty's knowledge of verb raising, as related to adverb placement (for example, with respect to examples such as **the chef cooked slowly the meat*), was native-like but also that her verbal regular morphology across both tasks might be considered fossilized (as compared with irregular verbs). (2The findings of this study confirmed the results of a previous one looking only at production tasks (Lardiere 1998. (2

The same attrition symptoms have been found in EFL near-native Spanish speakers with respect to *that-trace* effects in grammaticality judgments, fill-in-the blanks and wh-question formulation tasks (Escutia 1999). (2The presence of the complementizer *that* in such construction (e.g., *Who did you say *that came to the party?*) seemed to be optional in the grammar of these advanced speakers, especially in the case of those whose real exposure to the L2 had begun in their post-adolescent years. Most of them were EFL teachers themselves who had never been made aware of this constraint. This would seem

to be an example of residual optionality in their grammatical representation since no discourse to respond to was provided.

In Escutia (1998, 2002) two study cases were reported of two respective adult Spanish advanced learners of English who had both lived in an English speaking country for a long time. Their L2 spontaneous (everyday conversation) and semi-spontaneous oral performance (production uttered during a recorded interview) was gathered and presented later to them in disguised form as individual contextless items in an acceptability judgment task. Some (then considered) derived properties of the Pro-Drop and Verbal Agreement parameters of Universal Grammar (UG), or innate constraints in the development of natural grammars, were examined trying to show that the learners had not fixed them univocally. The studies also tried to show that their L2 competence -as seen both from the two different tasks, one more introspective and the other more spontaneous- was rather uniform in that both their judgments and oral production showed lack of detection of some of the differences between the L2 native grammar and their own non-native one.

Thus, the knowledge shown by the oral production data could not solely be ascribable to circumstantial performance or discourse interface factors but reflected some kind of more stable underlying grammatical representation. It was concluded that both learners had developed an L2 grammar where certain aspects, supposedly derived from the fixation of parameters, had not been univocally acquired. This seemed to be the case as indicated, specifically, by the following phenomena: the presence of some null pronominal referential subjects (those in embedded subject-correferential clauses: *They don't think that *(they) are coming*); the absence of some pleonastic pronouns (especially in embedded clauses: *I think *(it) is important to be there*); inverted subjects with unaccusative and passive verbs (*but then (it) happened many things; and also it was established a school*) and in embedded relative clauses with a relativized object (*The moment that represents the picture is my graduation*); the presence of *that*-trace effects; and adjacency violations or adverbial interruptions between a verb and its object because of L1 transfer of verb raising (*I saw physically the university*). (2Still, in spite of the convergence found in the two types of tasks, the more introspective one was somewhat more accurate probably because it taps closer to the syntactic competence of the speakers while the other, less accurate, has to deal more with discourse interface conditions.

On the other hand, Escutia (2008, 2010) studies how English and Spanish as a foreign language (EFL and SFL, respectively) advanced students seem to construct their L2 grammar with respect to unaccusative and passive predicates as seen in consistent written production data. As mentioned before, these are intransitive predicates which favor verb - subject inversion (both in Spanish and in English) and (overt) expletive anticipation of the notional postverbal subject (in Standard English, *there* for NPs and *it* for clausal subjects. (2Those data, in turn, are examined in Escutia (2012) to compare the structures produced by those learners, and conclude that both types of advanced learners may be using similarly expletive or default pleonastic *it* and the Spanish pronoun *se*, respectively, producing parallel fossilizable structures (e. g.: **it happened something terrible / *se ocurrió algo terrible*. (2The fact that Escutia (2016) also finds converging introspective data by an advanced SpL2 learner with very long and rich exposure to the L2 unaware of judging his own naturalistic production with *se* overgeneralizations as individual contextless items (e. g. **se faltaron muchos a clase*) might suggest that *it* and *se* could have equivalent syntactic value in their respective L2 grammars in constructions that are subject to fossilization.

Moskovsky and Ratcheva (2014) examined two-year longitudinal data from a Russian university teacher, an advanced fluent adult learner of English, with excellent cognitive

and motivational dispositions, who had been living in an English-speaking country for eight years totally immersed in the L2 language and culture. He showed symptoms of fossilization in his production with respect to different types of items but the study centered on article use in particular, looking at his fluctuation between native and non-native usage and backsliding. They also presented their learner with a grammaticality judgement task to test his intuitions about the use of articles in English, which was also presented to eight native controls, showing a clear difference in knowledge with the latter. Thus, these authors suggest that fossilization is a competence phenomenon, rather than just a performance one, when the learners are trying to produce their own meaning.

The results of the previous studies, then, are congruent with Han's (2006) remarks about the consistency between grammaticality judgments and naturalistic data. In fact, she concludes that grammaticality judgments may well be a "viable alternative for studying fossilization" (p. 76). Thus, such a more monitored type of task, may confirm prior findings based on naturalistic production within ongoing longitudinal investigations of fossilization.

Nevertheless, current research (see, for example, Lozano & Mendikoetxea 2013 and Mendikoetxea & Lozano 2018) centers at the same time on the interface between syntax and externalization (both discourse and phonetic realization) and on the language-internal interface (lexicon-syntax). Authors favor, thus, a multi-interface approach in order to provide a deeper understanding of the factors involved in, for example, inversion in L2 acquisition and in interlanguage grammars in general by using corpus and experimental data, looking both at core syntax and the interfaces and considering representational and processing models as well.

In any case, whether fossilization is a competence or a performance phenomenon, or has to be approached from a more global perspective, taking into account both internal and external interfaces, our goal here is just detecting it both in the oral and (more monitored) written production of certain constructions by adult learners of EFL/L2. In order to do that, it is not necessary to go into either their theoretical linguistic underpinnings, the locus of occurrence or source of their attrition.

3. THE STUDY

4.1 Learners and types of items

As mentioned in the introduction, the data for this study have been drawn from two sources: first, in the case of the twelve linguistic majors, from their written assignment papers about applied linguistics; second, in the case of the nine Romance language speaking personalities, from oral interviews (mainly) and a few video lectures. The former are last year college students with an advanced level of English as measured by their having passed the C1 level exam of the Common European Framework of Reference⁵ the year before. The latter group is made up of nine learners: four speakers of peninsular Spanish, one of Mexican Spanish, one of Brazilian Portuguese and two of Italian. Seven of them have spent more than twenty years in English speaking countries having to use the L2 in their jobs and are still living in those countries for most of the year. Although the other two do not live in English-speaking countries, they have acted in many English-speaking films and spent considerable time both in England and the United States. Despite not all having the same L1, L2Ls from typologically similar L1 backgrounds tend to fossilize around the same linguistic elements (Trenkic 2009; Balcom 1997; Oshita 2001). They

have been chosen because their production data are publicly available and because they started really learning English in their post adolescent years, as did the college students, most of whom just took an EFL compulsory class every year of their pre-university school life.

Both groups are trying to get their own meaning across but through different means and different amounts of planning because the students' papers do require more and, in that sense, correspond to a more monitored kind of production than the rather spontaneous one of the oral interviews or even the lectures of one of the personalities, which are not read but delivered orally using powerpoint displays. If the types of non-native constructions examined also occur in the personalities' less planned L2 production, this would support their not being idiosyncratic performance mistakes but rather resulting from similar underlying linguistic specifications and their interaction with contextual factors. Showing that their non-native constructions are similar to those of our advanced students would point to their being part of a set that tends to fossilize. Let us not forget that fossilization should be most evident in production tasks like these, where learners primarily attend to meaning and draw from their own linguistic resources (Ellis 2003: 16).

The fact that we are contrasting data from two clearly diverse groups, one from a tutored academic L2 learning setting and the other from an untutored and more unstructured one does not constitute a drawback of the study, just the opposite: if it is found that both groups produce the same kind of utterances, which is our general hypothesis, these may be candidates for fossilization since they occur both in rather spontaneous production as well as in a more introspective kind, as the students do not have to encode the L2 on the spur of the moment, unlike the personalities, but can think more about it. Thus, if that is the case, their presence might signal their rather persevering status in the IL of adult L2Ls with the same or typologically similar L1s. In fact, if speakers of typologically similar L1s coincide in the type of error, it may be a sign that the factors at play are mainly linguistic and not idiosyncratic. Furthermore, although both groups are of adult learners, the academic group is rather younger than the other. This plays in favor of the candidacy of fossilization for the tested items since the long passing of time with exposure to robust input of learners with good cognitive capacity and motivation (and continuous study of the L2 in most cases) does not seem to change the outcome for the second group, again, a sign of attrition in L2L.

As mentioned above, fossilization is a local phenomenon (cf. Han & Odlin 2006), and, as such, only some specific units of fossilization related to the expression of subjects will be examined, not all the possible manifestations of a supposedly native overarching linguistic setting encompassing them. After having observed their pervasiveness in the production of high-intermediate and advanced EFL students, the non-native items chosen to confirm their condition as possible fossilization candidates and whose presence in both sets of data we predict are the following: (1) null expletives and null subordinate subjects correferential with a main or matrix clause referent: *I think *(it) is important to be there; They don't think that *(they) are coming* (cf. White 1985, Liceras 1989, Phinney 1989 Escutia 1998, 2002 and many others), presented in two different chart columns in the appendices, and (2) inverted subjects -both clausal and phrasal- with unaccusative and copula/passive verbs anticipated or not preverbally by a non-standard inserted expletive: *(it) happened many things; it was established a school⁶* (cf. Escutia 2008), again corresponding to two different columns. Because of our previous experience with students, we should expect inversion more frequently anticipated by the expletive than not.

The frequent production of both types of items already found in the studies mentioned above, suggests a lack of command of the distributional properties of the target

construction in advanced EFL learners. English requires overt expression of the subject of a clause, whether main or subordinate (except for imperatives and some minor clauses (as in (\emptyset) *Stop it!* *As soon as (\emptyset) possible*; (\emptyset) *Born to poor parents, he still succeeded in life*). (2Spanish, on the other hand, allows both null and overt subjects, depending on discourse pragmatics. The variable nature of subject marking in Spanish, which does not favor overt expression of its pronominal subjects once mentioned or recoverable from context, as it would signal another referent (Fernández-Soriano 1991), constitutes a super-set with respect to English, where there is only one possibility no matter what the discourse conditions are (e.g. *Cuando Pedro_i llegó a casa, él_i??/; empezó a comer* 'when Pedro came home, *(he) began to eat').

The same happens with subject-verb inversion, which is freer in Spanish though it is required syntactically with unaccusative and reflexive-passive verbs (which are really much more frequent than periphrastic passives: *Se abrieron las puertas* > *las puertas fueron abiertas*: 'seref opened the doors' > 'the doors were opened'. (2Inversion is preferable with intransitive verbs as the focus position of new information without, as in English, an anticipatory expletive of the post-verbal subject (e. g. *¿Qué ocurrió?* 'What happened?': (1) *Ladraron/estuvieron ladrando los perros toda la noche* '*barked/were barking the dogs the whole night': the dogs barked/were barking the dogs the whole night; (2) *Sonaron muchos timbres toda la noche* '*rang many bells/ many bells rang/there rang many bells the whole night. (2Again, English here is a subset of Spanish, where the subject can syntactically occur both pre and post-verbally though the latter option is preferred for informational focus.

The two items chosen here as predicted to occur in both sets of data, then, production of inverted and null subjects, might seem to have to do more with accuracy at the syntax-discourse interface because, in terms of semantic alignment, the L1 and L2 are congruent with respect to the syntax-semantics interface, as the subject in the case of unaccusatives and passives in either is really the internal argument of the verb. Besides, both the subject, in the case of the expletives in English, or the null pronouns in Spanish have no semantic role or, having one, it is discursively recoverable, respectively.

4.2 The data

Because this is a qualitative study, only the error tokens will be provided, in order to show if their type of item forms part of these learners' IL. We have also observed that the corresponding native-like counterparts (with non-inverted subjects and overt pronominal ones) also belong in their IL, as they are advanced proficient L2Ls. It is precisely this residual optionality having to do with discourse factors that characterizes fossilization.

4.2.1 The students' written data

As explained above, these data correspond to non-native constructions from the written essays of 12 college students about different topics in Applied Linguistics. Nine of them were female, corresponding more or less to the female/male ratio of students obtaining in our English department. We think that this female predominance in the sample is not a drawback of the study since it has been shown that women have, in general, higher linguistic ability than men. What is meant is that, apart from other motivational or social factors, when learning language, girls' brains show greater activity in the areas used for language encoding while boys' show activity in the areas associated with visual and aural functions (Burman, Bitan & Booth 2008. (2This may play in favor of the production data being in fact more native-like. All of them were done at home and under the express

proviso of using their own language, not copying from texts, as it is evident from the non-native constructions they show.

Table 1 is provided below with the total number of tokens per type of item. Appendix I shows the specific utterances the students produced. Although, for reasons of space, the broad context of the utterances is not given one can easily ascertain the topic being discussed if one is minimally acquainted with certain areas of Applied Linguistics.

Item	Student I	Stu II	Stu III	Stu IV	Stu V	Stu VI	Stu VII	Stu VIII	Stu IX	Stu X	Stu XI	Stu XII	\bar{x}
Inversion	5	1	2	1	2	1	3	5	1	4	1	2	2,4
2, It + inversion	5	3	3	4	10	5	5	6	1	6	3	3	4,5
Null S Main	2	1	1	4	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	1.08
Null S Subord	1	0	1	3	2	1	2	1	0	1	1	1	1,16

Table 1. Students' results

4.2.2 Personalities' oral production

As already mentioned, nine L1 Romance-language personalities have been chosen as a second group of L2Ls for comparison: four male speakers of peninsular Spanish and five female ones (one speaker of Peninsular Spanish, one of Mexican Spanish, one of Brazilian Portuguese and two of Italian. (2All of them are, then, speakers of typologically similar languages in terms of subject omission and inversion⁷. The personalities have been chosen -apart from the reasons given before- because it is not easy to find other type of people with the same conditions of exposure, length of residence and abundance of data. The names that will be used are fictional ones in order to keep their anonymity as safe as possible⁸.

Although they have their own different backgrounds, all of them have in common that, at some point in their careers, they took the step of going to work and/or live in an English-speaking country either for life (Jess and Gaby), or as their operational base where they spend long periods of time. In all cases they have been learning the L2 for at least twenty years (most of them many more), have had language coaches and have taken formal classes for long periods of time. They do not use it in the same degree because in the case of three of them their partners are L1 speakers of the same language, but all have to use and be exposed to it much of the time for their work and social life.

Let us provide some more detail of their English language backgrounds. Jess, 86, has lived in the United States for almost sixty years since he arrived in his late twenties knowing little English. His data come from both oral lectures and interviews. The case of Alda is a bit different from the others because she does not use English so much nowadays but has done so very often for most of her professional life and frequently gives interviews in the language. She is now 86 and went to work in the USA in her early twenties, lived for long periods of time in English speaking countries and has interacted in the language very often. Her case is like that of Yoc, 77, in their continuous exposure and interaction in English for decades. Maddy, 56, studied some EFL in school but when she started her professional life in the USA in the early 1990s, she could speak very little and, according to herself, she just picked it naturally because she has a good ear for languages (reportedly, she speaks three foreign languages, apart from his native Italian) but she has always used a language coach for her many films in English. Gaby, 70, is Brazilian and

went to live and work in the United States in her mid-thirties knowing little English and has lived there since then. Both Raúl, 51, and Roz, 60, had to learn the language at the workplace -like Yoc- in their early twenties in the USA, where, at the beginning, they had to read their lines phonetically by heart though all three would later take formal lessons for years. Bea and Belle, 46 and 51 years old, respectively, started learning the L2 in their late teen years (apart from the EFL classes they had in high school) and even lived in the United States for one year as students before returning to their countries first and then going back again two years later, after which they have spent most of the time there working in English. This earlier exposure to English shows both in their fluency and pronunciation as compared with the others -except, perhaps less clearly, with Gaby and Maddy- who are as fluent but have a bit more of a foreign accent.

One may safely say that the data of all these speakers probably reflect the end-state grammar of mature and highly-exposed-to-the-language seasoned L2Ls, which may provide a window into aspects of ultimate attainment and fossilization. The learners' suitability for participation in fossilization research is optimal in terms of length of residence, cognitive capacity, learning conditions, motivation, exposure to input and opportunity to engage in authentic communication (Han 2013).

Table 2 below displays the total number of tokens per type of item. For each speaker, a table is provided in Appendix II with their respective oral utterances.

Item type	Yoc (pen. Sp.)	Raul (pen. Sp.)	Jess (pen. Sp.)	Gaby (brazil)	Bea (Mexican)	Roz (pen. Sp.)	Belle (pen. Sp.)	Alda (Italian)	Maddy (Italian)	\bar{x}
Inversion	2	2	4	5	0	1	0	0	0	1.5
<i>It+invers</i>	4	6	1	3	9	2	2	3	2	3.5
Null S Main	4	6	6	3	1	5	3	2	7	4.6
Null S subord	2	7	6	12	2	7	4	4	4	6

Table 2. Personalities' results

3. DISCUSSION

In tables 1 and 2 the same kind of non-native constructions are present in both groups of L2Ls for different types of production tasks. It is clear from these data that all of these L2Ls have difficulties in identifying the subject in a native-like manner. They seem to be entrenched non-native constructions, as confirmed by their perseverance in the speakers with much higher exposure to robust L2 input and interaction, pointing to a well-established underlying linguistic system whose specifications can hardly be modified and its restructuring might only occur partially. On the other hand, comparing writing that has been planned, which, arguably, might seem to be closer to some kind of learned grammatical system of knowledge, with less planned spontaneous interview conversations and still finding coincidences in the types of non-native constructions found may point to a core of rules based on the interplay between the L1 and L2 underlying grammars and discourse factors. Probably, the oral interviews reflect better the learners' attempts to express their own meaning, leading more likely to fall back on their L1 as the conceptual basis for articulation (Han 2010; Han & Lew 2012. (2

For both groups, there are fewer tokens of unanticipated inverted subjects with unaccusative, copula, passive or existential verbs than with *it* insertion (looking at the average, half, approximately, for both groups. (2In some cases there are none, as for Bea and Belle, which might be a sign of higher proficiency given the high number of interviews sifted through for both (with Alda it is not so clear due to the smaller number of interviews found. (2With complement or unergative verbs there are very few in either group: one from student I of an embedded relative clause with a relativized complement: *This shows the capacity that *has the brain to process information*; student X with two tokens of quotative inversions with *insist* (e.g.:...*insisted Yari*); and students XI and XII with *being* (e.g.: ...*being their goal to affect the way in which they think*), possible in their L1 but not in the L2. There is also student IX with three examples of passives with *there* which, though correct, sound very unnatural (marked with ?, like ?*There have been selected repurposed apps*) as compared with their corresponding unanticipated ones with the passive subject in canonical syntactic position.

Among the personalities, Jess, Gaby and Yoc present several cases of unanticipated inversions with *be* and unaccusatives *come* and *happen* (e.g.: ...*and came with the congress the voting for impeachment; and then was one thing after another; happened many crazy things*); Raúl also with *be*, and Roz one token of an embedded relative clause with a relativized complement and a transitive verb (*I could see in him the effect that *was producing my performance*). (2Jess has the example *This is something that made it possible the human organization of humans* where an expletive anticipates a NP object rather than subject like all other cases encountered but the phenomenon is basically the same because, again, only clausal objects can be anticipated this way. Thus, it seems that all participants are aware of the thematic nature of the only (internal) argument of unaccusative constructions keeping it verb internally but still having to fill the syntactic subject position to the left of the verb as the L2 syntax calls for.

It is no wonder that the learners have difficulty with inversion for these verbs since the absence of inversion in the L2 with unaccusatives and passives is less close to the semantics than its presence in the L1. Underlying semantics point to the syntactic subject as the internal (postverbal) argument of the predicate and placing it preverbally involves its syntactic movement there. Besides, the learners might have received little negative feedback to the contrary, especially the personalities as their interaction in the L2 has probably been more focused on meaning than the students'. As in the case of null subjects, the L2 does not provide evidence of the interdiction of postverbal subjects.

In their advanced EFL classes, the students have been made aware of and do corresponding practice in, the use of anticipatory *it* only with clausal subjects and unstressed *there* with NPs. Using these structures involves linguistic knowledge both at the level of the syntax and its interface with discourse factors (focus) and phonetic ones (like the end-weight principle of keeping more linguistic material after the verb. (2The fact that these notional subjects may correspond to new information and so tend to appear postverbally is independent of the provision of an anticipatory syntactic element which, besides, is not necessary in their L1 (cf. Escutia 2008. (2The latter is rather a sign of building an internal grammatical system with specifications of both the L2 (provision of expletive *it*) and the L1 (inverted NP subject), as such a structure does not exist in the L1 and the standard variety of the L2 -the one they work with in their classes and books- requires a different expletive. Still, the IL of these students is moving within a possible grammar since other (non-standard) varieties use the same expletive as our students in all contexts (i.e. black vernacular English: *it ain't no heaven for you to go*. cf. Labov 1969).

These types of non-native constructions are found both in the students' planned writing and in the older learner's spontaneous or half-spontaneous oral production as some -few, just for one speaker- of the data are also drawn from lectures, more amenable to following a certain structure or an outline. Thus, a broad spectrum is covered of what has been called the *IL style continuum* (Tarone 1983⁹). (2This points to their being a stable part of their L2 competence as manifested in discourse processing and production along more (written) or less (spoken) careful styles.

With respect to the production of null syntactic subjects either in main or subordinate clauses, we find, as expected from their presence in many previous studies, that all our L2Ls do produce them in discourse. The fact that we find fewer in the students is due to the fewer data taken from them. Those of main clauses correspond mainly to postverbal clausal subjects without expletive anticipation, especially in the case of the students, which could be classified as just inversion of clausal subjects with copula verbs. There are also some cases of null anaphora *it* whose reference can be recovered in the preceding (students') written or (personalities') spoken discourse: e. g., several examples from different personalities with *depend* (*Maybe (∅) depends on the role I'm playing*) and *be* (*At the beginning (∅) was very flattering for him*). (2Those of subordinate clauses occur both with adverbial and embedded clauses whose referents are in the main clause (e.g.: *which_i is really very good because (∅:it_i) keeps you really humble; It represents the character_i in the way that (∅: it_i) should have been represented*). (2In some cases they correspond to a null anticipatory *it* of a postverbal clausal subject (e.g. *I think (∅) is very nice once in a while to talk to people who's followed you all your life*). (2As expected in cases of attrition, there are inconsistencies within the same speaker: for example, Yoc and Raul produce, respectively, the following utterances with internal inconsistencies in the presence of referential *it*: *No, because (∅) was my time, it was my life* and ... *but it doesn't depend on me, (∅) depends on what they offer you*¹⁰.

It may really be the case, then, that L2 syntax-discourse interface structures are more amenable to implicit than explicit learning (as Han 2013 suggests) in the sense that properties like inversion, which depend so much on discourse factors may not be taught explicitly and can only be learned through robust input and interaction. However, they are first regulated by the syntax of either language and are freer in word order in the learners' L1. For example, with no context provided, *many people came to the party* can be translated to the L1 either, word for word, as *mucha gente vino a la fiesta* or, with subject-verb inversion, *vino mucha gente a la fiesta*, that is, with the subject placed pre or postverbally. The latter is the proper answer in Spanish to the question *what happened (at the party)?* with respect to the party, the stage topic, displaying focus on the postverbal subject. The L2 might answer both *that many people came to the party* or, more formally, rather in written discourse, *that there came many people to the party*. That is, in oral discourse, the L2 displays inversion much less than the L1 because it is more syntactically determined even in the kind of robust input that has been referred to, as it is quite formal and literary. Thus, it seems that the L1 interface cues for inversion and keeping track of subjects are overriding those of the L2, which are more syntactically determined. That maybe partly why the interviews with the personalities do not seem to show much higher proficiency in this area of inversion. Still, the fact that they tend to provide an expletive of sorts to those inverted subjects shows that exposure to the L2 has left in all the learners the awareness of the need for a preverbal syntactic subject.

The same could be said about the omission of pronominal subjects in the L1, which, once their referent is mentioned in the preceding discourse, either in the main or subordinate clause of a complex sentence, they can be omitted and identified by the verbal

inflectional morphemes. Thus, the learners may be using the discourse mechanism of identification of their L1. At the syntactic level of the sentence they may not produce these non-native constructions because, as advanced learners, they are proficient in the syntax of the L2. It is those other interface aspects occurring when one has to produce the language in discourse that may be more influenced by the L1 discourse mechanisms of identification, less amenable to explicit teaching and more permeable to L1 transfer.

As can be seen from the older learners' speech, the *it*-insertion construction ($it_i + VP$ (unacc./be/pass.) + NP_i : take Alda's *It's not important the appearance, the way you are with your friends*), also common in the planned written IL (and also in speech, though not recorded here) of advanced adult Spanish learners of English in an institutional milieu seems to persevere in the spontaneous oral production of older Romance learners with long stays in English speaking countries and much more time of exposure and practice of the language in natural contexts¹¹. This points to its being a clear candidate for fossilization in the English IL of this type of speakers. It seems to be more frequent than simple inversion with the same type of verb -as it does not happen with other types. Their latter's occurrence might then point to a lower level of language proficiency as it does not acknowledge the need of a necessary preverbal element. This may be consistent with the fact that Belle and Bea, the apparently more proficient speakers, display no example of it despite their many interviews consulted. This much lower frequency of unanticipated inverted subjects might go against its clear status as a fossilizable type in favor of the anticipated ones (**...if once happened in your life something like this* (from Yoc) might seem to be less proficient in the L2 than **it happened in your life something like this*).

If, as it is likely, the input the EFL students in an instructed setting are exposed to is, on the whole, non-robust, that is, infrequent and inconsistent, one may not rely on its doing the job of correcting the L1 discourse biases about subject position and expression with respect to new information and null subject production even though the syntax may be in place. Still, Spanish students nowadays are exposed to a lot of English data, especially these ones, who take an interest in being immersed in English because of their chosen college major. Besides, many spend their summers in English speaking countries and watch a lot of English videos. Furthermore, this type of students may develop a metalinguistic consciousness about certain aspects of the language, in particular about the non-omission of pronominal subjects as they are always warned about it. However, the strength of the L1 discourse cues always at hand when one has to perform linguistically, along with both the null semantic contribution of expletives and the ease of identification of coreferential subordinate subjects may all cooperate in producing these non-native constructions.

Even though we have concentrated more on the *it*-insertion construction, some of our learners retain both the (unanticipated) inversion of subject with unaccusative, copula and passive verbs - though it seems that in smaller measure than the other- and the non-native use of null subjects instead of expletive -and even referential- *it* in subordinate subject coreferential clauses. All these seem to be manifestations of the same underlying IL system, which legitimizes null (preverbal) syntactic subjects in discourse. It runs parallel to how advanced English L2 learners of Spanish or Italian do not produce inversion when it is appropriate -and even necessary- and overproduce subject pronouns in their Spanish IL.

As explained above, the *it* insertion construction is consistent with the grammars of both the L1, which prefers inversion with the types of verbs (unaccusatives and passives) and corresponding discourse conditions, and the L2, with both possibilities of either placing the NP subject before the verb or anticipating it with an expletive (*there*, in the standard variety) and placing the NP post-verbally. Besides, it also occurs in the opposite direction,

that is, when the L1 is English and the L2 is Spanish: in this case the item chosen as expletive may be the Spanish pronoun *se* and it looks like this structure tends to fossilize as well, as explained above (cf. Escutia 2016). (2This IL provides an intermediate solution whereby the same expletive occurs anticipating both NPs and clauses, as it occurs in other natural languages like French (e. g. *il existe la possibilité de les rencontrer /il paraît qu'il va faire de froid/il est mort le soleil* 'there exists the possibility of meeting them again/it seems that it's going to get cold/the sun has died') or German (*Es gibt nur Wasser überall/Es ist interessant, dass niemand den Fehler bemerkt hat* 'there is only water everywhere/It is interesting that nobody has noticed the mistake'); that is, using the default expletive *it* in all cases, inserted in standard English only to anticipate clausal subjects¹².

This *it*-insertion structure does not exist in the L1, so it is not originated in L1 transfer but responds to a creative construction of the IL system, which resorts to it rather than inversion or placing the subject NP preverbally when it is the focus of information. The fact of its presence in the IL of advanced L2L's of several L1 null subject romance backgrounds may point to its stability as a fossilized idiosyncratic structure of null subject Romance IL.

These data seem to contradict those of Lozano & Mendikoetxea (2013) of acceptability judgements of advanced (C2 proficiency level) EFL learners who accept *it*-insertion structures at the same level as \emptyset -insertion, as compared with the corpora data they analyzed, where overproduction of the former was rampant. Our own data conform more with these corpora data, probably because when it comes to producing one's own meaning (thus, at the level of the interface syntax-discourse) L1 transfer seems to be more active.

For both sets of learners, we are moving within the confines of adult age with respect to the beginning of significant exposure to the L2. The data might be quite different for learners with as long but earlier exposure than our adult speakers, as some studies suggest (cf. Johnson and Newport 1989, Long 1990, Newport 1991, Hartshorne, Tenenbaum, & Pinker, 2018). (2We have to consider that our students have basically had an EFL instructed exposure to the L2 from their early adolescence. They may also have probably listened to a fair amount of English multimedially and only had some more intense face-to-face interaction with native speakers in their vacation periods, which means that, if there really is a sensitive period for L2A around adolescence, they were either past or in the middle of it when they started with that impoverished exposure to the L2. No doubt the case of the personalities is even clearer in this respect since two of them seemed to be in the same situation as our students (Bea and Belle), and the rest really began their real exposure to the L2 as adults.

It should have been very interesting to have presented both groups with an acceptability judgement test of the items they had themselves produced or with equivalent ones as more of the whole gamut of IL styles might have been covered. This would have given us a more thorough picture of their knowledge about the type of items discussed. However, as far as it goes, one can say that the personalities' data may confirm the fossilizable status of the types of items chosen (though less clearly so of the unanticipated inversion. (2Another drawback is the lack of a comparison with what native speakers would do in their interviews to see if one finds the same types of items.

We could have also added as candidates for fossilization the very common non-native constructions of S-Aux inversion in embedded questions (Escutia 2002), Adjacency effects with adverbials (cf. White 1990, Trahey and White 1993) and resumptive pronouns in relative clauses (Gass 1979, 1982; Gass and Lee 2007), especially relativizing the subject position (and also other positions), which might not have been expected from learners who do not do so in their L1. All of these are also present in the interviews data of the personalities. We have not taken them into account due to the fact that they were not so

frequent in our student's written output (although we have observed them very often both in their oral and written production) and because of the focus of our study on those types of non-native constructions traditionally associated with null subject languages. We leave them for possible future research.

Finally, when presenting non-native constructions such as these, one may feel the responsibility of providing some remedial work to restructure the non-native linguistic system somehow. Such work could be applied to these non-native constructions and doing extensive in-class controlled practice with the students, making them aware of them as used non-natively in real texts like the ones used here, apart from providing negative evidence or correction when necessary. On the other hand, one may wonder if they are the natural end for the type of learner studied here and no remedy is at hand except a cosmetic one in those situations that naturally afford awareness and monitoring such as written production or formal spoken tasks. Other speech situations do not lend themselves to such awareness and control, which might anyway hinder naturalness and even expressiveness in communication.

NOTAS

1 At the time they talked about (developmental) errors rather than non-native constructions and also different from (performance) mistakes.

2 Unless it is filled with an adverbial of place or time: *...and at that moment came the answer from the other side; Near the house stood an huge pine tree.*

3 We are referring here to, and our examples mainly deal with, what some authors consider to have clausal or sentential focus, where one can postulate a "stage topic", that is, an implicit topic which signals the spatio-temporal parameters of the predication, the here and now of it (Erteschik-Shir 1997).

4 These are the other type of discourse conditions dealt with in our examples, when a clause may be pragmatically predicated of a topical referent not having at the same time a surface syntactic topic, as illustrated in the comparison between the English dialogue and the corresponding Spanish version:

P. What's the problem with Michael? ¿Qué le pasa a Michael?

R. He's just had an accident. ¿(*Él) acaba de tener un accidente

Here, in R. the syntactic subject (Michael), referred to by the pronoun he is the topic, in pragmatic terms. In null-subject Romance languages, like Spanish, the syntactico-pragmatic conditions of the language require for the third person pronoun *él* to be omitted seeming on the surface (as if there is no apparent syntactic constituent as topic) even though there is clearly a topical referent signaled by the verbal inflectional morphology.

5 At the C1 CEFR level, a language learner can: understand a wide range of long and demanding texts or conversations; express ideas without too much searching; effectively use the language for social, academic or professional situations; create well-structured and detailed texts on complex topics.

6 In both groups, the corresponding tokens from this category correspond to a real pronominal anticipation of a NP not mentioned before and not to an anaphoric element referring back to some preceding referent which is repeated again for clarification (after a comma in writing and a small pause in speech. (2

7 It is for this reason that no French L1 speaker has been chosen even though it is also a Romance language and there are plenty of speakers of this kind that might have been picked. French is a non-null subject language.

8 The same thing applies to the source and URL of the original interviews or lectures the data have been drawn from. If a specialized researcher -one who is supposed to be discreet about it because

of their exclusive professional interest- is interested in the exact place and time where they can be found, they can email the author of the article.

9 Tarone (1983) distinguishes different varieties within a speaker's performance ranging from the one produced for unattended speech data, which she calls the vernacular style, to a more careful style when the speakers can monitor most their speech, with different varieties in between).

10 In the case of null subjects in general, we have tried not to use those with third person referential or expletive *it* preceding the form *is* because in speech both might be conflated and difficult to distinguish. Still, in a couple of cases that we have allowed them, the automatic subtitles of the youtube screen have been activated to check for it trying to avoid that problem.

11 Although it only constitutes anecdotal evidence, I can witness to finding both myself, other English teachers and advanced learners using at times such idiosyncratic construction in speech on the spur of the moment.

12 It might be interesting to see if advanced L1 speakers of French and German do produce the *it-V-NP* construction as well, which might reflect L1 transfer. If it is a question of transfer in this case, our guess is that advanced speakers will be more conscious of it and will not do it.

REFERENCES

- Al-Kasey, T. and Pérez-Leroux, A.-T., 1998. Second language acquisition of Spanish null subjects. In Flynn, S., Matohardjono, G., O'Neil, W. (eds.), *The Generative Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 161-185.
- Alexiadou, A., E. Anagnostopoulou & M. Everaert., 2003. *The Unaccusativity Puzzle*. Oxford University Press.
- Balcom, P., 1997. Why is this happened? Passive morphology and unaccusativity. *Second Language Research* 13, 1, pp. 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1191/026765897670080531>
- Barbosa, P., 1995. *Null Subjects*. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT. Cambridge, Mass.
- Barbosa, P., 2000. Clitics: A Window into the Null Subject Property. In Costa, J., eds.), *Portuguese Syntax: Comparative Studies*. New York: Oxford Press, pp. 31-93.
- Belletti, A., Bennati, E. & Sorace, A., 2007. Theoretical and developmental issues in the syntax of subjects: Evidence from near-native Italian. *Natural Language Linguist Theory* 25: 657-689.
- Burman, D., Bitan, T., Booth, J.R., 2008. Sex Differences in Neural Processing of Language Among Children. *Neuropsychologia*: 46, 5, pp. 1349-1362. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2007.12.021>
- Domínguez, L. & Arche, M. J., 2014. Subject inversion in non-native Spanish. *Lingua* 145, pp. 243-265.
- Erteschik-Shir, N., 1997. *The Dynamics of Focus Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R., 2003. *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Escutia, M., 1998. Variability and non-variability in the English L2 acquisition of an adult Spanish speaker. *Perspectives on Spanish Linguistics*, 2. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, pp. 25- 43.
- Escutia, M. 1999. Age and that-trace effects. *Estudios ingleses de la Universidad Complutense* 7, pp. 109-118.
- Escutia, M., 2002. Universal Grammar, transfer and variability: a case study. *Estudios ingleses de la Universidad Complutense* 10, 2002, pp. 67-86.
- Escutia, M., 2002. First language effect on Spanish learners' production of indirect interrogative clauses. *Círculo* 10. 1-5. Available at <http://ww.ucm.es/info/circulo/no10/index.htm>
- Escutia, M., 2008. Transfer and Universal Grammar in Unaccusative Constructions Errors. *Miscelánea*, 37, pp. 23-38.

- Escutia, M., 2010. El uso de "se" con verbos inacusativos por estudiantes avanzados de español como lengua extranjera: transferencia y reestructuración. *Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada* 23, pp. 129-152
- Escutia, M., 2013. Expletives and unaccusative predicates in L2A. *Higher Education of Social science* 2, pp. 1-14.
- Escutia, M., 2016. L2 Spanish preverbal 'se' in analysis and production data. *Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada*, pp. 30-63
- Fernández Soriano, O., 1989. Strong pronouns in null-subject languages and the avoid pronoun principle. *MIT working papers in linguistics* 11, pp. 228-239.
- Filiaci, F., Sorace A. & Carreiras, M., 2014. Anaphoric biases of null and overt subjects in Italian and Spanish: A cross-linguistic comparison. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience* 29(7), pp. 825-843.
- Gass, S., 1979. Language transfer and universal grammatical relations. *Language Learning* 29, pp. 327-344.
- Gass, S., 1982. From theory to practice. In Hines, M. & Rutherford, W., eds.) *On TESOL '81*: 129-139. Washington DC: TESOL.
- Gass, S., 1997. *Input, Interaction, and the Second Language Learner*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers
- Gass S. and Lee, J., 2007. Second Language Acquisition of Relative Clauses. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. Volume 29, 2, pp. 329-335
- Han, Z. -H., 2004. *Fossilization in Adult Second Language Acquisition*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Han, Z.-H., 2006. Fossilization: Can grammaticality judgment be a reliable source of evidence?. In Han Z.-H. & Odlin, T., eds.) *Studies of fossilization in second language acquisition*, pp. 56-82. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Han, Z.-H., 2009. Interlanguage and fossilization: Towards an analytic model. In Cook, V. & Wei, L., eds.) *Contemporary applied linguistics I: Language teaching and learning*. London: Continuum, pp. 137-162.
- Han, Z.-H., 2013. Forty years later: Updating the Fossilization Hypothesis. *Language Teaching* 2, pp. 133 -171. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000511>.
- Han, Z.-H. & Lew, W.M., 2012. Acquisitional complexity: What defies complete acquisition in SLA. In Szmrecsanyi, B., & Kortmann, B., eds.), *Linguistic Complexity in Interlanguage Varieties, L2 Varieties, and Contact Languages*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 192-217.
- Hartshorne, J. K., Tenenbaum, J. B., & Pinker, S., 2018. A critical period for second language acquisition: Evidence from 2/3 million English speakers. *Cognition*, 177, pp. 263- 277. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2018.04.007>
- Hertel, T.J., 2003. "Lexical and discourse factors in the second language acquisition of Spanish word order. *Second Language Research* 19, pp. 273- 304.
- Hilles, S., 1986. Interlanguage and the pro-drop parameter. *Second Language Research* 2, pp. 33-52.
- Johnson J.S. and Newport E.L., 1989. Critical period effects in second language learning: the influence of maturational state on the acquisition of English as a second language. *Cognitive Psychology* 21 (1), pp. 60-99.
- Kato, Mary A., 1999. Strong and weak pronominals and the null subject parameter. *Probus* 11(1). pp. 1-38.
- Labov, W., 1969. *The Logic of Non-Standard English*. Georgetown Monographs on Language and Linguistics, 22, pp. 1-31.
- Lardiere, D., 1998. Dissociating syntax from morphology in a divergent L2 end state grammar. *Second Language Research*, 14 (4), pp. 359-375.
- Lardiere, D., 2007. *Ultimate Attainment in Second Language Acquisition: A Case Study*. New York: Routledge
- Liceras, J. M., 1988. Syntax and stylistics: more on the pro-drop parameter. In Pankhurst, J. *Studies on Language Acquisition*, 7. De Gruyter Mouton

- 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.), *Language acquisition: A linguistic approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 109–133.
- 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 and Japanese speakers. *Second Language Research*, 15(1), pp. 1–40. <https://doi.org/10.1191/026765899678128123>
- Lightbown, P. M., 1985. Great Expectations: Second-Language Acquisition Research and Classroom Teaching. *Applied Linguistics*, 6, 2, pp. 173–189. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/6.2.173>
- Lightbown, P. M., 2000. Anniversary article: Classroom SLA research and second language teaching. *Applied Linguistics* 21, pp. 431–462.
- Lightbown, P. M., 2003. SLA research in the classroom/SLA research for the classroom. *Language Learning Journal* 27, pp. 4–14.
- Long, M. 1990. Maturational constraints on language development. *Studies in second language acquisition* 12, pp. 251–85.
- Long, M. H., 2003. Stabilization and fossilization in interlanguage development. In Doughty, C. J. & Long, M. H., eds.), *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* Malden, MA: Blackwell, pp. 487–535.
- Lozano, C., 2003. *Universal Grammar and focus constraints: The acquisition of pronouns and word order in non-native Spanish*. University of Essex: Unpublished PhD dissertation.
- Lozano, C., 2006a. "Focus and split intransitivity: The acquisition of word order alternations in non-native Spanish. *Second Language Research* 22(2): 145–187. <https://doi.org/10.1191/0267658306sr264oa>.
- Lozano, C., 2006b. The development of the syntax-discourse interface: Greek learners of Spanish. In: Torrens, V. & Escobar, L., eds.), *The acquisition of syntax in Romance languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 371–399.
- Lozano, C., 2009. Selective deficits at the syntax-discourse interface: Evidence from the CEDEL2 corpus. In Leung, Y., Snape, N. & Sharwood-Smith, M., eds) *Representational Deficits in Second Language Acquisition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 127–166.
- Lozano, C. & Mendikoetxea, A., 2013. Corpus and experimental data: Subjects in second language research. In Granger, S., Gilquin G. & Meunier, F., eds), *Twenty Years of Learner Corpus Research: Looking back, Moving ahead*. Corpora and Language in Use. Proceedings 1, Louvain-la-Neuve: Presses universitaires de Louvain, pp. 313–323.
- Mendikoetxea, A. & Lozano, C., 2018. From Corpora to Experiments: Methodological Triangulation in the Study of Word Order at the Interfaces in Adult Late Bilinguals (L2 learners). *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 47(02), pp. 411–430.
- Montrul, S. and Bowles, M., 2009. Back to basics: Differential Object Marking under incomplete acquisition in Spanish heritage speakers. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 12, 3, pp. 363–383.
- Montrul, S. & Rodríguez-Louro, C., 2006. Beyond the syntax of the null subject parameter: A look at the discourse-pragmatics distribution of null and overt subjects by L2 learners of Spanish. In Torrens, V. & Escobar, L., eds.), *The acquisition of syntax in Romance languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 401–418.
- Moskovsky C. and Ratcheva, S., 2014. L2 Fossilization: A Competence or a Performance Phenomenon. *The Open Communication Journal* 8, 9–17.
- Newport, E., 1990. Maturational constraints on language learning. *Cognitive Science* 14, pp. 11–28.
- Oshita, H., 2001. The unaccusative trap in second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 23(02), pp. 279 – 304. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263101002078>.
- Pérez-Leroux, A., Glass, W. L., 1999. Null anaphora in Spanish second language acquisition: probabilistic versus generative approaches. *Second Language Research*, 15(2), pp. 220–249. <https://doi.org/10.1191/026765899676722648>
- Phinney, M., 1987. The pro-drop parameter in second language acquisition. In Roeper, T. and Williams, E., eds), *Parameter setting*. Dordrecht: Reidel, pp. 221–38.

- Pladevall, E., 2013. Adult L2 Spanish development of syntactic and discourse subject properties in an instructional setting. *RAEL (Revista Electrónica de Lingüística Aplicada)* 12, pp. 111-129.
- Saville-Troike M., 2006. *Introducing Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge Introductions to Language and Linguistics.
- Selinker, L., 1972. *Interlanguage*. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 10, pp. 209-231.
- Singleton, D., 1989. *Language acquisition: the age factor*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Singleton, D., 1995. Introduction: a critical look at the critical period hypothesis in second language acquisition research. In Singleton, D. and Lengyel, Z., (eds), *The age factor in second language acquisition*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters: pp. 1-29.
- Sorace, A., 2000. Syntactic optionality in non-native grammars. *Second Language Research*, 16 (2), pp. 93-102.
- Sorace, A., 2003. Near-nativeness. In C. J. Doughty & M. H. Long (eds.), *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 130-151. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Sorace, A., 2004. Native Language Attrition and Developmental Instability at the Syntax-Discourse Interface: Data, Interpretations and Methods. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 7(02), pp. 143 - 145. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728904001543>
- Sorace, A., 2005. Selective optionality in language development in Syntax and Variation: Reconciling the Biological and the Social. In Leonie Cornips and Karen P. Corrigan (eds.) *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory* 265, pp. 55-80.
- Sorace, A. & Serratrice, L., 2009. Internal and external interfaces in bilingual language development: Beyond structural overlap. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 13(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006909339810>
- Tarone, E., 1983. On the Variability of Interlanguage Systems. *Applied Linguistics*, 4, 2, pp. 142-164. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/4.2.142>
- Tsimpli, I., Sorace, A., Heycock, C. & Filiaci, F., 2004. First language attrition and syntactic subjects: A study of Greek and Italian near-native speakers of English. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 8, 3, pp. 257-277. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069040080030601>
- Trahey, M. and L. White., 1993. Positive evidence and preemption in the second language classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 15, 181-204.
- Trenkic, D., 2009. Accounting for patterns of article omissions and substitutions in second language production. In M. P. García Mayo & R. Hawkins (eds.), *Second language acquisition of articles: Empirical findings and theoretical Implications*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 115-143.
- White, L., 1985. The pro-drop parameter in adult second language acquisition. *Language Learning* 35, pp. 47-62.
- White, L., 1990. The verb-movement parameter in second language acquisition. *Language Acquisition* 1, pp. 337-60. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327817la0104_2
- White, L., 2003. *Second Language Acquisition and Universal Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zobl, H., 1980. The formal and developmental selectivity of L1 influence on L2 acquisition. *Language Learning*, 30, 43-57. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1980.tb00150.x>

APPENDIX I: STUDENTS' WRITTEN DATA

LEARNER	INVERSION no expletive	INVERSION <i>it</i> -insertion	NULL SUBJECT Main clause	NULL S Subordinate
Student I	<p>First there is cooing, then starts babbling</p> <p>After this stage appears the one-word stage</p> <p>In this stage come into play mistakes</p> <p>This shows the capacity that has the brain to process information</p> <p>Then arises the question of how much can language dictate what we think</p>	<p>Later it arose the idea that Eskimos have certain prefixes</p> <p>In English and Indonesian it is used the expression a long time</p> <p>Then it is found a summary of the arguments</p> <p>It must be borne in mind the following details: ...</p> <p>It is noticeable the wrong use of the particle</p>	<p>The more transformations the more difficult (\emptyset) is for us to process the sentence</p> <p>In English (\emptyset) seems to be natural to have the pronouns he, she, it</p>	<p>it is dangerous in the sense that (\emptyset) might provoke undesirable responses</p>
Student II	<p>They have exposed the idea that exist certain central metaphors</p>	<p>In the Work of Tannen it has been done a differentiation between the two types of conversational styles</p> <p>It has also been researched the tendency that subordinates have to use indirect speech</p> <p>Then it arises the question of whether or not our mind is shaped by language</p>	<p>... just because you speak differently (\emptyset) doesn't mean you think different</p>	
Student III	<p>Thought is possible without language, being babies an example of this</p> <p>Thought and language are different, being language the means by which we communicate thoughts</p>	<p>It will be explained the possible connection between language and thought</p> <p>It will also be mentioned the different ways in which languages express different concepts</p> <p>There is a part in which it is described the variety of terms used.</p>	<p>In Lackoff and Johnson (\emptyset) is argued that there are central metaphors</p>	<p>Unlike English, Spanish only speaks of intentional actions when (\emptyset) is obvious that someone did it</p>

<p>Student IV</p>	<p>In Russian are used different adjective endings</p>	<p>It has been researched the subtle shades of meaning that different word orders convey</p> <p>It's interesting the thing that speakers living in Miami probably have a minimal vocabulary for snow</p> <p>Thus, it is interesting the way in which indirect speech can be used</p> <p>It was made an experiment which consisted in teaching speakers a new way to talk about time</p>	<p>In that simple sentence (\emptyset) is needed to mark the masculinity of the chair many times</p> <p>after reading this info (\emptyset) is clear that speakers of different languages think differently</p> <p>For instance, in English (\emptyset) is needed to change the verb to know if the action happened in the past</p> <p>... and one has to mark if (\emptyset) is something that the person has heard</p>	<p>To discuss the belief that (\emptyset) is not language what shapes our thoughts</p> <p>You need to be more specific and mention what kind of tree (\emptyset) is</p> <p>They showed images in which (\emptyset) was clear who made the action</p>
<p>Student V</p>	<p>Not only was described the theoretical background there</p> <p>There was a difference between oral language and reading comprehension, being this identified as the problem</p>	<p>It is avoided possible confusions in the terminology</p> <p>It has been opted for the one suggested by E Anthony</p> <p>However, it will be tackled the methods which had an impact</p> <p>It is given priority to the teaching of speaking</p> <p>It was created a language learning program</p> <p>It is only used the target language</p> <p>it is taken into account the unconscious elements involved</p> <p>It is needed an atmosphere in which learners feel comfortable</p> <p>It is preferred fluency to accuracy</p> <p>It is suggested the employment of songs</p>	<p>To understand emotional meaning (\emptyset) is necessary to comprehend the vocabulary</p>	<p>The principal advantage of this approach is that (\emptyset) allows the possibility of including other methods</p> <p>... since the learners decide the materials that (\emptyset) will use in the classroom</p>

		It is recommended the utilization of body answers		
Student VI	... to learn a foreign language, being English the language in this case	<p>It was begun to take into consideration the cultural factors</p> <p>It is presented/ defended the idea that language must be treated as a whole/ that each person has 8 different intelligences</p> <p>It has been taken into account any kind of factor that could influence language learning</p> <p>There is no method that could be considered the best and probably it will never be</p> <p>It existed a need for new approaches</p>		in German the Sun is feminine and in Spanish (∅) is masculine
Student VII	<p>For the learning of a foreign language are necessary two processes</p> <p>This is the way how appears the study of other methods</p> <p>A subject in which is taught the different phenomena of the language</p>	<p>It happened something similar</p> <p>It will be included information about the Orton-Gillingham approach</p> <p>if it is simultaneously used the multiple sensory methods</p> <p>It should be avoided long texts</p> <p>It exists the conception that dyslexia can be cured</p>		<p>In sum, children even though (∅) repeat to some extent words and phrases create language</p> <p>Taking into account the whole learning that implies any word and the relation to each component that (∅) represents, we can say...</p>
Student VIII	<p>In the next point are going to be developed some of the activities that use multisensory techniques</p> <p>With dyslexic children might be used activities that use some of their senses</p>	<p>It is also found the previously mentioned taboo words</p> <p>It occurred bigger changes in word formation</p> <p>It occurred bigger changes in word formation</p>		There are advanced students who really feel that (∅) are bad at breaking words

	<p>In this point are presented some general exercises</p> <p>You can create a box in which appear words with these sounds</p> <p>...using fun worksheets in which appears a legend with simple instructions</p>	<p>It occurred the process of specialization</p> <p>It is found such words as hobnob</p> <p>It has been explained the different types of semantic change</p>		
Student IX	<p>In the year 731 in which can be found historical events such as the historical work of Beda</p>	<p>Sometimes it may occur the opposite process</p> <p>There have been chosen popular applications oriented to language learning</p> <p>There have been selected repurposed apps</p> <p>There have been created five groups</p>	<p>To understand the history (\emptyset) is crucial not only to know....</p>	
Student X	<p>Visually could be observed rare ocular movements</p> <p>In a state of emotional discomfort, insisted Conture</p> <p>On the one hand, appears a gradual start of stuttering</p> <p>Tension while producing language, insisted Yairi</p>	<p>It can also occur other types of interruptions</p> <p>In this paper it will be used the term person who stutters</p> <p>It has been found an excessive tension while stuttering</p> <p>It was analyzed different strategies that patients used</p> <p>It could also be found more phonemes where the subject stutters</p> <p>In this test it can be seen three different punctuations given</p>	<p>Now that (\emptyset) is clear what kind of symptoms can appear, let's continue with ...</p> <p>...but for a person who stutters (\emptyset) might be a real struggle to form the sound</p>	<p>The technique is called semantic feature analysis for the reason that (\emptyset) is a vocabulary strategy to help students</p>
Student XI	<p>...being their goal to affect the way in which they think</p>	<p>Now it will be analyzed the conversation</p> <p>It can be clearly seen the influence of their L1.</p>		<p>When the air controller listens to the communication, (\emptyset) hesitates about the pilot's indecision</p>

		...but it could have been a slight decrease at the end of the unit		
Student XII	...being the best education in nursery school In the last last day will be the awards ceremony	it can also be found a chapel in that school It was also really noticeable the separation in class among the different "tribes" it will be stated a hypothesis on the possible final results	First of all (\emptyset) is important to choose a topic of their interest	Tell the students that (\emptyset) is a good option to do it about Christmas

APPENDIX II: PERSONALITIES' DATA

LEARNER	INVERSION no expletive	INVERSION it-insertion	NULL S MAIN CLAUSE	SUBORDINATE NULL
YOC (L1 Peninsular Spanish)	But if once happened in your life something like this (2009) Happened many crazy things in my life (2010)	It (=there) will be some time in the future for us to be together (1999) So, when it came that situation and starting to have time to play (2012) I can play for all kinds of ages: It's incredible that (2014) It was great the opera of Dubai (2018)	For me, (\emptyset) was not an easy decision because I had already three kids (2010) So, (\emptyset) was something that I didn't think (2012) I think so, (\emptyset) was a very different situation (2014) No, because (\emptyset) was my time, it was my life (2014)	The girls, (\emptyset) is something that (\emptyset : they, people) think is very interesting (2014) I adore him because (\emptyset) was an incredible singer (2015)
RAÚL (L1 Peninsular Spanish)	When you put two Spaniards together usually are long nights (2010) And then are those characters that I want to put more attention to (2012)	It has to happen something that is out of control (2007) It's spectacular the rugby nowadays (2008) It's like this the world (2008) And that's why it's important friends and family because they remind you who you are (2012)	Because somebody will see it and (\emptyset) will be meaningful to that person (2010) But it doesn't depend on me, (\emptyset) depends on what they offer you (2012) For me, (\emptyset) was one of those moments where I was pinching myself (2017) The other day (\emptyset : I) was talking to Asgar about it (2018)	We're working in this movie that I think (\emptyset) is gonna be a good one (2012) I wanted to know where (\emptyset : it, the character) was coming from (2015) I think that (\emptyset : it, his attitude) has to do with my mom (2017) ...in other words, that (\emptyset : it) is based on the material. (2017)

		<p>I think it's important the body language (2012)</p>	<p>They just are with all the consequences. And usually (\emptyset: they) are people who are very loving and caring for others (2018)</p> <p>For me (\emptyset) was a great moment because I really admire his work (2018)</p>	<p>If you want to see the world of narcotraffic as (\emptyset: it) was invented (2017)</p> <p>I knew that (\emptyset: it) was never going to happen (2018)</p> <p>Because, again, (\emptyset) shows you that the strongest, the people with real talent are good people, usually (\emptyset) are great people endowed with empathy (2018)</p>
<p>JESS (L1 Peninsular Spanish)</p>	<p>Organisms which can live only by killing other organisms, which (\emptyset: there) have been several of these cases (2012)</p> <p>If I run the program again (\emptyset: there) come different outcomes (2013)</p> <p>In some respects more important are behavioural differences between us and the apes (2014)</p> <p>In the final decade (\emptyset: it) had been discovered that where the land is exposed but if there has been this kind (2015)</p>	<p>...that made it possible the human organization of humans (2014)</p>	<p>In the old times (\emptyset: it) was explained as the result of the intentional action of a Supreme Being (2012)</p> <p>Sometimes in the case of religion (\emptyset: it) has to do with the interpretation (2013)</p> <p>For all the examples he gave, (\emptyset: it) has been shown how the evolution occurred (2013)</p> <p>Moreover (\emptyset: it, molecular biology) allows us to reconstruct the history of living organisms (2015)</p> <p>For much of time (\emptyset: it, the brain) was like that, about 600 grams (2016)</p> <p>But I think that by and large (\emptyset: there) will be progress (2016)</p>	<p>Wilmot pointed out that (\emptyset: it) had taken him 270 efforts to clone Dolly (2012)</p> <p>So the best they can do for the genes is to be eaten by the female so that (\emptyset: she) is very healthy, produces more healthier babies (2012)</p> <p>The theory of intelligent design accomplishes exactly the opposite of what (\emptyset: it) intends (2013)</p> <p>What bipedalism implies is that (\emptyset: it) leaves the arms free (2014)</p> <p>Those genes will be favored because (\emptyset) are more likely to be transmitted to more progeny (2014)</p> <p>The only animal that is aware that (\emptyset) exists as an individual (2014)</p> <p>Those things will be favored because (\emptyset: they) are more likely to be transmitted to more progeny (2014)</p> <p>...so (\emptyset: he, Hume) derives moral principles from facts (2014)</p> <p>Gorillas and chimpanzees cannot speak, not only because (\emptyset: they) don't</p>

				<p>have the ability but also because they cannot emit the sounds we can (2016)</p> <p>...if (∅: it, life) happened long ago then I mean a few thousand years (2017)</p> <p>If (∅) had occurred we would know about it (2017)</p> <p>A person living in Scandinavia can't do very well because (∅: she) cannot synthesize vitamin D (2017)</p>
GABY (Brazilian)	<p>that's when came in the bottle the message that he needed to talk to me (2016)</p> <p>And came with the congress the voting for impeachment (2016)</p> <p>And then was one thing after another (2016)</p> <p>And then was the same director who invited me to do acting (2016)</p> <p>And then became part of my life being recognized in the street (2016)</p>	<p>What's wrong in Brasil is that it should be a dialogue and not like a country divided (2016)</p> <p>It's happening something right now: that Brazil is divided (2016)</p> <p>The present, which is now the past because it passed a year (2017)</p>	<p>When you're not representing a character as a star that's when (∅) should matter (2016)</p> <p>And when (∅: what you have inside) goes to the audiences, it's theirs too (2016)</p> <p>...and that's why (∅: the film) becomes so strong (2017)</p>	<p>Why did you impose that (∅: it) would be me to do that character (2016)</p> <p>He showed me where (∅: it) was gonna be (2016)</p> <p>I think that (∅: it) came in the time when we needed something and that film represents that resistance... and as long as (∅: there) is democracy we have the right (2016)</p> <p>... because (∅: it, the film) became in a way connected with that story (2016)</p> <p>.... because (∅: it, the film) touched them in that way (2016)</p> <p>I think that (∅: it, the film) brought back columns of discussion (2016)</p> <p>Why Sao Paulo was so ugly because (∅) was so big and everything... (2016)</p> <p>And there is a long silence, so (∅) creates some feeling that you don't know what's gonna happen (2016)</p> <p>He told me (∅: it) was gonna be relaxed and it really was (2016)</p>

				<p>The other day that was the occupy movement that they took over the city, so (\emptyset: it) demonstrated that the city was not the few makers in the art (2016)</p> <p>That's when I think that (\emptyset: her call to be an actress) started (2017)</p> <p>I think that (\emptyset: it) is the audiences that decides (2016)</p> <p>I think (\emptyset: there) would be movies by then (2016)</p> <p>Because I thought (\emptyset: it) could be one of the friends (2017)</p>
BEA (Mexican Spanish)		<p>...because it's being stolen all the money (2006)</p> <p>It's really not investigated the wonders of the other half (2015)</p> <p>It must also be exciting for men what can be our contribution (2015)</p> <p>It did not help that part (= that part didn't help) (2015)</p> <p>It was divided the school between the good nuns and the bad ones (2017)</p> <p>It was too clear your thought process (2017)</p> <p>It makes no sense the character (2017)</p> <p>It doesn't work because it's still very strong his accent (2017)</p>	<p>...but for the youth (\emptyset: it, this fact) is very important (2015)</p>	<p>Because my father was very jealous, (\emptyset) didn't allow me to go to college until I turned 16 (2015)</p> <p>I think that (\emptyset) is important to tell our stories (2017)</p>

		It just keeps feeling strange this movie (2017)		
ROZ (L1 Peninsular Spanish)	I could see in him the effect that was producing my performance (2019)	It was too big the light that the character produced (2018) And then it came to me what he was explaining before (2019)	The happiest time for me in America was not in front of a camera, (∅) was in 49th street (2015) In a way (∅) has to do with my own story (2017) For us (∅) was very important to have an institution behind At the beginning (∅) was very flattering for him (2018) For me has been very important all the work that I have done with him (2019) For me was very important all the silences of the character (2019)	The meaning of the bull is that (∅) is a bull (2018) ... and the other issue I thought that (∅) was faith (2015) I am very grateful to my profession not for what (∅: it) gave me in terms of being famous...but in terms of what it taught me as a human being (2015) It represents the character in the way that (∅: it) should have been represented (2018) I like to be precise because (∅: there) may be movies that have not been very strong that year but they have a fantastic soundtrack (2018) For me is almost impossible to verbalize how emotional (∅: it) is to have reached this point with this movie (2019) It was one of the best experiences in my life because (∅) actually established a new order (2019)
BELLE (L1 Peninsular Spanish)		It's really inspiring everything that he gives you (2012) It's very intriguing this picture (2018)	(this time) (∅: it) was a different man but the same behavior (2012) ...but (∅: it) depends, in every character I use different things to prepare (2018) Yes, in a way (∅: it) can be a comfort zone but in a way, it is more delicate (2018)	... I like that (∅: it) is not a formula, that is not really related to that (2013) Which is really very good because (∅) keeps you really humble (2018) Because that day I think (∅: he) had a semi-nude scene (2018) And I think that (∅) is as important for him as the first day (2019)
ALDA (Italian)		It has spread so much the Mediterranean diet	Maybe (∅) depends on the role I'm playing (1977)	You cannot imitate Chaplin because (∅) is unimitable (1977)

		<p>that it is wonderful (2012)</p> <p>It (: there)'s something incredible that it's happening to me (2016)</p> <p>It's not important the appearance; the way you are with your friends that's life, the good life (2020)</p>	<p>Sometimes was difficult to work with him (2014)</p>	<p>...and it's now that I feel that (∅) is gone forever (2009)</p> <p>I think (∅) is very nice once in a while to talk to people who's followed you all your life (2016)</p> <p>It's so moving sometimes that (∅) really brings up tears (2016)</p>
MADDY (Italian)		<p>...and so it was really a beautiful experience this movie (2013)</p> <p>I don't know what it means really to have a base and I don't know how it's gonna be my life next year (2013)</p>	<p>... and also Keanu Reeves, so (∅) was a very big cast (2013)</p> <p>If it's a big budget or not (∅) doesn't really matter (2013)</p> <p>I love animals but, because of that, (∅) was easy to learn (2016)</p> <p>Actually (∅) was funny at the beginning (2016)</p> <p>For me, (∅) was like the possibility to back in film (2018)</p>	<p>I started out as a model because (∅) was the easiest way to escape (2010)</p> <p>...because Italian movies are not anymore like (∅) used to be (2012)</p> <p>When I work with him I don't think that (∅) is my husband (2012)</p> <p>I think more of the process of creation because was really, it was really the process of creation (2013)</p> <p>When we did the rape scene was actually easier that way (2010)</p> <p>... and was really interesting to work with Sophie and really there was a beautiful chemistry between us and was beautiful to go to Cannes together (2016)</p>