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SUBJECT OMISSION/PRODUCTION IN CHILD LANGUAGE

Child L1: [+/null subject] monolingual grammars

(1) a. Broke this [Peter, 2;0.1] EN [-null subject]
    b. Feel better [Naomi, 1;11]

(2) a. Horita viene [LV II: 78 -2.0] SP [+null subject]
[(he/she) now comes]
    b. Tengo un pelo [María, 2;00]
[(I) have a hair]

SUBJECT OMISSION/PRODUCTION IN CHILD LANGUAGE

Child 2L1: [+/-null subject] bilingual grammars

(3) a. Roars [Simon, 2;05] EN [-null subject]
    b. Falled [=fell] [Simon, 2;06]
    c. Ride it [Manuela, 1;09]

(4) a. No puedo subir [Leo, 2;05] SP [+null subject]
    b. Ahora hacemos esto [Simon, 3;00]
    c. Tengo más [Manuela, 1;11]

(Deuchar & Quay 2000; Liceras, Fernández Fuertes & Pérez-Tattam 2008;
Liceras Fernández Fuertes & Alba de la Fuente 2012)
CROSS-LINGUISTIC INFLUENCE

Effects of cross-linguistic influence

- Facilitating effect
  - (a) more adult-like forms along the acquisition process
  - (b) earlier attainment of adult grammar

- Interfering effect
  - (a) less adult-like forms along the acquisition process
  - (b) later attainment of adult grammar

Cross-linguistic influence has been accounted for in terms of

- Linguistic theory (i.e. interfaces, core syntax)
- Language dominance
- Input factors

(Paradis & Navarro 2003; Serratrice et al. 2004; Müller 2007; Argyri & Sorace 2007; Paradis 2011; Fernández Fuertes & Liceras 2010; Liceras et al. 2010; Unsworth et al. 2010; Argyri, Sorace, & Tsimipli 2010; Sorace 2011; Liceras et al. 2011; Liceras et al. 2012, among others)
CROSS-LINGUISTIC INFLUENCE BETWEEN ENGLISH AND SPANISH: SENTENTIAL SUBJECTS

- Null/overt subjects in English and Spanish: interference or facilitation?
- Possible options for English/Spanish bilinguals:

CHILD BILINGUAL SPANISH

- Overproduction of subject pronouns [interference?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>SPANISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>overt subject pronouns</td>
<td>overt subject pronouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- syntactic</td>
<td>- (non-)pragmatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- obligatory</td>
<td>- optional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- For economy reasons overt subjects do not transfer (Liceras et al. 2012)
- Lexical specialization in Spanish (null; overt-weak): facilitating effect

- Overproduction of null subjects??: difficulty linked to acquiring the pragmatic value of their overt counterparts?? (Liceras et al. 2010)
CROSS-LINGUISTIC INFLUENCE BETWEEN ENGLISH AND SPANISH: SENTENTIAL SUBJECTS

- Null/overt subjects in English and Spanish: interference or facilitation?
- Possible options for English/Spanish bilinguals:

CHILD BILINGUAL ENGLISH

- More omission of subject pronouns [interference?]
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPANISH</th>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>null subjects (AGR markers)</td>
<td>null subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- grammatical option</td>
<td>- ungrammatical option</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Less omission of subject pronouns [facilitation?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPANISH</th>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGR markers</td>
<td>less null subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ overt subject pronouns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- two sets</td>
<td>- one set</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MINIMALIST ACCOUNTS OF THE NULL SUBJECT PARAMETER

Speas 1994; Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1998

- Spanish pronominal markers *versus* English pronominal subjects
- Agreement features associated with a functional category, Tense

**SPANISH:** EPP checking: V merges with DP morpheme

(5) Vamos

\[ \text{[go-2nd pp]} \]

‘We go’

```
TP
  
  T

  [ va ]

  [ mos ] [+D]

  va-[mos]j
```

2. LINGUISTIC THEORY & SUBJECTS
MINIMALIST ACCOUNTS OF THE NULL SUBJECT PARAMETER

Speas 1994; Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1998

- Spanish pronominal markers versus English pronominal subjects
- Agreement features associated with a functional category, Tense

ENGLISH: EPP checking: DP pronoun moves to Spec TP

(6) We go
MINIMALIST ACCOUNTS OF THE NULL SUBJECT PARAMETER

Speas 1994; Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1998

- Spanish pronominal markers *versus* English pronominal subjects
- Agreement features associated with a functional category, Tense

SPANISH OVERT PRONOMINAL SUBJECTS: merged to a focus position

(Fernández Soriano 1989; Kato 1999; Ordoñez 1997)

(7) Nosotros vamos
[we go-2nd pp]

![Diagram of NP structure with Spec, TP, VP, AP, nosotros, va1-mosj, [va1], [mosj]]
MINIMALIST ACCOUNTS OF THE NULL SUBJECT PARAMETER

Holmberg 2005; Sheehan 2006; Martínez 2011

- EPP checking proceeds in the same way in SP and in EN: SU rises to Spec TP
- The subject of SP can be spelled out (i.e. overt) or not (i.e. null)
- The possibility of having a zero pronoun is a PF matter

(8) (Nosotros) vamos
[we go-2nd pp]
We go
MINIMALIST ACCOUNTS OF THE NULL SUBJECT PARAMETER

Holmberg 2005; Sheehan 2006; Martínez 2011

It is a more refined version of EPP checking because:

- *We* and *–mos* do not occupy different structural positions
- Spanish weak overt pronouns were not dealt with in previous proposals
- Spanish overt pronouns were considered to always have pragmatic value
- English (one option, only with PF realization) is clearly depicted as a subset of Spanish (two options, with or without PF realization)
HYPOTHESIS #1
INTERFERENCE: OVERPRODUCTION OF SUBJECT PRONOUNS IN CHILD BILINGUAL SP

ENGLISH/SPANISH BILINGUAL DATA: FROM ENGLISH INTO SPANISH

- The Spanish of bilingual children would contain more overt subjects than the Spanish of monolingual children because of influence from their other L1

HOWEVER ...

- PF realization in English as the only option (obligatory presence of subject pronouns)

- Spanish non-PF realization option is preferred under minimalist economy premises
HYPOTHESIS #2
NO INTERFERENCE: NO OVERPRODUCTION OF SUBJECT PRONOUNS IN CHILD BILINGUAL SP

The Spanish of bilingual children would not contain more overt subjects than the Spanish of monolingual children (no influence from their other L1)

SO ...

Cross-linguistic influence should not favour weak overt pronouns in SP
The English of bilingual children would contain more null subjects than the English of monolingual children because of influence from their other L1.

The more economic option (i.e. pronouns with no PF realization) is transferred.

However ...

This would be the option if Spanish only had this non-PF realized pronoun.
But Spanish does have the PF realized option as well.
The English of bilingual children would contain less null subjects than the English of monolingual children because of influence from their other L1.

**THIS IS SO IF ..**
- The other L1, Spanish, plays a facilitating role (as the superset language)
- One of the options (the overt/PF one) is transferred
- This overt option reinforces the overt value of English subjects

**THEREFORE ...**
- The null subject stage would be shorter
- The so-called RI [non-adult non-inflected verbs] stage would be shorter
PARTICIPANTS & DATA SELECTION

Table 1. Data selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child</th>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>MLUw range [SP]</th>
<th>MLUw range [EN]</th>
<th>Corpus [CHILDES]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simon [EN/SP]</td>
<td>1;10 – 2;11</td>
<td>1.070 – 3.705</td>
<td>1.000 – 2.765</td>
<td>FerFuLice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo [EN/SP]</td>
<td>1;10 – 2;11</td>
<td>1.143 – 3.438</td>
<td>1.000 – 3.018</td>
<td>FerFuLice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>María [SP]</td>
<td>1;07 – 2;06</td>
<td>1.481 – 4.647</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>López-Ornat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naomi [EN]</td>
<td>1;06 – 2;07</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1.058 – 3.689</td>
<td>Sachs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Number of verbal utterances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child</th>
<th># verbal utterances [SP]</th>
<th># verbal utterances [EN]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simon [EN/SP]</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo [EN/SP]</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>María [SP]</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naomi [EN]</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1,248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PATTERNS OF OMISSION / PRODUCTION OF SPANISH SUBJECTS

Null and overt subjects

OVERVIEW

- MORE null subjects THAN overt pronominal subjects ($p=0$)

| Table 3. Bilingual and monolingual Spanish subject production |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|                 | null          | pronoun        | other overt    | total          |
| Simon [EN/SP]   | 74.6%         | 11.4%          | 14%            | 100% (304)     |
| Leo [EN/SP]     | 72%           | 12%            | 16%            | 100% (379)     |
| María [SP]      | 70%           | 6%             | 24%            | 100% (761)     |
PATTERNS OF OMISSION / PRODUCTION OF SPANISH SUBJECTS

Null pronominal subjects

BILINGUALS
- Similar pattern in children and adults: 1st and 3rd PS are favoured (p=0)
- Only adults produce more 2nd PS and 3rd PP forms (p=0)

MONOLINGUAL
- More null subjects than bilinguals but a similar pattern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1PS</th>
<th>2PS a</th>
<th>2PS b</th>
<th>3PS</th>
<th>1PP</th>
<th>2PP a</th>
<th>2PP b</th>
<th>3PP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>María</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PATTERNS OF OMISSION / PRODUCTION OF SPANISH SUBJECTS

Overt pronominal subjects

BILINGUALS

- Lower production of all persons but 1\textsuperscript{st} PS in children and adults
- Very low number of subject pronouns in children (learning process)

MONOLINGUAL

- Similar number of overt subject pronouns as bilinguals

| Table 5. Subject personal pronouns in bilingual and monolingual Spanish |
|------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
|                  | 1PS             | 2PS \textit{a} | 2PS \textit{b} | 3PS             | 1PP             | 2PP \textit{a} | 2PP \textit{b} | 3PP             | Total           |
| Simon            | 88.6\%          | 8.6\%          | 0               | 2.8\%           | 0               | 0               | 0               | 0               | 100\% (35)     |
| Leo              | 69\%            | 13.3\%         | 0               | 17.7\%          | 0               | 0               | 0               | 0               | 100\% (45)     |
| Adults           | 63\%            | 23\%           | 0               | 7.8\%           | 2.5\%           | 0.7\%           | 0               | 3\%             | 100\% (396)    |
| María            | 64\%            | 26\%           | 0               | 6\%             | 0               | 0               | 4\%             | 100\% (50)     |
| Adults           | 47.5\%          | 43.5\%         | 2\%             | 6\%             | 1\%             | 0               | 0               | 0               | 100\% (101)    |
4. THE STUDY

PATTERNS OF OMISSION / PRODUCTION OF SPANISH SUBJECTS

RIs with null and overt subjects

(9) a. yo corriendo [I running] [Leo 2;05]
b. Mamá tapar [Mummy to cover] [María 1;07]

- Scarce production of RIs with null and overt subjects
- More RIs with null subjects in monolingual child (p=0)

Table 6. RIs with null and overt subjects in bilingual and monolingual Spanish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Infinitives</th>
<th>Gerunds</th>
<th>Participles</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Null / overt</td>
<td>Null / overt</td>
<td>Null / overt</td>
<td>Null / overt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>3 / 1</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
<td>2 / 2</td>
<td>2.2% / 3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo</td>
<td>0 / 1</td>
<td>0 / 1</td>
<td>7 / 3</td>
<td>2.5% / 4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>María</td>
<td>35 / 3</td>
<td>3 / 0</td>
<td>2 / 0</td>
<td>7.5% / 1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The numbers in parentheses indicate the frequency of each category out of the total observed instances.
PATTERNS OF OMISSION / PRODUCTION OF SPANISH SUBJECTS

Overall production of null vs. overt pronominal subjects

NULL SUBJECTS

- More null subjects in the monolingual child but similar tendency in adults
- A reflection of the implementation of the null subject parameter in child SP

OVERT SUBJECTS

- More overt subject pronouns in bilinguals (p=0.03 in Leo; p=0.01 in Simon)
- Bilingual adults produce more subject pronouns than monolingual adults (p=0)

Table 7. Null vs. overt pronominal subjects in bilingual and monolingual Spanish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Null</th>
<th>Pronominal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>86.6% (227/262)</td>
<td>13.4% (35/262)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo</td>
<td>85.8% (273/318)</td>
<td>14.2% (45/318)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>83.3% (1981/2377)</td>
<td>16.7% (396/2377)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>María</td>
<td>90.9% (500/550)</td>
<td>9.1% (50/550)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>90% (911/1012)</td>
<td>10% (101/1012)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PATTERNS OF OMISSION / PRODUCTION OF SPANISH SUBJECTS

monolingual *versus* bilingual data

- Distribution of null/overt subjects
  - Same distribution of null/overt subjects in Spanish
  - The 3 children´s output patterns their respective adult input

THEREFORE ... in the case of Simon & Leo

- There is no overproduction of subject pronouns *(hypothesis #2 is confirmed: there is no transfer from English)*

- There is no overproduction of null subjects *(hypothesis #1 is not confirmed)*
4. THE STUDY

PATTERNS OF OMISSION / PRODUCTION OF ENGLISH SUBJECTS

Null and overt subjects

- English pronominal subjects are favoured over null & other overt subjects \( (p=0) \)

Table 8. Bilingual and monolingual English subject production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>null</th>
<th>pronoun</th>
<th>other overt</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simon [EN/SP]</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>100% (302)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo [EN/SP]</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>100% (419)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naomi [EN]</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>100% (1248)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PATTERNS OF OMISSION / PRODUCTION OF ENGLISH SUBJECTS

#### Null pronominal subjects

**BILINGUALS**

- Null subjects tend to refer mainly to 1\textsuperscript{st} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} persons \((p=0.01)\)
- Same pattern in adults (informal dialogue)

**MONOLINGUAL**

- Same pattern as bilinguals but more null 1\textsuperscript{st} person \((p=0)\)

#### Table 9. Null subjects in bilingual and monolingual English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1\textsuperscript{st}</th>
<th>2\textsuperscript{nd}</th>
<th>3\textsuperscript{rd}</th>
<th>1\textsuperscript{st}</th>
<th>2\textsuperscript{nd}</th>
<th>3\textsuperscript{rd}</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>100% (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>100% (91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100% (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naomi</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>100% (324)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100% (20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PATTERNS OF OMISSION / PRODUCTION OF ENGLISH SUBJECTS

Overt pronominal subjects

BILINGUALS

- Much higher than in Spanish
- Very few instances of plural pronouns

MONOLINGUAL

- Same pattern as bilinguals

Table 10. Subject personal pronouns in bilingual and monolingual English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal pronouns</th>
<th>Non-nominative</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1PS</td>
<td>2PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naomi</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. THE STUDY

PATTERNS OF OMISSION / PRODUCTION OF ENGLISH SUBJECTS

RIs with null and overt subjects

(10) a. a wolf eat Fergie [instead of *a wolf eats Fergie]  
    b. all gone [instead of *all is/has gone]

§ Same pattern: a higher use of RIs with null subjects (p=0)

Table 11. RIs with null and overt subjects in bilingual and monolingual English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Infinitives</th>
<th>Gerunds</th>
<th>Participles</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Null / Overt</td>
<td>Null / Overt</td>
<td>Null / Overt</td>
<td>Null / Overt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>25 / 5</td>
<td>20 / 2</td>
<td>23 / 2</td>
<td>85% (58/68) / 3.8% (9/234)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo</td>
<td>37 / 11</td>
<td>22 / 10</td>
<td>19 / 2</td>
<td>74% (78/105) / 5.5% (23/414)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naomi</td>
<td>72 / 44</td>
<td>68 / 58</td>
<td>4 / 5</td>
<td>32% (143/442) / 12.7% (107/838)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall production of null vs. overt pronominal subjects

- Lower number of null subjects in bilinguals  
  \( p = 0 \)
- Bilinguals do not omit more subject pronouns than monolingual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Null</th>
<th>Pronominal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>18.7% (44/235)</td>
<td>81.3% (191/235)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo</td>
<td>20.1% (91/453)</td>
<td>79.9% (362/453)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>0.9% (30/3482)</td>
<td>99.1% (3452/3482)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naomi</td>
<td>37.9% (324/855)</td>
<td>62.1% (531/855)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>2.7% (20/749)</td>
<td>97.3% (729/749)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PATTERNS OF OMISSION / PRODUCTION OF ENGLISH SUBJECTS

monolingual *versus* bilingual data

- Distribution of null/overt subjects:
  - Bilinguals produce less null subjects than the monolingual child
- Uninflected forms:
  - Bilinguals behave like the monolingual child

THEREFORE... in the case of Simon & Leo

- There is no overproduction of null subjects
  (*hypothesis #3 is not confirmed: no NEGATIVE transfer from Spanish*)
- They realize earlier that the non-PF form is not an option for English
  (*hypothesis #4 is confirmed: POSITIVE transfer from Spanish*)
4. THE STUDY

PATTERNS OF OMISSION / PRODUCTION OF SUBJECTS

SPANISH
- bilinguals = monolingual
- no overproduction of subject pronouns
  
  **hypothesis #2 confirmed: no transfer from EN**
- no overproduction of null subjects
  
  **hypothesis #1 not confirmed**

ENGLISH
- bilinguals produce less null subjects
  
  **hypothesis #3 not confirmed: no transfer from SP**

  **hypothesis #4 confirmed: transfer from SP**

**Spanish saliency**, as reflected in the two types of subjects, ‘transfers’ into English by making children project the requirements of the adult grammar sooner than monolinguals
SO… IN THE ENGLISH OF THESE BILINGUALS…

- Spanish plays a facilitating role (as the superset language)
  - one of the options (the overt/PF one) is transferred
  - this overt option reinforces the overt value of English subjects
In a bilingual situation, as compared to a monolingual one, lexical specialization (saliency) in one of the languages of the bilinguals would facilitate the acquisition of the other language.

‘Lexical specialization’ HERE consists of implementing a null or an overt realization of the subject for EPP checking: the non-PF realization for Spanish and the PF realization for both English (this being the only option) and Spanish.
The acquisition of sentential subjects: an analysis of English and Spanish monolingual and bilingual corpora
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