

5-1-2015

La Quiero Ver~Quiero Verla: Monolingual and bilingual children's variable clitic placement

Anita Rao

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/ling_etds

Recommended Citation

Rao, Anita. "La Quiero Ver~Quiero Verla: Monolingual and bilingual children's variable clitic placement." (2015).
https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/ling_etds/27

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Electronic Theses and Dissertations at UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Linguistics ETDs by an authorized administrator of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact disc@unm.edu.

Anita Rao

Candidate

Linguistics

Department

This thesis is approved, and it is acceptable in quality and form for publication:

Approved by the Thesis Committee:

Dr. Naomi Shin, Chairperson

Dr. Jill Morford

Dr. Rosa Vallejos-Yopán

**LA QUIERO VER~QUIERO VERLA
MONOLINGUAL AND BILINGUAL CHILDREN'S VARIABLE
CLITIC PLACEMENT**

by

ANITA RAO

**B.A. LINGUISTICS
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH, 2012**

THESIS

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

**Master of Arts
Linguistics**

The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

May, 2015

DEDICATION

To my family, friends, and all of those who have supported me throughout this process.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Naomi Shin for her invaluable insight and guidance throughout this process. I would also like to acknowledge Dr. Jill Morford and Dr. Rosa Vallejos-Yopán for being on my thesis committee and for their helpful comments and suggestions on this manuscript. To all of them I am eternally grateful.

I cannot fail to mention the overwhelming amount of support from my husband, James, as well from my family and friends. Without them, this work would have been very lonely.

**LA QUIERO VER~QUIERO VERLA
MONOLINGUAL AND BILINGUAL CHILDREN'S VARIABLE CLITIC
PLACEMENT**

by

ANITA RAO

B.A. Linguistics, University of Pittsburgh, 2012

ABSTRACT

This study addresses whether/how monolingual and bilingual Spanish-speaking children differ in their acquisition of grammar by examining direct object clitics in contexts where either proclisis or enclisis is possible (*Lo voy a ver* vs. *Voy a verlo*). The current study examines variable clitic placement in sociolinguistic interviews conducted with 21 Spanish-English bilingual children of Mexican descent, ages 5-11, and 71 monolingual children in Mexico, ages 6-11. All direct object clitics in variable contexts were extracted (N =140 tokens, .2% of total word count). Both the monolingual and bilingual children produced high rates of proclisis (76%, 75%, respectively). It is concluded that naturalistic production data do not support the view that English impacts bilingual children's patterns of variable clitic placement in Spanish. Instead, their patterns of use are the same as those found among monolingual children.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vii
1. Introduction.....	1
2. The feature under study: direct object clitics.....	2
2.1 Clitics: Fixed versus Variable Position	3
2.2 Distribution	5
2.3 Factors Affecting Variable Clitic Placement.....	7
2.4 Language Contact.....	14
2.5 Factors Contributing to Contact-Induced Change.....	17
2.6 Cases of Language Contact in Spanish.....	19
2.7 Clitic placement in child language.	26
2.8 Literature Review Summary	29
3. Methods	29
3.1 Procedure	30
3.2 Interview Process	30
3.3 Subjects.....	31
3.4 Predictor Variables.....	32
3.5 Exclusions	37
3.6 Summary of Methods	39
4. Results	40
4.1 Analysis.....	41
4.2 Main Effects	43
4.3 Qualitative Analysis.....	46
4.4 Summary of Results.....	51
5. Discussion and Conclusion	51
5.1 Distribution	53
5.2 Language Contact.....	54
5.3 Linguistic Factors and Variable Clitic Placement.....	58
5.4 Limitations of the Study	68
5.5 Future Research.....	69
5.6 Conclusion	69
6. References.....	70

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. A summary of all exclusions.	39
Table 2. Monolingual and bilingual children.	42
Table 3. Results of the multivariate analysis.	43
Table 4. Clitic placement by clause type.	43
Table 5. Bilingual group: clause type and clitic placement.	44
Table 6. Monolingual group: clause type and clitic placement.	44
Table 7. Clitic placement by switch and same-reference in coordinated clauses.	44
Table 8. Clitic placement by animacy.	45
Table 9. Clitic animacy in the bilingual group.	45
Table 10. Clitic animacy in the monolingual group.	45
Table 11. Finite verb lexeme and clitic placement.	46
Table 12. Verb lexeme and clitic placement in the bilingual group.	47
Table 13. Verb lexeme and clitic placement in the monolingual group.	47
Table 14. A breakdown of enclitic tokens.	48
Table 15. The rate of proclisis in contact and non-contact varieties of Spanish.	54

1. Introduction

Variable clitic placement, also known as ‘clitic climbing’ in generative literature, is a morphosyntactic feature in Spanish where a clitic can be placed either pre-verbally or post-verbally in the construction: [finite+nonfinite verb]. For example, one can either say: *Lo puedo ver* (before the finite verb) or *Puedo verlo* (after the nonfinite verb). Previous research (Myhill 1988, 1989; Torres Cacoullós 1999; Schwenter and Torres Cacoullós 2014 etc.) has illustrated that linguistic features such as grammaticalization and animacy affect the variability between proclisis and enclisis in this construction.

If English does have an effect on clitic placement, then it is expected to find clitic omission or a preference towards enclisis as a reflection of English syntax. However, research on clitics in contact varieties of Spanish (Silva-Corvalán 1994; Darwich 2007; Peace 2013) has illustrated the opposite; clitic placement in Spanish is highly resistant to the contact effects of English. Less studied, and what is the focus of this thesis, is how bilingual children use this construction when there is a direct object clitic compared to monolingual children. That is, the current study investigates whether or not there is an effect from English syntax on to variable clitic placement for bilingual children. The limited amount of research on monolingual and bilingual children with respect to variable clitic placement offers a unique opportunity to understand language acquisition and potential contact-effects that may result during the development of this aspect of Spanish morphosyntax.

Previous studies that have been conducted concerning clitics and Spanish-English speaking bilingual children have yielded conflicting results. While there may be no difference between bilingual and monolingual children in some aspects of clitics,

specifically in clitic omission (Pueyo 1992; Larrañaga and Fuentes 2011), some studies suggest that there are still contact effects evident in bilingual children's Spanish at an early age of language development that make them different from monolingual children. One experiment, which specifically looks at variable clitic placement with respect to bilingual children (Pérez-Leroux, Cuza, and Thomas 2011), indicates that bilingual children have a bias towards enclisis. This bias, they claim, is a sign of transfer from English syntax into bilingual speech. But, the studies showing the influence of English are limited in scope because they either had only two to three subjects (Larrañaga and Fuentes 2011; Pueyo 1992), or the methodology itself (Pérez-Leroux et al. 2011) makes generalization to a broader population of bilingual children difficult. The small amount of research and inconclusive results lead to the present research questions asked in this study:

1. Does language contact affect variable clitic placement among bilingual children?
2. If not, what linguistic features do affect bilingual and monolingual children in the [finite+nonfinite verb] construction?

Based on the research of variable clitic placement from contact varieties of Spanish among adult bilingual and monolingual speakers, it is hypothesized that there will be no difference between bilingual and monolingual children. That is, even among children, variable clitic placement in Spanish is highly resistant to English. Furthermore, both bilingual and monolingual children will be sensitive to linguistic features such as grammaticalization and animacy in variable clitic placement.

2. The feature under study: direct object clitics

Clitics are unstressed pronouns. They cannot bear primary stress, and instead lean on an adjacent, stressed, word (Zwicky 1985). Clitics are similar to both independent and inflectional affixes. They can function as modifiers, or arguments, within a phrase akin to an independent word. However, like affixes, they are unable to stand alone. In Spanish, this can be seen in the following example:

- 1) A quién viste?
Who did you see?
- A ella
*La
Her (Ordóñez 2012: 424)

Clitics are also unable to be coordinated, modified, or focalized (Ordóñez 2012: 424). In general, the function of clitics in Spanish is narrow: they are pronominal, and usually refer to the object of a verb (Ordóñez 2012).

There are two sets of clitics in Spanish: animate and third person. Animate clitics are: *me, te, os, nos*, as well as the impersonal *se*. Third person clitics are: *lo, los, la, las, le, les*. These clitics, with the exception of *le/les*, correspond to the direct object of a verb. There are some contexts in Spanish where a clitic's position is fixed in either a proclitic (preverbal) or an enclitic (postverbal) position, while clitic placement is variable in the construction: [finite+non-finite verb]. In order to understand the processes that affect, what will be called in this thesis, variable clitic placement, it is first necessary to explain the contexts in which fixed clitic placement is required.

2.1 Clitics: Fixed versus Variable Position

2.1.1 Fixed position. Clitics can be fixed in either an enclitic or proclitic position. Spanish clitics correspond to the object referent of a clause. Clitics usually precede a

finite, or tensed, verb (proclisis). They can usually also follow a non-finite verb or an imperative (enclisis) (Ordóñez 2012: 430) as seen in the examples below:

2) Finite Verb: Yo lo vio
I see it.

3) Nonfinite Verb: Necesisto leerlo
I need to read it.

4) Imperative: Miralo!
Watch it!

In Medieval Spanish the rate of enclisis was 75% in the 13th century and 68% in the 14th century (Bouzoutia 2008: 16). There were some contexts that only permitted enclisis. For example, a verb in sentence initial position solely allowed enclisis.

Environments that allowed proclisis were contexts such as negation as well as questions as shown in examples (5) and (6):

5) Non los destroyré
'I will not destroy them' (Bouzouita 2008: 4)

6) Quien te fyzo rey?
'Who made you king?' (Bouzouita 2008: 4)

These contexts became more rigid by the Renaissance period. That is, imperative contexts required enclisis, while non-imperative contexts favored proclisis (Bouzouita 2008). The loss of pragmatic features due to semantic bleaching and token frequency led to the fixed position of direct object clitics in imperative and non-imperative contexts. Token frequency explains why, for instance, there can be an alternation in the past tensed forms of *creep/crept/creeped* but not in the verb *sleep/slept/*sleeped* (Bybee 1997: 380). *Slept* is used more frequently than *crept*. In grammatical change, *slept* resists alternation because of its higher token frequency than *crept*. In a similar way, pronouns resist change

more than nouns because pronouns are used more frequently (Bybee 1997: 381). Due to the high frequency of pronouns, their syntactic position is more rigid than nouns. The contexts in which object clitics are fixed in either a proclitic or enclitic position reflect the resistance of change due to this high token frequency (Bybee 1997). It also reflects generalization, or semantic bleaching, due to the loss of pragmatic features. This is a feature of grammaticalization, which will be discussed in later sections of the literature review.

2.1.2 Variable position. The construction [finite+non-finite verb] allows for variable clitic placement. One can either say: ‘*Lo puedo hacer*’ (proclisis) or ‘*Puedo hacerlo*’ (enclisis). Contexts requiring fixed clitic positions have led generative linguists to label the movement of a clitic from an enclitic position in the variable construction [finite+non-finite verb] to a proclitic position as ‘clitic climbing’. However, the view taken for this thesis is that the clitic does not necessarily move in the construction. Instead, the finite verb in a construction functions as an auxiliary, while the non-finite verb takes on the role of the main (finite) verb (Myhill 1989:228). The clitic, then, mimics a fixed position where it precedes a finite verb. The reason for enclisis is due to differences in verb lexeme as well as animacy.

2.2 Distribution

Proclisis is favored over enclisis in modern Spanish. The popularity of proclisis in variable context fluctuates in Old Spanish and in Modern Spanish. In looking at verbs in the construction [finite+non-finite verb] such as *haber de*, *deber (de)*, *ir*, *poder*, and *querer*, Spaulding (1927) finds that the rate of proclisis is higher than enclisis from the 13-17th centuries in these variable contexts. Prose texts from the 17th-20th centuries illustrate a dip in the popularity of proclisis in favor of enclisis in the same

[finite+nonfinite verb] construction. His study, however, only looks at written forms of Spanish. Other studies look at both spoken and written mediums of Spanish in order to gain a better picture of the distribution of proclisis and enclisis.

Variable proclisis has increased since Old Spanish (Torres Cacoullos 1999). In comparing progressive constructions such as *estar+-ndo* from Spanish texts (12th-16th centuries) with a present day corpus of spoken Mexico City Spanish, Torres Cacoullos (1999) finds that there is a significant increase in preverbal placement. Torres Cacoullos (1999) also notes that there is a difference between spoken and written mediums, and that enclisis was still favored in the corpus of essays and academic prose that she had studied. Davies (1995) also sees this discrepancy of proclitic placement in a variable context between spoken and written Spanish. His results show that, for example, a verb such as *acabar de* favors proclisis 85% of the time in spoken Spanish compared to only 29% of the time in written Spanish (Davies 1995: 372).

Synchronic studies (Gudmestad 2006; Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos 2014) demonstrate that proclisis is favored more than enclisis in modern, spoken Spanish. Gudmestad (2006) finds that proclisis is favored 89% of the time in Caracas Spanish (Gudmestad 2006: 5), and Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos (2014) find that proclisis is favored 72% of the time in Mexican Spanish (Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos 2014: 7). Additionally, other synchronic studies such as Myhill (1988; 1989) further show that internal features such as grammaticalization affect written text.

Rates of proclisis are higher in Modern Spanish than in Old Spanish. And, while there is a discrepancy between spoken and written Spanish, overall, variable proclisis is favored over enclisis. The discrepancy between spoken and written registers, the and the

overall popularity of proclisis can be explained by factors such as grammaticalization, construction frequency, animacy, and topicality.

2.2.1 Summary of diachronic changes. Clitic placement became categorical in Medieval Spanish; imperative contexts required enclisis while non-imperative contexts required proclisis. Clitic placement in fixed contexts is due to a loss of pragmatic features from token frequency and semantic bleaching. Clitics in the [finite+nonfinite verb] construction, however, are still variable; they can either appear in proclisis or enclisis. The factors that affect this variability will be discussed in the following sections.

2.3 Factors Affecting Variable Clitic Placement

Grammaticalization, construction frequency, animacy, and topicality all affect variable clitic placement in Spanish for both written and spoken registers.

2.3.1 Animacy. Animacy plays an important role in determining variable proclitic or enclitic placement (Myhill 1989, Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos 2014). The animacy hierarchy shows how one communicates in spoken discourse about a referent. This can be seen below:

Second Person → First Person → Third Person (animate) → Third Person (inanimate)

The more animate a referent is, the more likely it is that there will be proclisis (Myhill 1989:241). If the clitic is higher on the animacy scale than the subject, then one will most likely see proclisis. However, if the subject is higher on the animacy scale than the clitic, then enclisis will most likely occur. Examples of this can be seen in:

7) a. ‘Puedes herirme cuántas veces quieres’
 ‘You can wound me as many times as you want’ (Myhill 1989:242)

b. (Alternative clitic placement)
 *?Me puedes herir

*? You can wound me

- 8) a. 'Te puedo hablar de los que murieron...'
 'I can talk to you of the ones who died...' (Myhill 1989:243)
- b. (Alternative clitic placement)
 *? Puedo hablarte de los que murieron...
 I can talk to you of the ones who died...

In the first example *puedes* (second person indicative) is higher on the animacy hierarchy than the clitic *me* (first person). This means that enclisis is favored over proclisis. However, in the second example, the direct object clitic *te* (second person) is higher on the animacy hierarchy than *puedo* (first person indicative). This means that proclisis is more likely to be favored since the direct object clitic is higher in animacy than the subject of the sentence. Davies (1995) finds this in his study of computer-based corpora of Spanish. His results also show that clitics with an animate referent have a higher rate of proclisis 76% compared to inanimate clitics at 62% (Davies 1995:376).

Myhill (1988) notes that animacy and the type of verb or construction interact with each other in determining the placement of a clitic in either proclisis or enclisis. For example, an epistemic verb will still favor proclisis even when a subject is higher than the clitic on the animacy hierarchy (Myhill 1988:360) as demonstrated in example (14):

- 9) a. 'Lo quiero buscar'
 'I want to find it'
- b. 'Quiero buscarlo'

Myhill (1988) argues that proclisis would be acceptable in example (14) because *querer* is an epistemic verb; thus more grammaticalized. However, enclisis is still acceptable because the subject is higher than the clitic on the animacy scale. The inverse is also true. Even if a clitic is higher than the subject in animacy, if the verb does not normally favor proclisis, then the clitic will stay in an enclitic position (Myhill 1988: 360).

The type of verb and construction appears to outweigh animacy in determining the position of a clitic in a [finite+non-finite verb] construction. As will be seen, animacy, in conjunction with topicality, also has an effect on variable clitic placement.

2.3.2 Topicality. When a topical noun phrase is the argument of a nonfinite verb, proclisis can help make the noun phrase more prominent (Myhill 1989: 242). That is, the most prominent information tends to move to the beginning of a phrase. Proclisis can help to highlight the important information of a clause. Thus, in the same example as above, while either placement is acceptable, proclisis helps to make the clitic ‘te’ more prominent:

- 10) ‘Te puedo hablar de los que murieron...’
 ‘I can talk to you of the ones who died...’ (Myhill 1989:243)

This leads to Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos’ (2014) study. They find that topicality affects the distribution of proclisis and enclisis. In order to determine the effect of animacy on variable clitic placement, the authors looked at third-person clitics (*lo, la, los, las*). They hypothesized that if a direct object referent is mentioned either anaphorically or cataphorically, it means that it is important to the phrase. And, because of its importance (or topical persistence), proclisis will be favored.

Their results show that if the direct object referent is topically persistent, that is, if the referent is mentioned more than once within the following ten clauses preceding or following the referent, then proclisis is favored (Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos, 2014). Animacy, in conjunction with topicality, also affects the rate of proclisis in the [finite+non-finite verb] construction. The authors' results illustrate that inanimate direct object clitics have a higher rate of proclisis than animate third-person clitics due to topicality. They demonstrate that inanimate clitics had a higher rate of proclisis when the clitic referent was anaphorically persistent (86%). When the inanimate clitic was not anaphorically persistent, there was a lower rate of proclisis (75%) (Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos 2014: 16). For animate referents, the rate of proclisis was lower when persistent (74%) and when not persistent (64%).

2.3.3 Grammaticalization. Grammaticalization is the process in which a grammatical morpheme or construction gradually develops from lexical morphemes or other grammatical constructions. It goes through a cycle of extension, semantic bleaching, decategorization, and erosion (Bybee 1994:6). An example of grammaticalization can be seen in the verb *ir*. *Ir* has two meanings: motion (going towards something) and future. This path of motion to future is a common grammaticalization path (Bybee et al. 1994). Semantic 'bleaching', or generalization, accounts for both meanings of *ir*. The verb's original meaning of motion (movement towards something) becomes 'bleached' due to its widespread use, and gains the new meaning of futurity as its scope expands to other uses. Grammaticalization also accounts for the evolution of the progressive construction. Originally a locative expression, its

function broadened in scope and became generalized (Bybee et al. 1994: 129). In Spanish, one sees this transition from *estar* as a locative to *estar* as the progressive.

Myhill (1988; 1989) concludes that progressive constructions with verbs functioning as auxiliaries such as *estar* or *ir* have higher rates of variable proclisis than enclisis. Proclisis is favored in progressive constructions with *estar* 89% of the time. In progressive constructions with *ir*, proclisis is favored 86% of the time (Myhill 1989: 230). However, in constructions where *estar* and *ir* do not act as auxiliaries, enclisis is favored in lieu of proclisis. He argues that the difference between progressive constructions and other contexts is due to grammaticalization.

Recall that progressive constructions with *estar* and *ir* highly favor proclisis over enclisis (more than 80% of the time), whereas with more specified meanings variable proclisis is disfavored (Myhill 1989). Hence, the more grammaticalized a verb or construction, the more likely it is that proclisis will be favored over enclisis. *Estar* illustrates this point. The probability of variable proclisis when the verb is used in its original, locative meaning, is 38% compared to 89% when used in a progressive construction (Myhill 1989: 238, 239). Compare the following examples where one can place the clitic either before the finite verb or after the nonfinite verb:

11) Lo está viendo
He is looking at it

12) ‘...porque toda la cosecha de cebada estaba asoleandose en el solar’
‘...because the whole barley harvest was lying in the sun in the yard’
(Myhill 1989: 239)

Here, **Se estaba asoleando* denotes a locative meaning and for this reason, according to Myhill, enclisis is not favored.

Davies (1995) supports Myhill's hypothesis. Most of the verbs that allow proclisis in variable clitic placement are auxiliaries or modals. Myhill further points out that semantic differences between using proclisis or enclisis in the [finite+nonfinite verb] (Myhill 1988: 230) can be seen in other verbs besides *estar*. For example, *deber* has two different meanings. Its first meaning is epistemic as in:

- 13) 'Tu te debes acordar de él, pues fuimos compañeros...'
 'You must surely remember him, because we were schoolmates...'
 (Myhill 1989:231)

In this example, the *te* is in a proclitic position due to *deber*'s meaning of possibility, which is the more grammaticalized meaning. The other meaning of *deber*, which has a connotation of obligation, i.e. the root meaning, does not allow for proclitic placement. Another example of this is found with *poder*. Proclisis is more likely when *poder* conveys a meaning of possibility compared to its root meaning of ability:

- 14) a. 'Debí haberte comprado el sofá'
 'I should have bought you the sofa.' (Myhill 1989: 232)
 b. *?Te debí haber comprado el sofá
- 15) a. '...y ni siquiera sé cómo pude subirme al caballo...'
 '...and I don't even know how I managed to get on the horse...'
 b. *?'...y ni siquiera sé cómo me pude subir al caballo...'

In (14a) and (15a), the 'te' and the 'me' occur in postverbal position because of the non-grammaticalized root meaning of both *deber* and *poder*. Proclisis, as in (14b) and (15b), is blocked (or at least unexpected) with the non-grammaticalized meaning. Spoken registers demonstrate this at a higher rate as compared to written registers. For example, Davies (1995) found that *ir+a* had a rate of proclisis of 86% in spoken discourse as

compared to 66% in written discourse. *Poder*, another grammaticalized verb, had a 60% rate of proclisis in spoken discourse as compared to only 22% in written discourse.

2.3.4 Construction frequency. Torres Cacoullos (1999) shows that construction frequency, related to grammaticalization, also affects the distribution of variable proclisis and enclisis. She defines construction frequency as the process in which the components of a construction are found more frequently together than apart (Torres Cacoullos 1999:156). As the components of a construction, such as *estar+-ndo*, appear more frequently together, they become increasingly fused.

Due to this fusion, the components in the construction are treated as one unit. This means that a clitic will treat a construction like the progressive *-ndo* as one whole unit. The fusion of the components in a construction such as *estar+-ndo* means that there will be a loss of features found in Old Spanish as the construction becomes more grammaticalized. Multiple gerund constructions and constructions with intervening material with *estar* as the finite verb, for instance, have become increasingly rare in modern Spanish since the construction has become more tightly bound thus leading to a favoring of proclisis.

Torres Cacoullos (1999) further demonstrates that the Mexico City corpus, as well as novels, favor proclisis (89%) more than essays and other academic prose texts (68%) Torres Cacoullos (1999:159). In the essays and other academic prose texts that Torres Cacoullos looks at, she find that lower rates of proclisis coincided with lower construction frequency of progressive constructions (Torres Cacoullos 1999:165).

As shown in previous studies, highly grammaticalized verbs have a higher rate of proclisis than enclisis. Additionally, increased unithood with verbs such as *estar* predicts

a higher rate of proclisis. The rate of preverbal placement does not translate to a reduction of variability in the [finite+nonfinite verb] construction. The same internal features that favor proclisis also predict enclisis for specific reasons i.e. less grammaticalized verbs, lower on the animacy scale, and less topical.

2.3.5 Summary of linguistic features. Spanish clitics specifically function as referents to an object in a phrase (Ordóñez 2012). They are required to precede a finite verb, or to follow a non-finite verb. However, the position of clitics is variable in a [finite+non-finite verb] construction. Diachronic studies show that the popularity of preverbal placement in this construction has fluctuated from Old Spanish to Modern Spanish. In Old Spanish proclisis was favored, but in Middle Spanish (16th century) enclisis was favored. The popularity of enclisis is still found in written text even though proclisis has become popular once more in spoken Modern Spanish. Synchronic studies also demonstrate that proclisis is favored over enclisis in modern Spanish. Factors that affect variable clitic placement are: grammaticalization, construction frequency, animacy, and topicality. The more grammaticalized a construction or verb is, the more likely that proclisis will be favored. The more animate or topical a referent is, the more likely proclisis will be favored as well.

It has been established that linguistic factors contribute to variable clitic placement in the [finite+nonfinite verb+clitic] construction. Research on the potential effects of language contact on clitic placement and other aspects of Spanish morphosyntax will be looked at in the next section.

2.4 Language Contact

The first part of the literature review discussed the linguistic features that affect variable clitic placement in Spanish. This part of the literature review discusses the idea of language contact, and how English may or may not have an effect on this feature of morphosyntax. The first two sections examine opposing views on contact-induced change. The third section discusses cases of potential contact-induced change in subject-pronoun expression as well as clitic placement in contact varieties of Spanish. The last section focuses on prior studies of monolingual and bilingual children and their production of clitic placement in Spanish.

Language contact occurs when two or more languages are spoken within a speech community. Often, one language serves as the majority language, while the other language is used in more private settings. A potential result of language contact is contact-induced change. Contact-induced change occurs when the minority language acquires new phonological, lexical, and syntactic features from the majority language (Heine and Kuteva 2005). While linguists agree that finding concrete evidence of contact-induced change is difficult, they differ as to whether or not finding evidence of change at all is truly feasible. Poplack and Levey (2010), for example, argue that change is not an inevitable by-product of language contact, and that it is not easy to justify instances of contact-induced change (Poplack and Levey 2010: 412). It is challenging to distinguish change due to language contact and change due to natural processes within a language. Other linguists such as Heine and Kuteva (2005) as well as Silva-Corvalán (1994) take the view that there are reliable ways of identifying contact-induced change. By looking at instances of grammatical replication and the development of minor to major use patterns, grammaticalization, and the speech of bilingual or multilingual

speakers in a situation of intense contact, they argue that it is possible to see how language structure is potentially changing due to language contact.

Both Poplack and Levey (2010) as well as Heine and Kuteva (2005) agree that it is important to see whether or not a change could have taken place without language contact, and also agree that one should be cautious when investigating instances of change. For instance, consider example (16):

- 16) “Mami, yo quiero, yo quiero manzana jugo”
 “Mom, I want, I want apple juice” (Myers-Scotton 2002: 166)

Some linguists might claim that, because a bilingual Spanish-English child produces the utterance, it is an instance of contact-induced change due to a high rate subject pronoun expression in the utterance above. Such a phrase is not unique to a bilingual child, and can be expressed by a monolingual child as well. The author does not mention the potential influence of English on the word “manzana jugo” as a possible reflection of the English word ‘apple juice’ in their analysis of this phrase. Instead, she focuses on subject pronoun expression.

There is a disagreement about what factors constitute contact-induced change. Poplack and Levey (2010) argue that even if there does seem to be evidence of change, there may be other explanations, such as social factors or inherent variability in the construction itself that can account for the change. Nevertheless, one cannot completely discount contact-induced change especially in areas of intense contact. While the majority language may not influence a minority language outright, there may be more subtle ways in which the majority language does influence a speech community. However, one must be cautious since one needs robust evidence to definitively determine contact-induced change.

2.5 Factors Contributing to Contact-Induced Change

2.5.1 Grammatical replication and minor to major use patterns. Heine and Kuteva (2005) state that if a speaker creates a new morphosyntactic construction based on a construction in the majority language that is not shared with any family member of the minority language, but with members of the majority language, then this is an instance of contact-induced change (Heine and Kuteva 2005: 7). This process is an example of grammatical replication because one language borrows a construction from another language and incorporates it into its own syntax.

The process of a minor to major construction pattern is similar to grammatical replication in that a minority language adapts a construction from the majority language. Instead of borrowing a new construction from the majority language, this process occurs when an acceptable, though infrequent, construction, in the minority language becomes more frequent due to language contact. An example of this is in German where the word autumn can be said in two different ways: *Herbstzeit* and *Zeit des Herbstes* (Heine and Kuteva 2005: 46). The first way is the most frequent way of saying the word. However, speakers close to the Italian border favor: *Zeit des Herbstes*. It models the pattern of Italian due to language contact at the borders of the two countries. This process can be viewed as part of the early stages of grammaticalization. The process of a minor construction evolving into a majority construction follows a pattern that is similar to the stages of grammaticalization (extension, semantic bleaching, decategorization, and erosion) and in particular semantic bleaching. In the example of German, the genitive construction becomes more frequent and acquires a broader, more generalized scope. Hence, it becomes semantically bleached.

2.5.2 Grammaticalization. Recall that grammaticalization is the process in which a grammatical morpheme/construction evolves from a lexical morpheme or construction as in the English ‘be going to’, which started out meaning motion and eventually became the grammatical marker for futurity. Heine and Kuteva (2005) claim that grammaticalization and language contact go together. In fact, grammaticalization due to language contact occurs with genetically related languages (Heine and Kuteva 2005: 14). Through contact-induced grammaticalization, for example, a language can acquire a new verbal category (Heine and Kuteva 2005: 83). Contact-induced grammaticalization can also lead to, or accelerate, new grammatical categories within a language that already had an equivalent structure though not as frequent.

2.5.3 Bilingualism. Features of bilingual and multilingual speech can include: simplification, overgeneralization, transfer, analysis, and convergence (Silva-Corvalán 1994: 2). Simplification and overgeneralization are similar to one another. The difference is that simplification leads to the elimination, or contraction, of linguistic forms, whereas overgeneralization extends to unrelated linguistic forms (Silva-Corvalán 1994: 3). Simplification can lead to differences between bilingual and monolingual varieties even if the bilingual variety is not influenced by the L1 structure. According to Heine and Kuteva (2005), bilingual speakers strive to find equivalent structures in both languages. The result is that eventually non-equivalent structures are lost whereas equivalent structures remain due to the development of the minor to major use pattern.

The important part to remember is that even though bilingual speakers may overgeneralize and simplify structures in their L1 language, they do not radically change the structure of their L1 language (Silva-Corvalán 1994: 6). Silva-Corvalán (1994)

proposes that bilingual speakers employ cognitive strategies of simplification in order to handle two different linguistic structures. This simplification process is not a sign of “incomplete acquisition” of a language (Otheguy and Zentella 2012). Everyone employs a different grammar and uses it to be communicatively effective. This is a vital point. Despite simplification strategies, bilingual speech is not lacking compared to monolingual speech. Moreover, in many studies, bilinguals’ and monolinguals’ grammatical patterns are, for the most part, very similar (Silva-Corvalán 1994; Darwich 2007; Gutierrez 2008; Otheguy and Zentella 2012; Poplack and Levey 2010).

2.6 Cases of Language Contact in Spanish

The majority of the studies cited in this thesis relate to language contact between Spanish and English. In order to better understand these studies, a general overview of Spanish word order and syntax, as well as English word order and syntax, is given.

2.6.1 Spanish word order and subject/object expression. Spanish word order is variable in some contexts such as subject-verb, verb-object, and superordinate-subordinate phrases (Bolinger 1954: 219). There are some contexts in which word order is rigid such as prepositional phrases (Bolinger 1954: 219). Word order in the [finite+non-finite verb] construction can either be OSV: *lo voy a ver* or SVO: *voy a verlo*.

Spanish is a pro-drop language. This means that Spanish overt subject pronouns are variable and that null subjects are allowed in certain contexts. To illustrate this, one can either say: *Ella estaba viendo* or *Estaba viendo*. The variability in overt subject expression is not entirely free (Montrul 2004: 128). There are semantic-pragmatic elements such as focus and topicality that govern the distribution of the null subject. For example, introducing new information, or switch referent instances, increases the likelihood of subject expression.

2.6.2 English word order and subject/object expression. English has an SVO word order that is fairly rigid. Overt pronouns are almost always expressed in English, except in contexts such as the imperative: *I have the book* vs. *Have the book* as well as in same-referent coordinating constructions: *I went to the bookstore and Ø bought a book.*

The differences of word order and subject/object expression in both languages are important. Researchers have developed hypotheses regarding expected changes in Spanish as a result of contact with English. Silva-Corvalán (1994), for example, argues that if it were the case that English exerted influence on Spanish, then bilinguals would experience the following changes in their Spanish: i) Higher rates of subject pronouns due to the nearly categorical presence of overt subjects in English, (ii) An increase in pre-verbal subjects due to the rigid SVO word order in English, (iii) Omission of clitics in sentences where, in the English equivalent, oblique pronouns are not required (Silva-Corvalán 1994: 94) as in example (17):

- 17) ‘...y me dieron en la cara, y Ø quebraron mi, mi jaw’
 ‘...and they hit me in the face and broke my jaw’ (Silva-Corvalán 1994: 122)

(iv) An increase of bilinguals’ production of enclisis in the [finite+nonfinite verb] construction, also due to the rigid SVO word order in English. Interestingly, while there is some evidence that bilinguals produce higher rates of subject pronouns and that they produce more pre-verbal subjects than monolinguals do, for the most part the research to date has shown a great deal of continuity between monolinguals and bilinguals with respect to the morphosyntactic structures mentioned above. Each structure is discussed in more detail below.

2.6.3 Pronoun use in Spanish. Studies on subject pronoun expression in Spanish in situations of contact with English have been inconclusive. While some find a higher pronoun rate in bilingual speakers of Spanish (Shin and Otheguy 2009; 2013), others do not (Travis and Torres Cacoullos 2011; Silva-Corvalán 1994). Shin and Otheguy (2013) find that bilingual Spanish speakers living in New York for a long period of time, who also have a higher socio-economic status, produce higher rates of subject pronouns. Since the speakers who undergo the greatest increase in pronoun rates are also those who come from wealthier communities (Cubans and Colombians), they argue that social factors such as economic status, time spent in an area of language contact, as well as the closeness of a community, predict whether bilinguals' subject pronoun expression rates will increase. Thus, contact-induced change does not happen in all instances where there is language contact. While in New York the rate of subject pronoun use is higher in bilinguals, in other places such as Los Angeles and New Mexico this does not seem to be the case.

Furthermore, researchers have argued that studies of contact-induced change must examine more than just frequency of use of a particular structure. Instead, we must examine the contexts that condition usage (Poplack and Levey 2010). Studies that have examined constraints on pronoun use tend to show that bilinguals and monolinguals are, for the most part, very similar in their pronoun expression patterns (Otheguy & Zentella 2012; Torres Cacoullos & Travis 2011; Shin 2014).

Factors such as a switch in reference and priming affect subject pronoun expression among both monolingual and bilingual speakers of Spanish. One may conclude, then, that in some communities subject pronoun rates increase as a result of

contact with English. Nevertheless, constraints on pronoun expression for the most part remain intact (but see Shin 2014; Shin & Montes-Alcalá 2014).

2.6.4 Word order. In looking at Caribbean and Mainland Spanish in New York, Risso (2010) also finds that the rate of preverbal subject pronouns, for example *Ella vino* compared to *Vino ella* (Risso 2010: 102) is higher among the bilingual population who have lived in New York the longest compared to Mainland Spanish and immigrant speakers have lived in New York for a shorter period of time. She attributes the high rate of preverbal pronouns in Caribbean Spanish to intense contact with English. Because English generally places the subject before a verb, whereas Spanish word order is more variable, it can be interpreted that bilingual speakers who have lived in New York for a long period of time use English word order in placing subject pronouns.

Similarly, Cuza (2012) finds that there is evidence among heritage Spanish-English bilingual adults that English does have an influence on word order in embedded questions due to English syntax. That is, the heritage language speaker in the study switched word order in an embedded question such as: *Me pregunto qué compró Juan~ *Me pregunto qué Juan compró*. The results from both Cuza (2012) and Risso (2010) suggest that English may have an influence on some features of Spanish syntax such as preverbal pronouns and embedded questions.

2.6.5 Clitic omission. Silva-Corvalán (1994) suggests that one way to see if English does influence clitics in Spanish is to see whether or not there are high rates of clitic omission among the bilingual population. However, her results do not point to this. The range of clitic omission combined for accusative, dative, and reflexive contexts were under 10% (Silva-Corvalán 1994) for bilingual speakers.

Pueyo (1992) as well as Larrañaga and Fuentes (2011) both looked at clitic omission rates among bilingual children. Both studies found that the rate of clitic omission among bilingual children older than three years of age was similar to monolinguals. The studies, however, also suggest that there was still influence from the contact language at an early age of development, as will be discussed in the last section on bilingual and monolingual children.

2.6.6 Clitic placement in contact varieties of Spanish. As stated earlier, Silva-Corvalán (1994) notes that if English has an effect on Spanish, then perhaps one may see a preference towards enclisis in the [finite+nonfinite verb] construction due to English syntax. However, thus far there is no evidence that English has this effect on Spanish. Instead the studies show that there is no significant difference between bilingual and monolingual speakers in the preference of clitic placement (Gutiérrez and Silva-Corvalán 1993; Silva-Corvalán 1994; Darwich 2007; Gutierrez 2008; Peace 2013). All of these studies illustrate that, as with monolingual Spanish speakers, proclisis is favored over enclisis in variable contexts. This preference for proclisis has also been found for Spanish in contact with Asturian (López 2013).

Gutiérrez and Silva-Corvalán (1993) find that the preference for proclisis is found among both monolinguals and bilinguals (compared over three generations). The rates of proclisis for bilinguals were 73-80%, while for monolinguals the rate of proclisis was 88%. It was also found that the rate of proclisis among bilingual adults living in Massachusetts was 75% (Peace 2013: 145). And, while English does not seem to have a direct effect on clitic placement, Silva-Corvalán (1994), and Peace (2013) propose that the rate of proclisis among bilinguals is evidence of simplification. As such, English does

influence bilingual speakers indirectly due to the process of language simplification. Recall that simplification is the process in which linguistic forms (in this case proclisis versus enclisis in the [finite+nonfinite verb] construction) becomes more categorical. Thus, proclisis is favored over enclisis due to the juggling of two linguistic systems. Hence, the high rates of proclisis among bilingual speakers are not a result of internal variation; it is the result of language contact.

At the same time, Darwich (2007) finds that there is no significant difference between bilingual Spanish-English speakers in New York compared to monolingual Spanish speakers in the context of clitic placement. Gutierréz (2008) investigates clitic position in the [finite+non-finite verb] construction based on bilingual Spanish-English speakers in Houston and monolingual Spanish speakers from Michoacán, Mexico. He, as with Darwich (2007) finds that proclisis is favored among both monolinguals (77.5%) and bilinguals (~71%) (Gutierréz 2008: 304). Reflexive verbs and auxiliary verbs also show that both bilinguals and monolinguals favor proclisis compared to enclisis. Thus, there does not appear to be evidence of simplification in the rates of proclisis by bilinguals.

Montrul (2009) approaches this topic in a different way. Her study compares L2 speakers of Spanish, heritage language speakers of Spanish, and monolingual Spanish speakers. The study's results show that heritage language learners with a lower proficiency in Spanish have a more native-like knowledge of the use of clitics than L2 learners of Spanish with lower proficiency (Montrul 2009: 197). This suggests that bilinguals are able to develop the same knowledge of clitic placement akin to monolingual speakers.

As mentioned earlier, proclisis is favored cross dialectally (Davies 1995). This can also be seen in other situations of contact that is not between Spanish and English. Asturian-Spanish bilinguals, for example, favor proclisis even though Asturian is an enclitic language (López 2013). This shows that Spanish clitic position seems to be becoming more rigid in its syntactic structure. It also demonstrates that the position of clitics is not subject to contact-induced change because both contact and noncontact varieties both have high rates of proclisis.

2.6.7 Summary of contact-induced change. Contact-induced change remains a controversial subject due to the difficulty in separating contact-induced and language internal influence. Studies on subject pronouns in Spanish in intense contact with English do show a tendency for bilinguals to express more overt subjects, and to place subjects in pre-verbal position. This appears to support the minor to major use pattern concept as proposed by Heine and Kuteva (2005). However, clitic position does not seem to be affected by English. Despite theories of simplification, variable clitic placement appears to reflect the impermeability of clitic position to language contact.

The majority of studies show that proclisis is favored over enclisis. A possible explanation for these results could be due to grammaticalization and discourse-pragmatic factors. Because clitics have a higher token frequency, they have a higher resistance to change. And, since English does not have object clitics, there is no equivalent structure on which to base the structure in Spanish. It appears, then, that variability is attributed to internal processes and not to language contact. How monolingual and bilingual children produce clitics will be discussed in the next section.

2.7 Clitic placement in child language.

While there has been abundant research on variable clitic placement among monolingual and bilingual adults, less research has focused on children. The few studies that have been conducted have yielded conflicting results. Some studies suggest that there is no difference between bilingual and monolingual children; both use clitics in a similar manner (Pueyo 1992, Larrañaga and Fuentes 2011), even though there may exist some developmental differences early on. Another study (Pérez-Leroux et al. 2011), however, found that English does have a tangible effect on variable clitic placement for bilingual children.

2.7.1 Monolingual children. Monolingual children produce clitics starting from 1.9-2 years old (Requena, unpublished m.s.). Since children acquire clitics at an early age, and are also able to produce them with minimal placement errors, Requena hypothesizes that children will also be able to produce clitics in variable position in a similar to adult monolingual Mexican Spanish speakers. That is, children should also favor proclisis over enclisis. Requena's results show that, indeed, monolingual Spanish speaking children do favor proclisis (71%) compared to enclisis in the [finite+non-finite verb] construction (Requena, unpublished: 13). The adult rate of proclisis was 72%. This demonstrates that both children and adults show the same preference of variable clitic placement. Clitic omission among monolingual children, according to an elicited imitation task was 16% (Eisenclas 2003).

The results also demonstrate that linguistic constraints on variable clitic placement affect monolingual children. Specifically, verb lexeme was significant in constraining clitic placement. For example, children had a high rate of proclisis when the finite verb was *poder* and a lower rate of proclisis when the finite verb was *tener*. Though

there was a tendency to have a higher rate of proclisis when the children were around the ages of two and three years old, by the time they were four and five their rates of proclisis matched more closely to adults (Requena, unpublished m.s., 15-19).

2.7.2 Bilingual children. Larrañaga and Fuentes (2011) examine the acquisition of impersonal clitics and clitic omission in bilingual Basque-Spanish children spanning four years starting when the children were one, and ending when they were five. Basque allows the omission of impersonal clitics, while Spanish spoken in parts of Spain and Latin America does not. The authors hypothesized that Basque-Spanish children would drop clitics more than monolingual Spanish speaking children due to the influence from Basque. While the authors do find that their subjects make more omissions at an early age, after the age of three the rate of clitic omission decreases significantly and is comparable to their monolingual counterparts (Larrañaga and Fuentes 2012: 169).

Similarly, by studying three Spanish-English bilingual children in Los Angeles, Pueyo (1992: 262) found that his bilingual children subjects spanning the ages of five to seven years old produced clitics ‘correctly’ (according to the author) around 88% of the time, even though initially they had trouble with clitic omissions. It is necessary to be cautious about generalizing conclusions based on Larrañaga & Fuentes’ (2011) and Pueyo’s (1992) studies since both had a limited amount of subjects. While bilingual children may still be susceptible to some interference during the early stages of development, the studies do show that they become similar to monolinguals as they become older.

In contrast to Larrañaga & Fuentes’ (2011) and Pueyo’s (1992) studies, Pérez-Leroux et al. (2011) found significant differences between monolingual and bilingual

children with respect to clitic placement. This study was experimental and compared simultaneous Spanish-English bilingual children and sequential Spanish-English bilingual children, aged 3-8 years, in order to determine if English had an effect on variable clitic placement. They compared their findings to monolingual children from a study conducted by Eisenclas (2003) who had used the same imitation task. They found that their bilingual subjects, in particular the simultaneous bilinguals, showed an enclisis bias in variable clitic placement. Specifically, simultaneous bilinguals repositioned the clitic to enclisis 15% of the time compared to 6% of the time by monolinguals (Eisenclas 2003: 203). Pérez-Leroux et al. (2011) conclude that this preference towards enclisis is a sign of English transfer affecting bilingual speech.

2.7.3 Summary of clitics in child language. Monolingual children show the preference towards proclisis akin to adults. Bilingual children, on the other hand, appear to have differences from monolingual children in terms of clitic omission. While the rate of clitic omission is similar to monolingual children at an older age, there appears to be language contact influence among bilingual children at early stages of development.

Only one study has found that bilingual children have a higher rate of enclisis compared to proclisis in the [finite+nonfinite verb] construction. The mismatch between previous research and the Pérez-Leroux et al. (2011) study, as compared to the rates of proclisis and enclisis among adult speakers, is the motivation for the current study. The purpose of this study is to create a clearer picture of the effect of internal linguistic features within clitic placement on bilingual and monolingual children's speech. Contrary to Pérez-Leroux et al. (2011), it is predicted that bilingual children and monolingual children will both show a high rate of proclisis.

2.8 Literature Review Summary

Variable clitic placement is not random. There are linguistic factors such as grammaticalization and animacy that do affect the placement of the clitic. The preference for proclisis over enclisis has gone in waves, and in spoken Modern Spanish proclisis remains the favored choice. Studies such as Darwich (2007) and Silva-Corvalán (1994) have also illustrated that both monolingual and bilingual adults prefer proclisis in variable clitic placement. Furthermore, the existing literature suggests that monolingual children are able to produce clitics in a similar manner to adults. The studies that do look at Spanish-English bilingual children, however, illustrate that there may be some effect of English on variable clitic placement. The children in Pérez-Leroux et al. (2011) have a slight preference towards enclisis. Nevertheless, as the majority of studies find no difference between monolingual and bilingual adults, it is hypothesized that there will be no difference between bilingual and monolingual children, and that other factors will dictate the choice of variable clitic placement.

3. Methods

The purpose of this study is to investigate different factors that affect variable clitic placement. Specifically, the two research questions asked in this thesis are:

1. Does language contact affect clitic placement among bilingual children?
2. Are there differences in the factors influencing clitic placement for the two populations of children?

Based on previous research it is predicted that there will be no difference between bilingual and monolingual children. Instead, other linguistic factors will affect constrain

the choice between clitic positions in the [finite+nonfinite verb] construction. An outline of the null and alternate outcomes (H_1) if the predicted hypothesis (H_2) is disproven are:

- **H_0** = Nothing constrains variable proclitic or enclitic placement: the choice is completely random.
- **H_1** = Bilingual children will show a preference for enclisis that overrides any other linguistic factor due to contact with English.
- **H_2 (Main)**= Linguistic factors constrain the choice of proclitic or enclitic placement for both bilingual and monolingual children.

3.1 Procedure

Data for the current study come from Shin's corpus (in prep) of monolingual Spanish-speaking children in Mexico and Spanish-English bilingual children in Washington and Montana. All tokens of third person direct object clitics (*lo, la, los, las*) in variable clitic position were extracted from 92 sociolinguistic interviews. In total, there were 21 interviews with bilingual children and 71 interviews with monolingual children. The total combined word count for both monolingual and bilingual interviews was: 65,068. The combined number of tokens collected amounted to 140, making up 0.21% of the total data.

3.2 Interview Process

Interviews were comprised of a series of sociolinguistic questions ranging from topics concerning the child's school life to the child's favorite movies and T.V. shows. Two picture books were also used in conjunction with sociolinguistic questions. One picture book was the (Meyer 1969) story *Frog, Where Are You?* This book is about a boy, a dog, and the frog that the boy and the dog try to capture. The second picture book,

What's Pretend? (Ziefert 2004) is about games that two friends play with each other. The child recounted these stories to the interviewer in their own words while looking at the picture book. Some children also made up their own story, and some retold stories that they had heard.

3.3 Subjects

The subjects were children between the ages of 5-11 who lived in either the United States or in Mexico.

3.3.1 Bilingual children. Children in the bilingual group were between the ages of five and eleven, with a mean age of eight. They were all enrolled in school, spanning grades between kindergarten and the sixth grade. They also came from a similar socioeconomic background and were either born in the United States, or had moved to the United States at a young age. At the time of the interview, they were all living in the northwestern region of the United States, specifically in Montana or Washington. All children in the bilingual data set were proficient in both English and Spanish.

3.3.2 Monolingual children. Children in the monolingual group were between the ages of six and eleven, with a mean age of seven. Similar to the bilingual group, the children were between the first and the fifth grade in elementary school at the time of the interviews. All children at the time of the interview lived in either Queretaro or Oaxaca, which are two interior cities in Mexico. The monolingual group was solely fluent in Spanish. Though some children mentioned studying English in school, they were not proficient in it.

3.4 Predictor Variables

The study tested seven independent variables. The dependent variable tested is the proportion of proclisis in the construction: [finite+nonfinite verb]. The independent variables used examined are:

- Language Background (bilingual versus monolingual)
- Clitic Animacy (animate versus inanimate)
- Clause Type (non-coordinating versus coordinating)
- Verb Lexeme (finite verb)
- Aspect (progressive and non-progressive)
- Topicality (topical versus non-topical)
- Persistence (persistent versus not persistent)

An overview of each independent variable is seen below.

3.4.2 Clitic animacy scale. This study only includes third person pronouns. For this reason the animacy scale used was:

$$3^{\text{rd}} \text{ Person Animate} < 3^{\text{rd}} \text{ Person Inanimate}$$

This is a modification from Myhill's hierarchy as well as from the hierarchy used by Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos (2014). The distinction between the singular and plural were excluded because the important factor in this study is the animacy itself, not number.

The animacy of the clitic referent as well as the subject of the finite verb was coded for as either being 'animate' or 'inanimate'. Coding the animacy of both the clitic and the subject of the verb enabled us to see if a mismatch on the animacy hierarchy affected the choice between proclisis or enclisis. The subject and clitic were the 'same' when they matched in animacy as in:

- 18) “Cuando su **perro** salió corriendo no **lo pudo** atrapar.” (Mex 111)
 “When his dog came out running he could not catch it”

The finite verb *pudo* refers to the boy in the “Frog Story”. The clitic *lo* refers to the dog (*perro*) that appears earlier in the clause. Since the finite verb and the clitic are both animate, they are considered equals on the animacy hierarchy. However, if the utterance did not match in animacy (hence the subject of the finite verb is higher on the scale than the clitic), then it would be considered a mismatch as illustrated in example (19):

- 19) “...es que **mi hermanita quiere** crecerlo como Rapunzel.” (Mont 404)
 “...it’s that my sister wants to grow it (out) like Rapunzel.”

In (19), the subject, *hermanita*, is animate and is thus higher on the animacy scale than *lo* which refers to the sister’s hair. Because the subject is animate (higher on the scale) but the clitic is inanimate (lower on the scale), this was coded as representative of a ‘mismatch’ in animacy.

3.4.3 Clause type. Clauses were divided into coordinating or non-coordinating (main and subordinate) clauses. Coordinating clauses were defined as any clause that used the conjunctions *y* (and), *pero* (but), and *o* (or) after a comma such as:

- 20) “Quiero tener mi carrera porque quiero ayudar a los que están enfermos y pa’, y el dinero quiero enviarlo” (Mont 404)

“I want to have a career because I want to help those that are sick and for, and I want to send them money”

- 21) “Y fue a pescarla” (Mex 208)
 “And he was going to catch it”

Sentences such as example (21) were not counted as coordinating clauses because they did not conjoin two independent clauses. Instead, examples like (21) were coded as being non-coordinated clauses.

Whether or not the subject of the coordinating clause construction was the same or different from the main clause was also noted. The object of the coordinating clause was examined by means of anaphoric persistence. Example (22) illustrates a same-reference coordinating clause, while example (23) shows a switch-reference coordinating clause.

22) “...y **el lobo** sopló y sopló y **no podía tumbarla**” (Mex 322)

“...and he blew and he blew and he could not make it fall”

23) “Y **la rana** saltaba y saltaba, y **el niño** no podía pescarla.” (Mex 208)

“And the frog was jumping and jumping, and the boy was not able to catch it”

3.4.5 Finite verb lexeme. The finite verb, along with the nonfinite verb they appeared with in the [finite+nonfinite verb] construction was noted. *Ir*, specifically, was also coded for either being grammaticalized or ungrammaticalized i.e. whether it carried a meaning of future or of motion. The context in which *ir* appeared helped make this distinction. However, there were some instances where the distinction between what constituted a future and what constituted a movement meaning was sometimes elusive. In order to simplify this decision, the following guidelines were used in order to distinguish between meanings. It was determined that *ir* conveyed a meaning of future when the construction appeared in the present as in: *Lo voy a ver*. The assumption taken is that the construction [ir+infinitive] in the present denotes the future. When the construction appeared with temporal adverbs such as *cuando* (when), *antes* (before), *luego* (then),

después (after), especially if *ir* appeared in the imperfect, these temporal adverbs helped to determine futurity. This is because *cuando+ir* signifies that a temporal action is taking place as shown in (24):

- 24) “**Cuando**, iban, ya **iban a atraparla**, **atraparon** al perro en lugar de la rana.” (Mex 210)
 “When they were going to, going to catch it, they caught the dog instead of the frog”

In this example, the temporal adverb *cuando* (when) as well as the preterite form of the nonfinite verb ‘atrapar’ helps to determine that in this sentence *ir* denotes the future rather than movement. When *ir* was in the preterit, it was coded as having a movement meaning. Since the preterit conveys a completed action, a future meaning does not make sense, as demonstrated by example (25).

- 25) “Y fue a pescarla” (Mex 208)
 “And he went to catch it”

3.4.6 Aspect. The aspect of the nonfinite verb was coded for in order to see if it would have an effect on variable clitic placement. This is due to previous research (Myhill 1988; 1989) on how proclisis is favored more in progressive constructions as compared to other constructions.

3.4.7 Anaphoric and cataphoric persistence. Based on Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos (2014), anaphoric mention (topicality) and cataphoric mention (persistence) were coded for as a way to see if pragmatic factors affect variable clitic placement.

1. Topicality. Topicality was determined by whether or not the clitic referent had appeared as the subject or direct object within the previous ten intervening clauses from the clitic itself. If the referent did appear as the subject or direct object within ten

intervening clauses, it was considered topical, and was coded as such. Example (26) demonstrates this:

26) Anaphoric Mention:

- a. Entonces este **la rana** se siente muy triste
- b. Porque la pueden,
- c. **la quieren comer.**
- d. Después, el niño se cae con la red y la cubeta de agua y el perro igual
- e. Y la rana se- y el si- la rana se asombra (Mex 209)

“And so the frog felt sad because they could, they wanted to eat her. Afterwards, the boy fell with the net and the water pail and so did the dog. And the frog was amazed.”

‘La rana’ in this example is the subject in clause (a), and is mentioned before the clitic in clause (c).

2. Persistence. Persistence was determined by whether or not the clitic referent was mentioned more than twice in the following ten intervening clauses. This was coded as ‘persistent’ and the number of intervening clauses, as with anaphoric mention, was also noted. This is shown in (27):

27) Cataphoric Persistence:

- a. Se e’ta subiendo en el árbol
- b. y el perro e’ta mirándolo.
- c. Y él ya bajó y el perro va con él.
- d. Y otra vez ve la rana
- e. y se quería meter. (Mont 104)

“He was climbing the tree, and the dog was watching him. And he came down and the dog went with him. He saw the frog again and wanted to catch it.”

In example (27), the clitic referent, in this case the boy, was mentioned more than three times in the discourse following the clitic. If the clitic was not mentioned more than three times, then it was coded as not being persistent.

3.5 Exclusions

To control for factors that could potentially skew results, exclusions of various constructions were made. The total amount of exclusions came to 238 tokens, or 0.36% of the total, combined, interviews of monolingual and bilingual children. Below is each type of exclusion made, and what percentage it amounted to in the data.

3.5.1 Personal pronouns. First and second person personal direct object pronouns (*me, te, nos*) were excluded from final analysis of the data because they are inherently animate. *Se* was excluded because it is not a direct object pronoun. In order to fully realize the effect of animacy on clitic placement, these pronouns had to be excluded. There were 134 tokens of these pronouns (0.2% of total data).

3.5.2 Intervening material. Utterances with intervening material between the finite verb and the nonfinite verb as in: ‘*va con el niño acompañándolo*’ were eliminated due to invariability (**Lo va con el niño acompañando*). Furthermore, juxtaposed verbs such as: ‘*no voy a poder tenerlas*’ or ‘...*la quería hacer dormir*’ were eliminated. There were too few tokens of this type to determine whether or not there was variation between preverbal and postverbal clitic placement. Eighteen tokens with intervening material were found, making up 0.028% of the total data.

3.5.3 The indirect object clitic *le*. Indirect object clitics such as: ‘*Voy a decirle*’ were excluded from the data because the focus was on third person direct object clitics, not on indirect object clitics. There were 43 tokens of the indirect object clitic (0.07%).

3.5.4 *Lo que* constructions. This construction was excluded because the ‘*lo*’ does not refer to anything specific; it is just a particle in a construction as in: *Lo que habían dejado*. There were eight tokens of *lo que*...constructions. This made up 0.01% of the data

3.5.5 Double clitics. Double clitics, such as: “...*se los* *podía comer*” were excluded because of the complications that arise with these types of constructions. It was not clear what clitic influenced its position. Since the focus of this thesis was on third person direct object clitics, this was further motivation to exclude double clitics that usually were accusative-reflexive or direct-indirect objects. There were 31 tokens of this and made up 0.05% of the total data.

3.5.6 Repeated clitics and other ambiguities. When the clitic is repeated as in: ‘...*lo* *quiso tocarlo*’, one cannot tell where the speaker intended to place the clitic. Because of this ambiguity, repeated clitics were excluded from the data. Other exclusions were when the clitic acted as a subject rather than as a direct object clitic as in: “*Y la ranita, los habían seguido hasta su casa.*” (Mex 203). Cases of the type described here amounted to three tokens, or 0.004% of the total data.

3.5.7 Code switching. Because the study examined Spanish utterances, tokens where the speakers used English verbs in these constructions were excluded, amounting to 0.001% (one token) of the data. This token will be looked at in the discussion section (Chapter Five) of the thesis.

28) “...estos son los golie posts y estos son la pelota y **cuando los kick it, ‘cupamos a try kickarlo...**” (Mont 102)

“...those are the goal posts and thos are the ball and when they kick it, they are trying to kick it”

3.6 Summary of Methods

Table 1 illustrates the number and percentages of exclusions and the amount in percentages that each make up of the data.

Table 1: A summary of all exclusions.

Exclusion	Number of Tokens	Percentage of Data
Personal Pronouns	134	0.2%
Intervening Material	18	0.028%
Indirect Object Clitics	43	0.07%
Lo que... Constructions	8	0.01%
Double Clitics	31	0.05%
Repeated Clitics and Other Ambiguities	3	0.004%
Code Switching	1	0.001%
TOTAL	238	0.36%

What is left after these 238 excluded tokens are 140 tokens of variable clitic placement of third person direct object clitics. The construction is used infrequently, and there are few opportunities to observe object clitic placement when placement is not fixed. For both groups, third person direct object clitics in variable placement makes up 0.21% of the corpora. In order to see the relationship between the independent variables and clitic placement, an analysis using the step up/step down model in Rbrul (Johnson 2014) will be fitted to the data.

4. Results

The study investigated the rate of proclisis or enclisis in variable clitic placement and the factors that influence clitic placement. There were 140 tokens of variable clitic placement of third person direct object clitics. 51 tokens came from bilinguals and 89 tokens came from monolinguals. There were 34 observations of enclisis (24%) and 106 observations of proclisis (76%). In the bilingual data set, there were 13 tokens of enclisis (25%) and 38 tokens of proclisis (75%). In the monolingual group, there were 21 cases of enclisis (24%) and 68 tokens of proclisis (76%).

Quantitative results will be presented first followed by a qualitative analysis of the enclitic tokens. Recall that the research question has two parts:

1. Will bilinguals prefer enclisis to proclisis in variable clitic placement due to contact with English?
2. If there is no difference between groups, what factors do constrain variable clitic placement?

The hypotheses tested were as follows:

- H_0 (Null): Clitic placement is completely random. There will be no preference for clitic placement for either group.
- H_1 (Alternate Outcome Hypothesis): Bilingual and monolingual groups are different, and due to language contact bilingual children will prefer enclisis to proclisis.
- Main Hypothesis: Linguistic factors constrain the choice of proclitic or enclitic placement for both bilingual and monolingual children.

4.1 Analysis

To test the main hypothesis, the data was analyzed in the following way. A multivariate analysis using the step up/step down function in Rbrul (Johnson 2014) was fitted to the data in order to determine if there was a relationship between the independent variables in this study and variable clitic placement.

The first logistic regression model included the independent predictors of: language background, clitic animacy, clause type, anaphoric topicality, cataphoric persistence, and tense and aspect. Anaphoric topicality, cataphoric persistence, and tense and aspect did not come out as significant in the model. Thus, the following regression model excluded these predictors and focused on language background, clitic animacy, and clause type. Finite verb lexeme was not included in these models because there were too few data points for each lexeme. Instead, the rates of proclisis and enclisis were looked at for each lexeme.

The results of the second binary logistic regression model with the predictors of clitic animacy, clause type, and language background yielded no interaction effects. Instead, there the two main effects were: clitic animacy $p < 0.01$ and clause type $p < 0.01$.

4.1.1 Research question one. The first question asked was: Does language contact with English affect the bilingual group with respect to variable clitic placement? The H_1 (Alternate) hypothesis predicts that there will be a difference between bilinguals and monolinguals. Specifically, bilinguals would have a higher rate of enclisis due to language contact with English. Table 2 shows the overall distribution between proclisis and enclisis for bilingual and monolingual groups.

Table 2: Monolingual and bilingual children.

Clitic Placement	Bilingual		Monolingual	
	N	%	N	%
Proclisis	38	75	68	76
Enclisis	13	25	21	24
Total	51	100	89	100

The step up model in the multivariate analysis illustrated that participant group (monolingual and bilingual) was not a significant predictor in variable clitic placement, $p=0.80$. Bilinguals and monolinguals both prefer proclisis (75% and 76% respectively). The data fail to provide evidence in support of H1. However, it does not rule out as yet the null hypothesis.

4.1.2 Research question two. The second research question was: If there is no difference between groups, what are the linguistic factors that guide the choice between proclisis and enclisis in variable contexts? The main hypothesis of the study states that there will be no difference between the groups. Instead, other factors that influence clitic placement will affect both groups. In the analysis, the two significant main effects were: clause type $p<0.01$ and clitic animacy $p<0.01$.

To summarize briefly, since there was no difference between monolinguals and bilinguals in the rate of enclisis, and since clitic placement was significantly constrained by two linguistic predictors, we can reject both the null hypothesis and the H₁ hypothesis and accept the study's main hypothesis instead.

Table 3 illustrates the results of the regression analysis performed in Rbrul.

Table 3: Results of the multivariate analysis
 N=140 Input Probability= 0.38 (Rate of enclisis= 24%)

Predictor	Centered Factor Weight	N	% Enclisis
Clause Type			
Coordinating	0.67	29	45
Non-Coordinating	0.33	111	19
Clitic Animacy			
Inanimate	0.66	31	42
Animate	0.34	109	19

4.2 Main Effects

4.2.1 Clause type. Table 4 shows the distribution between clause type and clitic placement.

Table 4: Clitic placement by clause type.

Clitic Placement	Coordinating		Non-Coordinating	
	N	%	N	%
Proclisis	16	55	90	81
Enclisis	13	45	21	19
Total	29	100	111	100

Clause type is significant in determining variable clitic placement. Though there are fewer tokens for coordinating clauses than for main and subordinating clauses, there is a higher rate of enclisis in coordinating clauses than in non-coordinating clauses: 45% compared to 19% respectively. The results illustrate that there is a 0.67 probability that coordinating clauses will favor enclisis. The probability that a non-coordinating clause will have enclisis is only .33. A breakdown of clitic placement with respect to clause type by group is shown in Table 5 and Table 6.

Table 5: Bilingual group: clause type and clitic placement.

Clitic Placement	Coordinating		Non-Coordinating	
	N	%	N	%
Proclisis	8	67	30	76
Enclisis	4	33	9	23
Total	12	100	39	100

Table 6: Monolingual group: clause type and clitic placement.

Clitic Placement	Coordinating		Non-Coordinating	
	N	%	N	%
Proclisis	8	47	60	83
Enclisis	9	53	12	17
Total	17	100	72	100

While there is a difference in rates, bilinguals and monolinguals demonstrate the same trend. In both groups, the rate of proclisis in coordinating clauses is lower than in non-coordinating clauses.

Why should enclisis be preferred in coordinated clauses? A possible answer comes from an analysis of switch- and same-reference contexts. Table 7 presents the distribution of proclisis and enclisis with same- and switch- reference subjects.

Table 7: Clitic placement by switch and same-reference in coordinated clauses.

Clitic Placement	Switch-Referent		Same-Referent	
	N	%	N	%
Proclisis	11	73	5	36
Enclisis	4	27	9	64
Total	15	100	14	100

Same referent coordinating clauses favor enclisis 64% compared to switch-reference clauses that favor enclisis 27%. The verb lexemes with these nine same-reference coordinating clauses are as follows: *querer* (4), *poder* (3), *estar* (1), *empezar* (1).

4.2.2 Clitic Animacy. Table 8 illustrates the distribution of animacy and clitic placement.

Table 8: Clitic placement by animacy.

Clitic Placement	Animate		Inanimate	
	N	%	N	%
Proclisis	88	81	18	58
Enclisis	21	19	13	42
Total	109	100	31	100

One sees that the rate of enclisis with inanimate clitics is 38% compared to animate clitics at 19%. This distribution suggests that inanimate clitics favor enclisis more than animate clitics, although both types favor proclisis overall. Tables 9 and 10 show the distribution of clitic placement by animacy for each group.

Table 9: Clitic animacy in the bilingual group

Clitic Animacy	Proclisis	Enclisis	N	% Enclisis
Animate	26	4	30	15
Inanimate	12	9	21	43
Total	28	13	51	

The verb lexemes for the inanimate clitics in enclitic position in the bilingual group are: *querer* (6), *empezar* (1), *estar* (1), and *poder* (1). However, *empezar* and *estar* also appeared in coordinating clauses.

Table 10: Clitic animacy in the monolingual group

Clitic Animacy	Proclisis	Enclisis	N	% of Enclisis
Animate	59	17	76	22
Inanimate	9	4	13	31
Total	68	21	89	

What we see from Tables 9 and 10 is that in general, the trend for the two groups is the same: higher rates of enclisis with inanimate reference.

4.3 Qualitative Analysis

The low amount of enclisis in the data allows a further look into the factors that constitute these enclitic tokens. First, however, it is important to see the distribution of proclisis and enclisis by verb lexeme.

4.3.1 Finite verb lexeme. There were ten finite verbs that comprised the data.

Querer and *poder* had the highest amount of tokens, while *hacer* and *venir* had the lowest amount of tokens. Table 11 illustrates the overall distribution of the finite verbs in relation to their rates of proclisis and enclisis.

Table 11: Finite verb lexeme and clitic placement.

Finite Verb and Token Count	Proclisis	Enclisis
Invitar (14)	100%	No Tokens
Hacer (2)	100%	No Tokens
Haber (13)	92%	8%
Estar (17)	88%	12%
Ir (27)	78%	22%
Poder (28)	75%	25%
Tener (3)	67%	33%
Querer (31)	62%	38%
Venir (1)	No Tokens	100%
Empezar (4)	No Tokens	100%

The analysis shows that finite verb lexeme is highly significant. This can be seen in the stratification of the rates between proclisis and enclisis for each verb. All but *venir* and *empezar* have very low observed rates of enclisis. The low token count of *venir* and

empezar does not allow for generalization. However note that these verbs are not as grammaticalized as the other verbs.

Tables 12 and 13 illustrate the breakdown of verb lexemes that appeared within both the bilingual and monolingual data.

Table 12: Verb lexeme and clitic placement in the bilingual group.

Finite Verb	N	%Proclisis	%Enclisis
Haber	4	100	0
Estar	13	85	15
Ir	8	87.5	12.5
Poder	8	87.5	12.5
Tener	1	100	0
Querer	14	50	50
Empezar	1	0	100
TOTAL	51	75	25

Table 13: Verb lexeme and clitic placement in the monolingual group.

Finite Verb	N	%Proclisis	%Enclisis
Haber	9	89	11
Estar	4	100	0
Ir	19	74	26
Poder	20	70	30
Tener	2	50	50
Querer	17	70	30
Empezar	3	0	100
TOTAL	89	76	24

Here, one sees that both bilingual and monolingual children had a high rate of proclisis with the lexemes *haber*, *estar*, *ir*, and *poder*. Both bilinguals and monolinguals also used enclisis when the finite verb was *empezar*. The rate of proclisis with *querer* did differ among monolinguals (70%) as compared to bilinguals (50%). The differences in rates require further study, but other factors involved such as clitic animacy and clause type could have affected the rates among bilinguals and monolinguals. There are too few tokens of *tener* to make a generalization about the rate of proclisis with this verb lexeme.

4.3.2 Enclitic tokens. Below, Table 14 outlines the distribution of enclisis.

Table 14: A breakdown of enclitic tokens.

Context	Number of Enclitic Tokens
Coordinating Clauses	14
Finite Verb Lexeme (Including Inanimate Clitics)	20
Total	34

As seen in Table 14, coordinating clauses comprise 41% of enclitic tokens. The remaining 20, or 59%, of enclitic tokens can be explained by the finite verb lexeme. Excluding coordinating clauses, the remaining verbs that fit into this category are: *ir*, *querer*, and *empezar*. These tokens will be examined below.

Ir. The enclitic tokens of *ir* are shown below:

- 29) “Iba a agarrarlo pero él va a quebrar la cosa...” (Mont 302)
 “He was going to catch it but he is going to break the thing...”
- 30) “Y su papá, fue a acompañarla a la central.” (Mex 327)
 And her father was going to accompany her to the station
- 31) “Y fue a pescarla.” (Mex 208)
 And he was going to fish for it.
- 32) “La ranita fue a buscarlos.” (Mex 102)
 The frog was going to find them.
- 33) “Cuando, iban, ya iban a atraparla, atraparon al perro en lugar de la rana.”
 (Mex 104)

When they were going to...going to catch it, they caught the dog instead of the frog.

Recall that *ir* was considered to convey a meaning of motion when in the preterite. Out of the four tokens of *ir* in the preterit, only one was in proclisis. Examples (29) and (33) were the only ones to be in enclisis that were also in the imperfect. (29) and (33) can also be construed to have a meaning of future. All but one token of the preterit were in enclisis, while the majority of tokens in the present and imperfect were in proclisis. This suggests that the semantic difference between the grammaticalized and ungrammaticalized forms of *ir* affect clitic placement.

Querer. There are 12 tokens of *querer* where the clitic appears in enclisis.

Excluding the tokens in coordinating clauses (four), there are eight tokens of *querer* remaining. Despite clitic animacy not being significant in the analysis, note that five out of the 12 enclitic tokens also had inanimate clitic referents. These are shown in examples (34-37):

34) “Quiero conocerlo.” (Mont 201)

“I want to know it.”

35) “Quieres hacerlo?” (Mont 302)

“Do you want to do it?”

36) “Quieres hacerlo?” (Mont 302)

Do you want to do it?

37) “...quiere crecerlo.” (Mont 404)

“She wants to grow it [her hair].”

38) “Quiero verla” (Mont 404)

“I want to see it.”

There were three other tokens of enclisis with *querer* that cannot be explained by clitic animacy or clause coordination. These are:

39) “No quería matarlo” (Mont 302)
 “I did not want to kill it [a bear].”

40) “...entonces ellos ya no querían verlo nunca mas.” (Mex 322)
 “...so they did not want to see him [the wolf] anymore.”

41) “después, este, sus amigos de Tigger...este querían visitarlo.” (Mex 111)
 “after, then, Tigger’s friends...they wanted to visit him.”

Myhill (1989) discusses the semantic differences and the rates of proclisis when *querer* conveyed an antagonistic role compared to a non-antagonistic situation. There are too few tokens to analyze this semantic distinction thoroughly here, but note the negation in (39) and (40).

Empezar. Due to the small token set of *empezar* all four tokens of *empezar* appear below:

42) “Y, este, el osito Pooh empezó a buscarlos para...” (Mex 201)
 “And, then, Pooh started to find them...”

43) “...empecé a usarla” (Mont 302)
 “...began to use it.”

44) “...empieza a revisarlo” (Mex 321)
 “..he begins to examine him.”

45) “Empiezan a hacerlo” (Mex 203)
 “They began to use it...”

Examples (42-45) suggest that the finite verb outweighs clause type and clitic animacy. It illustrates that some verbs such as *empezar* favor enclisis. For example, the *los* in (42) and the *lo* in (44) are both animate. Yet, they still appear in enclisis. Although there is a

low token count of *empezar* in this thesis, this finding is in keeping with other studies that have also found that *empezar* favors enclisis (Davies 1995).

4.4 Summary of Results

In summary, the following predictors were significant main effects: clause type and clitic animacy. There was no significant difference between bilingual and monolingual children, $p=0.80$. They had similar rates of proclisis, and the analysis demonstrated that language background was not a significant predictor of variable clitic placement. Verb lexeme illustrates that finite verbs such as *estar* and *ir* have higher rates of proclisis than other verbs like *empezar*. This suggests that grammaticalized and ungrammaticalized verb lexemes constrain clitic placement. Tense and aspect, as well as anaphoric and cataphoric persistence were not significant.

The results allow us to reject the null and the H_1 hypothesis, which stated that bilinguals would have a higher proportion of enclisis compared to monolinguals. Variable clitic placement is not random. Instead, the variability in the [finite+nonfinite verb] construction is due to internal linguistic features, thus supporting the study's original hypothesis.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

The trend in Modern Spanish is to favor proclisis in the [finite+nonfinite verb] construction even though either proclisis or enclisis is acceptable. The results of this study illustrate that variable clitic placement is not random; semantic and syntactic features dictate the choice between proclisis and enclisis. The [finite+nonfinite verb] construction favors proclisis when the finite verb is more grammaticalized and also when the clitic is in a main or subordinating clause. The results suggest that the contexts that

favor enclisis are ones that have greater unithood and greater continuity in coordinating clauses.

The research questions explored in this study were: does language contact affect variable clitic placement as demonstrated by an enclisis bias in the bilingual group? And, if not, what factors do constrain variable clitic placement? The results indicate that language contact does not have an effect on variable clitic placement. Bilingual children do not prefer enclisis any more than monolinguals as illustrated from the results of the analysis. In fact, both groups have a preference for proclisis: 75% for bilinguals and 76% for monolinguals. With respect to the second research question, the results further illustrate that the factors that do affect variable clitic placement are the same for both groups. Both the monolingual and bilingual groups in this study are sensitive to the semantic distinctions between grammaticalized and ungrammaticalized finite verbs. They are also aware of the distinction between non-coordinating and coordinating clauses and place the clitic either pre-verbally or post-verbally depending on these contexts. The conclusions drawn from these findings are as follows:

1. Overall, proclisis is favored over enclisis. Variable clitic placement in Spanish is highly resistant to the effects of language contact; bilingual and monolingual children both used proclisis more than enclisis.
2. The children in this study mirror bilingual and monolingual adults (Silva-Corvalán 1994, Darwich 2007, etc.)

3. As the [finite+nonfinite verb] construction undergoes change in Spanish, verb lexemes such as [ir+nonfinite verb] demonstrate that the division between grammaticalized and ungrammaticalized lexemes affect clitic placement.

The first section in the discussion is on the distribution of proclisis in this study and how it compares to other dialects of spoken Spanish. The second section is on language contact and the absence of contact effects in variable clitic placement. The third section looks further into the significant and nonsignificant linguistic factors that affect variable clitic placement. Lastly, the implications and the conclusions drawn from the results will be discussed.

5.1 Distribution

As mentioned in the literature review, the trend in Modern Spanish is to favor proclisis over enclisis in the construction [finite+nonfinite verb] (Myhill 1988, 1989; Torres Cacoullos 1999). This trend is cross dialectal and appears in both contact and non-contact varieties of Spanish. This study supports this trend in Modern Spanish. Overall, the average rate of proclisis for both monolingual and bilingual children was 76%. This is comparable to rates of proclisis in other studies of non-contact varieties of Spanish such as Mexican Spanish: 73% and 77.5% (Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos 2014; Gutiérrez 2008, respectively). The rates of proclisis among bilingual children also correspond to similar studies on bilingual adults, as will be seen in the next section.

The findings from the thesis also match closely to previous research on adult bilingual Spanish-English speakers and clitic placement. Peace (2013), for example, found that proclisis was favored 75% among her subjects (Peace 2013: 145). Gutiérrez (2008) also found that preverbal clitics were favored between 69.6%-72.1% depending

on the generation of speaker in Houston (Gutiérrez 2008: 306). The rates of proclisis from the current study are generalizable to a broader population because they match very closely to the rates of proclisis that looked at contact and non-contact varieties of Spanish. Table 15 illustrates the rates of proclisis of spoken Spanish from different geographical locations:

Table 15: The rate of proclisis in contact and noncontact varieties of Spanish.

Location	Study	Rate of Proclisis
Mexico Monolinguals	Present Study	76%
US Bilinguals	Present Study	75%
Mexico City, Mexico	Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos (2014)	73%
Michoacán, Mexico	Gutiérrez (2008)	77%
Michoacán, Mexico	Gutiérrez and Silva-Corvalán (1993)	88%
Madrid/Sevilla	Davies (1995)	61%
Massachusetts	Peace (2013)	75%
Houston	Gutiérrez (2008)	~71%
New York	Darwich (2007)	64.6%

5.2 Language Contact

The results demonstrate that language contact is not a significant predictor in variable clitic placement. This supports the results of previous research on bilingual and monolingual adults in areas of intense language contact (Darwich 2007; Gutiérrez 2008 etc.). The absence of contact effects highlights important issues that Poplack and Levey (2010) raise concerning evidence of what constitutes contact-induced change.

5.2.1 The absence of contact effects in variable clitic placement. The approach taken in this thesis was that language is variable. The instances of enclisis found in the data could be explained through internal variability from semantic and syntactic features; the study failed to find any significant effect of language contact. This was evidenced by

the similarities between the bilingual and monolingual groups not only in the rates of proclisis, but also because of the analysis which showed that language background was not significant in predicting the outcome of either proclisis or enclisis. These results reflect a broader issue in determining the differences between what constitutes contact-induced change and inherent variation within a language.

While these results support the majority of previous research on both contact and non-contact varieties of Spanish, there is a discrepancy between the results of this study and the findings of the Pérez-Leroux et al. (2011) experiment that specifically investigated bilingual children and variable clitic placement. Recall that their experiment found that the bilingual children in their group had a bias towards enclisis compared to monolingual children. Using an elicited imitation task, Pérez-Leroux et al. (2011) showed that Spanish-English bilingual children used enclisis a quarter of the time even though the original sentence in the imitation task used proclisis (Pérez-Leroux et al. 2011: 229). In contrast, monolingual children given this same imitation task produced enclisis only 6% of the time when the stimulus sentence used proclisis (Eisenclas 2003: 203). Pérez-Leroux et al. (2011) suggest that the bilingual children's higher rate of enclisis is due to influence from English, as object pronouns always appear after the verb in English (*He wanted to see her.*).

The discrepancy between the results of Pérez-Leroux et al.'s (2011) experiment and the current study is likely due, in part, to the differences in methodologies. Their experiment used an elicited imitation task while the current study used sociolinguistic interviews. Another important difference between Pérez-Leroux et al. (2011) and the current study is the approach to variation. Poplack and Levey (2010) discuss how

researchers must examine patterns of variation in order to determine whether or not a proposed change is the result of contact effects. The current study recognized that internal variation inherent in this aspect of morphosyntax is conditioned by various linguistic factors, whereas Pérez-Leroux et al. (2011) took the approach that variable clitic placement is absent of pragmatic features (Pérez-Leroux et al. 2011: 221). Thus, any variability including the repositioning of the clitic from proclisis to enclisis was taken to be a sign of English influence. However, as shown in this study, semantic and pragmatic features do in fact affect variable clitic placement.

The Pérez-Leroux et al. (2011) study is not generalizable outside of their experiment because one does not know how well the elicited task mirrors the speech in the community. Thus, while Pérez-Leroux et al. (2011) found an enclisis bias among their bilingual subjects, their results must be taken with caution, especially in light of the findings from the current study and previous research showing nearly identical rates of production of proclisis among monolingual and bilingual speakers (Peace 2013; Gutierrez 2008; Darwich 2007).

While, overall, there was no evidence of English influence on proclisis/enclisis in the current study in general, one token suggests that in contexts of code-switching, English may leave its imprint on Spanish. Consider the following token, which was not included in the quantitative analyses above because the verb is in English.

46) “...estos son los golie posts y estos son la pelota y cuando los kick **it**,
‘cupamos a try kickarlo...’ (Mont 102)

It appears that this may be a case of the effect of English on variable clitic placement. The bilingual child code switches, and the clitic appears in enclisis, mirroring English syntax. Thus, one can ask: is this an example of English syntax affecting the child’s

speech, or is this simply an instance where the rarer variant is produced? In other words, is it possible that the child would have produced enclisis even if the entire utterance were in Spanish, thereby producing *tratamos de patearlo*? In fact, there is reason to believe that the enclisis in example (45) is not due to English, but rather an internal factor. Note that the clitic referent ‘it’ is in the clause right before the clitic itself ‘lo’. The subjects of the ‘kick’ and the ‘ocupamos’ are the same. This is, then, a context of same-reference continuity. As shown in the results, there was a high rate of enclisis (67%) when the clitic was in a same-subject reference coordinating clause. Travis and Torres Cacoulios (2011) discuss how even though there is code switching, bilingual speakers still adhere to the syntactic structures of both languages. There is not enough data either way to determine whether or not this particular example is due to transfer, or to internal language variability, but the results of the current study remind us that even in cases where it looks like the syntax of one language is being copied onto the other, internal factors must also be considered.

Recall that Heine and Kuteva (2005) proposed that bilinguals try to find equivalent structures between the major language and the minor language and use the major language’s construction as their own. One would expect, then, that this would manifest as higher rates of enclisis in variable clitic placement among the bilingual group. But, as seen in the results, this is not the case.

Similarly, Silva-Corvalán (1994) as well as Peace (2013) proposed that the high level of proclisis in her study among the bilingual population was a sign of language contact with English by means of simplification. The authors claimed that an increased reliance on proclisis was a means of simplifying Spanish in order to compensate for

having to handle two language systems. The fact that bilinguals, as well as monolinguals, had a similar rate of proclisis does not appear to support the idea of simplification for this study. Moreover, the fact that both groups' production of proclisis versus enclisis was conditioned by the same linguistic variables indicates retention of the underlying patterns. Since non-contact varieties of Spanish also favor proclisis over enclisis, simplification due to language contact is not the reason for the high popularity of proclisis.

The results say more about language acquisition in children than they do about contact-induced change. That is, the study shows that the same internal linguistic processes are at work among both bilingual and monolingual children. This suggests that bilingual and monolingual children develop this aspect of Spanish morphosyntax in the same way. The fact that both bilingual and monolingual children are affected by internal linguistic features that guide clitic placement in the [finite+nonfinite] construction suggests that the pattern of variation develops in a similar manner. The next section examines the linguistic factors conditioning this variation.

5.3 Linguistic Factors and Variable Clitic Placement

Variability is not random. And, though variable clitic placement is not affected by language contact, other linguistic features do constrain clitic placement. Specifically, these features are verb type lexeme and clause type. While not significant in this study, with more data, clitic animacy could possibly have a significant effect. What do these conditioning variables tell us about the variation in question? Decreased unithood among verb lexemes as well as greater continuity in coordinating clauses are key factors promoting enclisis.

5.3.1 Verb lexeme. Recall that clitics in fixed positions usually precede a finite, or tensed, verb such as in: *No lo vio*. There are also some fixed contexts, such as the imperative, that favor enclisis. Highly proclitic verbs such as *estar* demonstrate that there is increased unithood in the construction [*estar+ndo*] because it is not only a grammaticalized verb, but it is also perceived as one unit because of the frequency in which *estar* appears with a gerund. This increased unithood reflects a fixed context. Therefore, it makes sense that proclisis is used because the *estar+gerund* construction is treated as a fixed context.

This is a possible explanation why there are higher rates of proclisis than enclisis with finite verbs such as *estar* and *ir*: both of these verbs act as auxiliaries. This is supported in the current study, where the rates of proclisis for *estar* and for *ir* are very high: 88% and 78% respectively. The rate of proclisis of *estar* (88%) in this study closely matches the rate of proclisis of *estar* in Myhill's (1989) work (89%). In total, there were seventeen tokens of *estar*. Fifteen appeared in proclisis, while two appeared in enclisis. The two tokens of enclisis appear below:

47) "...y el perro **está mirándolo**" (Mont 104)
 "...and the dog was watching him"

48) "...yo he fuido* con mi mami al trabajo todos y había rayos y había en el cielo y **estábamos viéndolos** pero no nos hizo nada." (Mont 404)

"...I had gone* with my mother to work and there was lightning in the sky and we were watching them but we did not do anything"

These two tokens of enclisis with *estar* do not carry a locative meaning. Instead, note that they both appear in coordinating clauses, which, as I will discuss below, seem to promote higher rates of enclisis.

The data contains twenty-six tokens of *ir*. Twenty are tokens of proclisis and six are tokens of enclisis. The percentage of proclisis with *ir* in this study (78%) closely matches Myhill's (1989) observed rate of proclisis at 75%. The high rate of proclisis also supports other research by Gudmestad (2006) who found that *ir* favored proclisis 92.7%.

There is a clear divide between the grammaticalized and ungrammaticalized forms of *ir* as they relate to variable clitic placement. As with *estar*, proclisis is favored with the grammaticalized form of *ir*. This is seen in the data. Eighteen of the twenty tokens of proclisis convey futurity, while four out of the six enclitic tokens of *ir* conveyed motion. This means that proclitic tokens of *ir*, as with *estar*, show an increased unithood. The divide between the grammaticalized and ungrammaticalized tokens of *ir* can be seen in the following examples:

49) Future: “La va rentar” (Mont 402)
She is going to rent it.

50) Future: “Pero después él vino, agarró este... agarró manzana y...y lo iba a comer” (Mex 209)

“But after he came, he got a...got an apple and...and was going to eat it”

51) Movement: “La ranita fue a buscarlos.” (Mex 102)
“The frog went to find them”

52) Movement: “Y fue a pescarla” (Mex 208)
“He went to catch it”

This supports Myhill's work because it highlights the relationship between proclisis and the level of grammaticalization. These results also support the idea of construction frequency. Because both *ir* and *estar* appear more frequently as auxiliary verbs in the [finite+nonfinite verb] construction, it means that they have become increasingly fused;

they appear as one unit. Therefore, these constructions with *ir* and *estar* mimic a fixed context in which the clitic appears before the finite verb.

In general, the study supports Myhill's (1988; 1989) observations as well as the findings of Torres Cacoullos (1999) concerning grammaticalization and construction frequency. The more grammaticalized the finite verb, the higher the chance of proclisis. This is reflected by the rates of proclisis in the following verbs from this study:

- Haber 92%
- Estar 88%
- Ir 78%
- Poder 75%

It is to be expected that *estar*, *haber*, *ir*, and *poder* have the highest rates of proclisis because of their highly grammaticalized nature. The verbs with the lowest rates of proclisis were:

- Tener 67%
- Querer 62%
- Venir 0%
- Empezar 0%

There were only three tokens of *tener* in the data set. Two tokens were proclitic while one was enclitic. However, this enclitic token was also in a coordinating clause. It is difficult to determine whether or not the verb itself is the reason why the clitic was found in enclisis, or if it was due to clause type. All three tokens from the data appear below:

53) “La tuve que bañar.” (Mont 501)
 “She had to bathe.”

53) “Lo tengo que inventar” (Mex 318)
 “Do I have to make up [a story]?”

54) “Tuvo que revisarlo.” (Mex 327)

“I had to go back.”

Note that these tokens convey a meaning of obligation. Recall that obligation, as seen in *deber*, does not favor proclisis. Myhill (1989) and Requena (2014 presentation) show that *tener* overwhelmingly favors enclisis, unlike what was found in this data. Myhill (1989) found that only seven out of the forty-six tokens of *tener* (15%) were in proclitic position, and Requena found that *tener* only favored proclisis 26%. There are not enough tokens from this data to say whether or not one would have seen the same pattern found by Requena (2014 presentation) and Myhill (1989). The rate of enclisis in this study for *tener* was 33%. This is comparable to Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos (2014: 12) at 30%. However, the results of *tener* are inconclusive in this data set, and would need to be investigated further.

While *querer* favors proclisis, it still has a higher rate of enclisis compared to *estar*, *ir*, *haber*, as well as *invitar*. Myhill (1989), as mentioned in the results section, discusses the semantic difference between the conative and the root-meaning of ‘want’. This was not readily seen in the data from this study. However, recall that an epistemic verb like *querer*, which favors proclisis, will still allow enclisis when the subject is higher on the animacy scale than the clitic (Myhill 1989). Perhaps the higher rate of inanimate clitics with *querer* has affected the rate of proclisis from this data set. The rate of enclisis of *querer* does match closely with Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos (38% and 37%) who suggest that the low rate of proclisis is due to decreased unithood.

Examples of the rest of the finite verbs that had appeared in the study and their relation to grammaticalization and construction frequency appear below.

Haber

The rate of proclisis in this study for *haber* was 92%. This is expected because *haber* functions as an auxiliary, thus it has a highly grammaticalized form. Previous research has found that rate of proclisis with *haber* ranges from 80-100% (Davies 1995; Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos 2014).

Poder

As found in previous research, *poder* highly favors proclisis in this study at 75%. This is very high compared to the rate of proclisis according to Myhill (1989) who found the rate of proclisis for *poder* as 19%. The results from this study are comparable to Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos (2014) at 74% and also Requena (unpublished m.s.: 19) at 87%. However, this still leaves the low rate of proclisis found by Myhill (1989) unexplained. Myhill (1989) discussed how the difference in meaning between possibility and ability could have an effect on the placement of the clitic. For instance, a sentence in example (55) illustrates possibility, while example (56) illustrates ability:

55) "...un ataque LE puede venir a un viejo de mi edad..." (Myhill 1989:232)
 "It's possible for an old man like me to have an attack"

56) "...y ni siqueira sé cómo pude subirME al caballo..." (Myhill 1989: 232)
 "...and I don't even know how I managed to get on the horse..."

He points out that there appears to be a difference between its grammaticalized (possibility) and non-grammaticalized (ability) forms. This distinction was found in the data:

57) Possibility: "**Los puedes** abrazar" (Mont 403)
 "You can (it is possible) hug them"

58) Ability: "Puedo **leerlos**" (Mex 326)

“I can (am able to) read them”

- 59) Ability: “...que no **puedo pronunciarlas** en el ingles” (Mont 203)
 “...that I can not (am not able to) pronounce them in English”

In the current study, 26 out of the 28 tokens of *poder* conveyed possibility. Two tokens of *poder* as shown in examples (55) and (56) clearly conveyed a meaning of ability. In contrast, Myhill (1989) had more tokens of *poder* that conveyed ability compared to possibility that could explain the low rate of proclisis of *poder* in his study compared to the current one. The vast difference between Myhill’s observations and the rates of proclisis in this study could also be explained by the difference between written and spoken registers. Myhill (1989) did not use spoken data in his analysis. The author only used written texts in order to find instances of variable clitic placement. As seen in previous research (Davies 1995; Torres Cacoullos 1999) there is a difference between written and spoken mediums and variable clitic placement. Davies (1995), for example, found that *poder* favored proclisis 22% in written form compared to 60% in spoken form (Davies 1995: 374). Perhaps this is the reason why Myhill (1989) had such low rates of proclisis for *poder* as compared to this study and others (Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos 2014; Requena unpublished m.s.).

Invitar and Hacer

These verbs had no tokens of enclisis, potentially due to their auxiliary-like functions. In the case of *hacer*, both tokens conveyed the causative meaning rather than ‘to do something’:

- 60) “Lo hizo enojar” (Mont 405)
 “It made him mad”

- 61) “Lo hizo reir” (Mex 341)
 “He made him laugh”

Both of these tokens convey the meaning of the agent causing a reaction from the direct object. This demonstrates *hacer* functioning as a grammatical marker rather than conveying the actual action of ‘to do’. *Invitar* also appears to convey a permissive, or modal meaning such as ‘may’ or ‘can’, by functioning as an auxiliary. All fourteen tokens of *invitar* appeared in the following manner:

- 62) “Jose lo invita a jugar...” (Mex 306)
 “Jose invited (allowed) him to play...”

This demonstrates that there is a permissive function to *invitar* that makes it function more like an auxiliary than a transitive verb.

Venir and Empezar

In this data, *empezar* highly favors enclisis. There were no tokens of proclisis with this verb. In fact, even when the clitic with the finite verb *empezar* appeared with factors that would normally favor proclisis, the clitic still appeared in enclisis. Myhill observed that proclisis with the finite verb *empezar* occurred only 9% (Myhill 1989: 230). The low token count of *empezar* as a finite verb does not allow for generalization. However, *empezar* does illustrate the following: the type of finite verb outweighs clitic animacy. That is, finite verbs that highly favor proclisis will have proclisis even if the clitic is inanimate. Verbs that disfavor proclisis will favor enclisis even with animate clitics. This can be seen with *estar* and *empezar*:

- 63) “Y lo ‘tabamos jugando” (Mont 204)
 “And we were playing with it”

- 64) “Y, este, el osito Pooh empezó a buscarlos para...” (Mex 201)
 “And, then, the little bear Pooh began to find them so that...”

Proclisis in (63) is most likely because of the use of *estar* as an auxiliary verb, while in the second example, even though the clitic referent is animate, we find enclisis. This suggests that *empezar* still blocks proclisis, overriding other factors. There was only one token of *venir* and it appeared in enclisis. The low token count makes does not allow for generalization outside of this study.

5.3.2 Clause type. Not found in other research, the results show that coordinating clauses highly favor enclisis compared to main and subordinating clauses. Note that there were only 29 coordinating clauses compared to 111 tokens of non-coordinating (both main and subordinate) clauses. Yet, the rate of enclisis for non-coordinating clauses was 19% compared to 45% for coordinating clauses. Same-reference coordinating clauses have a higher chance of being enclitic (64%) compared to switch-reference coordinating clauses (27%). Example (65) is a clause with the same reference, while (66) is a clause with a switch reference.

65) “...entonces el lobo sopló y sopló y no podía tumbarla (Mex 322)

“...then the wolf blew and blew and could not take it down.”

66) “Él ya se va, y el perro lo va persiguiendo.” (Mont 104)

“He is going, and the dog is following after him.”

Myhill (1989) talks about the notion of topicality and its relation to proclisis. He states that more topical information will be pushed into a main clause (hence proclisis) in order to make it more prominent. Here, it appears that a non-coordinating or switch-reference clause highlights a more topical noun. A coordinating clause with the same subject referent does not need to make the argument topical as it is already accessible; hence, the higher rate of enclisis.

Related to this, Hapselmath (2004) discusses the idea of a conceptual unit in clause coordination. This is when the conjuncts are viewed as related to each other rather than being separate entities. Along this line, there is a distinction between tight and loose coordination (Hapselmath 2004: 9). Typically, tight coordination is used with things that are closely associated to one another. Thus, in example (65) the subject of the first clause as the wolf (*lobo*) is the subject of the verb (*podía*) in the coordinating clause. This would be an example of tight coordination linking because the clauses are related to each other. In example (66), however, the two conjuncts are not related to each other; the subject of the first clause i.e. the boy is not the subject of the coordinating clause. This would be an example of loose coordination because the conjuncts are not necessarily related to one another.

There has been some evidence that subject pronoun expression in Spanish is affected by this distinction between tight and loose coordination. Travis and Torres Cacoullos (to appear-a) for example, find that there is a lower rate of subject expression in a coordinating clause, especially in a same reference context.

It has been established that (65) is in a same-reference coordinating clause due to the subject continuity between the ‘wolf’ and the verb in the coordinating clause, *poder*. While the current study looked specifically at direct object clitics, there does appear to be a link between subject pronoun expression and clitic placement in same- and switch-reference coordinating clauses. It appears that both subject pronoun expression in these clauses, as well as clitic placement, rely on factors such as topicality and tight coordination linking. It is theorized that due to the close linking between the conjoined clauses, one would not want to break this continuation because it is viewed as one unit.

This, in turn, makes the argument of the coordinating clause less topical, or more accessible, hence a higher rate of enclisis. More research, however, is needed to fully see an interaction between topicality and clause coordination.

5.3.3 Animacy and topicality. The distribution of clitic animacy and clitic placement suggests that there is a higher proportion of enclisis by inanimate clitics. Recall that in the data, inanimate clitics favored enclisis 38% compared to 20% by animate clitics. This would support the results of Myhill (1989) as well as Davies (1995). However, it would not support the findings of other research (Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos 2014; Gudmestad 2006; Peace 2013). For example, Peace (2013) found a strong preference for proclisis (90%) by inanimate clitics among the bilingual group (Peace 2013: 146).

More surprising is that topicality and persistence are not significant predictors in this study. There was also no significant interaction between animacy and topicality, as Schwenter and Torres Cacoullos (2014) had found. The high number of non-coordinating (main and subordinate) clauses and the overall preference for proclisis could be a reason why topicality in terms of anaphoric and cataphoric mention did not turn out significant in the analysis for the current study.

5.4 Limitations of the Study

Variable clitic placement is an infrequent feature in Spanish morphosyntax. As such, there was a small amount of tokens collected from the data that could be analyzed. More data is needed in order to fully see the effect clitic animacy has on clitic placement. Additionally, more data would be needed in order to be able to make the observations found with *hacer*, *empezar*, and *tener* more concrete.

That being said, the data that was collected helped support previous research on the subject as well as add to the literature on variable clitic placement by means of the effects of clause type as well as the similarity between bilingual and monolingual children.

5.5 Future Research

There are many avenues for future research based on this study. One avenue is to look further into the language contact aspect of the study. It would be interesting to investigate L2 learners of Spanish, as well as bilingual children from other dialects of Spanish in order to compare those results with the results found in this study. Another area to research based on this thesis is to look at the linguistic features that affected variable clitic placement. The small amount of tokens from this study make it essential to find more data in order to fully see the effect of clitic animacy on variable clitic placement. Additionally, it would also be intriguing to do further research on a possible interaction between topicality and coordination in order to better understand the effects on variable clitic placement.

5.6 Conclusion

The hypothesis in this study is supported by the results: language contact does not have an effect on variable clitic placement. Instead, it is the internal variability that accounts for the position of the clitic in the [finite+nonfinite verb] construction.

There are some implications that arise from these results. First, the results of the thesis support the comments on contact-induced change by Poplack and Levey (2010). This is shown in the discrepancy between the findings here, and the findings of Pérez-Leroux et al. (2011) who also looked at the same construction with bilingual children. This discrepancy illustrates how methodology does affect whether or not one finds

evidence of contact-effects. Secondly, variable proclisis and enclisis is affected by internal linguistic features such as verb lexeme, particularly in the verbs: *estar*, *ir*, *haber*, and *poder*. Clitic placement is also affected by clause type due to continuity between referents, which renders reference more accessible.

While proclisis is highly favored, it still has not become a fixed context. Rather, the variability seen is due to semantic and syntactic distinctions that either favor or disfavor proclisis. These semantic distinctions in the [finite+nonfinite verb+clitic] construction retain the variability among both monolingual and bilingual Spanish-speaking children.

6. References

- Bouzouita, M. (2008). *At the syntax pragmatics interface: clitics in the history of Spanish*.
- Bybee, J. L., Perkins, R. D., & Pagliuca, W. (1994). *The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bybee, J. L., & Thompson, S. A. (1997). Three frequency effects in syntax. *Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: General Session and Parasession on Pragmatics and Grammatical Structure*, 373-388.
- Bybee, J. L. (2006). From Usage to Grammar: The Mind's Response to Repetition. *Language*. doi:10.1353/lan.2006.0186
- Cuza, A. (2012). Crosslinguistic influence at the syntax proper: Interrogative subject-verb inversion in heritage Spanish. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 17(1), 71-96.
- Croft, W., & Cruse, D. A. (2004). *Cognitive linguistics*. Cambridge, U.K: Cambridge University Press.
- Darwich, B. (2007). Los clíticos lo, la, los y las en situación de contacto: datos sobre el español en Nueva York. *LL Journal*.

Davies, M. (1995). Analyzing Syntactic Variation with Computer-Based Corpora: The Case of Modern Spanish Clitic Climbing. *Hispania* , 370-380.

Eisenclas, S. (2003). Clitics in Child Spanish. *First Language* , 193-211.

Gudmestad, A. (2006). Clitic Climbing in Caracas Spanish: A sociolinguistic study of *ir* and *querer*. *IULC Working Papers Online 06-03*.

González López, V. (2013). Asturian Identity Reflected in Pronoun Use: Enclisis and Proclisis Patterns in Asturian Spanish. *Selected Proceedings of the 6th Workshop on Spanish Sociolinguistics* , 70-86.

Gutiérrez, M. (2008). Restringiendo la subida de clíticos: reflexividad, modalidad verbal y contacto lingüístico en el español de Houston. *Hispanic Research Journal* , 299-313.

Hapselmath, M. (2004). Coordinating constructions: An overview. In *Coordinating Constructions (Typological Studies in Language)* (pp. 3-39). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Heine, B., & Kuteva, T. (2005). *Language contact and grammatical change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Johnson (2014) Rbrul (software package).

Larrañaga, P, & Guijaro-Fuentes,P. (2011). Clitics in L1 bilingual acquisition. *First Language* , 151-175.

Montrul, S. (2004). Subject and object expression in Spanish heritage speakers: A case of morphosyntactic convergence. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* , 125-142.

Myers-Scotton, C. (2002). *Contact linguistics: Bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Myhill, J. (1988). The Grammaticalization of Auxiliaries: Spanish Clitic Climbing. *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkley Linguistics Society* , 352-363.

Myhill, J. (1989). Variation of Spanish Clitic Climbing. *Synchronic and Diachronic Approaches to Linguistic Variation and Change* , 227-250.

Otheguy, R., & Shin, N. (2009). Shifting Sensitivity to Continuity of Reference: Subject Pronoun Use in Spanish in New York City. In *Español en Estados Unidos y otros contextos de contexto sociolingüística, ideología y pedagogía* (pp. 111-136). Frankfurt/Madrid.

Otheguy, R. & Zentella, A. (2012). *Spanish in New York: Language Contact, Dialectal Leveling, and Structural Continuity*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Ordóñez, F. (2012). Clitics in Spanish. The handbook of Hispanic linguistics, ed. by José Ignacio Hualde, Antxon Olarrea, and Erin O'Rourke, 423-451. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Peace, M. (2013). ¿Lo Puedo Subir or Puedo Subirlo? *International Journal Lasso* , 131-160.
- Pérez-Leroux, A., Cuza, A., & Thomas, D. (2011). Clitic placement in Spanish-English bilingual children. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* , 221-232.
- Poplack, S., & Levey, S. (2010). Contact-induced grammatical change; A cautionary tale. *Language and space: an international handbook of linguistic variation* , 391-418.
- Pueyo, F. (1992). El sistema de clíticos en niños bilingües de Los Angeles, Transferencia lingüística y motivación social. *Bilingüismo y adquisición del español, estudios en España y EE UU* , 255-273.
- Requena, P. (2014). Direct Object Clitic Placement in Mexican Child Spanish. Unpublished Manuscript.
- Requena, P. (2014). L1 Acquisition of Constraints on Spanish Variable Clitic Placement. [Powerpoint Slides].
- Requena, P. (2014). A Construction Grammar Perspective of Spanish Variable Clitic Placement. [PowerPoint Slides].
- Schwenter, S. & Torres Cacoullos, R. (2014). Competing Constraints on the Variable Placement of Direct Object Clitics in Mexico City Spanish. *Spanish Journal of Applied Linguistics* , NA.
- Shin, Naomi Lapidus. (in prep) Shin's corpus of child Spanish.
- Shin, Naomi Lapidus. (2014). Grammatical complexification in Spanish in New York: 3sg pronoun expression and verbal ambiguity. *Language Variation and Change* 26(3):303-330.
- Shin, N., & Montes-Alcalá, C. (2014). El uso contextual del pronombre sujeto como factor predictivo de la influencia del inglés en el español de Nueva York. *Sociolinguistic Studies* , 8(1), 85-110.
- Silva-Corvalán, C. (1994). *Language Contact and Change: Spanish in Los Angeles*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Spaulding, R. (1927). Puedo Hacerlo versus lo Puedo Hacer and Similar Cases. *Hispania*, 343-348.

Torres Cacoullous, Rena and Catherine E. Travis. To Appear-a. Foundations for the study of subject pronoun expression in Spanish in contact with English: Assessing interlinguistic (dis)similarity via intralinguistic variability. In Ana M. Carvalho, Rafael Orozco and Naomi Lapidus Shin (eds), *Subject pronoun expression in Spanish: A cross-dialectal perspective*. Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.

Torres Cacoullous, R. & Travis, C. (2011). Testing convergence via code-switching: priming and the structure of variable subject expression. *International Journal of Bilingualism* , 241-267.

Torres Cacoullous, R. (1999). Construction frequency and reductive change: Diachronic and register variation in Spanish clitic climbing. *Language Variation and Change* , 143-170.

Zwicky, A. (1985). Clitics and Particles. *Language* , 283-305.