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Cross-linguistic influence in BFLA

- Interaction between two language systems
- Conditions for this phenomenon:
  - interface
  - overlap
  - language dominance
  - input
The **routine processing** of overt pronominal subjects as co-referential with a subject antecedent in **English** increases the likelihood that overt pronouns will be **processed in the same way in Italian** in what might be considered as **an instance of cross-linguistic priming**.

Serratrice (2007: 235)
Why Dislocation constructions?

- Interface phenomenon
- Partial overlap across French and English
- Functionally important discourse function
Dislocations and interface

(1) Le lion, il court. 
(2) Il court, le lion. 
The lion, it/he is running. It/he is running, the lion.

Syntactically:
- definite Noun Phrase
- resumptive pronoun within the sentence

Pragmatically:
- topic-announcing

-> Brand-new referents may not occur in them.

(Lambrecht 1994: 188)
Pragmatic functions for LDs

- Establish a referent
  (3) *Le hat*, où est *le hat*? (Anne 2;05.04)

- Maintain a referent
  (4) *Bébé, Il* pleure (Anne 2;06.23)

- Switch/re-establish a referent
  (5) *The soup*, mix *it* now. (Anne 2;08.25)
Pragmatic functions for LDs

- Create a topical contrast
  
  (6) *That one*, Thomas do it (Anne 2;07.24)

- Make an emphasis on a referent
  
  (7) *You*, what *you* doing? (Anne 2;06.23)

- Add information about a referent
  
  (8) *Le hat, (i)*l est chaud (Anne 2;05.04)
Pragmatic functions for RDs

- In French: same pragmatic functions as for LDs except creating a topical contrast.

- Different in English:
  
  - Afterthought function
    
    (9) I was with Mummy and 0 come here, Father Christmas
    
    (Anne 2;08.25)

  - Pointer role
    
    (10) I like it, that (Anne 2;08.25)

(Notley et al 2007)
Frequency of dislocations

- Dislocations account for:
  - 25% of data in spoken French
    (De Cat 2007)
  - only 1% in spoken English
    (Snider and Zaenen 2006)
Research question

- Examine to what extent the regular use of two languages may lead to systematic cross-linguistic influence from French to English in the use of dislocation.

- Investigate the role of input the bilingual’s production of dislocation.
Data: the child

- Longitudinal corpus: Anne (2;4.0-2;8.24)
  - French-English bilingual
  - London
  - Exposure to English 0.65 (Krott et al. 2011)
  - 1hr/month in French and in English
  - First 6 months of recordings
Data: the child

Anne: dominant in English

- Number of French utterances
  - First sample: 74/143 French utterances
  - 6th sample: 43/223
  - Anne’s mlu in French and English sessions

![Chart](chart.png)
Anne’s use of her languages

- French sessions
- English sessions
Data: analysed sample

Anne’s data
- French sessions: 920 utterances
- English sessions: 799 utterances

Mother’s data
- Sample* of 200 utterances

Nanny’s data
- Sample* of 200 utterances

*Sample: first 2 files and last 2 files were separately merged. 100 utterances per merged file were randomly sample with replacement using the R software (http://www.R-project.org)
Coding scheme based on De Cat (2002)

Analysed and coded all utterances containing a topic but excluded verbless utterances and direct repetition

- Direction of dislocation (i.e. left or right)
- Dislocated element
  - Syntactic category (i.e. NP, pronoun...)
  - Old vs. new status
  - Pragmatic function (i.e. contrast, switch referent...)
- Resumptive element
  - Syntactic category (i.e. clitic, Ø ...)
  - Its syntactic role (subject, object ...)
## Results: Dislocations in the Data

Anne produced 66 dislocations in 1719 sentences containing a topic (3.84%)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anne's dis</th>
<th>Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English sessions</td>
<td>3.62%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French sessions</td>
<td>4.02%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anne</th>
<th>French dis</th>
<th>English dis</th>
<th>Mixed dis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English sessions</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French sessions</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>2.62%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anne’s production of dislocations in the French vs. the English session

- Percentage of Anne’s production of dislocation in French vs. English session

![Bar chart showing the percentage of Anne’s production of dislocations in French vs. English sessions. The x-axis represents the time points (2;04.00, 2;05.04, 2;06.01, 2;06.23, 2;07.24, 2;08.25), and the y-axis represents the percentage. The chart compares the Eng session (light blue bars) and the Fra session (dark blue bars).]
Anne’s and her mother’s total production of dislocations across languages

- Anne’s production of LDs and RDs (%)

- Mother’s production of LDs and RDs (%)

![Bar chart showing Anne’s and her mother’s production of LDs and RDs across languages.](chart)
Anne’s and her mother’s total production of dislocations

Anne’s total production of LDs and RDs (%)

Mother’s production of LDs and RDs (%)

[Bar charts showing Anne’s and her mother’s production of LDs and RDs]
General trend in Anne’s dislocations

- Cross-linguistic influence from French to English for topichood for a whole construction
- Higher production of dislocation in French contexts
- Similar proportion of LDs and RDs in output and input
## Pragmatic functions in LDs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>contrast</th>
<th>establish</th>
<th>maintain</th>
<th>switch</th>
<th>pointer</th>
<th>explain</th>
<th>emphasis</th>
<th>clarify</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,1</td>
<td>55,6</td>
<td>22,2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>5,3</td>
<td>31,6</td>
<td>5,3</td>
<td>5,3</td>
<td>10,5</td>
<td>5,3</td>
<td>36,8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12,5</td>
<td>37,5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>2,8</td>
<td>22,2</td>
<td>2,8</td>
<td>8,3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11,1</td>
<td>27,8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>21,2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,1</td>
<td>9,1</td>
<td>15,2</td>
<td>9,1</td>
<td>33,3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*frequency %
# Pragmatic functions in RDs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>contrast</th>
<th>establish</th>
<th>maintain</th>
<th>switch</th>
<th>pointer</th>
<th>explain</th>
<th>emphasis</th>
<th>clarify</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21,05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,5</td>
<td>5,3</td>
<td>21,05</td>
<td>42,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20,0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14,3</td>
<td>3,6</td>
<td>17,8</td>
<td>39,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,1</td>
<td>40,9</td>
<td>9,1</td>
<td>18,2</td>
<td>9,1</td>
<td>13,6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*frequency %
General trend for pragmatics

- Mother and Child use LDs in **similar pragmatic** context with the **exception** of **topical contrast**
  - Few productions in French
  - In English, topical contrast marked with SV

- Similar for RDs with the **exception** of the **afterthought function** (clarifying the referent)
  - Not appropriately encoding the referent OR
  - Influence from English
Nature of dislocated element in LDs
Nature of dislocated element in RDs

![Bar chart showing the nature of dislocated elements in RDs with categories such as 1st Pro, 2nd Pro, Partitif, Indef, Loc, Dem, Adv, Name, DP, Adj, Bare Noun. The chart compares the frequencies of Anne and Mother for each category.](image-url)
General trend in resumptive Elt

Left-dislocation:
- Anne: locative, DP, demonstrative
  (11) at my house, you eat
- Mother: demonstrative, DP
  (12) Ca, les craies, ça va pas là-dedans

Right-dislocation:
- Anne: DP, demonstrative
  (13) Il est où, my dog?
- Mother: DP, demonstrative, proper name
  (14) Il est là, Thomas.
Input vs. output

- High number of similarities:
  - Syntactic level (nb of LDs and RDs, nature of dislocated element)
  - Pragmatic level

- Few differences can be explained by pragmatic differences between French and English in the use of dislocation.
Conclusion

- Cross-linguistic influence occur for topichood at the level of a whole construction and not only at the level of individual referential expressions (e.g. pronouns for topic shift) (Serratrice et al. 2011).

- Further evidence on strong relationship between input and output.
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