



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Pronoun preference of children in a language without typical third-person pronouns

Citation for published version:

Iraola Azpiroz, M, Santesteban, M, Sorace, A & Ezeizabarrena, M-J 2017, 'Pronoun preference of children in a language without typical third-person pronouns', *First Language*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 168-185.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0142723716679799>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1177/0142723716679799](https://doi.org/10.1177/0142723716679799)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

First Language

Publisher Rights Statement:

The final version of this paper has been published in *First Language*, 37/2, November/2016 by SAGE Publications Ltd, All rights reserved. © Maialen Iraola Azpiroz, Mikel Santesteban, Antonella Sorace, Maria-José Ezeizabarrena. 2016. It is available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0142723716679799>

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.





Pronoun preferences of children in a language without typical third-person pronouns

Journal:	<i>First Language</i>
Manuscript ID	FLA-16-0004.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Manuscript
Keywords:	Null pronoun, overt anaphoric form, coreference, topic continuity, topic shift
Abstract:	<p>This study presents comprehension data from 6–7 and 8–10-year-old children as well as adults on the acceptability of null vs. overt anaphoric forms (the demonstrative <i>hura</i> ‘that’ and the quasipronoun <i>bera</i> ‘(s)he (him-/herself)’ in Basque, a language without true third-person pronouns. In an acceptability judgement task, a developmental change occurred in the preference for <i>hura</i> (Experiment 1): 6–7-year-olds showed a preference for the null pronoun in both topic-shift and topic-continuity contexts, while 8–10-year-olds, like adults, preferred <i>hura</i> in topic-shift contexts and null pronouns in topic-continuity contexts. However, no developmental shift was observed in the preference for <i>bera</i> (Experiment 2): unlike adults, neither 6–7- nor 8–10-year-old children selected <i>bera</i> over null pronouns in topic-shift contexts. They instead showed a general preference for null pronouns, an indication of tolerance for ambiguity – a pattern which differs from prior studies in other null-subject languages where ambiguous pronouns declined with age. The results reveal a different developmental pattern for <i>hura</i> and <i>bera</i>, which may be explained by the more rigid (syntactic) constraints operating on <i>hura</i> in comparison to <i>bera</i> in antecedent choice.</p>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

For Peer Review

Pronoun preferences of children in a language without typical third-person pronouns

Corresponding author:

Maialen Iraola Azpiroz, The University of Kaiserslautern, Erwin Schrödinger Straße 57,
67633 Kaiserslautern, Germany.

E-mail: maialeniraola@yahoo.es

Maialen Iraola Azpiroz^{1,2}, Mikel Santesteban², Antonella Sorace³
and Maria-José Ezeizabarrena²

¹ Faculty of Social Sciences, The University of Kaiserslautern, Germany

² Department of Linguistics and Basque Studies, University of the Basque Country
(UPV/EHU), Spain

³ School of Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences, The University of Edinburgh,
UK

Abstract

This study presents comprehension data from 6–7 and 8–10-year-old children as well as adults on the acceptability of null vs. overt anaphoric forms (the demonstrative *hura* ‘that’ and the quasipronoun *bera* ‘(s)he (him-/herself)’ in Basque, a language without true third-person pronouns. In an acceptability judgement task, a developmental change occurred in the preference for *hura* (Experiment 1): 6–7-year-olds showed a preference for the null pronoun in both topic-shift and topic-continuity contexts, while 8–10-year-olds, like adults, preferred *hura* in topic-shift contexts and null pronouns in topic-continuity contexts. However, no developmental shift was observed in the preference for *bera* (Experiment 2): unlike adults, neither 6–7- nor 8–10-year-old children selected *bera* over null pronouns in topic-shift contexts. They instead showed a general preference for null pronouns, an indication of tolerance for ambiguity – a pattern which differs from prior studies in other null-subject languages where ambiguous pronouns declined with age. The results reveal a different developmental pattern for *hura* and *bera*, which may be explained by the more rigid (syntactic) constraints operating on *hura* in comparison to *bera* in antecedent choice.

Keywords

Null pronoun, overt anaphoric form, coreference, topic continuity and topic shift

Introduction

Pronouns are reference-tracking devices that allow speakers to refer back to already introduced referents (i.e. anaphora) in the discourse or to anticipate referents that will be mentioned later on (i.e. cataphora). The so-called pronominal anaphora is a common linguistic device to avoid repetition of the same linguistic expressions (nominal categories, phrases, etc.). When using third-person pronouns, the speaker signals to the interlocutor mutual familiarity with their referents, since pronouns usually tend to refer to entities that have been previously mentioned in the discourse. Thus, in an ongoing conversation, for effective communication between two interlocutors to happen, the listener must be able to identify the referent of a pronoun, i.e. the antecedent. The identification of the antecedent may be difficult in certain contexts because pronouns are not categorical in interpretation—they do not convey enough referential information on their own but rather their interpretation is conditioned by both linguistic and extra-linguistic information. For this reason, reference assignment presents a challenge to models of natural language processing and also to the development of pronoun-antecedent mappings (O’Grady, 1997).

Early monolingual language acquisition research devoted a great deal of attention to children’s mastery of pronouns, e.g. whether children are capable of coordinating knowledge from different domains, since pronoun reference is subject not only to syntactic

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 but also to contextual constraints. In this regard, dependencies introduced by reflexive
10 pronouns have been reported to be mastered at an earlier stage (e.g. *Mary_i likes herself_{i/*j}*)
11 than those introduced by non-reflexive pronouns (*Mary_i likes her_{j/*i}*, see Guasti, 2002 for a
12 review), despite the latter being more frequent in child speech than the former (O'Grady,
13 2005). These differences have been explained in terms of the different principles governing
14 their interpretation; whereas a syntactic dependency is established for the interpretation of
15 reflexives, such a requirement does not hold for non-reflexive pronouns, where coreference
16 with an extrasentential referent involves accessing information beyond syntax (i.e.
17 discourse). Thus, syntactic dependencies relying on the computational language system are
18 more easily acquired than discourse dependencies, and they are less costly in terms of
19 processing, since they are immediately interpretable without requiring pragmatic
20 knowledge (O'Grady, 2005). Syntactic dependencies may also be dependent on individual
21 differences in cognitive control (Sorace, 2011).
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 More recently, research on the anaphoric dependencies of null-subject languages
41 with bilingual children has also provided evidence for the validity of the “syntax-before-
42 discourse” hypothesis by testing antecedent preferences for null and overt pronouns. In
43 Italian, the overt pronoun, which typically marks a change of referent, is specified for the
44 interpretable feature [+topic shift, +TS] (Sorace, 2000), whereas the null subject usually
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 signals topic continuity [-topic shift, -TS]. Studies that primarily focused on production
11 data from simultaneous bilingual children have reported a pragmatic deviance consisting of
12 an asymmetric overextension of overt pronouns (the use of an overt pronoun instead of a
13 null pronoun in [-TS] contexts, e.g.: *Mentre Gianni_i mangia lui_{?i} parla al telefono*. ‘While
14 Gianni eats he talks on the phone’, Sorace & Serratrice, 2009), but not in the other
15 direction, i.e. the use of null pronouns in overt pronoun environments (among others,
16 Serratrice, Sorace, & Paoli, 2004; Hacothen & Schaeffer, 2007). These findings led to the
17 conclusion that bilingual children acquire syntactic conditions for licensing null subjects at
18 an earlier stage than discourse-pragmatic constraints on pronoun realisation. However,
19 studies on comprehension, particularly in bilingual but also monolingual children, have
20 shown a bidirectional non-adult-like extension of the scope of both overt and null
21 pronouns, with the overextension of the null pronoun occurring to a lesser extent (e.g.
22 introduction of a new referent via a null pronoun instead of an overt pronoun in [+TS]
23 contexts, e.g.: *Perché Maria_i é uscita? ___{?j} ha deciso di fare una passeggiata*. ‘Why did
24 Maria leave? She decided to go for a walk’; Sorace, 2000).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Both monolingual and bilingual children acquiring a null-subject language have
46 been reported to go through a protracted stage in which they exhibit differential sensitivity
47 to the discourse conditions affecting the selection of appropriate pronominal forms (Shin &
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Cairns, 2012 for Spanish; Sorace, Serratrice, Filiaci, & Baldo, 2009 for Italian). However,
10 the pragmatically appropriate use of pronouns in different conditions usually develops over
11 time, with older children (8–10) resembling adult preferences of interpreting null pronouns
12 as coreferent with topical antecedents and overt pronouns as referring to non-topical
13 antecedents. Note, nevertheless, that in some studies younger children and not older ones
14 reproduce adults' pronoun interpretations, e.g. the preference of Greek-speaking 6–7-year-
15 old children for a topical antecedent for null pronouns does not remain stable with
16 increasing age, resulting in a U-shaped development (Papadopoulou, Peristeri, Plemenou,
17 Marinis, & Tsimpli, 2015). Thus, despite considerable research on the interpretation
18 preferences of pronouns in monolingual and bilingual development, there are still a number
19 of open questions regarding the felicitous use of pronominal forms in different discourse
20 contexts. Do school-age children lack syntactic knowledge, discourse knowledge, or both
21 kinds of knowledge, or is it rather the real-time use and updating of the referential
22 mappings in context which results in difficulties (see Sorace, 2011 for a discussion)?
23 Alternatively, is the development of the listener's perspective a crucial requirement for
24 adequate referential choice (Hendricks, Koster, & Hoecks, 2014; Shin & Cairns, 2012)?
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 In the current study, we examine the different antecedent biases of null and overt
48 pronouns and the developmental trajectory of children as they acquire the discourse
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 features of null and overt anaphoric subjects by comparing the performance of L1 Basque
10 6–7-year-olds with that of an older group of children aged 8–10; a control group of adults
11 was used as a baseline to observe the children’s developmental pattern towards the target
12 language. The present study aims to investigate the developmental stages in the acquisition
13 of the discourse features linked to null and overt pronouns in Basque, a null-subject
14 language without “true” third-person pronouns in which two overt forms, the demonstrative
15 *hura* ‘that’ and the so-called quasipronoun *bera* ‘(s)he (him-/herself)’ fulfil the anaphoric
16 functions of personal pronouns in other languages. To that end, we use an acceptability
17 judgement task based on short animations.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Anaphora resolution in languages with two pronominal 32 forms 33 34

35
36 The literature referred to in the previous section has mainly concentrated on the sensitivity
37 of null-subject language speakers towards the discourse features encoded in null and overt
38 pronominal subjects. However, in certain non-null subject languages, speakers must
39 become familiar with the distribution of two overt pronominal forms in anaphoric use: a
40 personal pronoun and a demonstrative. The pragmatic functions of personal pronouns and
41 demonstratives are closely related because they are used to organise the information flow in
42 the discourse by keeping track of previously mentioned referents. However, in a non-null
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 subject language such as German, these two pronominal forms display distinct referential
10 properties. Whereas in (1) the personal pronoun *er* is interpreted as referring to the
11 preceding subject antecedent *der Anwalt*, the demonstrative *der* is coreferent with the
12 object antecedent, *Klienten*.
13
14
15
16
17

18
19
20
21 (1) Der Anwalt_i sprach mit einem Klienten_j. Da er_i/der_j nicht viel Zeit hatte,
22 vereinbarten sie ein weiteres Gespräch nächste Woche.
23
24

25
26 ‘The lawyer talked to a client. Since he did not have much time, they agreed to have
27 another meeting next week.’
28
29
30

31 Example from Diessel (1998, p. 96)

32
33 These different patterns of antecedent preferences have been confirmed experimentally in
34 adult native speakers by Wilson (2009) using eye tracking. Whereas the demonstrative
35 made straightforward reference to a postverbal antecedent, the personal pronoun showed
36 ambiguous referential properties. Such divergent behaviour between pronominals was also
37 visible in the time course analysis conducted by Ellert (2013), in which the bias of the
38 demonstrative emerged earlier than that of the personal pronoun (800 vs. 1400 ms after the
39 onset, respectively). The observation that distinct pronominal forms behave differently has
40 also been made in Finnish by Kaiser and Trueswell (2008). According to these authors,
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 referring expressions can exhibit varying degrees of sensitivity towards a number of
10 different constraints in their preferences for the most appropriate antecedent, as formulated
11 in the Form-Specific Multiple-Constraints approach. Studies on pronouns and
12 demonstratives in Estonian (Kaiser & Vihman, 2006), Dutch (Kaiser, 2011) and English
13 (Brown-Schmidt, Byron, & Tanenhaus, 2005) have also reported similar results.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 These differences in the antecedent biases of personal pronouns and demonstratives
22 in non-null subject languages, with the latter exhibiting more definite preferences, parallel
23 the distinct biases observed for null and overt pronouns in null-subject languages (Sorace,
24 2011). In contrast to the overwhelming preference of the null pronoun for a topical
25 antecedent (see, among others, Alonso-Ovalle et al., 2002 for Spanish, Carminati, 2002 for
26 Italian and Mayol, 2009 for Catalan), the overt pronoun's bias towards a non-topical
27 antecedent is not always uniform. The variability in the overt pronoun's resolution
28 preferences depends, for example, on the number of referents in the sentence (Carminati,
29 2002), the language under study (Italian vs. Spanish, see Filiaci, Sorace, & Carreiras,
30 2014), and whether the sentence shows anaphoric or cataphoric dependencies (Kraš, Sturt,
31 & Sorace, 2014).
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Development trajectories in the acquisition of the discourse features of pronouns

In recent years, a substantial number of studies have been conducted on monolingual and bilingual children's developmental steps towards sensitivity to distinct discourse conditions influencing the selection of pronominal forms. In an acceptability judgement task conducted by Sorace et al. (2009) in Italian, overt pronouns were significantly more often accepted in [-TS] contexts by 6–7-year-old Italian monolingual children and by both Italian-English and Italian-Spanish bilingual children, in contrast to both 8–10-year-old monolingual child and adult controls. To a lesser extent, some pragmatically inappropriate null subject pronouns were also selected in [+TS] contexts by bilinguals regardless of age and language combination and less often by 6–7-year-old monolingual children. Such data suggest that Italian monolingual (and also bilingual) children learn to avoid ambiguity (avoidance of null pronouns in [+TS] contexts) earlier than redundancy (avoidance of redundant overt pronouns in [-TS] contexts).

Redundancy persisting in the course of sensitivity towards discourse conditions on subject pronouns has also been attested in Spanish. Shin and Cairns (2012) obtained preferences for null and overt pronouns in short stories presented to Mexican-Spanish school-aged children. Their results indicated that while 6–7-year-old children did not show

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 a preference for overt over null pronouns in [+TS] contexts, children from age 8 onwards
10 resembled adults in showing a preference for overt pronouns in [+TS] contexts. However,
11 no preferences for the null (vs. overt) pronoun in [-TS] contexts were exhibited by any
12 child group, not even the group of 14–15-year-olds, who still accepted redundant overt
13 pronouns as referring back to topical antecedents.
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21 The acceptability status of overt (*hura* or *bera*) and null subject pronouns in [+TS]
22 and [-TS] contexts has also been tested in Basque (Iraola Azpiroz, Santesteban &
23 Ezeizabarrena, 2014, Iraola Azpiroz, 2015) by adapting Sorace et al.'s (2009) materials. In
24 contrast to prior studies in Italian and Spanish in which redundant pronouns posed more
25 difficulties for children than ambiguous pronouns, 6–7-year-old L1 Basque-speaking
26 children showed more tolerance for ambiguity by accepting infelicitous null pronouns (the
27 always grammatical option) in [+TS] contexts. This was more evident when the null
28 pronoun was contrasted (in a two-choice preference task) against *bera* than when it was
29 contrasted against *hura*. In addition, preferences for null vs. *bera* were not affected by
30 discourse context, whereas preferences for null vs. *hura* definitely were. This finding
31 suggests that the mastery of the discourse features of *hura* and *bera* might involve different
32 acquisition patterns.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Third-person reference in Basque

A characteristic which distinguishes Basque from other null-subject languages previously studied, and particularly important for the phenomenon under study, is that Basque lacks “true” third-person pronouns. The pronominal inventory only consists of the first and the second person, and therefore Basque has been regarded as a *two-person language* (Bhat, 2004). A null pronoun is the most frequent option in Basque for referring to a third party, except for focused contexts or when a new topic is introduced. In the latter cases, the distal demonstrative *hura* ‘that’ is employed in Basque. In addition to *hura*, another overt pronominal form, namely the quasipronoun *bera* ‘(s)he (him-/herself)’, acts as a third-person pronoun and competes with the pronominal uses of *hura* (de Rijk, 2008). According to de Rijk, the quasipronoun status of *bera* stems from presence of the root *ber-* (with the adjectival meaning of ‘the same’). Despite some overlap in their distributions, *hura* and *bera* show different behaviour in antecedent preferences in intrasentential anaphora contexts, as in (2).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 (2) a. Peruren_i amak bera_{i/?j} ikusi du.

11 'Peter_i's mother has seen him_{i/?j}.'

12
13
14 b. Peruren_i amak hura*_{i/j} ikusi du.

15
16 'Peter_i's mother has seen him*_{i/j}.'

17
18
19 Examples from Eguzkitza (1986, p. 31)

20
21
22
23
24 *Bera* usually refers to persons or objects previously mentioned in the discourse, like *Peter*
25 in (2a), despite not discarding the possibility of referring to a third party. In contrast, *hura*
26 cannot make reference to an intrasentential antecedent (Laka, 1996), hence it refers to an
27 extrasentential referent in (2b).
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Pronoun resolution preferences of children in Basque

35
36 In order to advance our understanding of the development of sensitivity to discourse
37 constraints on the use of pronouns in null-subject languages, the current study investigates
38 Basque children's preferences for null and overt subject pronouns in [+TS] and [-TS]
39 contexts, and compares them to those of adults. The participants' interpretations of two
40 overt forms (the demonstrative *hura* 'that' and the quasipronoun *bera* '(s)he (him-
41 /herself)') in contrast to the null pronoun are analysed in an acceptability judgement task
42 based on short animations originally designed by Sorace et al (2009). In contrast to the
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 crosslinguistic developmental pattern in the sensitivity of the discourse features attached to
11 pronouns whereby pragmatically inappropriate null pronouns decrease earlier than
12 infelicitous overt pronouns, previous data from Basque have suggested that children have
13 greater difficulty in avoiding ambiguous null pronouns (Iraola Azpiroz, Santesteban &
14 Ezeizabarrena, 2014, Iraola Azpiroz 2015). Thus, the developmental pattern described in
15 the literature thus far may not be generalisable to Basque. The current paper extends the
16 samples of previous studies on children's pronoun interpretation in Basque in two
17 directions: a) in the number of participants in the 6–7-year-old group (in order to test the
18 consistency of the pattern previously found) and b) in age groups, by including data from
19 an older cohort (8–10-year-olds).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 The aims of the current study are twofold. First, it investigates whether Basque-
34 speaking children's antecedent preferences for choices of the two overt anaphoric forms
35 *hura* and *bera* differ from those of null pronouns, consistent with the patterns observed
36 crosslinguistically. More importantly, this study seeks to reveal the developmental paths
37 towards adult-like preferences for null and overt pronouns between ages 6–7 and 8–10. The
38 first prediction is that *hura* and *bera* will be preferred in [+TS] contexts by older children
39 and adults in accordance with the preferences shown by native speakers of null-subject
40 languages, whereas null pronouns will be preferred in [-TS] contexts. Based on our
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 previous data from 6–7-year-olds, a second prediction states that Basque-speaking children
10 will have more difficulty in discarding null pronouns in contexts involving a switch of
11 reference than in discarding overt pronouns in contexts of reference maintenance. Finally,
12 in accordance with our prior results reporting different discourse context effects for *hura*
13 and *bera*, our third prediction is that children will reach adult standards at an earlier stage
14 for the distribution of the demonstrative *hura* than for that of the quasipronoun *bera*.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Experiment 1: Preferences for *hura* ‘that’ vs. null subject pronouns

25 Participants

26
27
28
29
30 A group of 38 children with Basque as L1 (age range 6;3-7;4, mean 6;8, 22 F and 16 M), of
31 whom 19 previously participated in the study by Iraola Azpiroz (2015: Experiment 5) and
32 Iraola Azpiroz, Santesteban & Ezeizabarrena (2014: Experiment 2; N=19), took part in the
33 experiment. In addition, a group of 26 older children (age range 8;5-10;4, mean 9;5, 10 F
34 and 16 M) participated. The control group consisted of fourteen Basque native adults (age
35 range 17;2-57;5, mean 28;3). The data of one child from the younger group of children was
36 excluded from the analysis because he responded incorrectly to more than 50% of the filler
37 items. This threshold was implemented to ensure that participants understood the aim of the
38 task. The children were being raised in Basque-speaking families living in Tolosa, a town
39 located in a Basque-dominant sociolinguistic environment in the Spanish province of
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Gipuzkoa within the Basque Autonomous Community with an average rate of 50-75% of Basque knowledge (Altuna, 2007). The adult participants came from the same town as the children. Both the children and the adults were native speakers of Basque and used Basque predominantly in their family and social environments, but they also had daily exposure to Spanish.

Materials

The materials and methodology used by Sorace et al. (2009) for Italian were adapted to Basque. Experimental items consisted of short video clips with four characters (Mickey Mouse, Minnie Mouse, Donald Duck and Daisy) with whom the children were familiar. The videos showed one of the two characters in the foreground performing a one-referent action. The action was commented upon, either by the character involved in the action ([-TS] context, see (3)) or by a second character who saw the action ([+TS] context, see (4)). The action was followed by each of the two characters in the background stating what had occurred using either a null (3a, 4a) or an overt anaphoric form (*hura* 'that') (3b, 4b). The null pronoun was expected to be chosen in [-TS] contexts and the overt anaphoric form in [+TS] contexts.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 (3) [-TS] context

11 (Minnie and Daisy in the foreground; Mickey and Donald in the background)

12
13
14 Minnie falls and says: *Erori egin naiz!*

15
16 'I've fallen down!'

17
18 a. Donald: *Minniek ___ erori dela esan du.*

19
20 'Minnie said that ___ has fallen down.'

21
22 b. Mickey: *Minniek hura erori dela esan du.*

23
24 'Minnie said that she has fallen down.'

25
26
27 (4) [+TS] context

28
29 (Minnie and Daisy in the foreground; Mickey and Donald in the background)

30
31
32 Daisy falls and Minnie says: *Daisy erori egin da!*

33
34 'Daisy has fallen down!'

35
36 a. Donald: *Minniek ___ erori dela esan du.*

37
38 'Minnie said that ___ has fallen down.'

39
40 b. Mickey: *Minniek hura erori dela esan du.*

41
42 'Minnie said that she has fallen down.'

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 The task included a total of 16 experimental items (8 items per [-TS] and [+TS] condition)
10 and 10 filler items.
11
12
13
14

15 Procedure

16
17 Child participants were individually tested at school in a quiet room. The materials were
18 presented in a PowerPoint presentation on a laptop, and the children's responses were
19 recorded on an answer sheet. The participants were told that the four characters had started
20 to learn Basque, but that they sometimes made mistakes. Note that most children were
21 familiar with these characters from watching cartoons in Spanish on TV. The experimenter
22 piqued the child's interest by saying that she knew that the child spoke Basque very well,
23 and that she needed his or her help to decide which character located in the background
24 spoke "better" Basque. Participants indicated their preferences by pointing at one of the
25 characters. Trials were pseudorandomised, and care was taken to ensure that no more than
26 two trials of the same experimental condition were presented consecutively.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Data analysis

44
45 A mixed-effects logistic regression model was created with pronoun choice (preference for
46 null or overt forms) as the dependent variable, and with discourse context ([-TS] vs. [+TS])
47 and group (younger children vs. older children vs. adults) as fixed-effect variables
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 (treatment coded and centred, with [-TS] and the younger group as baseline intercepts). The
10 maximal random effect structures without convergence problems (justified by χ^2 -test model
11 comparisons) are reported, which in all cases resulted in models without any by-participant
12 or by-item random slopes. Because treatment coding compares the baseline intercept (e.g.
13 the younger group) with the other conditions of the variable (vs. older children and adults),
14 the performance of older children vs. adults was compared by running the best fit model
15 with older children as the intercept. Finally, whenever context by group interactions are
16 reported, simple [-TS] and [+TS] context models including group as the only fixed effect
17 were created in order to determine whether the group effects were significant for these two
18 context levels.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 Results

36
37
38 Table 1 reports the raw data and mean percentages of selection of *hura* and null pronouns in
39 [+TS] contexts.
40
41

42 [Insert Table 1.]
43
44

45 The main effect of context revealed that younger children had a stronger preference
46 for the use of *hura* in [+TS] than in [-TS] contexts (see Table 2), a preference also
47 displayed by both older children ($\beta = 3.842$, $SE = .362$; $z = 10.588$, $p < .001$) and adults (β
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 = 4.720, SE = .484; $z = 9.738$, $p < .001$), as shown by revealed models. The non-significant
10 main effect of “Group: older children” in Table 2 reveals that younger and older children
11 had a similar overall preference to select *hura* vs. null pronouns. However, the significant
12 main effects of group that compared the performance of younger children vs. adults
13 (“Group: adults” effect in Table 2) and older children vs. adults (revealed model
14 comparison: $\beta = .950$, SE = .438; $z = 2.167$, $p = .030$) revealed that both younger and older
15 children groups had a weaker tendency to select *hura* than adults. Finally, the significant
16 interactions between context and group (younger vs. older and younger vs. adults; see Table
17 2) revealed that both older children and adults showed a greater context effect (stronger
18 preference for *hura* in [+TS] contexts) than younger children. However, the non-significant
19 context by group interaction of the revealed model indicated similar context effects for
20 older children and adults ($\beta = .879$, SE = .583, $z = 1.506$, $p = .132$).

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

With the aim of exploring the context by group significant interactions, the [-TS] simple models determined that in this context, younger children exhibited a stronger preference to select *hura* than older children ($\beta = -1.867$, SE = .623, $z = -2.995$, $p = .002$) and adults ($\beta = -1.894$, SE = .807, $z = -2.348$, $p = .018$), whereas no differences were found between older children and adults ($\beta = -.027$, SE = .869, $z = -.032$, $p = .975$). In contrast, in the [+TS] context, younger children displayed a weaker preference for *hura* than older

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 children and adults ($\beta = 1.89$, $SE = .492$, $z = 3.854$, $p < .001$ and $\beta = 4.041$, $SE = .752$, $z =$
10 5.379 , $p < .001$, respectively), as did older children in comparison to adults ($\beta = 2.15$, $SE =$
11 $.756$, $z = -.032$, $p < .01$).

12
13
14
15
16 The results thus showed that there was a developmental progression towards the adult-
17 like preference for *hura* in [+TS] contexts. In Experiment 2, we investigated whether a
18 similar developmental pattern would also be observed for the overt anaphoric form *bera*,
19 whose scope seems to be larger than that of *hura* according to descriptive grammars.
20
21
22
23
24

25 26 27 Experiment 2: Preferences for *bera* ‘(s)he (him-/herself)’ vs. null 28 subject pronouns 29

30 31 Participants 32

33
34 Forty-four young Basque native children (age range 6;1-7;4, mean 6;6, 26 F and 18 M)
35 participated in the experiment. This sample of children aged 6–7 was an extension of the
36 sample in Iraola Azpiroz (2015: Experiment 6; $N = 23$). An older group of 27 children (age
37 range 8;5-10;4; mean 9;2, 11 F and 17 M) also took part in the study. The control group
38 consisted of ten Basque native adults (age range 18;0-20;0, mean 19;0). All participants
39 were different from those in Experiment 1.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Materials and Procedure

The materials and procedure were identical to those used in Experiment 1, except that in the overt pronoun condition, *bera* was used instead of *hura*.

Results

The raw data and mean percentages of selection of *bera* and null pronouns in [\pm TS] contexts are provided in Table 1. The main effect of context was non-significant neither for young children (see Table 2) nor for older children (relevelled model with older children as baseline intercept: $\beta = 241$, $SE = .339$; $z = .710$, $p = .477$), which indicates that they showed no preference for the use of *bera* either in [+TS] or [-TS] contexts. In contrast, the significant main effect of context observed by adults indicated that they had a stronger preference for the use of *bera* in [+TS] than in [-TS] contexts (relevelled model with adults as baseline intercept: $\beta = 2.977$, $SE = .494$; $z = 6.020$, $p < .001$). The main effect of group comparing younger children vs. adults was non-significant suggesting that younger children and adults exhibited a similar overall preference to select *bera*. However the main effects of group comparing older children vs. younger children (see Table 2) and older children vs. adults (relevelled model comparison: $\beta = .709$, $SE = .338$; $z = 2.099$, $p = .035$) resulted significant with older children selecting *bera* less often than both younger children and

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 **adults**. Finally, the significant interactions between group and context revealed different
10 (reversed) context effects for young children compared to both older children and adults
11 (see Table 2). In the case of younger vs. older children, despite both children's groups
12 showing non-significant clear preferences, whereas younger children showed a tendency to
13 prefer *bera* in [-TS] contexts, older children showed a tendency to prefer *bera* in [+TS]
14 contexts. Similarly, in the case of younger children vs. adults, in contrast to the non-
15 preference of younger children, adults showed a clear preference to select *bera* in [+TS]
16 contexts. In addition, the significant **group by context** interaction of the revealed model
17 indicated that the preference for *bera* in [+TS] contexts was stronger for adults than for
18 older children ($\beta = 2.736$, $SE = .481$, $z = 5.679$, $p < .001$).

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33 In the analysis of the group by context interactions, the [-TS] simple models
34 determined that in this context, younger children exhibited a stronger preference to select
35 *bera* than both older children ($\beta = -1.069$, $SE = .351$, $z = -3.046$, $p = .002$) and adults ($\beta = -$
36 1.794 , $SE = .537$, $z = -3.340$, $p < .001$), whereas no differences were observed between
37 older children and adults ($\beta = -.725$, $SE = .565$, $z = -1.283$, $p = .199$). In contrast, in the
38 [+TS] context, younger and older children displayed similar preferences for *bera* ($\beta = -$
39 $.418$, $SE = .330$, $z = -1.264$, $p = .206$), which in both cases was weaker than that of adults ($\beta =$
40 1.91 , $SE = .484$, $z = 3.957$, $p < .001$ and $\beta = 2.33$, $SE = .516$, $z = 4.517$, $p < .001$,

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 respectively).

14 Discussion

17 Previous research on the discourse features affecting subject pronouns in Italian and
18 Spanish (Shin & Cairns, 2012, Sorace et al. 2009) have revealed a developmental trajectory
19 towards adult-like preferences. In the present study, we examined the pronominal form
20 (null vs. overt) preferences of a group of Basque native adults and two groups of 6–7- and
21 8–10-year-old Basque native children in [-TS] and [+TS] contexts by means of an
22 acceptability judgement task in order to identify any developmental progression. The first
23 prediction that null and overt pronouns would show distinct biases in the older group,
24 similar to what has been observed in other null-subject languages, has been borne out in
25 adults (in both experiments), but only partially in the older child group (only in Experiment
26 1), and not at all in the younger child group. The second prediction that children would
27 demonstrate more difficulty with ambiguity than redundancy has turned out to be accurate.
28 Finally, the third prediction that there would be more significant developmental changes in
29 the resolution of the demonstrative *hura* from younger (6–7) to older (8–10) groups of
30 children than in that of the quasipronoun *bera* has also been confirmed.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Adult preferences

Adults preferred null pronouns in the [-TS] condition but overwhelmingly selected the demonstrative *hura* in the [-TS] condition. For *bera*, adults also showed a preference for a [+TS] interpretation, although this preference was weaker than the one showed for *hura*, suggesting that the two pronominal forms do not have identical referential dependencies.

The differences in the interpretation of distinct pronominal forms such as personal pronouns and demonstratives have been addressed by Cardinaletti and Starke (1999) in terms of Binding Theory (Chomsky, 1981). According to Principle B, pronouns cannot take as antecedent a referent in their governing category. In (4b) *Minnie said that she has fallen down*, Principle B does not forbid pronouns in complex sentences from selecting an antecedent outside of their finite clause. Thus, coreference with the preceding topical antecedent is possible for personal pronouns and hence for the quasipronoun *bera*. On the other hand, in line with the crosslinguistic tendency of demonstratives to take a non-topical antecedent (Diessel, 1999), coreference between the preceding topical antecedent and *hura* is not allowed. Falling under Principle C, *hura* behaves like a lexical item and must therefore be free from any c-commanding antecedent (Eguzkitza, 1986). Adults' stronger preferences for the contextual appropriateness bias of *hura* than for that of *bera* mirror the response patterns found in languages with two anaphoric forms (Ellert, 2013; Wilson, 2009)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 and support the predictions of the Form-Specific Multiple-Constraints approach (Kaiser &
11 Trueswell, 2008). At the same time, experimental data support the disjoint interpretation of
12 *hura* mentioned in descriptive grammars of Basque — not allowing an intrasentential
13 antecedent — and the more flexible reading of the quasipronoun *bera*, which does not
14 categorically disallow coreference with a topical antecedent.
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Child preferences

22
23
24 In both younger and older children's groups, discourse context only had an effect in the
25 contrast between the demonstrative *hura* and the null pronoun (Experiment 1). Whilst the
26 null pronoun was preferred in the [-TS] condition by both children's groups, there was a
27 developmental trend in the degree of sensitivity towards the [+TS] feature attached to *hura*:
28 although the 8–10-year-olds still did not select *hura* in [+TS] contexts to the same degree as
29 adults did, they showed a significantly stronger preference than 6–7-year-olds. On the other
30 hand, the choice between *bera* and null pronouns (Experiment 2) was not dependent on the
31 mapping between a particular pronominal form and the felicitous pragmatic considerations
32 for contextual appropriateness, with both younger and older groups showing a preference
33 for the null pronoun in both contexts. Thus, the two overt anaphoric forms apparently have
34 different developmental patterns. Furthermore, contrary to prior studies in which Italian and
35 Spanish children seemed to have more difficulties when dealing with redundancy (avoiding
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 inappropriate overt pronouns in [-TS] contexts) than ambiguity (avoiding infelicitous null
10 pronouns in [+TS] contexts, Shin & Cairns, 2012; Sorace et al., 2009), Basque children
11 appear to be more delayed in learning to avoid ambiguity, as shown in Experiment 2.
12
13
14
15

16 One reason for children to exhibit a more protracted developmental course for a
17 particular pronoun than for another could be that the former is more infrequent in the input
18 in comparison to the latter. The pervasive nature of frequency effects across domains in
19 children's first language acquisition has been discussed by Ambridge, Kidd, Rowland and
20 Theakston (2015), the idea being that the most frequent forms are learned first. Following
21 the same line of reasoning, based on her analysis of the different patterns constraining
22 Spanish subject expression, Shin (2015) argues that because subject pronoun omission is
23 more frequent than expression, children do not receive enough positive evidence from the
24 input to determine how and when to use pronouns first. She concludes that children may
25 require a long time to fully acquire the correct usage of input-driven structured variation
26 such as subject pronouns. However, she points out that Mexican-Spanish children receive
27 plenty of evidence with regard to where [+TS] contexts and not [-TS] contexts favour
28 pronouns, and such children are already sensitive to this constraint by age 6–7. For our
29 results, frequency effects may explain why Basque 6–7-year-olds' learner default (i.e. the
30 preferred option) is the null pronoun, mostly used in [-TS] but also in [+TS] contexts. In
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 fact, multiple (subject and object) argument drop is a frequently employed option in
10 Basque. However, we believe that input frequency is not the most likely determining factor
11 for the non-developmental trajectory of *bera* as opposed to *hura*, in particular because,
12 according to the largest written corpus available in Basque (EHME, Acha, Laka, Landa, &
13 Salaburu, 2014), *hura* and *bera* have similar frequency values (1124 and 1104 appearances
14 per million words, respectively). These two forms might also be relatively infrequent in the
15 children's input, as suggested by a small corpus of 1000 sentences extracted from a
16 dialogue between a 2-year-old child and his father, in which not a single example of
17 *hura/ha(re)k* 'that-absolutive/ergative' was reported in anaphoric use, and only one
18 example of *bera* in the adult speech (Ezeizabarrena, 2009). Thus, although these
19 observations need to be considered with caution, we suggest that input frequency might not
20 be a determining factor for the different developmental trajectories of *bera* and *hura*.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 A more convincing explanation for the difference between children's resolution of
38 *hura* and *bera* in relation to adult pronoun resolution strategies is the different nature of the
39 anaphoric dependency in which both overt pronouns are involved. Adults' and older
40 children's non-selection of *hura* in [-TS] contexts is motivated by the impossibility of
41 coreference between *hura* and the c-commanding subject antecedent, which in turn results
42 in resolution of the dependency at the first opportunity (Efficiency Requirement, O'Grady,
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

2005). In contrast, the correct interpretation of *bera* requires a longer search for an appropriate antecedent, since Principle B applied to personal pronouns does not offer guidance with only discourse constraints being available. The results obtained thus suggest that less costly anaphoric dependencies such as the syntactic dependency between *hura* and the subject antecedent are acquired earlier by children than discourse dependencies with no immediate resolution, as is the case for *bera*. Thus, the current findings support the previously attested pattern that syntax comes before discourse in development, providing further evidence for the widely discussed Interface Hypothesis (Sorace & Filiaci, 2006; see also Sorace, 2011 for discussion).

Another possibility for the differences observed in the developmental patterns of *hura* and *bera* is the more stable behaviour of *hura* vs. the ambiguity of *bera* in the adult language. *Hura* shows a stronger tendency to choose a referent more uniquely (*rigidity*) by more efficiently limiting the number of potential antecedents than *bera*, which has several readings: coreference with a proximate referent in the discourse — overlapping with the referential properties of the null pronoun — or with a third party. In addition, the disjoint interpretation of *hura* may be more salient for children because demonstratives are among the first words children learn (always among the first fifty, and usually among the first ten words (Clark, 1978)), and children are aware that demonstratives usually (as deictics) make

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 reference to entities in local contexts. The early production of demonstratives in child
10 language is driven by their communicative function for establishing joint attention — a
11 prerequisite for communication and language — together with depicting pointing (Diessel,
12 2012). The pattern of acquiring the more restricted form earlier than the less restricted one
13 has also been observed in the acquisition of the anaphoric use of German demonstratives
14 and personal pronouns (Bittner & Kuehnast, 2012). 8–10-year-olds' general preference for
15 null pronouns may have been affected by the difficulties in restricting the scope of potential
16 antecedents for *bera*.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27
28 One more factor that should not be disregarded in this multifaceted context is
29 children's difficulty in taking another person's perspective, i.e. children were insensitive to
30 the shift of topic marked by the speaker in the reported speech context of the items tested.
31 In fact, there is evidence that referential functions such as *switching* (introducing a new
32 character) and *maintenance* (referring to the same character) are not equally challenging for
33 children. Canadian English-speaking 7–8-year-old children, for example, exhibited lower
34 adequacy levels in switching than in maintenance functions in narrative practice (Colozzo
35 & Whitely, 2014). The ability to take perspective requires a long time for children to learn,
36 as has been observed in several studies on the interpretation of pronouns, and only develops
37 with increasing linguistic experience and cognitive capacity (Hendricks et al., 2014; Shin &
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Cairns, 2012). However, if this factor affected children's interpretation of the subject
10 pronoun, the different developmental patterns found for *hura* and for *bera* would still
11 remain unexplained. Further research is needed to determine the age at which children
12 show adult-like preferences for *bera* in [+TS] contexts. However, it is very likely that
13 children do not attain adult-like control over the distribution of *bera* before age 14–15, as
14 suggested by several studies analysing children's systematic use of referring expressions
15 (Karmiloff-Smith, 1986; Hickmann, 2003; Shin & Cairns, 2012). The present study is
16 based on children's comprehension of the discourse features attached to pronouns, but
17 because several studies have argued that pronoun production precedes pronoun
18 comprehension (see Hendricks, 2014 for a review), future studies with production data are
19 needed to shed light on whether Basque-speaking children exhibit the correct production of
20 *bera* and *hura* at an earlier stage than what present comprehension data suggest. This would
21 be very valuable to further support the existence of an asymmetry between children's
22 production and comprehension of pronouns.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Conclusion

47
48 In an acceptability judgement task, the general preference of Basque-speaking 6–7-year-old
49 children for the null pronoun regardless of discourse context indicated that the interpretable
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 [+TS] feature, which is mapped onto *hura* and to a lesser extent onto *bera* in the adult
11 grammar, is still underspecified at that age. The responses of the group of older children
12 revealed a developmental change in the resolution of *hura*: like adults, these 8–10-year-old
13 children showed different antecedent choice preferences between null and overt pronouns
14 in Basque, in line with Carminati (2002). In contrast, children's resolution of *bera* did not
15 change significantly over the age ranges studied, with 8–10-year-olds still not showing a
16 clear interpretative preference. Thus, sensitivity to the discourse conditions of the two overt
17 anaphoric forms seems to follow two different trajectories, with the [+TS] feature of the
18 demonstrative *hura* 'that' emerging earlier than that of the quasipronoun *bera* '(s)he
19 him/herself'. *Hura*, being constrained by syntactic principles, conveniently reduces the
20 number of possible antecedents, as shown in adults' more robust resolution preferences
21 compared to the more flexible interpretation of *bera*. Differences in the frequency of the
22 two overt anaphoric forms and null pronouns appears to be compatible with an earlier
23 emergence of the discourse constraints attached to the null pronoun, but frequency effects
24 for the acquisition of the contextual conditions affecting the distribution of *hura* and *bera*
25 require more empirical support.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Acknowledgements

We are very grateful to the pupils and teachers of the Basque schools *Laskorain ikastola* and *Uzturpe ikastola*, as well as to Kepa Erdozia, Oxel Uribe-Etxeberria, Amaia Munarriz and Mikel Iraola for their helpful contributions. We also wish to thank the editor and the reviewers for their insightful comments.

Funding

This work was supported by the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration (Grant No. 613465); the Basque Government (IT665-13, IT-676-13, POS2015_2_0008); the University of the Basque Country (UFI11/06) and the Ministries of Science and Innovation & Economy and Competitiveness (FFI2012-37884-C03-02, FFI2014-55733-P, FFI2015-68589-C2-1-P (MINECO/FEDER), RyC-2013-14722).

Table 1. Raw data, percentages (in brackets) and *SDs* (in italics) per cell for overt pronouns, null pronouns and miscellaneous responses per group in each experimental condition of Experiments 1 and 2.

	[-TS] contexts			[+TS] contexts			Context effect ¹
	Overt	Null	Misc	Overt	Null	Misc	([+TS] minus [-TS]) Overt
Experiment 1: <i>HURA</i>							
6–7-year-olds	75 (24.7%) <i>43.18%</i>	229 (75.3%)	0	110 (36.5%) <i>48.23%</i>	191 (63.5%)	3	35 (11.8%)
8–10-year-olds	15 (7.2%) <i>25.93%</i>	193 (92.8%)	0	138 (67.6%) <i>46.89%</i>	66 (32.4%)	4	123 (60.4%)
Adults	11 (9.8%) <i>29.89%</i>	101 (90.2%)	0	97 (89.0%) <i>31.44%</i>	12 (11.0%)	3	86 (79.2%)
Experiment 2: <i>BERA</i>							
6–7-year-olds	154 (43.8%) <i>49.67%</i>	198 (56.3%)	0	126 (36.2%) <i>48.12%</i>	222 (63.8%)	4	-28 (-7.6%)
8–10-year-olds	55 (25.7%) <i>43.80%</i>	159 (74.3%)	2	63 (29.3%) <i>45.62%</i>	152 (70.7%)	1	8 (3.6%)
Adults	13 (16.3%) <i>37.12%</i>	67 (83.8%)	0	58 (72.5%) <i>44.93%</i>	22 (27.5%)	0	45 (56.2%)

¹The *Context effect* column shows the participants' preference for overt pronouns, with positive values indicating a preference for overt pronouns in [+TS] contexts and negative values indicating a preference for overt pronouns in [-TS] contexts.

Table 2. Generalized linear mixed models for Experiments 1 and 2.

	β	<i>SE</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>
Experiment 1 (HURA)				
(Intercept)	-1.037	.204	-5.082	< .001
Context: [+TS]	.718	.222	3.235	.001
Group: older children	.010	.325	.033	.973
Group: adults	.961	.406	2.367	.017
Interaction: [+TS]/older	3.123	.402	7.770	< .001
Interaction: [+TS]/adults	4.002	.515	7.761	< .001
Experiment 2 (BERA)				
(Intercept)	-.469	.179	-2.611	.009
Context: [+TS]	-.331	.300	-1.104	.269
Group: older children	-.646	.213	-3.026	.002
Group: adults	.062	.318	.197	.844
Interaction: [+TS]/older	.573	.281	2.036	.041
Interaction: [+TS]/adults	3.309	.457	7.238	<.001

Reference

- Acha, J., Laka, I., Landa, J., & Salaburu, P. (2014). EHME: A new word database for research in Basque language. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology* 17: E79.
- Alonso-Ovalle, L., Fernandez-Solera, S., Frazier, L., & Clifton, C. (2002). Null versus overt pronouns and the topic-focus articulation in Spanish. *Rivista Linguistica/ Italian Journal of Linguistics* 14: 151-170.
- Altuna, O. (2007), Euskal Herriko kale erabileraren neurketa. Ikerketaren nondik norakoak. *BAT aldizkaria*, 64, 21-31.
- Ambridge, B., Kidd, E., Rowland, C.F. & Theakson, A.L. (2015). The ubiquity of frequency effects in first language acquisition. *Journal of Child Language* 42: 239-273.
- Bhat, D. N. S. (2004). *Pronouns*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bini, M. (1993). La adquisición del italiano: más allá de las propiedades sintácticas del parámetro pro-drop. In J. Liceras (ed.), *La lingüística y el análisis de los sistemas no nativos*, pp. 126-139. Ottawa: Dovehouse.
- Bittner, D., & Kuehnast, M. (2012). Comprehension of intersentential pronouns in child German and child Bulgarian. *First Language* 32: 176-204.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Cardinaletti, A., & Starke, M. (1999). Responses and demonstratives. In H. van Riemsdijk (ed.) *Clitics in the languages of Europe*, pp. 280-289. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Carminati, M. N. (2002). *The processing of Italian subject pronouns*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Massachusetts at Amherst, USA.
- Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Clark, E. V. (1978). From gesture to word: On the natural history of deixis in language acquisition. In J. S. Bruner & A. Garton (eds.), *Human growth and development: Wolfson College lectures 1976*, pp. 85-120. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Colozzo, P., & Whitely, C. (2014). Keeping track of characters: Factors affecting referential adequacy in children's narratives. *First Language* 3: 155-177.
- Diessel, H. (1999). *Demonstratives: Form, function, and grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Diessel, H. (2012). Deixis and demonstratives. In C. Maienborn, K. von Heusinger, P. Portner (eds.), *An International Handbook of Natural Language Meaning*, Vol. 3, 2407-2431. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Eguzkitza, A. (1986). *Topics in the syntax of Basque and Romance*. Doctoral dissertation. UCLA, USA.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Ezeizabarrena, M.J. (2009). Development in language mixing: early Basque-Spanish
10 bilingualism. In J.Grinstead (ed), *Hispanic child languages: typical and impaired*
11 *development*, pp. 57-89. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
12
13
14
15
16 Filiaci, F., Sorace, A., & Carreiras, M. (2014). Anaphoric biases of null and overt subjects
17 in Italian and Spanish: a cross-linguistic comparison. *Language and Cognitive*
18 *Processes* 29: 825-843.
19
20
21
22
23 García Alcaraz, E., & Bel, A. (2015). The acquisition of co-referential properties of
24 pronouns in bilingual and L2 Spanish speakers. *Proceedings of the 39th Boston*
25 *University on Language Development. Online Proceedings Supplement*. Retrieved
26 from: <http://www.bu.edu/buclid/files/2015/06/Garcia-Alcaraz.pdf>
27
28
29
30
31
32
33 Guasti, M.T. (2002). *Language acquisition: The growth of grammar*. Cambridge, MA: MIT
34 Press.
35
36
37 Hacoen A., & Schaeffer, J. (2007). Subject realization in early Hebrew/English bilingual
38 acquisition: The role of crosslinguistic influence. *Bilingualism: Language and*
39 *Cognition* 10: 333-344.
40
41
42
43
44
45 Hendriks, P. (2014). *Asymmetries between language production and comprehension*
46 (Studies in Theoretical Psycholinguistics 42). Heidelberg: Springer.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 Hendricks, P., Koster, C., & Hoecks, J. (2014). Referential choice across the lifespan: Why
11 children and elderly adults produce ambiguous pronouns. *Language, Cognition and*
12 *Neuroscience* 29: 391-407.
13
14
15
16 Hickmann, M. (2003). *Children's Discourse; Person, Space and Time across Languages*.
17 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
18
19
20
21 Iraola Azpiroz, M., Santesteban, M. & Ezeizabarrena, M.J. (2014). The discursive feature
22 specification of the pronoun *hura* in child (L1 and L2) and adult Basque. *Selected*
23 *Proceedings of the Romance Turn V. Workshop on the Acquisition of Romance*
24 *Languages*, pp. 134-157. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31 Iraola Azpiroz, M. (2015). *Anaphora resolution in children and adults: An experimental*
32 *study of mature speakers and learners of Basque*. Tübingen: Günther Narr-Verlag.
33
34
35
36 Kaiser, E. (2011). Salience and contrast effects in reference resolution: The interpretation of
37 Dutch pronouns and demonstratives. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 26: 1587-
38 1624.
39
40
41
42
43 Kaiser, E., & Trueswell, J. C. (2008). Interpreting pronouns and demonstratives in Finnish:
44 Evidence for a form-specific approach to reference resolution. *Language and*
45 *Cognitive Processes* 23: 709-748.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Kaiser, E., & Vihman, V. (2006). On the referential properties of Estonian pronouns and
10 demonstratives. Paper presented at the *22nd Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics*,
11 Aalborg, University, Denmark.
12
13
14
15
16 Karmiloff-Smith, A. (1986). From metaprocess to conscious access: evidence from
17 children's metalinguistic and repair data. *Cognition* 23: 95-147.
18
19
20
21 Kraš, T., Sturt, P., & Sorace, A. (2014). Native and non-native processing of Italian subject
22 pronouns: evidence from eye-tracking. Paper presented at *AMLaP XX*, Edinburgh 4-6
23 September 2014.
24
25
26
27
28 Laka, I. (1996). *A brief grammar of euskara, the Basque language*, Ms., University of the
29 Basque Country, Vitoria-Gasteiz. Available online: <http://www.ehu.es/grammar>.
30
31
32
33 Mayol, L. (2009). *Pronouns in Catalan: information, discourse and strategy*. Unpublished
34 doctoral dissertation. University of Pennsylvania, USA.
35
36
37
38 O'Grady, W. (1997). *Syntactic development*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
39
40 O'Grady, W. (2005). *Syntactic carpentry: An emergentist approach to syntax*.
41 Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
42
43
44
45 Papadopoulou, D., Peristeri, E., Plemenou, E., Marinis, T., & Tsimpli, I. (2015). Pronoun
46 ambiguity resolution in Greek: Evidence from monolingual adults and children.
47
48
49
50 *Lingua*: 98–120.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Rijk, R. P. G. de (2008). *Standard Basque. A Progressive grammar*. Cambridge, MA: MIT
10 Press.
11
12
13
14 Serratrice, L., Sorace, A., & Paoli, S. (2004). Crosslinguistic influence at the syntax
15 pragmatics interface: Subjects and objects in English-Italian bilingual and
16 monolingual acquisition. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 7: 183-205.
17
18
19
20
21 Shin, N.L. (2015). Acquiring constraints on morphosyntactic variation: Children's Spanish
22 subject pronoun expression. *Journal of Child Language*.
23
24 [http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=9883308](http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=9883308&fileId=S0305000915000380)
25
26 [http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=9883308](http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=9883308&fileId=S0305000915000380)
27 [http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=9883308](http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=9883308&fileId=S0305000915000380)
28 [http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=9883308](http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=9883308&fileId=S0305000915000380)
29 [http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=9883308](http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=9883308&fileId=S0305000915000380)
30
31 Shin, N. L. & Cairns, H. S. (2012). The development of NP selection in school-age
32 children: reference and Spanish subject pronouns. *Language Acquisition* 19: 3-
33 38.
34
35
36
37
38 Sorace, A. (2000). Differential effects of attrition in the L1 syntax of L2 near-native
39 speakers. In S. C. Howell, S. A. Fish, and T. Keith-Lucas (eds.), *Proceedings of the*
40 *24th Boston University Conference on Language Development (BUCLD24)*,
41 pp. 719-725. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
42
43
44
45
46
47 Sorace, A. (2011). Pinning down the concept of 'interface' in bilingualism. *Linguistic*
48 *Approaches to Bilingualism* 1: 1-33.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 Sorace, A., & Filiaci, F. (2006). Anaphora resolution in near-native speakers of Italian.
10
11 *Second Language Research* 22: 339-368.
12
13
14 Sorace, A., & Serratrice, L. (2009). Internal and external interfaces in bilingual language
15
16 development: Beyond structural overlap. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 13:
17
18 195-210.
19
20
21 Sorace, A., Serratrice, L., Filiaci, F., & Baldo, M. (2009). Discourse conditions of subject
22
23 pronoun realization: Testing the linguistic intuitions of older bilingual children.
24
25 *Lingua* 119: 460-477.
26
27
28 Wilson, F. (2009). *Processing at the syntax-discourse interface in second language*
29
30 *acquisition*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Edinburgh, UK.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60