

1

**The Bottleneck Hypothesis in L2 acquisition [Recurso electrónico] : L1 Norwegian learners' knowledge of syntax and morphology in L2 English / Isabel Nadine Jensen ... [et al.]**

Este artículo se encuentra disponible en su edición electrónica. Su acceso electrónico es a través del enlace de 'Acceso al documento'.

References: p. 23-27

The Bottleneck Hypothesis (Slabakova, 2008, 2013) proposes that acquiring properties of the functional morphology is the most challenging part of learning a second language. In the experiment presented here, the predictions of this hypothesis are tested in the second language (L2) English of Norwegian native speakers. Two constructions are investigated that do not match in English and Norwegian: One involving functional morphology, subject–verb (SV) agreement, which is obligatory in the L2 but non-existent in the first language (L1), and one involving syntax, verb-second (V2) word order, which is obligatory in the L1, but restricted to specific contexts in the L2. The results of an acceptability judgement task indicate that the participants struggled more with identifying ungrammatical SV agreement than ungrammatical word order. We conclude that the findings lend tentative support to the Bottleneck Hypothesis.

Second language research. -- 2020 (January), v. 36, n. 1, p. 3-29

1. Agreement 2. Core syntax 3. Functional morphology 4. L1 Norwegian 5. L2 English 6. The Bottleneck Hypothesis 7. Verb-second 8. Word order

---

2

**F0 patterns of tone versus non-tone languages [Recurso electrónico] : the case of Vietnamese speakers of English / Anh-Thu T Nguyen**

Este artículo se encuentra disponible en su edición electrónica. Su acceso electrónico es a través del enlace de 'Acceso al documento'.

References: p. 116-119

This article reports a study that aimed to find out whether F0 patterns of L2 English produced by Vietnamese speakers are different to those of native English speakers, whether the non-native F0 patterns are transferred from Vietnamese, and to what extent English and Vietnamese F0 profiles differ. Ten native/L1 Australian English speakers, 20 Vietnamese speakers of English (10 beginners and 10 advanced speakers) and a control group of four native/L1 Vietnamese speakers were included. The F0 profiles (F0 maximum, F0 minimum, F0 range, F0 mean and F0 standard deviation at three levels: utterance, syllable and phoneme) were obtained from a set of 10 English sentences and 20 Vietnamese utterances. The results showed that F0 patterns of beginning-level L2 English are systematically different from those of native English speakers, which can be transferred from their native tone language. Nevertheless, the advanced speakers' ability to produce native-like F0 patterns indicates the effect of language learning experience on prosodic acquisition. The data and results of this study contribute to the understanding of the process and nature of second language acquisition.

Second language research. -- 2020 (January), v. 36, n. 1, p. 97-121

1. Australian English 2. F0 patterns 3. L2 prosody 4. Stress 5. Tone 6. Vietnamese

---

3

**Frequency at the syntax–discourse interface [Recurso electrónico] : a bidirectional study on fronting options in L1/L2 German and L1/L2 English / Holger Hopp, Joseph Bail, Carrie N. Jackson**

Este artículo se encuentra disponible en su edición electrónica. Su acceso electrónico es a través del enlace de 'Acceso al documento'.

References: p. 92-94

The present study investigates whether second language (L2) speakers are sensitive to the information-structural constraints and frequency distributions at the syntax–discourse interface in the L2. L1-German–L2-English and L1-English–L2-German speakers completed a speeded naturalness judgment task. For sentences presented in broad or narrow-focus contexts, they judged the naturalness of fronted locative (LP) and temporal (TP) adverbial phrases and fronted objects in both English and German. English and German differ in the frequency with which they employ these constructions. With high-frequency fronted-LP and TP sentences, both

the L2 English and L2 German speakers exhibited equivalent judgments as their L1 counterparts, in spite of differences in the perceived naturalness and relative frequency of these constructions in English vs. German. Like L1 speakers, L2 English and L2 German speakers also judged the less-frequent fronted objects as more natural in narrow-focus than broad-focus contexts, showing successful acquisition at the syntax–discourse interface. However, they judged fronted object sentences as more natural overall than their respective L1 counterparts in both English and German. Together, these findings suggest that convergence at the L2 syntax–discourse interface is possible per se, but that lower construction frequency in the input entails persistent overgeneralization of non-canonical options in the L2.

Second language research. -- 2020 (January), v. 36, n. 1, p. 65-96

1. Frequency 2. Information structure 3. Non-canonical word 4. Syntax–discourse interface 5. Word order

---

4

**A mare in a pub? [Recurso electrónico] : nonnative facilitation in phonological priming / Kira Gor, Svetlana V. Cook**

Este artículo se encuentra disponible en su edición electrónica. Su acceso electrónico es a través del enlace de 'Acceso al documento'.

References: p. 136-137

A phonological priming experiment reports inhibition for Russian prime-target pairs with onset overlap in native speakers. When preceded by the phonological prime /kabila/, the target /kabak/ (кобыла – КАБАК, mare – PUB) takes longer to respond than the same target preceded by a phonologically unrelated word. English-speaking late learners of Russian also show inhibition, but only for high-frequency prime-target pairs. Conversely, they show facilitation for low-frequency pairs. In semantic priming (e.g. carnation – DAISY), facilitation is observed for the same two lexical frequency ranges both in native speakers and learners of Russian, suggesting that the primes and targets in the low-frequency range are familiar to the nonnative participants. We interpret nonnative phonological facilitation for low-frequency words as evidence for sublexical processing of less familiar words that is accompanied by reduced lexical competition in nonnative lexical access. We posit that low lexical competition is due to unfaithful, or fuzzy phonolexical representations: nonnative speakers are unsure about the exact phonological form of low-frequency words. Such unfaithful representations are not strongly engaged in lexical competition and selection. High reliance on sublexical rather than lexical processing may be a general property of nonnative word recognition in case when the words are less familiar and have a low level of entrenchment.

Second language research. -- 2020 (January), v. 36, n. 1, p. 123-140

1. Auditory 2. Lexical access 3. Native 4. Nonnative 5. Phonological 6. Priming 7. Russian 8. Second language 9. Semantic

---

5

**A systematic review of transfer studies in third language acquisition [Recurso electrónico] / Eloi Puig-Mayenco, Jorge González, Alonso Jason Rothman**

Este artículo se encuentra disponible en su edición electrónica. Su acceso electrónico es a través del enlace de 'Acceso al documento'.

References: p. 53-58

The present systematic review examines what factors determine when, how and to what extent previous linguistic experience (from the first language, second language or both languages) affects the initial stages and beyond of adult third language (L3) acquisition. In doing so, we address what a bird's eye view of the data tells us regarding competing theoretical accounts of L3 morphosyntactic transfer. Data couple together to suggest that some factors are more influential than others. As discussed, the systematic review transcends the field of adult multilingualism precisely because of what it reveals, as a prima facie example in behavioral research, in terms of how different types of methodological considerations impact the way data are interpreted to support or not particular claims.

Second language research. -- 2020 (January), v. 36, n. 1, p. 31-64

1. L3/Ln acquisition 2. Methodological considerations 3. Systematic review 4. Transfer selection 5. Typological proximity