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# Preface

## Abstract

The main topic of this doctoral dissertation is on the analysis of syntactic structures in language acquisition, specifically in the domain of Czech and Slovak learners which acquire the Italian language. In particular, I will focus on the complex noun phrase subdomain, showing the compositionality of the phrase structure and the hierarchical fashion of this component. The analysis is casted in the Minimalist-oriented framework of the Generative Grammar (Chomsky [1995](#ref-chomsky1995); Chomsky [1998](#ref-chomsky1998); Chomsky [2013](#ref-chomsky2013); Hauser, Chomsky, and Fitch [2002](#ref-hcf2002)) and its application in the field of the second language acquisition (Rothman and Slabakova [2017](#ref-rothmanSlabakova2017); Slabakova, Leal, and Liskin-Gasparro [2014](#ref-slabakovaLealLiskin2014)).

The usage of an established computational ground to conduct the work, where the data retrieved by fieldwork is stored in a coherent corpus which easily permits to be queried and interpolated for the research purposes, represents a standpoint for this research in its totality, yielding for a data-based approach to the whole process. The annotation schema of the data is standardized in order to adhere to the major point of discussion into the discipline (Clark [2010](#ref-clark2010); Kuebler and Zinsmeister [2015](#ref-kueblerZinsmeinster2015); Kurdi [2016](#ref-kurdi2016)), representing the plus to furnish a data source which is independent to the merely contingent purposes.

This research aims to offer a way to investigate how second language acquisition can be seen grounding on a coherent set of data in terms of annotation schema: it does insist either on the speculative questions both on computational models involved.
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# Introduction

The main question of this thesis yields a twofold mindset that is not a corollary of the research but which represents the process in which the work was conducted: how could I investigate a particular area of the language faculty as language acquisition in a way which can gain from the usage of the digital instruments in order to ground the theoretical analysis on actual data?

The idea under this research moves across the motivation to investigate over an empirically-grounded path the strategies shown by the learners during the acquisition of second languages, using an established coherent digital architecture. My task is twofold: on one side this provides for the developing of a theoretically-grounded framework to research in the fields of Second Language Acquisition (SLA), while on the other this necessitates to develop a linguistic corpus which collect in a coherent fashion a wide set of data that represent some spotted linguistic facts in order to give a transparent documentation of the learning path. The usage of the modern tools in developing a linguistic corpus yields for a fully documentable research path, in which is possible to reconstruct the steps and the choices which underlie its development, the methods used in the analysis, the correctness of the outcomes. This kind of research is intimately multidisciplinar in nature, embracing different approaches and areas of interest: digital humanities, corpus and computational linguistics for the development of the linguistic corpus, general and theoretical linguistics, studies on SLA and interlanguage for the theoretical analysis.

This introductive chapter collects a preliminary way to represent the main areas of the research, the methods involved in the analysis and the possible outcomes of such a way to conduct the work.

## Background for the thesis

### Data-based research: definition

### Data-based research: motivations for the thesis

## Objectives of the thesis

The three main objectives of this thesis are methodological, empirical and theoretical.

1. **Methodological objectives**  
   To address the decision and the methods raised by the compilation, the storage and the design of a learner based corpus, exploring the effective procedures for retrieving the relevant features for the analysis;
2. **Empirical objectives**  
   To explore the previous generalizations of the acquisitional path in SLA literature comparing with the amount of linguistic productions given by different learners;
3. **Theoretical objectives**  
   To describe the features which are relevant for characterise the language variety effect and the place of interlanguage.

### Methodological objectives

### Empirical objectives

Amongst many scholar the role of the native language (L1) has been raised as a factor of possible conditionation in the way which the target language (L2) is acquired during the learning path: an emblematic case is the *transfer* of the knowledge about the structures of the L1 to the target, revealing the intermediate steps of the acquisitional path defined with the term *interlanguage* (Selinker [1972](#ref-selinker1972)), that we can refer as to **Interlanguage Hypothesis** (IlH). Different from this hypothesis –which recognizes a central place to the native language in the acquisitional path– is the **Monitor Model** (Krashen [1981](#ref-krashen1981)), a multi-focal perspective on language acquisition where different factors are described as involved in the process and where the L1 could not represent that conditionation.

During the last 20 years, a considerable part of linguistic literature is involved in developing some sort of models to think how the faculty of language can work, in its biological (Hauser, Chomsky, and Fitch [2002](#ref-hcf2002)), computational (Fodor [2001](#ref-fodor2001)) and cognitive components in a highly interdisciplinary environment. Studies on SLA is a fertile field, which relies on comparative and contrastive analyses of linguistic phenomena, either both from an applied view (Ellis [1994](#ref-ellis1994)) than by theoretically grounded perspective focused on Generative framework (GenSLA) (Guasti [2002](#ref-guasti2002); Hawkins [2001](#ref-hawkins2001); Rothman and Slabakova [2017](#ref-rothmanSlabakova2017); Sorace [2011](#ref-sorace2011)). In this sense appears that the adoption of a coherent framework to analyze the variation in grammar into a *parametric* model (Chomsky [1995](#ref-chomsky1995)) can be suitable for long-standing researches on SLA and interlanguage, also based on independent data-mining initiatives as in the case of the present purposes, which disentangles the data in a form of a linguistic corpus and the linguistic analysis.

The dataset used in this thesis aims to display either the different linguistic outcomes in a wide range of communicative situations by the same learner, both than a sociolinguistic grained analysis where the variety of educational or age range can show different linguistic behaviors.

### Theoretical objectives

From a theoretical viewpoint, the research is inserted in the current theories that rely on the hierarchical functioning of the language faculty, for which the variation among languages are reconducted to a parametrizing of choice among the structures of languages (Adger [2013](#ref-adger2013); Chomsky [1995](#ref-chomsky1995); Chomsky [1998](#ref-chomsky1998); Chomsky [2013](#ref-chomsky2013); Chomsky [2015](#ref-chomsky2015); Rizzi [2013](#ref-rizzi2013)), which are constant between the language structures, despite of the wideness of the variation amongst the languages:

We are concerned, then, with states of the language faculty, which we understand to be some array of cognitive traits and capacities, a particular component of the human mind/brain. The language faculty has an initial state, genetically determined; in the normal course of development it passes through a series of states in early childhood, reaching a relatively stable steady state that undergoes little subsequent change, apart from the lexicon. To a good first approximation, the initial state appears to be uniform for the species. (Chomsky [1995](#ref-chomsky1995))

This view permits on one side to compare the syntactic structures in a coherent and schematic way, while on the other it concentrates moreover on the hierarchical fashion of the language faculty than on the linear order displayed by the utterances (Kayne [1994](#ref-kayne1994); Moro [2000](#ref-moro2000)). In this perspective is generally assumed that the hierarchical phrase structure plays a central role in syntactic computation, while the *flattering* of such structures into a mono-dimensional workspace is a matter of externalization constraints and interface conditions (e.g. the need to give an ordered array where every item of the sentence is present at one time in order to be spelled out). I will summarize this in a representational way with the usual tree-diagram in Fig.1.

Figure 1 Representation of syntactic structures

Figure 1 Representation of syntactic structures

Given this way to proceed, that assure a coherent framework to compare languages in a parametric way, the main theoretical question addressed here concerns the relevance and the potential usage of this perspective in the analysis of a dynamic system as during the acquisitional path and the strategies raised up by learners during the various steps in the interlanguage.
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Given this way to proceed, that assure a coherent framework to compare languages in a parametric way, the main theoretical question addressed here concerns the relevance and the potential usage of this perspective in the analysis of a dynamic system as during the acquisitional path and the strategies raised up by learners during the various steps in the interlanguage.

## Outline of the thesis

The first year is dedicated to the setting-up of the corpus, with the starting operations to acquire the data and elaborate a coherent way to annotate the texts with a standard schema. During the second year the corpus is planned to grow up for reach a significance level of >15000 words in order to provide quantitative analyses. Third and fourth year will be spent in developing the theoretical analyses and refining the informatic architecture of the project, evolving in a user-friendly and interrogable way to dispense the data. The theoretical outcome constitues the main topic of the research.
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