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Abstract: The study examined heritage speaker grammars and to what extent they diverge with respect to grammatical gender from adult L2 learners. Results from a preference task involving code-mixed Determiner Phrases (DPs) and code-mixed copula constructions show a difference between these two types of operations. Heritage speakers patterned with the control group of L1 Spanish/L2 English speakers for the copula/agreement constructions but differed from the control group for the DP conditions. We argue that it may be the case that the two operations (concord versus agreement) are processed differently by heritage speakers and people raised monolingually. If this idea is on the right track, then it can be assumed that it is processing and not different underlying representations that are the cause of the differences among the groups.
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1. Introduction

A central and longstanding issue in language acquisition research has focused on whether very different learning contexts can result in the same end state grammar. This debate can be extended to heritage speaker grammars. That is, first, what is the ultimate attainment of learners who have received input from two (or more) languages from birth, or early childhood? Second, in what way, if any, does the end state grammar differ for heritage speaker bilinguals and monolingual speakers? Third, to what extent do age, literacy in the second language, and quality/quantity of input play a role? We will define heritage speaker bilingual as in Rothman (2009), where the term takes into account two typical categories of
bilingual speakers. Under Rothman’s definition, a heritage speaker can be, on the one hand, someone who received input from two (or more) languages simultaneously from birth or, on the other hand, someone who received input from the home/heritage language exclusively from birth and had the community language introduced later on (usually at school age). In both cases, the speaker has acquired the heritage language naturalistically and has acquired some level of proficiency in the heritage language but has gone on to become dominant in the community language. Assuming that the community language is the dominant language for heritage speaker bilinguals, the question of whether and to what extent there is transfer from the dominant language is crucial for understanding the nature of heritage language grammars and their eventual end state.

While ultimate attainment research has typically examined post-childhood learners of a second (or third) language, only very recent work has reexamined the age factor (Montrul 2008). Increasingly, studies on end state grammars are focusing on populations, such as heritage language bilingual learners, where age is not a factor in acquisition. Since heritage language bilinguals receive input from birth then, intuitively, age should not be a factor in their acquisition and their end state should be native-like, however, the data do not support this claim (Liceras et al. 2008; Montrul 2002, 2004, 2008, 2009; Pires and Rothman 2009; Rothman 2007; Valenzuela et al. 2009). Montrul (2008) and Polinsky (2005) argue that simultaneous bilinguals are “incomplete” learners of their L1 (or home language). This view suggests that heritage speaker grammars should be compared to monolingual grammars but falls into a type of “comparative fallacy.” Comparative fallacy (Bley-Vroman 1983) refers to the error of studying, for example, a second language grammar by comparing it to the target language (instead of studying it in its own right), which leads to the conclusion that the non-native grammar is an “incomplete” or “imperfect” version of the target grammar. Extending this idea to the study of heritage languages, the heritage language should not necessarily be compared to a monolingual grammar because the amount and quality of input in each case is necessarily different and thus may not be entirely comparable. A heritage speaker grammar may be a complete version of the language based on the reduced input. Rothman (2007) and Pires and Rothman (2009) suggest that these learners might be complete acquirers of emerging dialects of the heritage language that, by virtue of the language contact situation in which they exist, have already experienced internal change, which means the input provided to the next generation is not completely comparable to the monolingual situation. Under this view, the heritage grammar is not “monolingual-like,” which is not to say that it is not native-like, either in amount and/or quality of input and end state.

The aim of our study is to contribute to the literature on the characterization of bilingual grammars by examining what the differences in determiner selection and agreement in copula constructions means for the status of gender in bilingual grammars. In order to further examine central issues related to the characterization of bilingual grammars, we explore the role of feature assembly and code-switching in heritage Spanish grammars. We investigate the way in which features are assembled in two different bilingual grammars and the status of these features in two separate linguistic operations—agreement and concord—which are related to gender agreement in Spanish. The results from this study are also discussed in terms of learnability and the possible application to teaching heritage speakers.

2. Grammatical Gender in Spanish

Spanish nouns have inherent gender (Carroll 1989), masculine or feminine, which is an inherent lexical feature. Therefore, a Spanish noun enters the syntax with an intrinsic gender feature. Harris (1991) has argued that only words ending in -a are gender marked and that -o words present the default; words ending in -e are so marked for purposes of syllabicity.
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(1) Nouns with canonical gender marking:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MASCULINE: -o</th>
<th>FEMININE: -a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>libr-o</td>
<td>mes-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>book (MS)</td>
<td>table (FS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Nouns with non-canonical gender marking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MASCULINE: -e / -consonant</th>
<th>FEMININE: -e / -consonant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>coch-e bar</td>
<td>clas-e luz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>car (MS) bar (MS)</td>
<td>class (FS) light (FS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agreement within the Determiner Phrase (DP) in Spanish takes place via the operation concord and is shown in (3a–d):

(3) a. El libro viejo
    the (MS) book (MS) old (MS)

b. La mesa vieja
    the (FS) table (FS) old (FS)

c. El coche viejo
    the (MS) car (MS) old (MS)

d. La canción vieja
    the (FS) song (FS) old (FS)

An important assumption within the Minimalist model of syntax (Chomsky 1998, 2005) is that features can be interpretable or uninterpretable. If a feature is uninterpretable, it does not play a role in determining meaning, whereas if it is interpretable, it does play a role in determining meaning. In this way, uninterpretable features must be deleted before entering the semantic component of grammar. Assuming Chomsky (1998), deletion of uninterpretable features takes place when uninterpretable person/number features agree with a complete set of person/number features on the noun. Gender is a f-feature that is interpretable (it contributes to aspects of meaning) and is found on the head noun (Chomsky 1995, 2001; Pesetsky and Torrego 2007), while determiners and adjectives have uninterpretable features (they do not play a role in determining meaning). However, although the gender feature on the noun is interpretable, it is not crucial for semantic interpretation. Nevertheless, if the interpretable gender feature is not acquired on the noun, agreement features may not match within the DP (the operation of concord). It is therefore difficult to tease apart whether problems with agreement within the DP are due to mapping (mapping features and morphemes) or whether they are due to not having acquired the inherent gender feature on the noun itself.

With respect to feature bundling, a distinction can be made between types of gender agreement. Within the DP, agreement between the noun and the adjective is an instance of the operation of concord, whereas agreement involving the verb is an operation of agreement (Baker 2008; Radford et al. 2007). In this way, there are two distinct processes for agreement that take place depending on whether it is in the DP or the verbal domain. Baker (2008: 66) outlines that this distinction is motivated by two reasons: 1) the features present in the different domains are different (e.g., verbs but not adjectives display person features); and 2) syntactically, the two processes are different (e.g., verbs “search downward” for agreement while adjectives agree upwards).
In Spanish/English code-mixed DP, a gendered and an ungendered item are present; it can be a Spanish determiner (gendered) and an English noun (ungendered) as in (4a–b) or an English determiner (ungendered) with a Spanish noun (gendered) as in (5a–b):

(4) a. el book b. la table
the (MS) libro (MS) the (FS) mesa (FS)

(5) a. the libro b. the mesa
book (MS) table (FS)

Radford et al. (2007) argue that convergence requirements constrain mixing within a DP; namely, mixing between a modifier and a noun is ruled out if it leads to a gender mismatch and thereby a crash. In the case of the Spanish/English mix, the gender feature in these mixed utterances cannot be valued and therefore leads to a crash at the semantic level. However, mismatches such as the type shown in (4) and (5) do occur (Liceras et al. 2008, among others), which, under Radford et al.’s (2007) convergence constraint on this type of mixing, is accounted for by stipulating that children “accommodate” the gender properties of the noun to the determiner. This notion can be extended to adult bilinguals, since children show accuracy on gender from an early age.

Agreement is an operation associated with the verbal domain. In (6), we have a Spanish copula construction and although the verb does not have a gender feature, the adjective does have a gender feature that must agree with the subject:

(6) La ciudad es ruidosa
The city (FS) is noisy (FS)
“The city is noisy”

3. Previous Research

3.1 Spanish/English Code-mixing

A salient characteristic of bilingual grammars is that of code-switching, where properties from two languages are systematically “mixed” within a phrase or sentence (e.g., Poplack 1981, 1984, 2001, 2004, etc.; Radford et al. 2007; Toribio 2001a, 2001b). Liceras et al. (2008) found that the treatment of code-mixed DPs (lexical-functional DP mixing) was different for L1 Spanish speakers who speak English than for bilingual L1 speakers of Spanish/English. The Liceras et al. (2008) code-mixing data has shown that in situations where the determiner is in Spanish and the noun is in English, a Spanish speaker will agree the determiner with the inherent gender of the noun in Spanish, as in (7a–b), while a bilingual speaker will use the default masculine form of the determiner regardless of the gender of the Spanish noun counterpart, as in (8a–b):

(7) a. el book b. la table
the (MS) libro (MS) the (FS) mesa (FS)

(8) a. el book b. el table
the (MS) libro (MS) the (MS) mesa (FS)

While Liceras et al. (2008) focused on the type of code-mixing (namely, English determiner with Spanish noun or Spanish determiner with English noun), the present study focuses on what the differences in determiner selection and agreement in copula constructions means for the status of gender in bilingual grammars.
3.2 Acquisition of L2 Gender

Previous research on the acquisition of gender in adult L2 learners has shown that agreement errors are persistent in L2 learner grammars. Franceschina (2001) found the high number of gender errors indicated that “uninterpretable gender features are not fully or correctly specified or even altogether absent from the subject’s L2 syntactic representations” (243). White et al. (2004) established that both L1 English and L1 French learners of L2 Spanish produced errors with gender at the lowest level of proficiency, regardless of the presence of the gender feature in the L1. Masculine was again identified as a default gender marking. McCarthy (2007) accounted for gender mismatches within the Distributed Morphology (DM) framework and argued that underspecification and avoidance of feature clash is the source of errors for gender.

Code-mixing provides an interesting diagnostic for the status of the gender feature in Spanish/English bilingual grammars because it allows us to explore several issues related to gender selection. First, if gender is acquired on the noun itself, then code-mixed DPs should not have mismatches, while copula constructions may be treated differently, since concord and agreement are different operations. That is, concord is related to the noun while the agreement operation is part of the verbal domain. Second, if differences in gender selection are found between Spanish heritage speaker bilinguals (simultaneous bilinguals) and Spanish/English bilinguals (adult learners of English), then it may indicate language dominance.

With respect to examining the status of gender in bilingual grammars, we ask the following research questions:

1. Are differences in determiner selection between bilingual and L1 Spanish speakers due to a difference in underlying structure (English DP versus Spanish DP)?
2. Have heritage speaker bilinguals acquired the abstract gender feature of Spanish?
3. If there is a difference between heritage speaker grammars and L1 Spanish grammars, what implications does this have for teaching heritage language Spanish?

We will assume that differences in gender selection for both types of constructions entails a difference in underlying structure. Moreover, accuracy in concord and not in agreement will provide evidence that the gender feature has been acquired.

4. Methodology

4.1 Participants

There were two groups of participants. One group consisted of Spanish heritage speaker bilinguals (n=20) who were living in Canada at the time of testing. This Spanish heritage group was comprised of all simultaneous bilinguals who were living entirely in English outside of the home and Spanish in the home. In our sample, the varieties of Spanish were from Spain, Colombia, Peru, and Mexico. All heritage speakers were either university students (all but one pursuing graduate degrees) or professionals with advanced university degrees. The other bilingual group was L1 Spanish speakers (n=32) who were all post-childhood learners of L2 English. This group was also made of university students (in graduate programs) or university graduates in professional jobs. A summary of group details are outlined in Table 1.

4.2 Experimental Design

As a means of classification and in order to maintain as homogenous a group of heritage speakers as possible, in addition to the language background questionnaire, participants were
asked to do independent language proficiency (Michigan Test for English and Wisconsin Test for Spanish) and vocabulary post-tests. None of the tasks provided the target noun in Spanish in order to avoid priming the gender of the noun counterpart in Spanish.

4.2.1 Vocabulary Test

For the Vocabulary Test, participants were provided with thirty English nouns and were then asked to translate them into Spanish (see Appendix A for the full test). A masculine and a feminine determiner were given in Spanish and they were asked to circle the appropriate one. The purpose of this task was to determine what gender they were assigning the Spanish translation. The target nouns were never given in Spanish (neither in the Vocabulary Test nor in the Sentence Selection Task) in order to avoid priming effects. This task was designed to confirm what translation participants gave to the English noun and to see if they assigned the appropriate gender. All nouns were carefully chosen in order to avoid dialectal variations. All words also appeared in the Sentence Selection Task. We used this test as a type of filter; if the participant gave us the wrong Spanish translation of the English word (i.e., a vocabulary word with another gender), then that participant was eliminated from analysis.

4.2.2 Sentence Selection Task

The main experimental task was a Sentence Selection Task (SST) in which we elicited preferences in two types of syntactic operations: concord and agreement. In this test, participants read a dialogue between two bilingual speakers that included either a code-switched DP or an agreement copula sentence. They were asked to choose the concluding statement that sounded most natural to them. The two types of code-mixing in this task were code-mixed DPs (concord) and agreement within copula constructions (agreement). For each type of code-mixed construction, there were six conditions for a total of twelve conditions in the entire test. There were three endings for masculine nouns (from less marked to more marked) and three endings for feminine (from less marked to more marked). Five tokens were provided for each condition,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Spanish Speakers</td>
<td>L1 Spanish / L2 English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in Canada at time of testing</td>
<td>Living in Canada at time of testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simultaneous bilinguals</td>
<td>Post-childhood learners of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant English*</td>
<td>Intermediate, advanced, near-native proficiency range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced/near-native proficiency in Spanish</td>
<td>Age range: 18–40 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age range: 18–40 years</td>
<td>Education: University degree (in progress or completed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: University degree (in progress or completed)</td>
<td>Education: University degree (in progress or completed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=20</td>
<td>n=32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dominance here is based on the language background questionnaire and the fact that they were and always have lived in Canada where the community language is English.
resulting in thirty code-mixed DP tokens and thirty code-mixed copula/agreement tokens. The following conditions in Figure 1 were used in the task. In Table 2, we give examples for each of the conditions.

Figure 1. Sentence Selection Task Conditions

4.3 Results

In Figure 2, we show the total distribution of responses for masculine and feminine tokens in both DPs and copula constructions (agreement). Figure 2 also shows the overall results for masculine and feminine tokens in both code-switched DP and copula/agreement constructions. As can be seen, the L2 English/L1 Spanish speakers chose the Spanish determiner based on the gender of the noun in Spanish, as in (9) for the code-mixed DPs, and for the copula constructions, they agreed the Spanish adjective with the gender of the Spanish translation of the English noun, as in (10):

(9) el (Det MASC) book (libro MASC) / la (Det FEM) chair (silla FEM)
(10) the party (fiesta FEM) fue fantástica (FEM)

The heritage speaker bilingual group, like the L2 English/L1 Spanish, preferred el (masculine determiner) with nouns that have a masculine Spanish translation, but, unlike the other group, chose optionally el or la (masculine or feminine, respectively) for nouns with feminine Spanish equivalents.

(11) el book (libro MASC) / el/la chair (silla FEM)

For the copula/agreement constructions, on the other hand, the heritage speakers, like the L2 English/L1 Spanish speakers, correctly agreed the Spanish adjective to a greater extent with the gender of the Spanish translation of the English noun (both masculine and feminine) in copula constructions in both regardless.

(12) the party (fiesta FEM) fue fantástica (FEM)
Table 2. Sentence Selection Task Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code-switched DP</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEM -a</strong></td>
<td><strong>MASC -o</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Juan: I had lots of fun anoche, pues, I ran into Sergio. Elisa: Seriously? ¿Dónde lo viste?  
  a. En la party  
  b. En el party | Juan: ¡Qué despiste! I totally forgot something. Elisa: ¿Qué te olvidaste?  
  a. La wine  
  b. El wine |
| **FEM -e**       | **MASC -e**       |
| Elisa: ¡Qué rico cenamos! Juan: Definitely. ¿Qué te gustó más?  
  a. La meat  
  b. El meat | Juan: Elisa, can you help me carry some things from my car? Elisa: Of course. ¿Qué quieres que lleve?  
  a. La dessert  
  b. El dessert |
| **FEM -consonant** | **MASC -consonant** |
| Elisa: Acabo de volver de México. Juan: Really! ¿Qué te gustó más?  
  a. La city  
  b. El city | Juan: I went to Europe y usé every single form of transportation. Elisa: What was your favorite?  
  a. La plane  
  b. El plane |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement/Copulas</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEM -a</strong></td>
<td><strong>MASC -o</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Elisa: Ayer fue el cumpleaños de Fernando. Juan: Really? And how was the party?  
  a. Fue fantástica  
  b. Fue fantástico | Juan: ¿Qué hay de beber? Elisa: All I have is BC wine.  
  a. Fine, es exquisita  
  b. Fine, es exquisito |
| **FEM -e**       | **MASC -e**       |
| Juan: I don’t want to finish this meat. Elisa: ¿Por qué? What’s wrong with the meat?  
  a. Está cruda  
  b. Está crudo | Juan: Gracias por la comida. Elisa: Did you like the dessert que hice?  
  a. ¡Sí! Está buenísima  
  b. ¡Sí! Está buenísimo |
| **FEM -consonant** | **MASC -consonant** |
| Elisa: Me acabo de mudar de Toronto. Juan: Oh! You don’t like the city?  
  a. No, es ruidosa  
  b. No, es ruidoso | Juan: Ayer vi tu colección de miniaturas. Elisa: Did you like the World War II plane?  
  a. ¡Sí! ¿Es nueva?  
  b. ¡Sí! ¿Es nuevo?
A factorial ANOVA shows a significant difference between groups in code-switched DP conditions and code-switched copula/agreement conditions for the heritage speaker group for feminine tokens ($F(1,40)=26.080$, $p=.000$), but not for masculine ones ($F(1,40)=2.199$, $p=.146$). However, the heritage group is still differentiating between DP and copula constructions in the FEM tokens in that they are choosing the feminine agreement in feminine contexts more often in the copula/agreement conditions (71%) versus the DP conditions (56%). That is, while the L2 English group does not differentiate between DP and copula/agreement conditions, the heritage group does differentiate between the two types of constructions, patterning with the L2 English group in copula/agreement conditions, but not in the DP conditions.

Figure 3 shows detailed results for code-switched DPs where the tokens are itemized by ending for the Spanish translation of the noun. The rationale for including this detail was to determine whether Spanish nouns that end in the so-called canonical ending (-o for MASC or -a for FEM) were somehow easier to acquire. The results in Figure 3 show that the heritage speaker group does not show an effect for the ending of a noun. That is, canonical (MASC -o / FEM -a) versus non-canonical ending (-e / -consonant) of the noun in Spanish does not seem to help.

In Figure 4, we show the results for code-switched copula constructions (agreement conditions) where the tokens are itemized by ending for the Spanish translation of the noun. In Figure 4, we see that the heritage speaker group had slightly higher accuracy (gender matching) with nouns whose gender in the Spanish translation are FEM with canonical -a ending, but there is no statistical significance.

In order to compare the heritage speaker group results for treatment of code-switched DPs versus code-switched copula constructions, a within group ANOVA was performed and it revealed that the heritage speaker group shows a significant difference in treatment of feminine tokens in the code-switched DPs versus the copula/agreement constructions ($F(3,57)=20.272$, $p=.000$), but no significant difference for the masculine tokens across code-switch type ($F(3,57)=27.323$, $p=.151$).
Figure 3. Code-switch DP: Distribution of Responses for Masculine/Feminine (by Spanish Gender-matched Noun Ending)

Figure 4. Copula/Agreement: Distribution of Responses for Masculine/Feminine (by Spanish Gender-matched Noun Ending)
5. Discussion and Conclusion

Our first research question was whether differences in determiner selection between bilingual and L1 Spanish speakers were due to a difference in underlying structure. Our results showed that matching of gender features in code-mixed DPs (operation of concord) was not treated in the same way by heritage speakers and L1 Spanish speakers. That is, in the grammar of the heritage speakers, the English noun was not assigned the same gender feature of the Spanish counterpart for the feminine tokens in the copula constructions (agreement) condition; on the other hand, matching of gender features was higher. While the heritage group did not agree the Spanish adjective with the English nouns whose Spanish translations were feminine to the same extent as the L2 English/L1 Spanish group, heritage speakers were more accurate on feminine tokens in the code-switched copula constructions than in the code-switched DPs. This difference in supplying feminine agreement in the two types of constructions indicates a difference in treatment of the two constructions by heritage speakers and, at least in code-switched contexts, a possible difference in underlying structure.

The second research question was whether heritage bilinguals have acquired the abstract gender feature of Spanish. In the DP conditions, heritage speakers differed significantly from the L1 Spanish speakers in the feminine tokens. That is, heritage speakers chose, more often, the default masculine determiner (el) with nouns whose Spanish equivalents were feminine than did the L1 Spanish group. The reason may be due to the way in which heritage speakers, as opposed to L1 speakers, treat the “lexical-functional” code-mixed DPs. Namely, heritage speakers may be treating these types of switches as borrowings and thereby resort to the default MASC determiner. However, for the copula constructions, heritage Spanish speakers were more accurate with the feminine gender tokens than in DP conditions. This difference in treatment of agreement within copula constructions and concord in DPs seems to indicate something deeper; perhaps the different operations (concord versus agreement) are processed differently. This still maintains the view that the underlying structures are different between DPs and copula/agreement, but that is also true for people raised monolingual. It is how these two operations are processed that may be different for the different speaker groups rather than a problem with the gender feature itself.

The third research question was if heritage Spanish speakers and L1 Spanish speakers differed significantly in their treatment of the two structures, what implications does this have on teaching the heritage language. The results from this study support the notion that heritage speaker grammars are not “monolingual-like” (Montrul 2008; Rothman 2009; Sorace 2007). If we assume that the abstract feature gender has been acquired by heritage speakers as shown in the more monolingual-like patterning of preference for the copula/agreement constructions (i.e., higher accuracy in feminine tokens in copula constructions), then there are two possible explanations for the lack of convergence between both groups. On the one hand, it could be the case that heritage speakers treat lexical-functional code-mixing (the DP conditions) as borrowings and therefore resort to the default masculine gender marking regardless of the gender of its Spanish equivalent. That is, results may refer to selection preferences in code-switched constructions but not to gender agreement/concord itself, since the operation that is being forced is present in Spanish but not in English DPs (as accounted for by Liceras et al. 2008). On the other hand, it may be the case that the two operations (concord versus agreement) are processed differently by heritage speakers and people raised monolingual until late childhood or early adulthood. If this idea is on the right track, then it can be assumed that it is processing and not necessarily different underlying representations that are the cause of the differences among the groups. With respect to teaching, since heritage speakers are exposed to Spanish from birth, we can exclude age as being an issue. The issue, then, can be the amount of exposure and/or dominance of the community language. The heritage speakers in this study behaved monolingual-like on some aspects of grammatical gender and displayed English dominance.
in others. For heritage language instruction, this may be an indication that more exposure to communicative Spanish input (process of concord) is required and not necessarily direct focus on form (process of agreement). Further testing in this direction is needed to tease these two possibilities apart with online and comprehension tasks. Despite the shortcomings of the present study, the data provide new insights into heritage speaker bilingual acquisition. The experimental data provide insight into the way different bilingual speakers process and analyze data and specifically the way in which gender agreement/concord is perceived and analyzed by different bilingual groups.
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APPENDIX

Vocabulary Test

For the task below, (a) please translate the following English words into Spanish and (b) circle the appropriate article (el or la).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Word</th>
<th>Spanish Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. the beer</td>
<td>el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. the city</td>
<td>el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. the plane</td>
<td>el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. the party</td>
<td>el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. the pone</td>
<td>el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. the street</td>
<td>el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. the dessert</td>
<td>el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. the fork</td>
<td>el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. the food</td>
<td>el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. the friendship</td>
<td>el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. the nose</td>
<td>el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. the chicken</td>
<td>el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. the wine</td>
<td>el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. the bridge</td>
<td>el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. the suit</td>
<td>el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. the garden</td>
<td>el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. the tablecloth</td>
<td>el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. the forehead</td>
<td>el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. the kitchen</td>
<td>el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. the park</td>
<td>el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. the light</td>
<td>el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. the song</td>
<td>el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. the gift</td>
<td>el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. the bread</td>
<td>el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. the movie theater</td>
<td>el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. the meat</td>
<td>el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. the knife</td>
<td>el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. the table</td>
<td>el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. the snow</td>
<td>el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. the fountain</td>
<td>el</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>