The diversity of the evidential systems in the world languages might have important relations to questions regarding universal and language-specific points in terms of the acquisition of evidential structures (Matsui & Fitneva, 2009). A following question is whether unattested patterns are equally learnable as frequent ones, with the right proportion of training (Finley & Badecker, 2008), or whether some logically possible grammatical systems are rare because of an operating learning bias (Culbertson, Smolensky & Legendre, 2012; Fedzechkina, Jaeger & Newport, 2012). The three evidentiality systems in the current study were designed analogously to Bartell and Papafragou (2015). Each system contained written scenarios of three evidential categories: direct, inferential, and reportative. In each system the categories marked with an evidential morpheme differed. The participants' first language was a grammatically evidential Non-firsthand versus "everything else" (Aikhenvald, 2004) type, while their second language did not contain grammatical evidentiality. Learnability was measured through participants' accuracy and response time to whether an evidential marker should or should not be used across the different scenarios in the different systems.

The main hypothesis was based on the typological universals' assumptions. The two systems that were widely spread were expected to be significantly easier to acquire, compared to the third system, which has not been documented in any language so far (Aikhenvald, 2004). The alternative hypothesis believed that the learnability would depend on participants' language background, where their L1, by the logic of the L1 Factor theory (Rothman, Iverson & Judy, 2010), would provide a morphosyntactic transfer when acquiring evidential structures. In this case, the systems resembling Bulgarian the most and, at the same time – encompassing the same direct-indirect categorical division in the marking as Bulgarian, would be the easiest for acquisition.

Despite the fact that the mixed-model analyses did not display any significant effect or interaction, the trends showed that the accuracy data partially supported the alternative hypothesis of this study, where the least successfully acquired evidential system was the one that omitted the possibly universal cognitive and semantic distinction between direct and indirect information (Aikhenvald, 2004; Faller, 2002; Papafragou et al., 2007; Universität Konstanz, 2009). Finally, the most successful acquisition of the system mostly resembling the Bulgarian one provided a partial support for the L1 Factor theory (Rothman, Iverson & Judy, 2010) for this data.