Unlike Italian, which allows Acc-clitics to co-occur in impersonal SE sentences, Spanish shows a restriction where only objects preceded by the Differential Object Marker (DOM) permit clitics to coocur with impersonal SE:

1) I libri/i ragazzi li si\textsubscript{IMP} vede (Italian)
2) I libri/i ragazzi si\textsubscript{IMP} ved-ono (Italian)
3) *(A) las niñas se\textsubscript{IMP}las ha visto contentas (Peninsular Spanish PS, Río Plata Spanish RPS)
4) *(A) Las cerezas se\textsubscript{IMP}las preparó con vino vs. Las cerezas las preparó con vino.

This contrast can be explained if: A) structural accusative case is not available in Spanish Se constructions (contrary to Italian), and, therefore, there is no source for accusative case in (3)-(4), and B) DOM objects receive no structural accusative case either (Mondoñedo 2002, Torrego 1998, Torrego 2010). Let us assume that DOM objects in (3) and (4) receive case through a functional projection like the applicative head licensed above V suggested in Torrego 2010. We claim, contrary to Italian objects, that Spanish DOM objects in (3) (4) are not left dislocated, but in the lower Spec of the applicative head. Whenever the DOM object appears to the left, the applicative head must surface with an overt clitic. However, there is no unifying solution for the Spanish dialects on the overt realization of this applicative head. In this paper we explore three basic patterns: In Mexican Spanish (MS), the clitic surfaces as the dative as in (5). In Rioplatense Spanish (RPS) it does so as the accustive as in (6). Peninsular Spanish (PS) (for leísta and non-leísta dialects), on the other hand, shows variability depending on the gender of the NP preceded by the particle a (7). Thus, dative-\textit{le} is common for masculine singular, less common for feminine.

5) A los niños-as se\textsubscript{IMP} les veía felices (MS)
6) A lo/as niños-as se\textsubscript{IMP} los/las veía felices ( RPS)
7) A lo/as niños-as se les/las\textsubscript{IMP} veía felices. (PS)

The dative DO in the contexts of impersonal SE for MS and PS are not the same Dative IO (Cuervo 2003). Thus, the clitic dative DO in SE\textsubscript{IMP} cannot be doubled in either dialect when the object is in situ (8), contrary to dative IOs (9):

8) ?*Se\textsubscript{IMP} les veía a los niños felices (MS and PS)
9) Se\textsubscript{IMP} les dio el libro a los niños (MS and PS)

This implies that a higher applicative heads (Pylkänen 2008, Cuervo 2003) is responsible for IO datives as opposed to the lower DO datives. This is very clear in RPS and PS, which do not allow the clitic with a variable, as opposed to dative, SE contexts:

10) A quién se\textsubscript{IMP} (*lo/*le)vió? ( in RPS and PS)
11) A quién se\textsubscript{IMP} le dio el libro? (RPS and PS)

We derive the microparametric differences between MS and PS on the morphological composition of this applicative head. Thus the applicative shows partial gender distinctions in PS, but not in MS. RPS on the other hand, shows all gender distinctions. We claim that this is not an accident. In RPS, the same applicative head responsible for doubling in situ
DOM objects in (12) (13) is also responsible for the licensing of preverbal objects in SE\textsubscript{IMP} in (14):

12) Lo veo al niño contento (RPS)
13) Se\textsubscript{IMP} lo ve contento al niño. (RPS)
14) Al niño se\textsubscript{IMP} lo ve contento. (RPS)

In MS and PS, this head only surfaces through overt movement, a common state of affairs in most agreement systems.

The applicative head is required with null animate non-arbitrary objects in all dialects. This is expected because animates in all these dialects require the DOM. The analysis, thus, involves movement of the null empty object to the Spec of this applicative head, contrary to what happens with null inanimates:

15) El presidente dijo que se\textsubscript{IMP} *(le/lo) eligió por ser el mejor. (Animate Null object)
16) Este cuadro es caro porque se\textsubscript{IMP} (*lo) pintó en el siglo X. (Inanimate non arb Null object)

However, this does not imply that inanimates in general might not enter into a Spec relationship with this applicative head. They do that only when they are marked with the DOM:

17) (*A) la lentejas se las/les hierve a fuego lento

Finally, only one applicative head is compatible with this impersonal SE construction. This is shown by the impossibility of having double animate objects, contrary to what it is found in non-impersonal constructions in (19). The impossibility is due to the fact that two animate objects are competing for checking against this same applicative head:

18) *A María se\textsubscript{IMP} me la recomienda.
19) A María me la recomendaron.

The introduction of this applicative head goes hand in hand with the introduction of impersonal SE. Some periphrastic passives permit the appearance of impersonal SE only when some applicative element (not necessarily the above one) is involved:

20) Por cuestiones de papeleos se\textsubscript{IMP} *(me) fue denegada la visa

These examples, corroborate the SE in Spanish does receive accusative case, since the object of the passive is present. The applicative head is responsible for the licensing of the IO. We have found two types of SE with passives with montransitives and with ditransitives. In the paper we provide evidence of this taxonomy in all dialects of Latin American Spanish.