A Case Study of Three Chinese-Spanish Varieties: Tense-Aspect Morphology in Instructed and Non-Instructed Language Use[1]

Travis Evans-Sago

Indiana University-Bloomington

Researchers in second language acquisition (SLA) have examined the acquisition and use of tense-aspect (TA) morphology in predominantly tutored, second language (L2) varieties (Andersen & Shirai 1996; Bardovi-Harlig 1998; Quesada 2013; Salaberry 2005, 2011, 2013). Language contact scholars have focused on L2 acquisition in immigrant situations in which L2 learners acquire the host country's language in an untutored environment (Clements 2002, 2003, 2009; Klein & Perdue 1992, 1997; Sharma & Deo 2010). This case study addresses the effects of instructed and non-instructed contexts on language learning by examining similarities and differences in L2 use of TA morphology among three Chinese-Spanish learner varieties: an untutored variety spoken by a Chinese immigrant living in Spain (Clements 2003, 2009) and two tutored varieties spoken by Chinese learners of Spanish who are studying in the United States and have varying degrees of experience with Spanish. The production data, retrieved from three 45-minute sociolinguistic interviews, yielded a total of 390 tokens. Quantitative and qualitative analyses revealed trends across the learner varieties, which include lower rates of overtly marking state verbs in all learner varieties, an innovative aspectual marker *ya* 'already' in the Chinese immigrant variety, and a distinct interplay of semantic factors for each L2 variety. Findings suggest an effect of the learning context on L2 use of TA morphology.

Keywords: second language acquisition, language contact, bilingualism, instructed contexts, non-instructed contexts, immigrant speech, the basic variety, pidgins and creoles, pidginization, tense, aspect, lexical aspect.

1. Introduction

The Uniformitarian Principle in linguistics posits that the language processes of the present may elucidate the language processes of the past, in that they must

---

be largely similar—if not the same—across time and space (Bergs 2012; Labov 1972). Applying this observation to contexts of instructed and non-instructed language learning, we would expect to observe for a given linguistic variable, shared processes and outcomes of second language (L2) acquisition across situations of multilingualism and language contact (see Geeslin & Evans-Sago in press, and Siegel 2006, for discussions). Nevertheless, second language acquisition (SLA)[2] and language contact (LC) studies have found that the learning context may affect overall L2 development and use (Clements 2009; Pérez-Vidal 2014; Tarone & Liu 1995). Several individual and social factors related to the learning context have been linked to L2 variation, such as learner identity (Norton 2000, 2013), social and psychological distance from the target community (Schumann 1976), learner investment (Norton Peirce 1995), learner motivation (Dörnyei 1994), quality and quantity of input (Gass 1997), and opportunities for interaction (Long 1996), among several others (see R. Ellis 2008; Geeslin & Long 2014; Klein & Dimroth 2009, for overviews).

Case studies have been especially useful for identifying the effects of the learning context on language development. Clements (2009), for instance, reveals similarities and differences in L2 use among two Chinese immigrants living in Spain. His informants, Luis and Jenny, share key traits in their L2 production (e.g., devoicing of voiced stops, the preference of consonant-vowel structure, the lack of noun and verb morphology, etc.), but several differences were also found. Jenny's speech is highly fluent with a rich vocabulary and a more developed pronominal and aspectual system, whereas Luis's speech lacks these features but reveals the consistent use of *la* 'the (feminine, singular)' and a higher rate of inflectional marking. Clements attributes these differences to their L2 ecologies. Jenny's speech is a "direct reflection of her situation between 1994 and 2004, during which she has increasingly spent time with Spanish speakers rather than Chinese speakers" (Clements 2009: 131). On the other hand, Luis reported that, outside of their work and school environments, he and his family had "virtually no contact with Spanish speakers" (Clements 2009: 130). The environment or ecology of each immigrant, regardless of a shared first language (L1) or even host culture, differentially affected the learner varieties, such that, in Jenny's case, a more dynamic ecology with increased interactions with native speakers of the L2 helped her to develop a rich vocabulary with which to express herself.

---

[2] In this paper, I distinguish between the field of second language acquisition (SLA) and the processes and outcomes of second language acquisition (L2 acquisition).

The present case study extends Clements (2009) by examining instructed as well as non-instructed varieties to address the effect of the learning context. Specifically, it contrasts the use of tense-aspect (TA) morphology in three distinct Chinese-Spanish varieties: an untutored variety spoken by a Chinese immigrant living in Spain (Clements 2003, 2009) and two tutored varieties spoken by Chinese learners of Spanish who are studying in the United States. One instructed learner is a Ph.D. student in Hispanic Literatures and had a yearlong exchange experience in Cuba, and the other instructed learner had, at the time of the study, completed only the final course of the undergraduate Basic Language Program with no previous experience in a Spanish-speaking country. Similarities and differences in L2 use of Spanish TA morphology found across these three Chinese-Spanish learner varieties are evaluated with respect to the learning context and language experiences of each learner.

2. The Basic Variety

Researchers in SLA have long been concerned with identifying universal processes in L2 development (see, for example, the Morpheme Studies; Dulay & Burt 1974; Goldschneider & DeKeyser 2001; Larsen-Freeman 1976). One exemplary study that establishes universal stages of L2 acquisition is Klein and Perdue's (1992, 1997) longitudinal work on forty adult immigrants in Europe. From these untutored learners, ten different L1-L2 combinations resulted in rich comparative data for identifying universal principles and constraints on non-instructed language learning. The functionalist study posits that, irrespective of the L1 or L2 involved, a Basic Variety (BV)—that is, a "well-structured, efficient and simple form of language"—emerges in this type of language learning situation (Klein & Perdue 1997: 301). Based on this definition, the BV seems akin to a pidgin because both may contain simplifications and reductions. However, a pidgin is a community-wide solution among groups of speakers with different L1s. The non-native speakers in this context typically lack continued access to the target language and therefore use a pidginized version of it as a vehicle of communication in the community (Schumann 1978: 368). The BV instead represents an individual-level learner solution to the ongoing communicative pressures to interact with native (and non-native) speakers of the target language on a regular basis (e.g., the workplace).

According to Klein and Perdue, pragmatic, semantic, and phrasal constraints interact at every level of proficiency, but their relative weight or influence in utterance organization varies according to three overlapping phases

(see Klein & Perdue 1992: Ch. 7, for a complete discussion). In the first phase, Nominal Utterance Organization (NUO), there is a preponderance of nouns, adverbs, and particles, as well as sometimes adjectives and participles. Verbs are largely absent, or if present in smaller numbers, they do not exert the same "structuring power" as expected from them, such as argument structure and case role assignment (Klein & Perdue 1992: 302). During the second phase, Infinite Utterance Organization (IUO), verbs increase in presence and demonstrate evidence of possessing different types of valency in which agentivity assigns position of its nominal actants. More important to the nomenclature, verbal marking is not indicative of finiteness. In fact, the point at which a clearer distinction between finite and non-finite components of the verb can be made—not necessarily congruent with native norms in the L2—is the principal criterion for determining whether a learner has arrived at the level of Finite Utterance Organization (FUO).[3] Moreover, Klein and Perdue (1992: 304) state: "the initial steps in development are dominantly guided by universal principles, and factors attributable to the specifics of individual languages are more characteristic of later stages". The FUO is the point at which the learner variety is furthest away from the universal principles and constraints in the BV, and it may instead be most variable due to L1 and/or L2 influence. Finally, transition from one phase to the next is not rapid, nor even linearly progressive, as defining characteristics from each phase may overlap or recur at various points in the learner variety.

A significant finding from Klein and Perdue's research is that all learners attain the level of IUO, but not all learners demonstrate evidence of reaching the latest phase of FUO. With respect to instructed versus non-instructed learning, tutored learners have been found to develop morphological marking—with varying degrees of success—and thus reach the final FUO phase. Untutored learners (e.g., some immigrants) tend to lack such marking in L2 use, remaining at the IUO phase of development. Klein and Perdue's findings beg the question why many tutored learners, but not untutored learners, reach a level of FUO. With this question in mind, the present study argues that the learning context and language experience of learners can account for differences in L2 use across the three Chinese-Spanish learner varieties, while

---

[3] The IUO phase is equivalent to Schumann's (1978) pidginization, defined as the "imperfect speech of second language learners acquired through *restricted contact* with speakers of the target language" (Schumann 1978: 368; emphasis added). Like the IUO, verbs are present in a pidginized variety but may not indicate finiteness. De-pidginization, according to Andersen (1983: 10), refers to an "increase in complexity" of the learner varieties (e.g., finite marking in the FUO phase) as learners approximate the norms of the target language.

similarities may instead reflect the influence of universal processes of L2 acquisition.

3. Tense and Aspect

Comrie (1985: 235) defines tense as a deictic, "grammaticalized expression of location in time" and aspect as "not deictic…, but rather refer[ring] to the internal characterization of a situation". Aspect may be further discussed in terms of lexical and grammatical notions. In the first case, lexical aspect pertains to the set of real-world situations or eventualities denoted by predicates, also known as Vendler's (1967) *Aktionsart*. The typology set of *Aktionsart* consists of four lexical predicate classes based on a configuration of semantic features: states (–dynamic, +durative, –telic), activities (+dynamic, +durative, –telic), accomplishments (+dynamic, +durative, +telic), and achievements (+dynamic, –durative, +telic). In the second case, grammatical aspect applies to the verbal morphology that encodes the "temporal perspectives on those [real-world] situations taken by the speaker" (Sharma & Deo 2010: 111). In terms of morphological marking, the interplay of these two notions of aspect has given rise to much variation in the TA systems around the world in L1, L2, and LC varieties.

Theoretical viewpoints on grammatical and lexical aspect differ in whether researchers characterize these types of aspect as operating distinctly from each other (Smith 1991) or functioning in a compositional, interdependent relationship (de Swart 1998). Most L2 tense-aspect studies are based on the Lexical Aspect Hypothesis (LAH), which predicts that lexical aspect is the primary influence in L2 tense-aspect morphological systems. Research has demonstrated that L2 learners of Spanish at the beginning stages of acquisition may rely on the preterit as a default past marker when morphologically encoding temporal-aspectual relations, but that as proficiency increases, they begin to rely on lexical aspect as a cue for "prototypical choices" (e.g., Andersen 1986, 1991; Andersen & Shirai 1996; Salaberry 1999, 2000, 2002, 2005, 2011). That is, learners produce the preterit for telic verbs and the imperfect for atelic verbs. In more advanced stages, they begin to incorporate more "non-prototypical" choices, such as the imperfect with achievement verbs (e.g., *Cuando vivía en México* **llegaba** *tarde a la escuela…*(vs. *llegué*) 'when I lived in Mexico I used to arrive late to school…') and the preterit with state verbs (*Ayer* **estuve** *hablando con mi mamá…*(vs. *estaba*) 'yesterday I was talking to my mom…'),

8

reflecting perhaps an increased influence of discourse-pragmatic factors like backgrounding and foregrounding (Bardovi-Harlig 1998).

3.1. Spanish

In Spanish, various forms of inflectional tense morphology may be used to express the past, including the preterit (1a), the imperfect (1b), and the present perfect (1c) forms, among others (Delgado-Díaz 2014: 14).[4]

(1)   a.   *…de Hugo para acá fueron los peores.*

          '…from Hugo to here were the worst ones.'

       b.   *…en casa yo era la mayor…*

          '…at home I was the oldest.'

       c.   *Pues con eso es que más yo he bregado.*

          'Well it was with that that I grappled most.'

Depending on the context, preterit and imperfect forms may appear with each of Vendler's lexical classes, as shown in my examples (2a-d).

(2)   a.   *Gabriel pareció/parecía feliz.*   STATE

          Gabriel seemed-PRET/seemed-IMP happy

          'Gabriel seemed happy.'

       b.   *Gabriel estudió/estudiaba en la biblioteca.*   ACTIVITY

          Gabriel studied- PRET/studied-IMP in the library

          'Gabriel studied in the library.'

       c.   *Gabriel preparó/preparaba la cena.*   ACCOMPLISHMENT

          Gabriel prepared-PRET/prepared-IMP the dinner

          'Gabriel prepared the dinner.'

---

[4] These examples were retrieved by Delgado-Díaz (2014) from the PRESEEA (Proyecto para el Estudio Sociolingüístico del Español de España y de América) Puerto Rico corpus.

    d.   *Gabriel entró/entraba en la casa.*   ACHIEVEMENT

        Gabriel entered-PRET/entered-IMP in the house

        'Gabriel entered the house.'

The selection of preterit over imperfect forms depends largely on the discourse context. The preterit, for example, expresses the onset or completion of an event, as in my example (3a), while the imperfect expresses events, sometimes incomplete or lacking an overt endpoint, such as with habitual (3b), progressive (3c), or intentional (3d) meanings, among others.

(3)   a.   *Isabela   corrió   hasta la parada de autobús   pero*

        Isabela   ran-PRET until   the stop   of bus   but

        no   llegó   a tiempo.

        NEG   arrived-PRET   on time

        'Isabela ran to the bus stop but didn't get there in time.'

    b.   *Isabela corría   a   la   parada de   autobús*

        Isabela ran-IMP   to   the   stop   of   bus

        todas   las mañanas.

        all   the mornings

        'Isabela used to run/ran/would run to the bus stop every morning.'

    c.   *Isabela corría   a la parada de autobús cuando la vi.*

        Isabela ran-IMP to the stop   of bus   when   CL saw-1SG

        'Isabela was running to the bus stop when I saw her.'

    d.   *Isabela corría   conmigo mañana,   pero ya   no   puede.*

        Isabela$_i$ ran-IMP with-me tomorrow, but   now Ø$_i$ NEG can

        'Isabela was running with me tomorrow, but now she can't.'

Because tense and aspect in Spanish is marked with inflectional suffixes, such as in the preterit *jugué* ('played') versus the imperfect *jugaba* ('played,' 'used

to play,' 'would play,' 'was playing'),[5] expressing temporal-aspectual notions in L2 Spanish can prove challenging for learners whose native languages express tense or aspect differently. The lack of a one-to-one correspondence between the L1 and L2 in the formal means of expressing TA (e.g., morphological or periphrastic) may represent one source of difficulty for learners when encoding temporal-aspectual distinctions in the L2, regardless of the L1 (Salaberry 2013).

3.2. Mandarin Chinese

Traditional accounts describe the aspectual system of Mandarin Chinese as one which "relies heavily on adverbs and pragmatics" rather than on overt morphology (Smith & Erbaugh 2005: 713). Aspectual viewpoints may be (non)obligatorily expressed by both perfective morphemes, such as the verbal particle *le*, the experiential *–guo*, and the resultative *–wan*, and the imperfective morphemes, such as the progressive *zai* and suffix *–zhe*. A discussion of the most frequent (and complex) of these morphemes, the particle *le*, will serve to provide an overview of the aspectual system in Mandarin Chinese, which may speak to the overall nature of tense and aspect in the Chinese-Spanish data.

Robson (2005) provides a complete discussion on two functions of the particle *le* in Mandarin Chinese, which will inform the analysis of the temporal-aspectual system of Chinese-Spanish interlanguage. The first function of the *le* particle appears formally as a verbal suffix and identifies the *completion of an event*, and the second function is expressed formally as a sentence-final particle that indicates a *change of state*. Most importantly, therefore, the particle *le* is an aspectual, not tense, marker. Unlike tense, the viewpoints for using the *le* particle are "irrelevant to Speech time" or *non-deictic*, as it makes no specific reference to the time of utterance (Robson 2005: 338).

As representative of the 'relative' or non-deictic, rather than 'absolute' or deictic, tense (Comrie 1985: 56), the *le* particle has perfective and imperfective viewpoints, in which the former includes "both the initial and final endpoints, regarding the situation as a whole unit, [and] the imperfective view focuses on the intervals within a situation, ignoring both the beginning and the end of the situation" (Robson 2005: 334-335). Therefore, the perfective and imperfective viewpoints can be expressed through a combination of relations between the Event (E) and Reference (R) times (Reichenbach 1947). First, for

---

[5] See Delgado-Díaz (2014) for more details on aspect in Spanish.

the perfective viewpoint, an event may be contained within R-time, such as in (4) with the adverbial *yesterday*, reproduced from Robson (2005: 335).

(4) 他   昨天   睡了   十个钟头。

   Ta   zuotian   shui-le   shi-ge-zhongtou

   he   yesterday sleep-ASP   ten-CL-hour

   'He slept ten hours yesterday.'

With a perfective viewpoint, an event may occur before the R time. Considering Speech (S) time, the R- and E-times may both occur either in the past, such as a pluperfect situation in (5a) (Robson 2005: 357), or in the future as in (5b) (Robson 2005: 336).

(5) a. [R- and E-times, respectively, are in the past]

      昨天   我 到家的   时候， 他 已经   睡了。

      Zuotian wo dao-jia de   shihou, ta (yijing) shui le

      yesterday I   reach-home-PART   time   he (already) sleep ASP

      'He (already) had gone to bed when I arrived home yesterday.'

    b. [R- and E-times, respectively, are in the future]

      到 下午   三点，   他就 睡了   十个钟头了。

      Dao xiawu   san-dian   ta jiu shui-le   shi-ge-zhongtou le

      up-to afternoon three-clock he then sleep-ASP ten-CL-hour ASP

      'By 3 o'clock this afternoon he will have slept ten hours.'

When the time relationship is inverted, such as the R-time within the event in (6) or the R-time before the event in (7), an imperfective reading holds (Robson 2005: 336).

12

(6) 我   回来的时候，   他   (正)在 看电视。

Wo   huilai-de-shihou   ta   (zheng)zai   kan-dianshi

I   return-PART-time   he   DUR   watch-television

'When I came back, he was watching television.'

(7) 晚上   吃了饭，   我们   一块   看电视。

Wanshang chi-le-fan,   women yikuair kan-dianshi

evening   eat-ASP-meal, we   together watch-television

'Tonight after dinner, let's watch television together.'

The distinction Robson (2005) raises with respect to tense and aspect is an important one to consider upon examining the present Chinese L1-Spanish L2 learner varieties. Although Spanish has a TA system in which both tense and aspect may be simultaneously marked, a Chinese learner of Spanish may encounter difficulty encoding one, the other, or either potentially due to influence of the L1 temporal-aspectual system (i.e., transfer).

4. Research Questions

This paper asks two specific research questions aimed at understanding the overall production of each learner (Questions 1 and 2). In contextualizing the L2 use of past-tense morphology for these learners, it addresses the overarching question of the effect of the learning context on L2 use (Question 3).

1. For these Chinese learners of Spanish, in past-time reference, what proportion of verb types and tokens are produced and in what order, from most to least frequent, in a sociolinguistic interview? How do these proportions vary according to learner, in terms of frequency and verb class?

2. For each learner, what are the orders of the lexical aspect (i.e., Vendlerian) factor weights affecting overt past-tense marking? Do these orders conform to expectations where events favor overt past-tense marking and states disfavor it?

13

3. What qualitative differences in L2 use of overt TA marking exist across these learners? What role does the learning context have on the linguistic outcomes for each learner?

5. The Study

5.1. The Informants

The present study extends Clements' (2002, 2003, 2009) discussion of Jenny, an untutored Chinese learner of Spanish who immigrated to Spain, to include my own interviews with two tutored Chinese learners of Spanish, who are each at different levels of proficiency and currently studying Spanish in the United States.

Jenny, into her late twenties upon arrival in Spain in 1994, had not previously studied any Spanish and very little English. For the first nine years, she worked in a Chinese restaurant in Madrid and interacted mostly with Chinese people. In the beginning, she lived exclusively with Chinese women where opportunities for input and interaction in Spanish were arguably limited. By 2000, she had become more integrated into Spanish society. At the time of the interview, she was working predominantly with Spaniards as a manicurist, masseuse, and acupuncturist, and she had developed several friendships with local Spaniards to the point of preferring to spend time with her Spanish friends over people in the local Chinese community. Moreover, she regularly read *revistas de corazón* 'magazines of the heart' and followed local events in Spain. As Clements (2009: 130) observed, "her vocabulary is substantial," but her "language development is constrained by the system she created during the first nine years of her residence in Madrid". Her learner variety, therefore, was non-instructed.

Teresa, in her late twenties, is obtaining her Ph.D. in Hispanic Literatures at a large Midwestern university in the United States. Further, she is currently an Associate Instructor of Spanish at the same institution. In China, she studied English throughout primary, secondary, and post-secondary levels of education. She only began studying Spanish at a Chinese college where she eventually earned her B.A. in Spanish. During her third year of college, she participated in a yearlong exchange program to Cuba with other Chinese nationals. She shared a room with a Chinese roommate during her sojourn. At the time of the interview, the China-Cuba exchange program was her only experience in a Spanish-speaking country, and the three years she has spent in

the United States represent her first and only exposure to an English-speaking country. She explicitly mentioned that she speaks slightly more Spanish than English in the United States, which she attributes to the rigor and intensity of her Ph.D. program and her introverted personality that prevents her from interacting with many other people in either language. She also lives alone.

Evan, in his early twenties, was, at the time of the interview, an undergraduate junior studying at the same institution as Teresa. His major was Business Administration but he has since transferred to another institution and changed his field of studies to Information Sciences. Evan had spent no time in a Spanish-speaking country, and he stated that he had never interacted with any native speaker of Spanish. He had also completed only up to the highest intermediate-level Spanish course offered at his university's Basic Language Program. Despite the course level, he rated himself as a beginner learner of Spanish. Finally, he did not study Spanish in high school. Like Teresa, though, he studied English throughout primary and secondary schools in China. During his senior year of high school, he attended a boarding school in New York where he "really learned English." Therefore, in total, he has lived in the United States for four years, and he has never traveled to any other English-speaking country.

5.2. The Corpora

Jenny's complete dataset consists of two-and-a-half hours of transcriptions obtained by means of three semi-guided, sociolinguistic interviews conducted by Clements in 2002 and 2003. Interview topics included family and childhood, early years in Spain, work life, friends, dating, hobbies, and plans, among several others. Data from the second and third interviews were subsequently transcribed by the present author. For the purposes of the current study, only the data from last 45 minutes of the first hour-long interview will be coded and analyzed to ensure comparability to Teresa's and Evan's data. Each of the datasets of the two tutored learners consists of the last 45 minutes of an hour-long, sociolinguistic interview, conducted by the present author in 2017. As one of the transcribers of Jenny's interviews, I was familiar with the contents of Jenny's interview and structured my interviews with the classroom learners as similarly as possible to the interview conducted by Clements. Nevertheless, a change in interviewer is one potential limitation.

As the variable structure of interest in the present study is the production of TA morphology in past-time expression, I extracted only those verb phrases (VPs) in past-time contexts for each interview. Past-time contexts were

determined by a combination of sentence- and discourse-level clues.[6] First, a VP was operationalized as an utterance with the presence of a verb, regardless of finiteness, and any partial utterances, simple noun phrases, or false starts were excluded from analysis. Next, the designation of past-time context was determined if the interviewer had asked the informant a question about childhood or some reference was made to an earlier point in the informants' lives. In any case of ambiguity, the author cautiously removed the data from further analysis. For Jenny, the total number of VPs in past-time contexts is 170, for Teresa, 101, and for Evan, 119 tokens.

5.3. Coding

The independent variable is the lexical aspect of past tense tokens. Originally, the factor group consisted of states, activities, accomplishments, and achievements, but due to a low number of accomplishment tokens, the factors ultimately included states, activities, and the combination of accomplishments and achievements into telic events. Table 1, below, provides examples from Jenny's interview data to show how the factors were operationalized for each participant's data.

Table 1: Operationalization of factors: lexical aspect

Lexical aspect	Example
State	*Fuela China,* **vive** *de Hongkong, y luego volvé China año mil novesiento ochenta.* 'Outside China, he **lived** in Hongkong, and later he returned to China in 1980.'
Activity	*Primero hase China, primero* **estudio**. 'What I first did in China, first I **studied**.'
Accomplishment	*No* **pinta** *de este cuadro. Sabe? Pinta de este.* 'He didn't **paint** this painting. You know? He painted this one.'
Achievement	*Nació e(n) Nanking.* 'I was **born** in Nanjing.'

The dependent variable was binary: overt or non-overt past-tense marking. Non-overt past-tense marking included the first- and third-person singular forms of the present tense (e.g., *tengo* 'I have' or *hase* 'he does'), wholly unanalyzed chunks (e.g., *conóselo* 'know him IMPERATIVE'), and infinitives, both fully

---

[6] Extracting only tokens of past-time reference represents a departure from Clements' (2009) treatment of Jenny's data, in which no distinction of tense was explicitly made.

expressed with *-r* (*hablár* 'to speak') or potentially reduced (e.g., *llegá* 'to arrive'). Overt past-tense marking included uses of the preterit (e.g., *nació* 's/he was born'), progressive *–ndo* (e.g., *hablando* 'speaking'), and past participle *–do* (e.g., *terminado* 'finished'). Additionally, and crucially for the discussion of the particle *le*, the present study included VPs with the use of *ya* 'already' (regardless of the form). This decision was motivated by the literature and the qualitative analysis below. In his study, Clements (2009) suggested that *ya* and *–do* may be "incipient" completive markers. Example (8) provides a brief sample of the evidence suggesting that the marker *ya* has obtained the function of an aspectual marker, akin to Heine & Kuteva's (2005) notion of equivalence or a pivot between the L1 and L2 and replicating the L1 pattern into the L2 (Matras & Sakel 2007).[7]

(8)   *Yo luego a la cuatro cuatro año ya   volvé   Shanghai*

       I   later   at the four four   year already return   Shanghai

       'Later, at four years old, I returned to Shanghai.'

Given that Jenny refers to a specific R time, the use of the marker *ya* functions as an aspectual marker rather than as only an adverbial (see Jenny's discussion below for more details).

6. Quantitative Analysis

In this section, I provide the descriptive statistics of verb types and tokens and their frequencies for each of the informants, followed by a multivariate analysis of the Lexical Aspect Hypothesis (LAH) factors affecting overt past-tense marking. The verb types with the highest number of tokens, regardless of morphological form, are *ser* 'to be,' *hablar* 'to speak,' *estar* 'to be,' *trabajar* 'to work', *tener* 'to have,' *vivir* 'to live,' existential *haber* 'there is/are,' *ir* 'to go,' *conocer* 'to meet/know (a person),' *venir* 'to come,' and *llegar* 'to arrive,' among other slightly less frequently-used verbs like *aprender* 'to learn,' *poder* 'to be able to,' *nacer* 'to be born,' *querer* 'to want,' *saber* 'to know (a fact),'

---

[7] Equivalence, according to Heine and Kuteva (2005: 220) is applied to "situations where a use pattern or category in one language is conceived or described as being the same as a corresponding use pattern or category in another language". The L2 learner hypothesizes a sort of equation between a grammatical concept or structure in the L1 and L2.

coger 'to take,' *pensar* 'to think,' *decir* 'to say/tell,' *gustar* 'to be pleasing,' *solicitar* 'to apply for,' *volver* 'to return,' etc.

6.1. Descriptive statistics

For the combined datasets of all three participants (in Table 2), we observe that the 390 VPs extracted from past-time contexts represent a total of 82 different verb types. The verb types with the highest number of tokens, regardless of morphological form, are *ser* 'to be,' *hablar* 'to speak,' *estar* 'to be,' *trabajar* 'to work,'

Table 2: Frequency of Verbs, All Informants

Verb Types (*N* = 82)	Tokens, per V (*N* = 390)	%, per V	Cum. %
ser 'to be' (1 V)	49	12.6%	101%[8]
hablar 'to speak' (1 V)	20	5.1%	88.4%
estar 'to be,' *trabajar* 'to work' (2 Vs)	17	4.4%	83.3%
tener 'to have' (1 V)	15	3.8%	74.5%
vivir 'to live' (1 V)	14	3.6%	70.7%
haber (existential) 'there is/are,' *ir* 'to go' (2 Vs)	13	3.3%	67.1%
conocer 'to meet/know a person,' *venir* 'to come' (2 Vs)	11	2.8%	60.5%
llegar 'to arrive' (1 V)	10	2.6%	54.9%
aprender 'to learn,' *poder* 'to be able to' (2 Vs)	9	2.3%	52.3%
nacer 'to be born,' *querer* 'to want,' *saber* 'to know (a fact) (3 Vs)	8	2.1%	47.7%
coger 'to take,' *pensar* 'to think' (2 Vs)	7	1.8%	41.4%
decir 'to say/tell,' *gustar* 'to be pleasing,' *solicitar* 'to apply for,' *volver* 'to return' (4 Vs)	6	1.5%	37.8%
buscar 'to look for,' *cambiar* 'to change,' *hacer* 'to do' (3 Vs)	5	1.3%	31.8%

---

[8] Due to rounding, the sum of the cumulative frequencies is 101%. Also, the decision to compile the cumulative frequencies in descending order was to highlight the proportion of the least frequent verbs.

encontrar(se) 'to find (oneself),' *enseñar* 'to teach,' *estudiar* 'to study,' *ganar* 'to earn,' *pasar* 'to pass, spend, etc.' (5 Vs)	4	1.0%	27.9%
abrir 'to open,' *alquilar* 'to rent,' *comprar* 'to buy,' *llamarse* 'to be called,' *pintar* 'to paint,' *recibir* 'to receive,' *salir* 'to leave' (7 Vs)	3	0.8%	22.9%
acabar(se) 'to finish,' *casar(se)* 'to get married,' *cerrar* 'to close,' *dar* 'to give,' *entrar* 'to enter,' *funcionar* 'to work,' *gastar* 'to spend,' *marchar(se)* 'to leave,' *mirar* 'to look at/watch,' *poner* 'to put,' *preguntar* 'to ask,' *quedarse* 'to stay,' *quejarse* 'to complain,' *regresar* 'to return,' *sentir(se)* 'to feel,' *terminar* 'to finish,' *tomar* 'to take,' *viajar* 'to travel,' *visitar* 'to visit' (19 Vs)	2	0.5%	17.3%
abandonar 'to abandon,' *aceptar* 'to accept,' *aplicar* 'to apply,' *complementar* 'to complement,' *completar* 'to complete,' *considerar* 'consider,' *contestar* 'to answer,' *empezar* 'to begin,' *enviar* 'to send,' *frustrar* 'to frustrate,' *graduarse* 'to graduate,' *impresionar* 'to impress,' *introducir* 'to introduce,' *invitar* 'to invite,' *jugar* 'to play,' *levantar(se)* 'to lift (or get up),' *llevar* 'to carry/take,' *morir* 'to die,' *necesitar* 'to need,' *ofrecer* 'to offer,' *perder* 'to lose,' *pisar* 'to step foot in,' *planear* 'to plan,' *realizar* 'to realize (as used by participant),' *resultar* 'to result/end up,' *separar* 'separate' (26 Vs)	1	0.3%	7.8%

This subset of frequent verbs represents only one quarter of the total verb types ($n = 22$; $N = 82$) but over two-thirds of the verb tokens in the entire corpus ($n = 270$; $N = 390$). In terms of lexical aspect, state verbs account for over half of the frequent-verb subset and about 40% of the whole corpus. Upon examining the most frequent uses of verbs by participant, defined here as the production of more than one token per verb type, we note some differences across the learners. As shown in Table 3, Jenny produced by far the highest number of verb types ($n = 34$) and tokens ($n = 163$). For her part, Teresa had the second-largest range of verb types ($n = 23$) but, in fact, produced the fewest number of tokens overall ($n = 74$). Evan, on the other hand, produced the fewest verb types overall ($n = 17$) but a moderate number of tokens ($n = 102$). In terms of lexical aspect, Jenny's most frequent verb types are the activity verb *trabajar* ($n = 15$) and the state verb *vivir* ($n = 12$), along with the state *estar*, the activity *hablar*, and the achievement *venir*, each ($n = 9$). In contrast, Evan exhibits a preference for the state verb *ser* ($n = 37$), followed by the state verb *tener* ($n = 11$) and then the activity verb *hablar* ($n = 9$). Teresa also has the state verbs *ser* ($n = 11$) and *haber* ($n = 7$) as her most frequent verb types.

Table 3: Most frequent verbs by participant

Evan		*Jenny*		*Teresa*	
Verb Types (*n* = 17)	**Tokens, per V** (*n* = 102)	**Verb Types** (*n* = 34)	**Tokens, per V** (*n* = 163)	**Verb Types** (*n* = 23)	**Tokens, per V** (*n* = 74)
Ser	37	trabajar	15	ser	11
Tener	11	vivir	12	haber	7
Hablar	9	estar hablar venir	9	decir	6
Querer	6	aprender coger	7	ir	5
Estar	5	conocer llegar nacer volver	6	enseñar poder	4
Haber Ir	4	pensar saber	5	conocer encontrar estar	3
Gustar hacer saber	4	buscar cambiar estudiar ganar ir solicitar	4		
		abrir alquilar gustar pasar pintar poder salir	3	comprar dar funcionar hablar llamarse llegar nacer poner quedarse recibir regresar tener tomar venir	2
conocer llegar poder preguntar sentir(se) solicitar vivir	2	acabar cerrar gastar haber marchar tener viajar casarse	2		

6.2. Multivariate Analyses

For this section, separate multivariate analyses of variance were conducted for the LAH in *Rbrul* (Johnson 2009), with participant and verb as random effects, for all participants (see Table 4), Jenny (Table 5), Teresa (Table 6), and Evan (Table 7).

Table 4: LAH factors affecting overt past-tense marking, all participants

Log likelihood -246.047 - Total N 390				
Lexical Aspect	**Logodds**	**Factor weight**	**Percentage**	**N**
Event	1.042	.74	66%	146
Activity	-0.379	.41	56%	81
State	-0.663	.34	45%	163

Input: .546; AIC: 500.094; Total R2: .383; p < .001

LAH results reveal that for all participants, overt past-tense marking is favored with event verbs, that is, achievements and accomplishments, with a proportion of 66% and a factor weight of .74, where weights greater than .5 indicate favoring and less than .5, disfavoring. According to the logodds, events are 1.042 times more likely to be marked overtly than not at all. States are least likely to be marked at a proportion of 45%, a factor weight of .34, and logodds of -0.663.

Table 5: LAH factors affecting overt past-tense marking, Jenny

Log likelihood --86.247- Total N 170				
Lexical Aspect	**Logodds**	**Factor weight**	**Percentage**	**N**
Event	1.519		.82	71
Activity	-0.380		.41	52
State	-1.140		.24	47

Input: .862; AIC: 180.495; Total R2: .620; p = .013

For Jenny's data, in Table 5, the LAH model nearly mirrors the results of the combined corpus of all three speakers. Regarding lexical aspect, overt marking was strongly favored for events at a factor weight of .82, and she was 1.519 times more likely to mark verbs for this lexical aspectual class. Conversely, for states, overt marking was strongly disfavored at a factor weight of .24, and she was 1.191 times less likely to mark these verbs.

Table 6: LAH factors affecting overt past-tense marking, Teresa

Log likelihood -33.855 - Total N 101				
Lexical Aspect	**Logodds**	**Factor weight**	**Percentage**	**N**
Event	1.666	.82	98%	71
Activity	0.152	.54	92%	52
State	-1.818	.14	60%	47

Input: .096; AIC: 75.710; Total R2: .446; p < .001

On examining Teresa's data, we again note a mostly similar pattern to that of the larger dataset. For lexical aspect, event verbs strongly favor overt past-tense marking, factor weight .84, but state verbs strongly disfavor it, factor weight of .14. Unlike the corpus with all three participants combined, activity verbs show a slight favoring of overt morphology, factor weight of .54.

Table 7: LAH factors affecting overt past-tense marking, Evan

Log likelihood -73.626 - Total N 119				
Lexical Aspect	**Logodds**	**Factor weight**	**Percentage**	**N**
Activity	0.496	.62	82%	17
Event	0.291	.57	79%	24
State	-0.787	.31	56%	78

Input: .260; AIC: 155.253; Total R2: .086; p = .026

With respect to Evan's data, we observe our first departure from the order of factors present in the larger corpus and the smaller datasets of the other two participants. For example, for the LAH, activity verbs ($n = 17$) are the strongest to favor overt past-tense marking, factor weight of .62 and logodds of 0.496, followed closely by event verbs ($n = 24$), factor weight of .57 and logodds of 0.291.

7. Qualitative Analysis

According to descriptive statistics and multivariate analyses, we observed several similarities and differences in the L2 use of TA marking in past-time reference across the three learner varieties produced by one immigrant and two classroom learners of varying proficiencies. In this section, I provide a discussion on the trends of the aggregate data, followed by a focus on each

individual case study, and finally, a summary tying together the similarities and differences in L2 use as they relate to instructed versus non-instructed learning contexts.

7.1. Combined Corpus

As a group, the three informants in this study used a range of verb types in their production that includes each of the four lexical classes of verbs. Regarding most frequent verb types, each learner produced event and state verbs more frequently and activity verbs less frequently.

Multivariate analyses confirmed predictions made by the LAH. Overt past-tense marking, defined as inflectional morphology in addition to aspectual markers like the adverbial *ya* or past participle *–do* in Jenny's case, is favored with achievement and accomplishment verbs. Activities and states disfavored past-tense marking. Although this study does not examine the preterit and imperfect distinction, but rather the presence or absence of temporal-aspectual marking in past-time reference, we can draw parallels with the work of Andersen and colleagues. The LAH posits that learners will use the preterit as a default past marker when morphologically encoding temporal-aspectual relations, but will then later use lexical aspect as a cue for choice between the preterit and the imperfect. In the present study, we observe that, as a group, these three learners indeed rely on lexical aspect as a cue for producing overt TA marking, regardless of whether this includes nativelike inflectional morphology. This finding indicates that these Chinese learners of Spanish, despite speaking a typologically distinct, morphologically analytical L1, can express temporal-aspectual relations in a more morphologically synthetic L2 system based on lexical aspect.

7.2. Jenny

Jenny, an immigrant living in Spain, speaks a fluent learner variety that is identifiable as Spanish (Clements 2009). Her system is rather developed, despite a preponderance of nonnative-like utterances, such as in (8) above and (9) below. For instance, she produced the highest number of verb types ($n = 34$), which, at least for verbal expression, confirms Clements' observation that her vocabulary is substantial. Moreover, she produced verbs of all lexical verb classes, the most frequent ones represented by events, followed by activities and finally by states (Table 5).

The relatively lower use of state verbs overall reflects the near absence of *ser* and the lower frequencies of state verbs *estar* and *tener* in Jenny's speech.

The absence of state verbs may be related to a combination of L1 transfer[9] and permanence at an earlier stage of copula development. In L1 Chinese, predicative adjectives do not require a copula linking the subject to the adjective, and in Jenny's L2 data, no use of either of the copula (*ser* or *estar*) was observed with adjectives. In sentences with predicative nominals, however, the Chinese copula is required. In this dataset, Jenny's single use of *ser* is indeed with a predicative nominal, as in (9).

(9)   *Con   gente   soy   chica   una   poquito   tímido*

        with   people   am   girl   a   little   shy

        'With people, I am a little shy girl.'

Furthermore, the absence of copula in her adjectival predicates may reflect a hypothesized first stage of copula development in which learners undergo a stage of omission (VanPatten 1985, 1987). Restricted input during the first nine years she lived in Spain reduced the feature pool to which she was exposed and thus constrained her early L2 variety, and L1 transfer with this universal strategy of omission likely colluded to maintain the system at status quo. Although access to input and opportunities of interaction with native speakers of Spanish increased over the years, her communicative goals were likely satisfied by the innovations to her earlier variety, at least as this applies the use of copula and state verbs.

Regarding the multivariate analyses, Jenny's data are in line with the LAH model from the combined corpus, where telic events favor overt past-tense marking and atelic events do not. That said, overall rates of overt TA marking were lowest for Jenny as compared to the other learners. She marked telic events and activities at a rate of only 38% each, and TA marking with states was low at 13%. This latter finding represents a further measure in support of the discussion of state verbs as they relate to L1 transfer.

Regarding the Basic Variety, Jenny's variety extends well beyond Klein and Perdue's nominal utterance organization (NUO) phase. Instead we may situate her learner variety somewhere between the infinite (IUO) and finite (FUO) phases. In the first place, the high frequency of verb types and the influence of semantic factors are two indicators that she has reached, at

---

[9] Siegel (2007: 177) defines transfer as a "psycholinguistic process that occurs when people fall back on their first language to compensate for a lack of linguistic knowledge in a second language when they are trying to acquire or communicate in that language".

minimum, the IUO phase. To determine whether she shows any evidence of reaching the FUO phase, a qualitative look into her production is in order. The reader will recall that finiteness need not require inflectional morphology, and thus nonnative-like resources potentially used by Jenny to mark it need to be examined. Specifically, Jenny's use of what Clements (2009) calls an "incipient" completive marker was deemed as one good place to start.

In the following qualitative analysis, I discuss both structural and functional similarities between Jenny's uses of the adverbial *ya* and the Chinese *le₁*/*le₂* particles. To accomplish this, I examine cases in which Jenny expresses perfective and imperfective viewpoints, and then I compare these to equivalent Mandarin examples. The present discussion does not represent the whole story, but the objective is to illustrate that Jenny is marking aspect with the adverbial *ya*, regardless of whether her marking is nativelike or not.

In example (10), we observe E-time within R-time for simple sentences, and the E-time is overtly marked with the adverbial *ya*.

(10) *1984   de junio   o   julio   ya   coge pasaporte*

1984   of June   or   July   already   get passport

'June or July of 1984 I got my passport.'

Compare Jenny's production to the Mandarin example in (11) from Robson (2005: 344), in which we have another durational R-time, albeit a shorter frame.

(11) 我   今天   去买了   东西。

Wo   jintian   qu mai-le   dongxi

I   today   go buy-le₁   thing

'I went shopping today.'

Here, E-time (i.e., shopping) is marked by *le₁*. Just as in the case where Jenny got her passport within the R-time of June or July of 1984 (example 10), shopping in example (11) took place within the R-time of today.

In example (12), we have a perfective viewpoint of E-time before R-time in Jenny's speech.

(12)   *Tú   ya   visto?*

       you   already   see-PART

       'Have you seen her or did you see her (before now)?'

Jenny's example is comparable to the Mandarin example in (13) from Robson (2005: 342).

(13)   我   已经   问了   老王。

       Wo   yijing   wen-le   Lao Wang

       I   already   ask-le_1 Lao Wang

       'I have already asked Old Wang (about the matter).'

Both examples (12) and (13) illustrate the E-time marked with the adverbial *ya* or the particle le_1, respectively. In (12), Jenny is asking the interlocutor if he has seen a common friend before the interview, thus E-time before R_s—that is, the present S-time. In (13), the E-time (i.e., ask) is also before R-time (i.e., R_s). Both yield perfective readings with corresponding markers.

      In example (14), we have an imperfective viewpoint where R-time is within the E-time in Jenny's speech.

(14)   *Y   otro   mujé-chica casado   tiene   maridu   ya   conócelo   este.*

       and other woman-girl married   has   husband already   meet-him   this

       'And the other woman was married when she met him (or he met her).'

The adverbial *ya* surfaces in the R-time and not E-time, unlike in our observations in (10) and (12). Here I argue that Jenny is marking the R-time with *ya* in a way similar to the aspectual function of le_2, which is used to indicate the "inchoative aspect of a situation whose R-time is always included in its E-time" (Robson 2005: 360). In (14) Jenny is talking about a married friend who has involved himself in an extramarital affair with another married woman. The R-time is when the two people met, and the E-time is the fact that the other "woman-girl" is married or has a husband. The R-time is included within the E-time, and it is itself inchoative. For instance, there is a time when the two people had not known each other, subsequently followed by a time they did know each other. Compare (14) to the following series of Chinese examples in (15a-e),

26

which mark with *le₂* a 'newly developed state of the situation which, *[sic]* can be telic or atelic' (Robson 2005: 355).

(15) a. 他 抽　烟　　了。

　　　　　Ta chou yan　　le

　　　　　he pull　smoke　le₂

　　　　　'He smokes (now).' [He didn't before.]

　　　b. 他　不　抽　　烟　　了。

　　　　　Ta　bu　chou　yan　　le

　　　　　he　not pull　smoke le₂

　　　　　'He does not smoke (any more).' [He quit smoking.]

　　　c. 他　跑　五　　英里　了。

　　　　　Ta　pao wu　　yingli le

　　　　　he　run five　　mile　le₂

　　　　　'He (can) run(s) five miles (now).' [He couldn't before.]

　　　d. 孩子　　长大　　　了。

　　　　　Haizi　　zhang-da　　le

　　　　　child　　grow-big　　le₂

　　　　　'The child has grown up.' [The child was young before.]

　　　e. 他　是　研究　　生　了。

　　　　　Ta　shi　yanjiu　　sheng le

　　　　　he　is　graduate　student le₂

　　　　　'He is a graduate student (now).' [He becomes a graduate student.]

Besides a correspondence to the *le₂* particle, this example may also reflect a type of innovation in Jenny's L2 Spanish variety (see also Bao 1995, 2005, for a discussion of *already* in the contact language Singapore English). It is important

to note, for example, that in neither the published nor the newly transcribed data does there appear the time adverbial clauses *cuando* 'when' or *mientras* 'while.' It could be that Jenny is using the adverbial *ya* in a manner like the *le₂* particle not only to signal the change of state of the R-time within E-time but also to express the *de shihou* 'when' or 'while' adverbial clause in her learner variety.

This qualitative analysis points to Jenny's sensitivity to aspectual relations via her use of the adverbial *ya*, repurposed as a set of aspectual markers (ya_1 and ya_2). Although related more to conceptual L1 Chinese transfer (i.e., transfer to nowhere) (Kellerman 1995) than to native Spanish norms of use, the incipient markers $ya_{1/2}$ indicate verb finiteness in this L2 variety.[10] Further, semantic considerations suggest that her system is not altogether dissimilar to intermediate classroom learners of Spanish, at least with respect to her L2 use of TA marking in past-time expression. However, low proportions of overt TA marking for all lexical classes support a classification of IUO with some overlap with FUO in the Basic Variety. Indeed, Jenny's attainment of this level reflects her unique immigrant experience: early restricted access to input and low social interaction with local Spaniards initially constrained her system. Moreover, a confluence of L2 processes, both universal and L1-L2 specific, led her to compensate with non-nativelike innovations and then maintain these norms despite living in the host country with increasing access to input and opportunities for interaction.

7.3. Teresa

Teresa, a Ph.D. student in Hispanic Literatures, has lifelong goals of speaking and writing academic Spanish. Her system reflects this formal orientation toward nativelike norms of TA use. According to her corpus, she produced the second-highest number of verb types ($n = 23$) but, in fact, the fewest number of tokens overall ($n = 74$). The most frequent verb class was events, followed by states, and finally activities (Table 6). This order differs from Jenny's, which exhibited fewer state verbs than the other lexical classes. Teresa's most frequent verbs, on the other hand, were *ser* ($n = 11$) and *haber* ($n = 7$), compared to

---

[10] Kellerman's (1995) 'Transfer to Nowhere Principle' posits that the influence of the L1 can happen on a(n) (initial) conceptual level in L2 acquisition. The L1 can operate on the way learners conceptualize the world, which, in turn, motivates them to look for correspondences in the L2 to express their ideas as they might in the L1 (i.e., an opportunity to transfer something to somewhere).

Jenny's *trabajar* (*n* = 15). In Teresa's speech, the copula *ser* appears with predicative nominals as well as adjectives, as in (16).

(16)   *Creo   que es   muy   humanista,   ¿no?*

       believe-1SG that is-3SG very   humanist   no

       'I believe that it's very humanist, right?'

Multivariate analyses for Teresa's data exhibit a similar pattern to that of the combined corpus. Namely, telic events favor overt past-tense marking but at a nearly categorical rate of 98%, compared to Jenny's 38%. Moreover, an important difference surfaces in Teresa's L2 variety when compared to Jenny's and the aggregated dataset: activity verbs show a slight favoring of overt morphology with a proportion of 92%. As a student in a Spanish Ph.D. program, Teresa is faced with demanding communicative pressures to present at conferences, write final papers, and engage in academic discussion in Spanish. Although an L2 learner with her background may certainly have less-than-native accuracy for any given variable, Teresa demonstrates that at least for TA morphology, she regularly marks telic events as well as activities. The verb type that Teresa marks least with past-time morphology is state verbs, such as in (17), at a rate of only 60%.

(17)   *Pero   al   principio hay   frustraciones   en   mi*

       but   at-the beginning there-are.PRES   frustrations   in   my

       coursework   no?

       coursework, no

       'But at the beginning there were frustrations in my coursework, right?'

Despite her level of attainment in Spanish, Teresa only marks tense and aspect above chance in her L2 variety. Chinese may, in fact, affect her L2 use of tense and aspect, though to a much lesser extent than in Jenny's case. State verbs, regardless of learning context, appear to evade overt TA marking in the L2 past-time expression of Chinese learners of Spanish.

     A qualitative examination of her L2 variety reveals a complex temporal-aspectual system, characterized by a rich inflectional morphology in line with nativelike norms. In (18), we observe the preterit (e.g., *dieron*), imperfect (e.g.,

no funcionaba 'it did not work') and the present perfect (e.g., *he perdido* 'I have lost').

(18)   *Ya ya **he perdido** contacto con todoh porque el internet en Cuba no **funcionaba** bien no y yo, ellos me **dieron** el correo y cuando **regresé** a china para escribirles no no no **recibí** nada.*

         'I have already lost contact with everyone because internet in Cuba does not work well, and I, they gave me the mail, and when I returned to China to write them, I didn't didn't didn't receive anything.'

In addition to these temporal-aspectual inflections, we should note that person and number are also expressed according to nativelike norms. In Jenny's speech, no such inflection was observed. Further, Teresa's use of the adverbial *ya* appeared normative in most, if not all, of the sentences in which she used them. Although her use of the present perfect instead of past perfect in (18) raises the question whether the co-occurrence of *ya* with a non-nativelike verbal form was related to Jenny's use of *ya* or merely incidental. Given that this example is the sole co-occurrence in the whole interview, the data suggest the latter.

Teresa has several indicators of an advanced L2 temporal-aspectual system in past-time expression: she has a wide range of verb types (including states) and her production exhibits nativelike inflectional morphology. She also provided some limited evidence of L1 influence, particularly with lower rates of overt TA marking with state verbs. Her attainment of this level of development appears motivated by demanding pressures to communicate well in academic settings. For example, her speech, exemplified in (19), often exhibited nativelike instances of coordination and subordination, necessary in formal discourse.

(19)   *Por eso, **aunque** no puedo salir, hay nativos hay hispanohablantes **con quien** puedo practicar mi idioma.*

         'For that reason, although I can't go out, there are natives, there are Spanish speakers with whom I can practice my language.'

Collentine (1995: 125) states that, regarding the later stages in the development of mood expression, which requires subordination, the "ratio of nouns-to-verbs" in L2 production should favor nouns over verbs as learners move away from producing paratactic phrases or the pre-syntactic 1:1 ratios of nouns to verbs (e.g., *Carlos come* 'Charles eats,' *yo estudio* 'I study,' Collentine 1995: 128). At several points throughout the interview, she remarked how she is introverted

and experiences relatively little interaction with speakers of any language outside the classroom. Her L2 variety, therefore, is one informed by formal instruction, a yearlong sojourn abroad in Cuba, and several years of reading the literary canon of the Spanish-speaking world.

7.4. Evan

Evan, a college junior at the same large Midwestern university as Teresa, completed the highest level of Spanish in the Basic Language Program (four semesters). He has had no experience abroad and virtually no contact with native Spanish speakers. His only interactions in Spanish have been with language instructors and predominantly English-speaking L2 learners of Spanish. In his interview, he produced the lowest number of verb types ($n = 17$). His most frequent verb class was states, followed by events, and then activities (Table 7). Yet another order of frequency emerges, which is different from that of the other learners. For instance, Evan's data show many tokens with *ser* ($n = 37$). This verb type represents nearly one-third of his 102 tokens of frequent past-tense VPs. Such a proportion of *ser* tokens suggests an overreliance on the copula in his L2 production, arguably a reflection of an underdeveloped vocabulary and his lower proficiency. Like Teresa, he produces both copula in adjectival predicates with mostly nativelike inflectional morphology (e.g., ***fue difícil*** 'it was difficult,' *estoy-* ***estaba*** *cansada* 'I am- was tired').

Multivariate analyses for Evan's data show that, like Teresa, both activities and telic events favor overt past-tense marking, though at somewhat lower rates (82% and 79%, respectively). State verbs disfavor marking but are marked at a rate above chance (56%). These lower rates reflect his limited experience with Spanish, but when compared to Jenny, an immigrant of 20 years in Spain, Evan presents a more consistent L2 system of overt TA marking. For this variable, explicit learning in instructed contexts over non-instructed ones attenuate the potential effects of L1 transfer regarding copula use and overtly marking state verbs.

His production showed evidence of having learned both preterit and imperfect forms in the classroom (e.g., ***hablé*** *mucho* 'I spoke a lot,' *uno conductor* ***hablaba*** 'a driver was speaking'), but again, the rate at which he overtly marked verbs in past-tense reference was lower than Teresa's overall. His lower rate of overt TA marking was often the result of choosing a present-tense over past-tense form (e.g., ***es*** *muy difícil* 'it is [read: was] very difficult'). In contrast to the immigrant speech, seldom were his tokens incorrect with regard to person or number (for comparison, see Jenny's *ellos* ***nació*** 'they were

born-3.SG'), nor were chunked forms produced to the same extent (see Jenny's *yo una mes, poquito poquito **conósolo** esta ciudad* 'I get to know [read: got to know] little by little this city in a month'). Use of coordination and subordination was also evident (e.g., *es muy difícil **porque** no tenía mucha - mucho práctica para hablar* 'it's very difficult because I didn't have a lot of practice speaking,' *muchas personas **que** traba –trabajan "there"* 'a lot of people that work "there"'), but the majority of these phrases involved only the subordinating conjunction *porque* 'because' or the cumulative conjunction *y* 'and' (e.g., *formación para fútbol **y** estoy- estaba muy cansada **y** completé una orientación corte **y** tenía que jugar* 'training for football and I am –was very tired and I completed a short orientation and I had to play'). Moreover, Evan's speech was the most dysfluent of the three speakers, consisting of frequent pausing, false starts (e.g., *pe- uh no um depende* 'but- uh no um it depends'), reformulations (e.g., *estoy- estaba* 'I am I was'), and English code-switching (e.g., *sí, es un representa- es un "recruiter"* 'yes, he is [read: was] a representa- he is [read: was] a "recruiter"').

Evan's L2 variety was effectively curated by instruction. The Basic Language Program at his university focuses extensively on the development of inflectional verbal morphology. His system reflects what he has been exposed to—that is, the types of input and explicit grammar learning required to pass the course. His verbal expression, while non-nativelike in some cases (use of the present forms, lower rate of overtly marking state verbs), conforms generally to the norms of native Spanish speakers (i.e., inflectional morphology, the preterit versus imperfect distinction). Recall that at the time of the interview, Evan had never interacted in Spanish with a native Spanish speaker. While he enjoys the language, he admits that he has made no special effort in learning it outside of class. His motivation for learning Spanish appears purely practical, to receive college credit and complete the foreign language requirement.

7.5. Summary

This study set out to compare the L2 use of TA morphology in instructed and non-instructed Chinese-Spanish varieties. The first learner, Jenny, was an immigrant to Spain who has had little to no formal instruction in the language. The present study echoes Clements' (2009) claim that Jenny's production appears constrained by the variety she developed in her earlier years living in Spain. For all verb classes, for instance, her rate of overt TA marking is well below chance, with state verbs disfavoring any marking. Further, she has developed an incipient aspectual marker by repurposing the Spanish adverbial

ya, which corresponds roughly to the Chinese markers *le*$_{1/2}$. Although her past-tense system appears to serve her in many communicative contexts, as Andersen (1984) describes for his case study of Anthony, future research should investigate more formally to what extent, if any, her system may act as any liability for other native speakers or advanced to near-native speakers to comprehend her.

The instructed learners, Teresa and Evan, deviated from the non-instructed learner, Jenny. Teresa is an advanced to near-native learner who studied Spanish for nearly a decade and lived in Cuba for a year. Different from Jenny, she overtly marks temporal-aspectual relations almost categorically, except for state verbs, in ways consistent to nativelike norms. Evan is a classroom learner who has had no experience interacting with native speakers of Spanish, either in the United States or abroad. In contrast to either of the other two participants, his L2 variety contains several types of dysfluency, shallower vocabulary, repetitive coordination and subordination, and an overreliance on the verb *ser*. Any departures from nativelike forms are not novel or appropriated forms like those in Jenny's learner variety, but instead they reflect evidence of the reduced feature pool of the L2 classroom and explicit instruction on the inflectional morphology used in Spanish past-time expression. The frequency at which he marks verbs in past-time contexts approaches that of Teresa's, including lower rates of overtly marking state verbs, and may reach near categorical use of overt morphology over time.

Among the differences in L2 use, one commonality observed across each of the learner varieties was state verbs remain most elusive to overt marking. We observed the complete absence of copula in adjectival contexts for Jenny, in addition to Teresa's and Evan's disfavoring of overt past-time marking of state verbs and stative sentence types. The implication is that for Chinese learners of Spanish—even at advanced levels of proficiency, L1 influence may persist in subtle ways for states in past-time expression. Future research employing a similar method of data collection and analysis should include learners of other L1s with both expressed and null copula to confirm this finding.

8. Conclusion

In keeping with the Uniformitarian Principle, we predict to find common patterns of L2 use independently of the learning environment. This is apparent in the correct predictions the Lexical Aspect Hypothesis (LAH) makes for the

distribution of overt past marking in the productions of all three speakers in the study: all speakers favor overtly marking events the most, states the least, and activities (dynamic, atelic) somewhere in between. The study has also identified both similar and differential learning outcomes among the one non-instructed learner and the two instructed learners, as discussed in the qualitative analysis of each of the speakers. Thus, Bergs' (2012: 96) suggestion that "every language period and every linguistic community must be investigated independently and in its own right" is good advice. In so doing, we can avoid the risk of anachronism—or in the case of L2 acquisition, anatopism—that Bergs describes, in which second language acquisition (SLA) and language contact (LC) researchers incorrectly attribute features of an L2 or contact variety to something from another time, place, or situation where such attributions are not warranted. While it is certainly in the interest of SLA to establish general models of L2 acquisition, the field should also consider more explicitly (i.e., more empirically) the micro- and macro-level factors constraining processes of learning that may sometimes lead to different outcomes. It is not the process but the outcome (i.e., linguistic feature) that for the individual learner, may loop back and serve as further input to the L2 grammar, such as is the case for Jenny's use of *ya* as an aspectual marker. Likewise, at the level of an L2 community where L2 speakers outnumber L1 speakers, a learning-derived outcome could potentially enter what Croft (2000) calls the "lingueme pool" and be replicated in those language contact situations characterized by L2 acquisition. To be sure, with such a wide array of social and individual factors constraining learning, it may be rather difficult to tease apart what feature is based on L2 input, L1 influence, or linguistic universals/constraints, but this is indeed the task and calling for SLA and LC researchers alike.

References

Andersen, Roger W. 1983. *Pidginization and creolization as language acquisition.* Rowley, MA: Newbury.

Andersen, Roger W. 1984. What's gender good for, anyway? In R. Andersen (ed.), *Second Languages: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, 77-99. Rowley, MA: Newbury.

Andersen, Roger W. 1986. El desarrollo de la morfología en el español como segundo idioma. In J. M. Meisel (ed.), *Adquisición del lenguaje-Aquisicão da linguagem*, 115-138. Frankfort: Vervuert Verlag.

Andersen, Roger W. 1991. Developmental sequences: The emergence of aspect marking in second language acquisition. In T. Huebner & C. A. Ferguson (eds.), *Crosscurrents in second language acquisition and linguistic theories*, 305-324. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Andersen, Roger W. & Yasuhiro Shirai. 1996. Primacy of aspect in first and second language acquisition: The Pidgin/Creole connection. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition*, 527-570. San Diego: Academic Press.

Bao, Zhiming. 1995. *Already* in Singapore English. *World Englishes* 14. 181-188.

Bao, Zhiming. 2005. The aspectual system of Singapore English and the systemic substratist explanation. *Journal of Linguistics* 41. 237-267.

Bardovi-Harlig, Kathleen. 1998. Narrative structure and lexical aspect: Conspiring factors in second language acquisition of tense-aspect morphology. *SSLA* 20. 471-508.

Bergs, Alexander. 2012. The uniformitarian principle and the risk of anachronisms in language and social history. In J. M. Hernández-Campoy & J. C. Conde-Silvestre (eds.), *The Handbook of Historical Sociolinguistics*, 80-98. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Clements, J. Clancy. 2002. On classifying language-contact varieties. In L. Sayahi & M. Westmoreland (eds.), *Selected proceedings of the First Workshop on Spanish Sociolinguistics*, 1-10. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Clements, J. Clancy. 2003. The Tense-Aspect System in Pidgins and Naturalistically Learned L2. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 25. 245-81.

Clements, J. Clancy. 2009. *Linguistic legacy of Spanish and Portuguese*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Collentine, Joseph. 1995. The development of complex syntax and mood-selection abilities in intermediate-level learners of Spanish. *Hispania* 78(1). 122-135.

Comrie, Bernard. 1985. *Tense*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Croft, William. 2000. *Explaining language change: An evolutionary approach*. London, UK: Longman.

de Swart, Henriëtte. 1998. Aspect shift and coercion. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16. 347–385.

Delgado-Díaz, Gibran. 2014. Teoría versus uso: Análisis sobre el pretérito y el imperfecto. *Boletín de filología* 49(1). 11–36.

Dörnyei, Zoltán. 1994. Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal* 78(3). 273-284.

Dulay, Heidi C., & Marina K. Burt. 1974. Natural sequences in child second language acquisition. *Language Learning* 24. 37-53.

Ellis, Rod. 2008. *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford.

Gass, Susan. 1997. *Input, interaction, and the second language learner.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Geeslin, Kimberly L., & Avizia Y. Long. 2014. *Sociolinguistics and second language acquisition.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Geeslin, Kimberly & Travis Evans-Sago. (in press). Bilingualism, second language acquisition, and language contact: Contrasts and shared processes. In S. Fafulas (ed.), *Amazonian Spanish: Language contact and evolution*.

Goldschneider, Jennifer M., & Robert M. DeKeyser. 2001. Explaining the "natural order of L2 morpheme acquisition in English: a meta-analysis of multiple determinants. *Language Learning* 51. 1-50.

Heine, Bernt & Tanya Kuteva. 2005. *Language contact and grammatical change*. Cambridge: Cambridge.

Johnson, Daniel E. 2009. Getting off the GoldVarb standard: Introducing Rbrul for mixed effects variable rule analysis. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 3. 359-383.

Kellerman, Eric. 1995. Cross-linguistic influence: Transfer to nowhere? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 15. 125-150.

Klein, Wolfgang & Clive Perdue. 1992. *Utterance structure: developing grammars again.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Klein, Wolfgang & Clive Perdue. 1997. The Basic Variety (or: Couldn't natural languages be much simpler?). *Second Language Research* 13. 301-47.

Klein, Wolfgang & Christine Dimroth. 2009. Untutored second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (eds.), *The new handbook of second language acquisition*, 503–522. New York: Academic Press.

Labov, William. 1972. Some principles of linguistic methodology. *Language in Society* 1(1). 97-120.

Larsen-Freeman, Diane E. 1976. An explanation for the morpheme acquisition order of second language learners. *Language Learning* 26. 125-134.

Long, Michael. 1996. The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition*. San Diego: Academic.

Matras, Yaron & Jeanette Sakel. 2007. Investigating the mechanisms of pattern replication in language convergence. *Studies in Language* 31(4). 829-865.

Norton Peirce, Bonny. 1995. Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly* 29. 9-31.

Norton, Bonny. 2000. *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity, and educational change*. Harlow, England: Pearson Education Limited.

Norton, Bonny. 2013. *Identity and language learning: Extending the conversation*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Pérez–Vidal, Carmen. 2014. Study abroad and formal instruction contrasted: The SALA Project. In C. Pérez–Vidal (ed.), *Language acquisition in study abroad and formal instruction contexts*, 17–56. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Quesada, Margaret L. 2013. The Primacy of Morphology in the Acquisition of Tense and Aspect in L2 Spanish Narrative Structure. In Chad Howe (ed.), *Selected Proceedings of the 15th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*, 62-77. Somerville: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Reichenbach, Hans. 1947. *Elements of Symbolic Logic*. London: Macmillan.

Robson, Shin Yong. 2005. The temporal relations and aspects expressed by the particle *le* in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 33. 333-65.

Salaberry, M. Rafael. 1999. The development of past-tense verbal morphology in classroom L2 Spanish. *Applied Linguistics* 20. 151-78.

Salaberry, M. Rafael. 2000. *The development of past tense morphology in L2 Spanish*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Salaberry, M. Rafael. 2002. Tense and aspect in the selection of past tense verbal morphology. In Rafael Salaberry & Yasuhiro Shirai (eds.), *Tense-aspect morphology in L2 acquisition*, 397-415. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Salaberry, M. Rafael. 2005. El desarrollo de la morfología del tiempo pasado en español como L2: Un estudio piloto. In M. L. Quesada & R. Maldonado (eds.), *Dimensiones del Aspecto en Español*, 125-148. México City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México & Querétaro: Universidad Autónoma de Querétaro.

Salaberry, M. Rafael. 2011. Assessing the effect of lexical aspect and grounding on the acquisition of L2 Spanish past tense morphology among L1 English speakers. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 14(2). 184-202.

Salaberry, M. Rafael. 2013. Contrasting Preterite and Imperfect use among advanced L2 learners: Judgments of iterated eventualities in Spanish. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*. 243-270.

Schumann, John H. 1976. Second language acquisition: The Pidginization Hypothesis. *Language Learning* 26(2). 391-408.

Schumann, John H. (1978). The relationship of pidginization, creolization and decreolization to second language acquisition. *Language Learning* 28(2). 367-379.

Sharma, Devyani & Ashwini Deo. 2010. A new methodology for the study of aspect in contact: Past and progressive in Indian English. In J. A. Walker (ed.), *Aspect in grammatical variation*, 111-130. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Siegel, Jeff. 2006. Links between SLA and creole studies: Past and present. In C. Lefebvre, L. White, & C. Jourdan (eds.), *L2 acquisition and creole genesis: Dialogues*, 15-49. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Siegel, Jeff. 2007. Transmission and transfer. In U. Ansaldo, S. Matthews, & L. Lim (eds.), *Deconstructing creole*, 167-201. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Smith, Carlota. 1991. *The parameter of aspect*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Smith, Carlota S., & Mary S. Erbaugh. 2005. Temporal interpretation in Mandarin Chinese. *Linguistics* 43. 713-756.

Tarone, Elaine & Guo-qiang Liu. 1995. Situational context, variation, and second language acquisition theory. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honour of HG Widdowson*, 107-124. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

VanPatten, Bill. 1985. The acquisition of *ser* and *estar* by adult learners of Spanish: A preliminary investigation of transitional stages of competence. *Hispania* 68(2). 399-406.

VanPatten, Bill. 1987. Classroom learners' acquisition of *ser* and *estar*: Accounting for developmental patterns. In B. VanPatten, T. R. Dvorak, & J. F. Lee (eds.), *Foreign Language Learning*, 19-32. Rowley: Newbury.

Vendler, Zeno. 1967. *Linguistics in philosophy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.