The role of dynamic contrasts in the L2 acquisition of Spanish past tense morphology
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This study examines the second language acquisition of Spanish past tense morphology by three groups of English speakers (beginners, intermediates and advanced). We adopt a novel methodological approach – combining oral corpus data with controlled experimental data – in order to provide new evidence on the validity of the Lexical Aspect Hypothesis (LAH) in L2 Spanish. Data elicited through one comprehension and three oral tasks with varying degrees of experimental control show that the emergence of temporal markings is determined mainly by the dynamic/non-dynamic contrast (whether a verb is a state or an event) as beginner and intermediate speakers use Preterit with event verbs but Imperfect mainly with state verbs.

One crucial finding is that although advanced learners use typical Preterit–telic associations in the least controlled oral tasks, as predicted by the LAH, this pattern is often reversed in tasks designed to include non-prototypical (and infrequent) form–meaning contexts. The results of the comprehension task also show that the Preterit–event and Imperfect–state associations observed in the production data determine the interpretation that learners assign to the Preterit and the Imperfect as well. These results show that beginner and intermediate learners treat event verbs (achievements, accomplishments and activities) in Spanish as a single class that they associate with Preterit morphology. We argue that dynamicity contrasts, and not telicity, affect learners’ use of past tense forms during early stages of acquisition.
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1. Introduction

Although the acquisition of past tense morphology (e.g. Imperfect and Preterit) is one of the most investigated areas in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research, the role that lexical aspect plays in the acquisition of these forms in the second language (L2) remains currently under debate. The leading hypothesis, i.e. the Lexical Aspect Hypothesis (LAH) (Andersen, 1986, 1991; Andersen & Shirai, 1994; Bardovi-Harlig, 2000), argues that certain form–meaning associations (i.e. telic–Preterit and atelic–imperfect) guide the emergence of past tense forms in L2 grammars. This hypothesis is especially relevant for the L2 acquisition of Spanish since temporal and aspect distributions (e.g. the Preterit/Imperfect contrast) are expressed through specific morphological forms in this language.

The validity of the LAH for the L2 acquisition of Spanish has not been satisfactorily demonstrated partly because of methodological issues affecting the design of the tasks employed (Camps, 2005; Comajoan, 2006; Montrul & Salaberry, 2003; Salaberry, 2008). There are two specific issues regarding the experimental design used in studies assessing the LAH which appear to be especially problematic. First, in some contexts the structure of a narrative (background and foreground) and the inherent aspectual properties of a predicate (telic and atelic) make opposite predictions regarding what morphological form (Preterit or Imperfect) is more likely to be used. Although this is potentially an ideal scenario in which to test the predictions of the LAH, such contexts are rare in naturally occurring discourse and therefore are difficult to test using uncontrolled narrative tasks. Second, because...
existing data have been elicited using either production or comprehension tasks only, studies using combined evidence from both types of tasks are not available. This is despite claims (e.g. Slabakova, 2001) that data elicited through carefully designed experiments are necessary to achieve a full understanding of L2 speakers’ competence in this grammatical domain.

The current study provides new insights into the role that lexical aspect plays in the acquisition of Spanish as a second language by explicitly addressing these two methodological issues. We will show how the combination of a specially designed corpus of L2 Spanish and a comprehension task can provide more complete evidence of L2 learners’ linguistic competence regarding Spanish past tense morphology. Crucial in this study is the fact that the corpus of L2 Spanish has been built using three different oral elicitation tasks with increasingly controlled structure (personal interview, semi-controlled impersonal narrative and controlled storytelling task). These three tasks were administered to the same group of 60 learners of Spanish whose first language (L1) was English. Through the use of this specific methodology we are able to show that some effects of lexical class are indeed clearly visible in the personal narrative task, a task widely used in previous literature testing the LAH, but that this task alone cannot be used as definite evidence to support this hypothesis. In this paper we will present combined results which show that although certain verbal features (dynamicty in particular) seem to play a role from the earliest stages of acquisition, the learners targeted possess a more sophisticated knowledge of aspectual morphology in Spanish than that predicted by the LAH.

This paper is structured as follows. Section 2 provides the theoretical background on how aspect is represented in Spanish and introduces the principles of the Lexical Aspect Hypothesis. Section 3 discusses the motivation for the present study focussing on several methodological inconsistencies in previous research. Section 4 introduces the production study and the rationale for the three tasks employed. Results from these three tasks, and in particular those elicited in non-prototypical contexts, are discussed in this section as well. Section 5 introduces the comprehension study and discusses the results elicited by a sentence-context preference matching task. Section 6 discusses the results and their implications for both theorising and methodological debates in formal SLA research. Section 7 presents the conclusions.

2. Aspect marking in native and non-native Spanish

Aspect provides information about the temporal development of an eventuality including whether events are finished, about to start or in progress. In Spanish, these properties are grammaticalised in the past tense in morphological forms known as Preterit, when the interval of time during which the eventuality takes place is finished (perfective), and Imperfect, when referring to intervals of time that are still in progress and are unfinished (imperfective):

(1) a. When Sue arrived (finished), my brother was cleaning (unfinished) the house.

b. Cuando Sue llegó (finished), mi hermano limpiaba (unfinished) la casa.

The aspectual meaning of a sentence is also determined by the inherent lexical semantic properties of the verbal predicate (the verb and its complements) (Dowty, 1986; Smith, 1991; Tenny, 1994; Verkuyl, 1993). For instance, events such as “break” or “build a castle” have inherent endpoints (are regarded as telic) in contrast to events such as “sleep” or “sing” which denote actions which do not involve a culmination point (regarded as atelic) (see Depreterere, 1995; Smith, 1991). The examples in (2) show how the same Spanish verb can be either telic or atelic and used with both Preterit (PRET) and Imperfect (IMP) morphology. Telic and atelic interpretations depend on the internal argument of the verb. The English translations indicate how this is expressed with different morphosyntactic means in English (morphological affixes on the verbs in (2a) and (2b), or periphrasis in (2c) and (2d)).

(2) a. Marta corrió (telic, perfective) por el parque (durante/en 15 minutos).


c. Marta lloró (atelic, perfective) por el parque (durante/en 15 minutos).

d. Marta lloró tres kilómetros (telic, imperfective) (durante/en 15 minutos).

Because the aspectual interpretation of a verb is compositional (dependent on the whole VP and not just the verb), it is possible that the same verb can be interpreted as atelic in some contexts ((2a) and (2c)) but telic in others ((2b) and (2d)). The examples above show that in Spanish the morphological form used can override the inherent aspectual value of events (atelic events with the Preterit in (2a) and telic events with the Imperfect in (2d)).

Four aspectual classes are typically distinguished according to the inherent aspectual properties of verbs:

2 The use of durante is grammatical in (2c) if it is interpreted as describing a habitual action.
The Lexical Aspect Hypothesis (LAH) (Andersen, 1986, 1991; Andersen & Shirai, 1996) is based on Vendler’s four-way verbal categorisation and was proposed to explain observed patterns in the use of tense and aspect morphology by second language speakers. According to this hypothesis, inherent aspectual properties of verbs guide the acquisition of tense and aspect morphology on the basis that certain correlations between morphological forms and aspectual properties of verbs (i.e. perfective–telic and imperfective–atelic) are prioritised in learner grammars (see Bardovi-Harlig, 2000; Salaberry, 2008, for extensive discussion on the role of the LAH in acquisition). More precisely, Imperfect and Perterit morphology are claimed to appear in a sequence of stages determined by the lexical properties of the verbal predicate so that perfective forms are expected to emerge with telic predicates (achievements and accomplishments) and spread to activities and finally to states later on. In contrast, imperfective forms are claimed to appear first with states and spread to activities and finally to accomplishments and achievements (see Figure 1).

The LAH assumes that the distribution of forms present in the input plays a fundamental role in the acquisition of aspect morphology based on both the Relevance Principle, i.e. learners will acquire the most relevant morphological form first (Bybee, 1985), and the Congruence Principle, i.e. learners will associate features which are semantically congruent such as telicity and perfectivity (Andersen, 1993; Andersen & Shirai, 1994; Shirai, 1993, 1995; Shirai & Kurono, 1998). The LAH also assumes an association between lexical class and grammatical marking based on prototype theory (Rosch, 1973, 1978) according to which each given category has its best exemplars, or prototypes, and a number of peripheral members, the non-prototypical exemplars, with fewer features in common. Shirai and Andersen (1995) argue that children first restrict the use of past tense morphology to the prototype of the category past (i.e. [+telic], [+punctual], [+result]) and restrict the use of progressive (which denotes the semantic features [+dynamic, −telic]) to activities and never to [−dynamic] predicates (i.e. states). In the case of L2 learners, it is hypothesised that learners would first associate one main meaning with each morphological form. These arguments assume the universality of the acquisition of perfective markers as children are said to show similar properties even if acquiring languages which encode aspectual distinctions in a different manner (although see Weist, 1989, for contradictory evidence). This is consistent with proposals which have argued that certain semantic distinctions (e.g. state versus process and punctual vs. non-punctual) are biologically programmed and emerge early in acquisition (e.g. Bickerton’s (1981) Language Bioprogram Hypothesis) and that both children and adults tend to favour the use of certain lexical and grammatical aspect combinations. For instance, it has been observed that properties such as telic (punctual), perfective and past on the one hand and atelic (durative), imperfective and present on the other, are natural form–meaning associations (Comrie, 1976) and that they cluster together as the result of non-linguistic cognitive constraints (see Wagner, 2010, for details). A large body of research has documented the existence of such prototypical combinations in children’s early use of morphological forms, including studies examining Spanish-speaking children using both production (Jackson-Maldonado & Maldonado, 2001) and comprehension (Grinstead, Pratt & McCurley, 2009). However, experimental data testing children’s comprehension of non-prototypical associations have confirmed that children can appropriately prefer non-prototypical form–meaning pairings in certain contexts and corroborates that prototypical associations are only tendencies observable in production data (Wagner, 2010; Grinstead et al. 2009). Taking this discussion into consideration we can summarise three main predictions of the LAH for L2 Spanish as follows:

---

**Figure 1. Expected pattern of spreading of Preterit and Imperfect forms across lexical classes.**

- States (be, love), activities (walk, swim), accomplishments (paint a picture, draw a circle) and achievements (break, die) (see Vendler, 1967). States are events that do not require an input of energy, do not have an inherent endpoint and have no internal structure; activities are events that have duration but lack an inherent endpoint; accomplishments are events that have duration and an inherent endpoint and achievements are events that have an inherent endpoint but do not have duration (they are instantaneous). The distinction between these four classes is based on the interaction of three different features: telicity, dynamicity and duration (Andersen, 1989; Comrie, 1976; Smith, 1991). Telic events (accomplishments and achievements) have inherent endpoints whereas atelic events (states and activities) lack inherent endpoints. Dynamic events (accomplishments, activities and achievements) have input of energy whereas non-dynamic events (states) lack input of energy. Finally, punctual events (achievements) happen instantaneously and have no duration.
reported that perfective morphology does not emerge with
would not occur for the Imperfect. Other studies have also
the Preterit, i.e. spreading from atelic to telic predicates
2002). Shirai (2004) also argues that Imperfect may not be
1994; Lubbers-Quesada, 2007; Salaberry, 1998, 1999,
is different from that of states (Bergström, 1995; Housen,
atelic activity events) has a developmental pattern which
Salaberry, 1998; Tracy-Ventura, 2008), with some studies
across classes as predicted by the LAH (Bergström, 1995;
did not find support for the spreading of past tense
forms has yet to be fully demonstrated. Some evidence
this hypothesis for the acquisition of Spanish past tense
4
Laura Domínguez, Nicole Tracy-Ventura, María J. Arche, Rosamond Mitchell and Florence Myles
3. The imperfective marker appears soon after the
2. The perfective marker is used first on achievement
1. Prototypical choices (i.e. perfective–telic and
aspectual predicates as well (Bergström, 1995; Camps,
achievement predicates exclusively and is used with other
some Imperfect was used with state verbs, the use of
past tense during early stages of acquisition. Although
learners seem to use the Preterit as a default marker of
findings of these studies converge in showing that
outcome seems to be more for the Preterit than for the
2002; Comajoan, 2001; Salaberry, 2000).
...results seem to indicate that lexical class is relevant for
radically than Spanish native speakers. Overall, these
is expected to be associated with the foreground of the narrative (Wallace, 1982). Specifically, perfective marking (1998; Bergström, 1995; Kumpf, 1984; Reid, 1980; Smith, 1984). It has been proposed that the distribution of temporal-aspectual forms can be determined by discourse grounding in narratives (Bardovi-Harlig, 1992, 1995, 2005; Shirai, 2004). One factor which has received extensive attention is the influence of discourse structure, in development of L2 morphology (see discussion in (Dry, 1992; Fleischman, 1990; Givón, 1987; Reinhart, 1984; etc.) have been found to play a part in the emergence of tense and aspect.

/ El chico empezaba a comer

3 See Salaberry and Ayoun (2005) and Montrul and Salaberry (2003) for the observation that the prototypical punctual–telic–Preterit associations predicted by the LAH.3 For instance, (/ Maria andaba) and imperfect–telic (\ El chico empezó a comer) contexts appear with those forms constituting the background events taking place), whereas the imperfective should be frequent in native natural speech, whereas non-prototypical associations are not and are therefore unlikely to be elicted through free narrative L2 tasks (interviews, fill-in-the-blank tests, etc.). Such tasks, therefore, are often biased to elicit Preterit forms, as they seem to be elicted more consistently.

Another methodological problem relates to the task plays a relevant role in eliciting the form–meaning associations predicted of the LAH.4 For instance, the type of observation that the prototypical punctual–telic–Preterit

In fact, it has already been argued that the type of task utilising paper-based tests, such as cloze or support the prediction of the LAH.
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As Table 1 shows, 60 learners were identified for the
participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Proficiency</th>
<th>Hours of Instruction</th>
<th>Typical Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>Year 13</td>
<td>Beginners</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>Year 13</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>Year 13</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>Year 10</td>
<td>Beginners</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>Year 10</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>Year 10</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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"Every morning was the same"), and secondly
Table 2. Oral elicitation tasks included in the current study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task type</th>
<th>Area investigated</th>
<th>Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal narrative</td>
<td>Emergence and development of past tense forms in naturally occurring contexts</td>
<td>Cat Story: Picture-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>story retell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal controlled</td>
<td>Emergence and development of past tense forms in exceptional contexts</td>
<td>Las Hermanas: Picture-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>story retell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal narrative</td>
<td>Emergence and development of past tense forms in naturally occurring contexts</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Verb types targeted in Las Hermanas task.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievements</th>
<th>Accomplishments</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>despertarse</td>
<td>leer un libro</td>
<td>visitar la ciudad</td>
<td>haber un revuelo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;wake up&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;read a book&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;visit the city&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;there is/was a commotion&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terminar</td>
<td>pintar un cuadro</td>
<td>comer tapas</td>
<td>creer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>los deberes</td>
<td>&quot;paint a picture&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;eat tapas&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;think/believe&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>llegar tarde</td>
<td>beber vino</td>
<td>sentir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a clase</td>
<td>&quot;drink wine&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;feel&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coger el</td>
<td>hablar</td>
<td>necesitar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tren</td>
<td>&quot;talk&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;need&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tranquilizarse</td>
<td>ir al colegio</td>
<td>ayudar</td>
<td>ser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;calm down&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;go to school&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;be&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ayudar</td>
<td>ser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ser</td>
<td>ser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hacer los</td>
<td>reírse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deberes</td>
<td>&quot;laugh&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acostarse</td>
<td>jugar al fútbol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;play football&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comer una</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pizza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The personal narrative (administered within a semi-structured interview) was the least controlled task, as learners were free to talk about memories from their childhood and their upbringing. Experimenters were coached to use specific questions to elicit both the Imperfect (e.g. "What did you use to do when you spent time with your grandparents?") and Preterit (e.g. "What did you do last weekend?")

4.4 Data collection and analysis

The oral data were collected by trained members of the research team following uniform elicitation protocols for each task. All speech was audiorecorded using portable digital equipment. The soundfiles generated by the oral tasks were transcribed using CHILDES/CHAT transcription conventions (http://childes.psy.cmu.edu).

Once each transcript was checked for accuracy, the soundfiles and transcripts were fully anonymised in preparation for public dissemination. Part of speech (POS) tagging of the CHAT transcripts using the Spanish MOR and POST programs was then carried out. Data from all tasks were coded for lexical aspect, discourse structure (background and foreground) and forms produced (PRET(erit), IMP(erfect), PRES(ent), etc.) which, in turn, were also coded for appropriateness (CORR(ect) or INC(or)R(ect)).

5 The complete corpus is available on the SPLLOC (Spanish Learner Language Oral Corpora) website (www.splloc.soton.ac.uk) and Talkbank (http://talkbank.org).

6 Special attention was paid to choose a suitable test to classify each predicate produced by the learners into one of the four lexical classes (states, activities, achievements and accomplishments). For a review of such tests see Arche (2006).
incorporated in each CHAT transcript as an extra tier of tagging (%VCX), which enabled the automatic analysis of various aspectual and discursive features (e.g. lexical aspect class, obligatory context, morphological form and discourse structure). The patterns of use (frequency of each form in each context) for each learner group were also analysed using further programs written by the research team.

4.5 Combined results from the three oral tasks

Overall, the results obtained by the three oral tasks show that 85% (17/20) of the Y10 learners were able to produce at least one past tense form (either Preterit or Imperfect) in the personal narrative task (the least controlled task) and 75% (15/20) did so in the impersonal narrative (Cat Story) task. One Y10 learner did not produce any Preterit in the personal narrative, and four learners (20%) did not use this form in the Cat Story task. In contrast, 40% (8/20) of the Y10 learners did not use any Imperfect forms in the personal narrative and 35% (7/20) did not produce it in the Cat Story. This result shows that 40% of beginner learners start using Preterit before Imperfect, a result which is congruent with previous findings which have also shown that Preterit usually emerges before Imperfect in L2 grammars. It also shows that the personal narrative task elicited the most past tense forms at beginner level, supporting previous findings as well. In contrast, 100% of the Y13 (intermediate) learners used at least one Preterit or one Imperfect form in both Cat Story and personal narrative, and only one learner did not produce any Imperfect in either of these two tasks.

The average use of Preterit and Imperfect forms for each lexical class (achievements, accomplishments, activities and states) was obtained for each of the three oral tasks (Las Hermanas, Cat Story and personal narrative). These results are shown in Tables 4 and 5.

A Poisson generalised linear model was used to determine how the rate of use of the Preterit (as opposed to the Imperfect tense) depends on the PROFICIENCY of the subjects, the LEXICAL CLASS used and the type of TASK carried out. The resulting ANOVA table (Table 6), can be used to determine the significance of the explanatory variables. It shows that all the variables and all of the second-order interactions are significant i.e. there is a significant interaction between each pair of variables. This is the case regardless of the order of the fitting of the variables. This means that both Lexical Class and Task Type have a significant effect on the likelihood that each group uses Preterit or imperfect. We can also see that the type of task determines the USE OF PRETERIT

7 Only instances of Preterit and Imperfect are reported in this study although other forms (e.g. present, non-finite verbs, past participles, etc.) were produced as well.

Table 4. Percentages of use of Preterit forms in each task and lexical class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Type</th>
<th>Lexical Class</th>
<th>Y10</th>
<th>Y13</th>
<th>UG</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>ACH</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STA</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat Story</td>
<td>ACH</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STA</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermanas</td>
<td>ACH</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STA</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Percentages of use of Imperfect forms in each task and lexical class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Type</th>
<th>Lexical Class</th>
<th>Y10</th>
<th>Y13</th>
<th>UG</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>ACH</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STA</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat Story</td>
<td>ACH</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STA</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>80.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermanas</td>
<td>ACH</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STA</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>80.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Significance of the explanatory variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Residual Deviance</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Residual deviance</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NULL</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>638.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>53.03</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>585.19</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.12</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>567.07</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical Class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>431.08</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>135.99</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency: Task</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>123.09</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency: Lexical class</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32.88</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>90.21</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task: Lexical class</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>68.07</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Average use of Preterit and Imperfect in the three oral tasks for beginner learners.

AND IMPERFECT WITH A PARTICULAR CLASS because the interaction between Task and Lexical Class is significant (p < .001, see last line of Table 6).

The results for the Y10 group (see Figure 2) show that learners use Preterit with accomplishment verbs (36%) more than with any other class, including achievements (19.8%), due to the high number of instances of the verb *ir* “go” produced by this group of learners. This group of speakers uses the Preterit with the same frequency for all other classes (i.e. a Tukey post-hoc test shows that only the difference in use between accomplishments and achievements (p = .001) and between accomplishments and activities (p = .005) was significant). In clear contrast with the predictions of the LAH, there were no differences between the use of Preterit in states and achievements (p = .8). The use of imperfect, although very low, is significantly higher for states (15.71%) than for any of the other three classes including activities (p = .002), where the use is rather low (3.6%). However, learners used the Preterit with states more often (20.5%) than the Imperfect (15.7%), a result which is not predicted by the LAH either. The difference in use between these two forms is not significant (p = .33), which shows that although Imperfect is preferred with states more often than with any other class, Preterit is used with states with similar frequency.

The results for the Y13 intermediate group show a clear increase in the use of Preterit and Imperfect forms (see Figure 3). This increase is especially pronounced for state verbs. Y13’s use of Preterit is significantly higher than the use of Imperfect for all classes (including activities) except for states where Imperfect was used more frequently (40.6%) than Preterit (28.6%) (the difference approaches significance: p = .06). The most interesting result is that this group is more likely to use Preterit if the verb is an achievement, an accomplishment or an activity (i.e. if the verb is [+dynamic]) than if it is a state. Similarly, this group is more likely to use the Imperfect if the verb is a state ([–dynamic]) than if it is an event. This result is, again, in clear contrast with the expected spreading of use of these forms across lexical classes suggested by the LAH and shows that telicity does not affect the pattern of use of Preterit and Imperfect for this group.

The results for the UG (advanced) group reveal the first observable effects of lexical class (telicity in particular) in the use of Preterit and Imperfect as the average use differs significantly across most of the classes (see Figure 4).
The use of Preterit is higher with achievements (69.5%) than with any other class and decreases to 60.7% with accomplishments, 42% with activities and 28.4% for states. All differences are significant except for that between the telic classes (achievements and accomplishments: $p = .18$). Similarly, the Imperfect is only used 16.7% with achievements and 24.2% with accomplishments (the two telic classes) whereas its use increases to 30.1% with activities and 58.3% with states, as also predicted by the LAH (although the difference between accomplishments and activities for the use of Imperfect is not significant: $p = .23$). In contrast to the other two learner groups, the use of Imperfect is for the first time significantly higher than the use of Preterit for states ($p < .001$).

The reported pattern of use of Preterit (Preterit is most frequently used with telic events and least frequently used with atelic events) is also observed in the results obtained by the native group (see Figure 5). However, even though the difference in use of Imperfect with achievements and states is highly significant ($p < .001$), no significant difference was found between accomplishments and activities ($p = .54$). Furthermore, the use of Preterit and Imperfect is not significantly different for accomplishments ($p = .82$) and activities ($p = .15$) showing that native speakers did not prefer one of these forms significantly more often for these two classes.

Overall, these results indicate that the combined use of Imperfect and Preterit for each of the lexical classes in the three oral tasks shows clear differences between the beginner and Y13 learners on the one hand, and the advanced learners and native controls on the other. While intermediate and beginner learners do not show the spreading pattern expected by the LAH for either of the two forms, the other two groups do show a pattern which seems consistent with this hypothesis especially for the most prototypical classes (achievements and states).

4.6 Use of Imperfect in non-prototypical contexts

In contrast to previous studies, the results reported in our study include those elicited by a controlled narrative (Las Hermanas) designed to push learners to produce Imperfect and Preterit forms in non-prototypical contexts. Therefore, it is important to examine how far this task influenced the use of these two forms. Next, a comparison is presented between the results obtained by this task and those obtained from the personal narrative and the Cat Story.

The results show striking differences. Figure 6 (native controls) and Figure 7 (advanced L2 speakers) demonstrate how these two groups used the Imperfect according to the pattern predicted by the LAH for the four lexical classes in the personal narrative and Cat Story tasks. In contrast, Las Hermanas was successful in altering this pattern in both groups and eliciting higher use of the Imperfect with telic classes and lower use with atelic classes.

These results allow us to see that the use of Imperfect by native speakers, as well as by advanced L2 speakers, only follows the predicted pattern of the LAH if the type of narrative context is not controlled. The following examples illustrate the use of Preterit with atelic verbs (examples
Dynamic contrasts in L2 Spanish past tense morphology

It is interesting to note how despite the fact that advanced speakers produced slightly fewer Imperfect forms with activities in Las Hermanas (27%) than in the other two oral tasks combined (31%), their use of Imperfect with states was hardly altered between tasks (59% produced in the personal narrative and Cat Story and 57% produced in Las Hermanas), but it was for the native speakers (72% compared to 53%). This result is revealing of the strength of the Imperfect–state association already observed in the oral data discussed in the previous section.

The results for the intermediate group (see Figure 8) also show a modified pattern of responses in non-prototypical contexts. However, and similarly to the advanced group, the use of Imperfect with states was similar in both sets of tasks (42% in personal narrative and Cat Story and 38% in Las Hermanas) and this was observed for activities (21% in personal narrative and Cat Story and 22% in Las Hermanas) as well.

Overall, these results highlight the resilience of the Imperfect–state association in the grammar of these speakers. The results from the beginner group, which are shown in Figure 9, indicate that this association is observable from the earliest stages of acquisition. As we see in Figure 9, this group prefers to use Imperfect with states in both sets of tasks. In fact, the use of Imperfect was highest in Las Hermanas (18%).

Overall, the results from this study can be taken as evidence that a strong Imperfect–state association guides the use of this form by L2 Spanish speakers from early on, and that the overall distribution of use of both Preterit and Imperfect cannot be fully accounted for by the LAH. This is particularly the case when we consider that the pattern of spreading across classes predicted by this hypothesis

(3) and (5)) and Imperfect with telic verbs (examples (4) and (6)) in the Las Hermanas task by one intermediate (Y13–50) and one advanced learner (UG-75):

(3) De repente en tren [había un gran revuelo\textsubscript{STA TE–IMP}]
[creyeron\textsubscript{STA TE–PRET} que había un problema y Gwen []
Gwen [sintió agua de lluvia\textsubscript{STATE–PRET} um [necesitó
ayuda del revisor\textsubscript{STATE–PRET}].

(Y13-50)

“Suddenly on the train there was a big commotion. They thought there was a problem and Gwen felt raindrops um she needed help from the conductor.”

(4) Gwen de niña [leía un libro\textsubscript{ACCOMP–IMP}]. [pintaba un
cuadro\textsubscript{ACCOMP–IMP} y [escribía un cuento\textsubscript{ACCOMP–IMP}]
cada fin de semana. Durante la semana [se
despertaba temprano\textsubscript{ACHIEV–IMP} y [terminaba sus
deberes\textsubscript{ACHIEV–IMP} temprano también.

(Y13-50)

“Gwen when she was a child would read a book, paint a picture, write a story each weekend. During the week she used to wake up early and used to finish her homework early too.”

(5) Y de repente en el tren mientras que [hablaba sobre su
niñez\textsubscript{ACTIVITY–IMP} [hubo un gran xx revuelo\textsubscript{STATE–PRET}].
Los dos [creyeron\textsubscript{STATE–PRET} que había un problema.

(UG-75)

“And suddenly while they were talking about their childhood there was a big commotion. Both thought that there was a problem.”

(6) Gwen de niña cada fin de semana [leía un
libro\textsubscript{ACCOMP–IMP}]. [pintaba un cuadro\textsubscript{ACCOMP–IMP} [escribía un cuento\textsubscript{ACCOMP–IMP} y durante la semana [se
despertaba temprano\textsubscript{ACHIEV–IMP}].

(UG-75)

“Gwen when she was a child each weekend would read a book, paint a picture, write a story, and during the week she would wake up early.”

It is interesting to note how despite the fact that advanced speakers produced slightly fewer Imperfect forms with activities in Las Hermanas (27%) than in the other two oral tasks combined (31%), their use of Imperfect with states was hardly altered between tasks (59% produced in the personal narrative and Cat Story and 57% produced in Las Hermanas), but it was for the native speakers (72% compared to 53%). This result is revealing of the strength of the Imperfect–state association already observed in the oral data discussed in the previous section.

The results for the intermediate group (see Figure 8) also show a modified pattern of responses in non-
One crucial finding to (i.e. whether the event is a state or not) when producing appear to be sensitive to one lexical property, dynamicity. Our results seem to indicate that beginner learners do more often with states than with any other type of verb. The results of the oral production study have shown that they are capable of using Imperfect with telic verbs in appropriate contexts as shown by the results of our controlled narrative task (Las Hermanas). This allows us to see that the latter possibility is more likely, than some change in discourse structure and grounding, a factor which can affect the use of Preterit and Imperfect forms.

5.1 Predictions

The LAH is in line with the Default Past Tense Hypothesis. This hypothesis argues that beginner learners preferred the use of Preterit over Imperfect when speaking about a past tense event, a result which seems consistent with Salaberry’s (1999) findings. This hypothesis expects that the initial stage of development of past tense forms is characterised by an overgeneralisation of the Preterit. Although our results show, consistent with previous studies which have also shown strong support for this hypothesis, that the use of Imperfect is widespread in early stages of acquisition, our study also shows that these learners use the Imperfect significantly across verb classes (including states) as the result of L1 transfer. Although our results show consistent with Salaberry’s (1999) evidence against the spreading of Imperfect across classes consistent with previous studies which have also shown evidence against the spreading of Imperfect across classes. Furthermore, and in clear contrast to the predictions of the LAH, both Preterit and Imperfect were used with the target language. The comparison between the results of the LAH and our findings reflects form–meaning associations which are frequent in developmental route, or whether such a pattern merely could be used as a significant piece of counterevidence. The comparison between the results of the LAH and our findings reflects form–meaning associations which are frequent in developmental route, or whether such a pattern merely could be used as a significant piece of counterevidence.
Table 7. SCMT design.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Type of verb</th>
<th>Target form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Habitual</td>
<td>Eventive</td>
<td>Imperfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Habitual</td>
<td>Stative</td>
<td>Imperfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>One-time event</td>
<td>Eventive</td>
<td>Preterit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>One-time event</td>
<td>Stative</td>
<td>Preterit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Stative</td>
<td>Preterit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>Eventive</td>
<td>Imperfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>Eventive</td>
<td>Imperfect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In one-time-event context, the reverse pattern is expected (high acceptance scores for Preterit and low acceptance scores for imperfect). These predictions are proposed under the assumption that whether the verb is an event or a state plays no role in the acquisition of these forms.

In contrast, any differences in responses across verb types would indicate an influence of dynamicity (the feature which explains the stative/eventive distinction). In particular, if learners are sensitive to the [+/-dynamic] distinction they would tend to accept the Imperfect more often with states than with events and would tend to reject the Preterit with states more often than with events. Crucially, in one-time-event contexts we should find evidence of higher acceptance of the Preterit with event verbs than with states and higher rejection of the Imperfect with events than with states.

5.2 Participants

The same 60 learners who participated in the production study took part in the comprehension study. The control group was formed by a group of 15 native speakers of peninsular Spanish.

5.3 Task design

Two sets of variables were included in the task design: type of predicate (eventive or stative) and type of context (one-time event, habitual, progressive, and continuous). These were combined to produce 32 different test items (see Table 7).

The participants were asked to rate the appropriateness of a pair of (Imperfect/Preterit) sentences in a particular context using a five-point Likert scale (–2, –1, 0, +1, +2). Each context was carefully biased toward either the sentence with Preterit (depicting one-time-event actions) or the sentence with imperfective morphology (depicting continuous, habitual, or progressive actions). We are aware that the decision to use English in the description of the situations could have influenced learners’ judgements in this task. However, we are not entirely sure that introducing the context in Spanish would have been problem-free either as learners could have based their choices on the Spanish forms available in the descriptions. In the end, due to the wide range of L2 proficiencies of our participants, we were forced to introduce the situations in the learners’ native language to ensure that the less experienced Spanish speakers (the beginner group) could perform this task.

Example (7) illustrates a sample test item where the introductory context represents a habitual action. Sentence (7b), with imperfective morphology, is appropriate in this context.

(7) When Ana was a child she had a very close friend, Amy, and she liked to spend a lot of time at her house after school.

a. Ana estuvo [PRET] mucho en casa de Amy al salir del colegio. (inappropriate)
   “Ana was in Amy’s house a lot after school.”

b. Ana estuvo [IMP] mucho en casa de Amy al salir del colegio. (appropriate)
   “Ana used to be in Amy’s house a lot after school.”

The responses given by each participant were counted and the mean average of each chosen option in each experimental condition was calculated. Mean values were then transformed into percentages. Two types of statistical analyses, within and between groups, were carried out using paired-samples t-tests for the former and a one-way ANOVA with Tukey post-hoc tests for the latter.

5.4 Results

The results of this study are summarised in Figures 10 and 11. Figure 10 shows the average ratings for both input sentences (with Preterit and Imperfect morphology) in contexts where Imperfect is the appropriate form (i.e. contexts depicting habitual, continuous or progressive actions in the past). Figure 11 shows the average ratings for
and comprehension and different levels of task control) the results of four different tasks (including both production and the LAH, by assessing to what extent comparing the tests produced similar results. Similarly, an effect arising from the type of verb was found for Imperfect (F(1,34) = 10.792, p = .003) and Preterit (F(1,38) = 6.0255, p = .01) sentences. This result suggests that these two groups of learners had more difficulty rejecting the sentence with Imperfect when the verb was a state than when the verb was an event. This result suggests that intermediate and advanced learners did not judge sentences with Imperfect as appropriate form (i.e. contexts depicting one-time events) as frequently as they did with Preterit. The results obtained from the production data also reveal that, at least in perfective contexts, learners' responses seem to be revealing a strong Imperfect–state and Preterit–event association. These results also support the hypothesis that dynamicity is the lexical feature which affects the learner's responses. This is evidenced by the fact that learners do not prefer the Preterit over the Imperfect with states even when this is the appropriate option (in one-time-event contexts). The results from the SCMT have shown that a state–Preterit association exists in the learners' grammar of intermediate and advanced L2 Spanish. This finding is also supported by the fact that learners do not prefer the Preterit over the Imperfect with states even when this is the appropriate option (in one-time-event contexts). However, the association found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. However, the association found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data. This result converges with similar types of associations found in the production data.
whether English event verbs are always perfective is an interesting possibility, but it is crucial in the acquisition of Spanish past tense that our results as supporting the view that L1 transfer plays a role in this case, it is dynamicity and not telicity that is involved in the interpretation of telicity in Spanish (see relevant review in Salaberry, 2008).

It is not obvious how the current explanation for the imperfect association guides the L2 acquisition of French Preterit association. That is, although lexical aspect plays a role in this case, it is dynamicity and not telicity that requires a sustained input of energy as argued by Comrie, 1987; Kihlstedt, 2002), but why this semantic contrast is limited group of frequently used state verbs (see Collins, 2002, for similar findings in L2 English and Bardovi-Harlig, 2005, for relevant discussion). The analysis of the details in Table 8).

Recall that intermediate, and even advanced learners, also using a wide variety of state verbs at this stage. Advanced learners and native controls. This group is standing debate.

One anonymous reviewer suggests that our results can provide more robust evidence to resolve this long-standing debate.

Table 8. Percentage of use of Imperfect across state

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>UG</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>Y10</th>
<th>Y13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tener</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haber</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ser/estar</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“there is/are”</td>
<td>(2/67)</td>
<td>(8/202)</td>
<td>(23/497)</td>
<td>(12/283)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“have”</td>
<td>(3/67)</td>
<td>(54/202)</td>
<td>(106/497)</td>
<td>(38/283)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“be”</td>
<td>(57/67)</td>
<td>(115/202)</td>
<td>(254/497)</td>
<td>(169/283)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The review of the literature pointed out persistent problems with the methodology used in studies assessing semantic–morphology pairings and lack of convergence from different task types. It was argued that due to the rarity of particular forms in naturally occurring contexts, it was necessary to devise varied elicitation methods which were combined and demonstrated that learners' use of target forms. The results of the three production tasks were carried out an analysis of the different types of state verbs that our participants used with Imperfect forms in the least detailed in Table 8).

In the case of the beginner learners, their use of Imperfect with ser to a few high frequency types. This seems to indicate that it suggests that the aspectual nature of dynamic/non-durativity are the other two) and the most difficult to classify verbs in different lexical classes (telicity and dynamic events is largely lexical and it is not affected by the verbal phrase as a whole (i.e. dynamicity is a [+perfective] feature. This analysis implies that all speakers of English (as opposed to the telic/atelic distinction). An analysis along these lines would see well. This, in turn, presupposes that perfective/progressive being perfective so it is possible to assume that English eventive verbs in English are implicitly interpreted as a [+perfective] feature. This analysis implies that all and Pianesi (1997), that English dynamic verbs have imperfect association can enlighten these acquisition findings, except that it could be explained if we assume, following Giorgi 1976) can enlighten these acquisition findings, except that it could be explained if we assume, following Giorgi 1976) can enlighten these acquisition findings, except that it could be explained if we assume, following Giorgi 1976) can enlighten these acquisition findings, except that it could be explained if we assume, following Giorgi 1976) can enlighten these acquisition findings, except that it could be explained if we assume, following Giorgi 1976) can enlighten these acquisition findings, except that it could be explained if we assume, following Giorgi 1976) can enlighten these acquisition findings, except that it could be explained if we assume, following Giorgi 1976) can enlighten these acquisition findings, except that it could be explained if we assume, following Giorgi 1976) can enlighten these acquisition findings, except that it could be explained if we assume, following Giorgi 1976) can enlighten these acquisition findings, except that it could be explained if we assume, following Giorgi 1976) can enlighten these acquisition findings, except that it could be explained if we assume, following Giorgi 1976) can enlighten these acquisition findings, except that it could be explained if we assume, following Giorgi 1976) can enlighten these acquisition findings, except that it could be explained if we assume, following Giorgi 1976) can enlighten these acquisition findings.
LeBlanc, 2009). Our findings show that the frequency of research (see also Wulff, Ellis, Römer, Bardovi-Harlig & Las Hermanas of form meaning associations (see also relevant discussions in Gries and Wulff, 2005, 2009) has incorporated both corpus and experimental data to investigate a hypothesis of major interest in SLA. However, recent research (see McManus, 2009) has shown that the use of Preterit with telic events and Imperfect with atelic is not unique to native Spanish speakers. This study shows that even when the apparent lack of interest shown by formal SLA acquisition process when they have difficulty acquiring morphological contrasts. This study shows that even when learners end up forming these specific associations with atelic by these two groups of Spanish speakers. Thus, it was crucial to investigate this association in a controlled data (including the metalinguistic nature of the production study merit special attention. The combined evidence for the ungrammaticality (or lack of acquisition) for the use of a particular form cannot be used as limited with respect to the type of evidence they can provide. For instance, absence of positive evidence does not indicate that the use of Preterit with telic events and Imperfect with atelic is not unique to native Spanish speakers. As with other experimental methods (including frequency data and corpus data) has already been argued in linguistic theory (see Duffield, 1996). A few recent examples of such studies include Andersen & Shirai, 1994, White, 1989). The current study shows, however, that combining experimental and corpus data can indeed provide robust converging evidence on the mental representation of past tense morphology and their actual use to indicate that the use of Preterit with telic events and Imperfect with atelic is not unique to native Spanish speakers. As in the case of the advanced group, those learners appear to behave in a manner which is consistent with the LAH (as in the case of the advanced group). It may be possible that advanced learners have incorporated both corpus and experimental data to elicit those combinations. It may be possible that advanced learners have incorporated both corpus and experimental data to elicit those combinations. It may be possible that advanced learners have incorporated both corpus and experimental data to elicit those combinations. It may be possible that advanced learners have incorporated both corpus and experimental data to elicit those combinations. It may be possible that advanced learners have incorporated both corpus and experimental data to elicit those combinations. It may be possible that advanced learners have incorporated both corpus and experimental data to elicit those combinations. It may be possible that advanced learners have incorporated both corpus and experimental data to elicit those combinations. It may be possible that advanced learners have incorporated both corpus and experimental data to elicit those combinations. It may be possible that advanced learners have incorporated both corpus and experimental data to elicit those combinations. It may be possible that advanced learners have incorporated both corpus and experimental data to elicit those combinations.
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