

University of Montana

ScholarWorks at University of Montana

Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, &
Professional Papers

Graduate School

2012

Language Change in Spanish Heritage Speakers: the Interaction Between Lexical and Grammatical Aspect

Jackelyn Kelly Van Buren
The University of Montana

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd>

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Van Buren, Jackelyn Kelly, "Language Change in Spanish Heritage Speakers: the Interaction Between Lexical and Grammatical Aspect" (2012). *Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers*. 613.

<https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd/613>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.

LANGUAGE CHANGE IN SPANISH HERITAGE SPEAKERS: THE INTERACTION
BETWEEN LEXICAL AND GRAMMATICAL ASPECT

By

JACKELYN KELLY VAN BUREN

B.A. in Theoretical Linguistics, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, 2009

Thesis

presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Master of Arts
in Linguistics

The University of Montana
Missoula, MT

May 2012

Approved by:

Sandy Ross, Associate Dean of The Graduate School
Graduate School

Dr. Leora Bar-el
Linguistics

Dr. Irene Appelbaum
Linguistics

Dr. Naomi Shin
Modern and Classical Languages and Literatures

Language Change in Spanish Heritage Speakers: the Interaction Between Lexical and Grammatical Aspect

Chairperson: Dr. Leora Bar-el

This thesis focuses on preterit and imperfect usage in the Spanish of Chilean-American heritage speakers. Spanish heritage speakers in the United States are second generation bilinguals who learn Spanish in the home from Spanish speaking parents and learn English from school and the community (Montrul 2002; Rothman 2007). When societal factors limit heritage language exposure, tense and aspect morphology is susceptible to change (Guijarro-Fuentes & Clibbens 2004). Findings of a study on 11 Chilean-American heritage speakers show that production of the preterit is overextending, resulting in less frequent use of the imperfect.

Large-scale studies of US Spanish-English bilinguals' use of the Spanish past tense forms (*canté* 'I sang' preterit vs. *cantaba* 'I sang' imperfect) report changes in how first generation Spanish speakers use these forms (Montrul 2002; Silva-Corvalán 1994; Zentella 1997). The preterit is used to denote events viewed as a complete whole (perfective) and the imperfect denotes incompleteness or an action viewed as in progress in the past (imperfective). The current study employed a three part on-line questionnaire that included: (i) a language background and social variables section; (ii) a closed-question section using the story, *Ricitos de Oro* 'Goldilocks and the Three Bears'; and (iii) an open-question section where participants were asked to translate English past tense sentences into Spanish.

This study provides an in-depth analysis for the internally-driven motivations for the changing use of the preterit (perfective aspect) and imperfect (imperfective aspect). I account for the overextension of the preterit as a consequence of the interaction between lexical aspect (classification of predicates based on inherent meanings such as states and events) and grammatical aspect (externally coded aspectual properties such as the preterit and imperfect). Spanish heritage speakers are making use of lexical aspect when producing overt aspectual forms. This is similar to how tense and aspect morphology is acquired and produced in children (Slobin 1977). This strategy is a way to use the information provided by lexical aspect, overt morphology, and discursive context to denote the aspectual interpretations of perfectivity and imperfectivity. This study has implications for educators who teach heritage speakers because they are known to have different needs than second language learners (Montrul 2002) and also adds to the literature on Chilean-Americans, an underrepresented group in bilingualism and heritage language studies.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Leora Bar-el, for the countless hours she spent helping me in the process of creating this thesis. My gratitude goes back to the first day of the Tense and Aspect seminar that Dr. Bar-el taught. I had never experienced a more intellectually stimulating and thought-provoking class discussion. It turns out, every lecture and every class by Dr. Bar-el provides the same excitement. I fall in love with linguistics all over again every time I hear her speak about language. She is an amazing mentor, professor, and researcher, and I am so grateful that she was willing to take me on as a student.

Though the University of Montana is a small program, it is full of incredible linguists and supportive students. I would like to thank Dr. Irene Appelbaum for being the first person I knew here and for taking me under her wing. She manages to make everyone laugh while simultaneously throwing out the wittiest comments I have ever heard. Any frustration from the last two years have been made bearable because of her down-to-earth advice and challenging linguistic discussions. I would also like to thank the professor who introduced me to Spanish linguistics and subsequently helped me find my niche: Dr. Naomi Lapidus Shin. Every discussion I have with her leaves me so excited I feel like I have just ingested a gallon of coffee. She has also taught me how to be a better teacher and student by thinking critically about every word I say or write. I am lucky I have had the chance to learn from the best.

I also want to thank Dr. Mizuki Miyashita, Dr. Tully Thibeau, and Dr. Lauren Felton-Rosulek. All have affected my life at UM and have helped me grow as a student and as a person. I have especially learned so much from my time working with Dr. Miyashita in the Blackfoot Language Group. I am grateful for her patience!

Of course, I would not be here if not for the invaluable support and love from my friends

and family. I am the luckiest person to be able to surround myself with such good people. I would like to thank Rebecca Yares and Scott Schupbach for their endless support, patience, and willingness to discuss linguistics with me at all hours of the day and night. I hope the paths in our lives never stop crossing. I would like to thank Bryon Schroeder for keeping me sane and providing me with actual meals during the thesis writing process. Through all the little frustrations, he was understanding and encouraged me to continue. I would also like to thank my parents for giving me all the support possible. Because of them, I have been able to focus on my passion and that is more valuable than any present I could receive.

Finally, I would like to thank the participants for this study. I could not have done this study without the help of my aunt, Viviana Mehner, and the Chilean-American Association of Las Vegas, of which she is President. I would also like to thank the Chilean Student Organization at UC Davis and the Chilean Student Association at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, for being so willing to help me find participants.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
List of Abbreviations	vii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: Lexical and Grammatical Aspect: From Cross-Linguistic Patterns to Spanish Tendencies	4
2.1 Grammatical Aspect: Perfectivity and Imperfectivity	4
2.2 Lexical Aspect: Four-way Predicate Classification and (a)Telicity	7
2.3 Spanish: Preterit and Imperfect	10
2.4 Temporal Boundedness and Semantic Context	14
2.5 Aspectual Conflicts	18
2.6 Aspect Acquisition in Spanish	19
2.7 Summary	21
Chapter 3: Chilean-American Spanish in the United States	23
3.1 Language Contact and Change	24
3.2 Internal Motivations for Spanish Heritage Language Change	26
3.3 Chilean-American Communities	28
3.4 Previous Studies of Heritage Speakers	29
3.4.1 Tense and Aspect in New York Puerto Ricans	32
3.4.2 Tense and Aspect in Mexican-American Spanish of Los Angeles, California	34
3.4.3 Heritage Language Tense and Aspect: Acquisition Explanation	38
3.5 Summary	40
Chapter 4: Methodology	42
4.1 Procedure	42
4.2 Participants and Social Variables	43
4.3 Closed-Question Morphological Task	46
4.4 Open-Question Translation Task	48
4.5 Questionnaire Issues	53
4.6 Classification of Lexical Classes	54
Chapter 5: Analysis	58
5.1 Results: Lexical Class and Grammatical Aspect Correlation	59
5.2 Results: Resolution of Aspectual Conflicts	62
5.2.1 Methods of Resolving Aspectual Conflicts	63
5.2.2 Default Aspectual Form	65
5.2.3 Summary	70
5.3 Results: Sentences Out of Context	71

5.4 <i>Ser</i> and <i>Estar</i>	72
5.5 Parallels with Russian Heritage Speakers	75
5.6 Summary	75
Chapter 6: Motivations for the Extension of the Preterit	77
6.1 Internal Motivations for Change in Spanish and (Im)perfectivity	78
6.2 Reducing Semantic Complexity: The Imperfect and the Progressive in Spanish	79
6.3 Unmarked Aspectual Interpretations	81
6.4 Saliency, Foregrounding in Discourse, and Aspect Acquisition	82
6.5 Summary	84
Chapter 7: Conclusion	86
7.1 Summary	86
7.2 Implications	87
7.3 Issues for Further Research	89
References	90
Appendices	95

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

IMPF	imperfect
PERF	perfective/preterit
PROG	progressive
FUT	future tense
INF	infinitive
PRES	present tense
DAT	dative
3sg	third person singular
1sg	first person singular
3pl	third person plural
Pl	plural
DO	direct object
ADO	animate direct object marker
PP	past participle
MS	masculine
FPl	feminine plural

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

This thesis aims to add to the literature on heritage language change by focusing on the Spanish of Chilean-Americans. I propose that the aspectual system of second generation Chilean-Americans (also called heritage speakers) changes from the first generation, and that furthermore, these changes are systematic. The change happens because of reduced Spanish input in a language contact situation. I investigate the change by presenting a study of the production of aspectual morphology by 11 Chilean-American heritage speakers. I argue that the use of the preterit is overextending, leading to the reduction of the imperfect with eventive predicates. This leads me to propose that Chilean-American heritage speakers are using lexical aspect to determine the use of the preterit and imperfect, analogously to how tense and aspect morphology is acquired in childhood (Slobin 1977). I account for this language change using a framework of the semantics of tense and aspect.

The main purpose of this study is to determine the frequency in production of the preterit and imperfect in Spanish heritage speakers and how this differs from the monolingual norm; the second purpose is to explain the change in frequency through correlations with predicate classes. The change can then be explained by the semantics of lexical and grammatical aspect that internally motivate the varying use of overt aspectual morphology. I claim that (1) lexical aspect, rather than context, determines the use of preterit vs. imperfect in heritage speakers, that (2) the use of the preterit is overextending with eventive predicates, and that (3) subsequently the use of the imperfect is becoming restricted to stative predicates. I claim that for heritage speakers the context paired with lexical aspect are enough to convey the semantic aspectual information that would otherwise be encoded in the preterit or imperfect. The preterit overextends because it is the unmarked form in the past tense and contains less semantic complexity than the imperfect.

The proposal put forth in this thesis has several implications for the field of linguistics. This thesis adds to knowledge concerning the interaction among tense, lexical aspect, and grammatical aspect. In addition, heritage language change and language contact represent quick grammatical change due to reduced exposure to the heritage language. Grammatical changes that occur quickly in heritage language situations not only have parallels in endangered language varieties but also give insights into standard processes of language change (Dorian 1973). Simplification of grammatical systems make up for loss of semantic nuances by compensation through other areas of the morphosyntax and lexicon (i.e. adverbial clauses, creation of new distinctions, increased reliance on certain forms or structures, such as lexical aspect).

This study also has implications for the study of heritage language acquisition and change. Similar findings of the overextension of the preterit in Spanish heritage speakers have been reported (Silva-Corvalán 1994; Montrul 2009) but until now there has not been an in-depth explanation for why the aspectual interpretation of perfectivity (realized by the morphological form *preterit* in Spanish) would increase in frequency and subsequently why use of the imperfective form would decline. This study has implications for the study of language acquisition due to parallels among the ways in which children acquire tense and aspect morphology, how heritage speakers use the morphology, and how the morphology is either a result of incomplete acquisition or simplification in adulthood.

In addition, this study has pedagogical implications for teachers of heritage speakers because heritage speakers are known to have different needs from second language learners (Montrul 2002). Understanding typical features of heritage languages aids in the creation of teaching materials for educators who have heritage speakers in their classrooms. This study also adds to the literature on Chilean-Americans, an unrepresented group in bilingualism and heritage

language studies. Chilean-Americans form a unique group because of the few concentrated neighborhoods nationwide, suggesting that linguistic change in this group of heritage speakers is most likely due to internally-motivated language changes rather than to influence from other heritage speakers.

This thesis is organized as follows. In Chapter 2 I discuss the semantics of tense and aspect, specifically focusing on perfectivity, imperfectivity, and lexical aspect. I give an overview of the distinction between grammatical aspect and lexical aspect. I explain how perfectivity and imperfectivity are manifested in the past tense in L1 Spanish speakers. I provide an overview of aspect acquisition which, according to my findings, has implications for how adult heritage speakers encode aspectual morphology. In Chapter 3 I present background on major Spanish heritage language studies. I discuss the changes expected in the language contact situation of Spanish-English bilingualism in the United States. The significance and features of Chilean-American communities are discussed. Previous findings on the tense and aspect system of heritage speakers that are a basis of comparison for the current study are also outlined in this section. In Chapter 4 I describe the methodology for this study and the classification of predicates into particular lexical classes in order to correlate grammatical aspect with lexical aspect. Chapter 5 presents both quantitative and qualitative analyses of the collected data, which show that the heritage language speakers' produce the preterit more than the imperfect. This chapter also discusses how participants resolved atypical lexical and grammatical aspectual pairings (such as perfective contexts with stative predicates) and discusses which form (imperfect or preterit) is unmarked for heritage speakers when giving translations of clauses without context. Chapter 6 situates the proposal in this thesis within the framework of a discussion of internal motivations for language change. In this section I relate my findings to the

cross-linguistic semantics of perfectivity and imperfectivity. In addition, I discuss parallels between acquisition of this aspectual contrast and the change exhibited in heritage speakers. I conclude in Chapter 7 by discussing the implications of my findings as well as showing how this thesis contributes to linguistic theory.

CHAPTER 2

LEXICAL AND GRAMMATICAL ASPECT: FROM CROSS-LINGUISTIC PATTERNS TO SPANISH TENDENCIES

The goal of this chapter is to provide an overview of perfectivity and imperfectivity, a central grammatical aspect contrast, and how they relate to lexical aspect, specifically in Spanish. Not all researchers agree that lexical aspect plays a role in the use of grammatical aspect in Spanish (Butt & Benjamin 2011), but studies on tense and aspect acquisition and Spanish heritage language change in the United States have shown that the two interact in ways that have implications for heritage language acquisition, simplification patterns, and language attrition (Montrul 2002; Jacobson 1986; Andersen 1991). The current study is the first to analyze how grammatical aspect correlates with Vendler's (1967) four-way predicate classification in Spanish heritage speakers in the United States.

2.1 Grammatical Aspect: Perfectivity and Imperfectivity

Although tense and aspect are intricately linked, the two categories differ with regards to temporal relations. Tense is strictly concerned with the time in which a situation occurred, relative to the moment of utterance. The three most common tense distinctions are past, present, and future. Aspect, on the other hand, refers to “different ways of viewing the internal temporal constituency of a situation,” (Comrie 1976:3). In other words, aspect is not concerned with when a situation¹ happened but rather focuses on the internal components of situations and informs us about their structure from a particular viewpoint. Aspectual distinctions can be restricted to a certain tense, such as the aspectual interpretations of perfectivity and imperfectivity, which are morphologically encoded only in the past tense in Spanish (Comrie 1976).

¹ Borrowing Smith's (1991) terminology, I use ‘situation’ as a cover term for all predicate types.

Grammatical aspect refers to the ways in which situations are perceived and does not refer to inherent meanings that verbs carry. Perfectivity and imperfectivity are generally at opposite ends of a spectrum (Rothstein 2004). Example (1) shows how imperfectivity and perfectivity are distinguished in English and gives an idea of their respective meanings. In English, imperfectivity in the past is encoded by the progressive and the habitual construction *used to + verb*. Both predicates in (1a) and (1b), *was building* and *built*, are in the past tense but encode different aspectual interpretations.

1. a. He lived in a hotel while he *was building* the house. (IMPF)
 - b. He *built* the house and then sold it for profit. (PERF)
- (Adapted from Rothstein 2004:1)

Languages vary as to whether they have overt morphological forms for perfectivity and imperfectivity. Imperfectivity can be realized as a progressive construction (i.e. *was walking* in English) or a non-progressive imperfective form (i.e, the imperfect in Spanish).

In example (1a), two events are happening simultaneously. The progressive is used to show that the event of *building a house* was in progress at the time the first situation, *lived in a hotel* was also happening². Imperfective aspect here gives a perspective on the internal constituency of the event, since it encodes the progression of the event. Perfective aspect, on the other hand, presents a situation as whole and bounded. The internal make-up and development of a situation encoded with perfectivity is not in focus; its beginning and/or end may be encoded but not the individual sub-parts that make up the event (Comrie 1976). Imperfectivity looks at the situation from an internal viewpoint, not making reference to its beginning or end. If a situation is encoded as imperfective, it must contain internal structure (Comrie 1976). That is, the

² The first situation *lived* is not in the progressive because it is a state, which will be defined in §3.2.

subcomponents of the situation must be analyzable and viewed as either in progress or a habitual, repeated event. A subtype of imperfectivity is the progressive, which is usually distinguished from habitual and nonprogressive continuous imperfective (Comrie 1976:25). English, for example distinguishes between habitual *John used to live here* and progressive *John was walking* in the past.

Aspect is a grammatical property that is encoded inflectionally or through adverbial constructions. Languages may combine aspectual morphology with tense, like the simple past tense marker *-ed* in English that can also encode perfectivity with its single episodic readings (i.e. ‘Mary read a book last night’, where the interpretation is that Mary started and finished reading a book last night) (Comrie 1976). It can also be the case that an aspectual form or distinction is only available in one tense in a language; for example, the imperfect and preterit are only expressed morphologically in the past tense in Spanish. In addition, a language may lack morphological tense but encode aspectual distinctions. Perfectivity lends itself to a past tense interpretation due to its nature of encoding completion and boundedness. Some languages that lack a past tense marker may still have past tense readings when situations are inflected with perfective aspect (Bybee et al. 1994).

Perfective and imperfective are two kinds of viewpoints for perceiving a situation and they are not necessarily incompatible. Events that are encoded as perfective can still have duration, such as in Russian *on postohal/prostojal tam čas* ‘he stood there for an hour’ (Comrie 1976:22) or the Spanish progressive construction with perfective morphology on the auxiliary *el estuvo trabajando toda la noche* ‘he **was** working all night’. Perfective marking does not exclude an event from having an internal structure, it is merely looking at a situation as a complete whole. It can also be used to focus on the inception or culmination of an event. Imperfective

marking, on the other hand, puts the internal structure of a situation in focus. Compare *Mary read a book last night* with *Mary was reading a book last night*. The first has a bounded interpretation and the second has a progressive, imperfective reading. The progressive focuses on the event as it was happening and because the event is analyzable and open, the reader can sense that another event may have also happened while Mary was reading.

Aspect can also interact with tense. The imperfective tends to be unmarked in the present tense because the present generally describes situations that tend to encode continuity or habituality (Comrie 1976:66). For example, the simple present in English generally encodes habituality with eventive predicates (i.e. *I run* is interpreted as *I am a runner*). In tenseless languages like Yoruba, perfective forms have the tendency to refer to the past if the situation is nonstative (Comrie 1976:82). Grammatical aspect can also interact with inherent semantic properties of verbs, leading to certain aspectual conflicts. In the following section we examine lexical aspect to shed light on these interactions.

2.2 Lexical Aspect: Four-way Predicate Classification and (A)telicity

Vendler (1967) categorizes predicates into a four-way classification based on their inherent semantic properties. Predicates are grouped into achievements (e.g. *recognize, reach*), accomplishments (e.g. *melt, intransitive freeze*), states (e.g. *know, be sick*), and activities (e.g. *walk, write*). The four types can be distinguished by the features static vs. dynamic, durative vs. instantaneous, and telic vs. atelic (Smith 1995). Telic predicates have inherent, natural endpoints and by reaching that endpoint the predicate undergoes a change of state; atelic predicates have no inherent endpoints. Instantaneous predicates lack any duration and happen at a single point in time; durative predicates have duration over an interval. Dynamic predicates produce a change

whereas static predicates hold over time without change or internal structure (Smith 1999). Each of the four situation types has a different combination of these temporal features distinguishing it from the others. The following table shows a classification of situation types using these features taken from Smith (1991:12).³

	Static	Dynamic	Durative	Instantaneous	Telic	Atelic
State	X		X			X
Activity		X	X			X
Accomplishment		X	X		X	
Achievement		X		X	X	

Table 1: Situation types classified by features

When classifying a predicate, the verb phrase as a whole must be taken into account. For example, *run* is an activity because it is atelic, durative, and dynamic but *run a mile* is an accomplishment because it is telic, durative, and dynamic. Further examples of each type of predicate (including an object complement) are (Smith 1991):

- a. States: *know the answer, love Mary*
- b. Activities: *push a cart, stroll in the park*
- c. Accomplishments: *build a house, walk to school, learn Greek*
- d. Achievements: *win the race, reach the top*

³ Smith (1995) also argues for a fifth situation type, semelfactives. These are events that happen instantaneously but results in no change of state, such as *knock, cough, and flap a wing*. I argue for classifying these predicates with activities, following Rothstein (2004) and Levin (1999).

In addition to distinguishing between lexical and grammatical aspect, inherent endpoints (telicity) and externally encoded temporal bounds (boundedness) must also be clarified. Above we defined telicity as an inherent semantic property of predicates. Boundedness and unboundedness is a distinction relevant to grammatical aspect. Telicity refers to whether the situation has a natural endpoint or not. Boundedness is a feature that can be encoded by overt morphology and refers to temporal boundaries (Depraetere 1995). Imperfectivity is described as encoding unboundedness and perfectivity denotes boundedness. If there is a temporal boundary (i.e. the situation is explicitly bounded due to overt morphology or adverbial clauses) then a situation ends due to an exogenous cause; for example, *I ran for two hours* denotes that the activity of running ended after two hours (an explicit, independent temporal bound) but that theoretically, the event of running could take place indefinitely if not for outside effects (not part of the inherent semantics) that cause the event to stop. For that reason, *run* is atelic. If one contrasts this with *I ran a mile*, we see that the difference is now in natural endpoints and telicity. Taking the verb with its argument *a mile*, the event finishes when the endpoint is reached

Another classification of predicates is states and events. Smith (1999) has shown how states and events are two fundamental concepts important to how humans cognize the world. This distinction is then reflected within situation types. Activities, though atelic like states, also pattern like events in that all events share the property of dynamism. Dynamic events refer to a change of state within the event; dynamic situations take place in a differentiated period and “dynamism brings with it both the assumption of an initial endpoint, and the possibility of an eventual endpoint,” (Smith 1999:486). Activities are dynamic because they take place in time and have the possibility of a final endpoint (unlike states, which continue undifferentiated). Languages may show lexical class and grammatical aspect paralleling a telic/atelic distinction or

a stative/eventive (or non-stative) distinction. One of the aims of this study is to determine if Chilean Spanish heritage speakers are making use of one division over the other. The following section on the Spanish preterit and imperfect will discuss how perfectivity and imperfectivity are encoded in the Spanish tense and aspect system and relate this to Spanish heritage language.

2.3 Spanish: Preterit and Imperfect

This section will describe how perfectivity and imperfectivity are encoded in Spanish, with the purpose of demonstrating how cross-linguistic patterns of lexical and grammatical aspect are relevant to the Spanish aspectual system. The term *preterit* is the Spanish equivalent of perfectivity and the term *imperfect* is the Spanish equivalent of non-progressive imperfectivity. Despite the Chilean dialect being a control in this study, the preterit/imperfect aspectual distinction in Spanish is not known to be affected by dialectal variation (Rothman 2008).

In Spanish, any situation type can combine with either the preterit or imperfect (Montrul 2002). The choice broadly depends on the context within the discourse, along with the verb and its arguments. The difference between (3a) and (3b) below the sentences is not one of tense (they are both past), but one of grammatical aspect. The overt morphology on the verb signals the grammatical aspect of the sentences.

2. a. *Juan cantaba* (IMPF)
‘John sang/used to sing’
- b. *Juan cantó* (PERF)
‘John sang’

Table 2 below shows the regular Chilean verb paradigm for the three verb conjugations, *-ar*, *-er*, and *-ir* based on the vowel of the infinitive. The inflectional morphemes on the verb signal person and number, in addition to tense and aspect.

Preterit	1sg	2sg	3sg	1pl	2pl/3pl
<i>hablar</i>	<i>hablé</i>	<i>hablaste</i>	<i>habló</i>	<i>hablamos</i>	<i>hablaron</i>
<i>comer</i>	<i>comí</i>	<i>comiste</i>	<i>comió</i>	<i>comimos</i>	<i>comieron</i>
<i>vivir</i>	<i>viví</i>	<i>viviste</i>	<i>vivió</i>	<i>vivimos</i>	<i>vivieron</i>

Imperfect	1sg	2sg	3sg	1pl	2pl/3pl
<i>hablar</i>	<i>hablaba</i>	<i>hablabas</i>	<i>hablaba</i>	<i>hablábamos</i>	<i>hablaban</i>
<i>comer</i>	<i>comía</i>	<i>comías</i>	<i>comía</i>	<i>comíamos</i>	<i>comían</i>
<i>vivir</i>	<i>vivía</i>	<i>vivías</i>	<i>vivía</i>	<i>vivíamos</i>	<i>vivían</i>

Table 2: Indicative preterit and imperfect paradigm for verbs *hablar* ‘to speak’, *comer* ‘to eat’, and *vivir* ‘to live’ (Butt & Benjamin 2011)

Some languages that have both perfective and imperfective morphology restrict their use with the four situation types. Russian, for example, does not allow perfective morphology with states (Smith 1991).

Tense and aspect in Spanish express temporal relations that interact with semantic and pragmatic features of the discourse as a whole (Paredes & Nova-Dancausse 2000). The imperfect is used for backgrounding information in a narrative; conversely, the preterit is used for

foregrounding and moving the action forward. We can see this from the following English example:

3. John was talking on the phone when the door opened.

The first clause in the progressive sets up a background for the second event clause, which is perfective, and it is here that the action or events move forward in the narrative. Silva-Corvalán (1983:765) finds in an analysis of how aspect is used in Spanish narratives that the imperfect is used to describe “entities, states, actions, and conditions that existed both before and during the time of the narrative.” Perfective events move the narrative forward because each event clause with perfective morphology produces a new reference time. On a narrative temporal line, each reference time interval brings each new event into focus (Smith 1999). The reference time is the point of evaluation that relates a situation to event time or speech time (i.e. the present perfect *I have run* in English has a reference point as the moment of utterance and the event time in the past) (Reichenbach 1947). Atelic situation types or unbounded events do not move the action forward, whereas closed events, accomplishments, and achievements do (Smith 1991).

For heritage speakers of Spanish in the United States, English becomes the dominant language through socialization. Subsequently, the two-way distinction in the past tense may pose a problem because English has only one way of marking the past tense morphologically, *-ed*. The English simple past generally corresponds to the Spanish perfective form because it usually has a single episodic reading (Rothman 2008). Going back to example (2) above, the way to produce *Juan cantaba* and *Juan cantó* in English would be as in example (4) below.

4. John sang.

Alternatively, English has a way of expressing habituality in the past tense using the verbal phrase *used to* or *would*, as in example (5).

5. John used to/would sing.

Example (5) is a periphrastic habitual construction as opposed to the inflectional construction in Spanish. These syntactic differences show that bilingual Spanish children growing up in the United States have two grammatical systems with two distinct aspectual systems, an English system and a Spanish system. Silva-Corvalán (1994) suggests that the Spanish preterit and imperfect distinction changes from two forms to one in the grammar of a second and third generation bilingual in order to lighten the cognitive load of distinguishing between the two aspectual systems in an adaptive simplification process. This happens due to reduced access to language input in the non-dominant language.

Spanish also has a progressive aspect construction that can be formed in the past, shown below in examples (6) and (7). The progressive construction in Spanish (also called continuous) can be combined with imperfect (6) and preterit (7) morphology on the ‘to be’ auxiliary *estar*:

6. Juan esta-ba canta-ndo
Juan be -IMPF.Past.3sg sing -PROG
‘John was singing’

7. Juan est- uvo canta-ndo
Juan be -PRET.Past.3sg sing -PROG
'John was singing'

The simple imperfect form *cantaba* 'I sang' does not exclude a progressive meaning, however (Comrie 1976). According to Butt and Benjamin (2011:214), if the event occurred in the past and was not a habitual occurrence, then "the difference between the continuous and non-continuous imperfect is often blurred, and modern Spanish often prefers the continuous form." This is an issue that has implications for external motivations for how heritage speakers' distinctions between the preterit and imperfect may change and will be discussed further in Chapter 6.

2.4 Temporal Boundedness and Semantic Context

Boundedness is a major component of the distinction between the preterit and imperfect in Spanish, as in the aspectual interpretations of perfectivity and imperfectivity. The preterit encodes a temporal boundedness onto an event and does not look at the event from within but rather as a whole. The event is perceived as having a beginning or end, or both, but the internal structure is not in focus, though the possibility of the event having an internal structure is not excluded. On the other hand, the imperfect encodes an event as unbounded and looks at the event from inside the situation. The internal structure of the event is in focus but not its inception or culmination (Montrul and Slabakova 2003). The imperfect in Spanish is most often used to describe habitual events and for backgrounding to indicate that the event was in progress when another situation occurred. Associating habituality exclusively with the imperfect can be

problematic, however, because if an event continued habitually and repeatedly in a specified period of the past, the preterit can also be used, as example (8) shows.

8. El Rey Salomón **reinó** durante 34 años (PERF)
'King Solomon reigned for thirty years'

In Spanish, the imperfect is more semantically complex than the preterit because it encodes a wider range of meanings that differ depending on context (Montrul 2002). Butte & Benjamin (2011:212-215) list the following uses of the imperfect: to denote past events in progress when something else happened (example 9), to denote events that continued in the past for an unspecified period (example 10), to denote the conditional (example 11), and for habitual events in the past that are generally translated in English with 'used to' or 'would' (example 12).⁴

9. Yo **volvía** del cine cuando vi a Niso
'I was coming back (IMPF) from the cinema when I saw Niso'
10. Le **exasperaban** estas comidas mexicanas de cuatro o cinco horas de duración
'These four- or five-hour Mexican meals exasperated (IMPF) him'
11. Prometieron que **venían**
'They promised they were coming (IMPF)'

⁴ Additional uses of the imperfect include certain forms of children's play language (called *imperfect lúdico* 'imperfect of play'), to make courteous requests, to replace the present tense in cases of reported speech and in streams of consciousness, and as an alternate use of the preterit in literary styles (Butt & Benjamin 2011).

12. Cuando era niño, Juan **jugaba** a fútbol

‘When he was a child, Juan used to play (IMPF) soccer’

(Butt & Benjamin 2011:212-215; Camps 2005:169)

The preterit is used primarily to describe an episodic event (example 13), for events that occurred in a specified period of time (example 14), to foreground events (example 15), for completed events (example 16), and to signal an event’s inception in the past (example 17) (Butt & Benjamin 2011):

13. Momentos después Pepe **tosió**

‘A few moments later Pepe coughed (PRET)’

14. **Estuve** destinado en Bilbao dos años

‘I was (PRET) stationed in Bilbao for two years’

15. Un día **vino** un representante del rey y **anunció** que iba a haber un gran baile en el palacio

‘One day a king's representative came (PRET) and announced (PRET) that there would be a grand ball in the palace’

16. Una vez que el dinero **estuvo** en mis manos, **compré** la casa

‘As soon as the money came (PRET) into my hands, I bought (PRET) the house’

17. Me **cayó** bien

‘I took a liking (PRET) to her/him’

(Butt & Benjamin 2011:206-211; Lunn & DeCesaris 1992:27)

Examples (18) and (19) below show two sentences whose only grammatical difference is the aspectual form on the verb:

18. Mi padre **fum-ó** mucho cuando era joven (PERF)

19. Mi padre **fuma-ba** mucho cuando era joven (IMPF)

‘My father smoked a lot when he was young’ (Butt & Benjamin 2011:206)

The difference between the two examples is subtle and depends on where the speaker wants the temporal focus to be. The main distinction is backgrounding and foregrounding, which arises through discourse. In (18), the preterit form *fumó* ‘smoked’ (PERF) denotes that this event is foregrounded and *cuando era joven* ‘when he was young’ is the backgrounded, descriptive information. In example 19, both events are in the imperfect and therefore backgrounded; this denotes that it is significant to the speaker that both events were in progress at the same time and that smoking was a habitual activity during this time. The event of smoking in the preterit also denotes that the event was bounded and completed during the time period of when he was young. The examples below show a finer distinction between the two forms.

20. **Acabó** de corregir el ensayo justo antes de entregarlo (PERF)

‘He **finished** correcting the essay right before turning it in’

21. **Acababa** de corregir el ensayo cuando dejó de funcionar la impresora (IMPF)

‘He (had just) **finished** correcting the essay when the printer stopped working’

In the first example, *acabó* ‘finished’ is in the preterit and refers to a specific moment, which is the moment the event culminates (Lunn & DeCesaris 1992:25). The predicate in the second example *acababa* ‘finished’ is in the imperfect; in this case, the event is backgrounded to the event of the printer not working.

2.5 Aspectual Conflicts

The aspectual interpretation of imperfectivity, being unbounded, seems to pair with atelic predicates because they have no inherent endpoints; the aspectual interpretation of perfectivity, being bounded, tends to pair with telic predicates because they do have inherent endpoints.

Although Spanish allows both the preterit and the imperfect to combine with any of the four situation types, when states or activities are paired with the preterit, and when accomplishments and achievements are paired with the imperfect, the semantics of the predicate can be affected.

For example, Spanish has a group of states that indicates the inception of a situation in the past when they appear in the perfective form. In reference grammars these are given with the explanation that the translations require different verbs in English. Notice that the verb in the following example is the same in both (a) and (b) but differs only with respect to its aspectual morphology in Spanish (Butt & Benjamin 2011:212).

- | | | | |
|--------|--|-----|---------|
| 22. a. | conoc-ía
know-IMPF.1sg
‘I knew Antonia | a | Antonia |
| | | ADO | Antonia |
| b. | conoc-í
know-PERF.1sg
‘I met Antonia’ | a | Antonia |
| | | ADO | Antonia |

Other states that belong to this category are *saber* ‘to know’, *poder* ‘can’, *tener* ‘to have’, *querer* ‘to want/like’, and *no querer* ‘to not want/like’ (Levy-Konesky & Daggett 1989). In Standard Spanish, temporal boundaries set by preterit and imperfect forms appear to be stronger than the inherent endpoints encoded within each predicate because of the temporal beginning point the preterit adds to the state, basically changing its lexical class to an achievement. In general, due to the imperfect focusing on the progression of an event rather than its beginning or end, states and activities tend to pair with imperfective morphology in Spanish. The same is true for the preterit tending to pair with accomplishments and achievements (Rothman 2008).

2.6 Aspect Acquisition in Spanish

Grammatical aspect interacts with tense and lexical aspect during language acquisition. The order of acquisition of grammatical elements in childhood has parallels with the complexity of grammatical structures and subsequently what parts of the grammar are most vulnerable to attrition or incomplete acquisition. Grammatical forms that encode the most semantic complexity are acquired later. Generalizations have been found regarding the relative order of tense and aspect in acquisition (Antinucci and Miller 1976) and have also shown that lexical aspect and grammatical aspect interact in L1 and L2 acquisition of Spanish (Jacobson 1986; Krasinski 1995). In the acquisition of both English and Spanish, part of the process involves learning the lexical aspect of each predicate as it is acquired individually. In Spanish acquisition, how perfective and imperfective morphology is produced initially corresponds with the predicate’s lexical class (Rothman 2008). Perfective morphology occurs first and with telic predicates; imperfective morphology is produced later and initially only with states.

Anderson (1991) proposes the Aspect First Hypothesis which claims that children acquire aspect before tense. At this point, when they are using tense morphemes they are initially encoding aspectual distinctions. For example, a child might say *ate apple* to mean that the event of eating the apple is complete, not necessarily that the event happened in the past. Lexical aspect also plays a role in the initial use of verbal morphology; telic predicates appear first only with perfective markers and atelic predicates first only appear with imperfective markers (Montrul 2002). Perfective morphology appears before imperfective morphology. By age 2 Spanish speaking children use the preterit to indicate the past tense but not yet the imperfect. This is significant for the possibility of incomplete acquisition if access to Spanish is limited after a certain age. The imperfect emerges almost a year later (by age 3) and initially only with states (Montrul 2002). Because frequency in the input is most likely a factor in the acquired or changing morphosyntax, the proportion of preterit and imperfect in the input should be considered. In monolingual Spanish data, Gili Gaya (1964) finds the preterit four times as frequent as the imperfect.

The Regression Hypothesis (RH) (Merel 2010) provides a framework in language attrition studies to predict the order of loss of grammatical elements and lexical properties. This prediction is based on the order of acquisition of these properties in child language development. What is acquired first in language acquisition should be lost last in attrition. For example, a study examining the loss of aspect and the subjunctive mood in Spanish confirmed the RH's prediction that the subjunctive would be lost first since it is acquired after aspectual morphology (Montrul 2009). Silva-Corvalán (1994) finds that the order of simplification or attrition of tense morphology is the mirror-image of their acquisition in L1 and L2 development. If the preterit forms in heritage grammars of Spanish have extended uses in contexts that are traditionally

reserved for the imperfect, this could be a reflection of their simplification being the mirror-image of their acquisition. In other words, the order of aspect acquisition and the Regression Hypothesis explain the loss or incomplete acquisition of the imperfect markers.

Research on aspect acquisition demonstrates the importance of lexical aspect in the acquisition of grammatical aspect in Spanish; if heritage speakers are exposed to reduced input of Spanish, the role of lexical aspect may remain just as important in their grammar as when acquiring tense and aspect initially.

2.7 Summary

This chapter describes the various uses of the preterit and imperfect in the past tense in Spanish. By denoting event completion and episodic readings of events in the past, the preterit encodes perfectivity. The imperfect encodes imperfectivity by denoting situations as in progress in the past, focusing on the internal structure rather than the event's inception or completion. The imperfect is more semantically complex than the preterit in Spanish. The child learning Spanish in a reduced input environment might not completely acquire all the various uses of the imperfect and it may therefore be especially vulnerable to loss (see Chapter 6 for discussion).

Lexical class and grammatical morphology are two components for encoding and interpreting aspect. Both are important for understanding how events and states are represented in linguistic systems and how situations are encoded in discourse as moving through time (Smith 1991). Situation types are divided into states, activities, accomplishments, and achievements. Predicates are categorized in terms of the temporal features of static vs. dynamic, telic vs. atelic, and instantaneous vs. durative. This four-way classification has been the basis for much work

done on semantic analysis and linguistic research and reflects how predicates pattern cross-linguistically (Rothstein 2004).

Though not all languages overtly mark grammatical aspect morphologically or use the interaction between lexical and grammatical aspect productively, studies on Spanish heritage language suggest that heritage speakers are making use of lexical aspect. However, not all studies are clear about how. The next chapter will provide a background of Spanish in the United States and on previous studies of aspect morphology in cases of Spanish-English bilingualism.

CHAPTER 3 CHILEAN-AMERICAN SPANISH IN THE UNITED STATES

In the United States, there are over 35 million native Spanish speakers (Lipski 2004) and there are at least 50 million people of Hispanic or Latino descent (U.S. Census Bureau 2010).

Communities in the U.S. with Spanish-English bilinguals provide a rich setting to study language change as a consequence of language contact. Based on self-identification, the Hispanic population of the United States currently represents more than half the total growth in population since 2000 (U.S. Census Bureau 2010). Between 2000 and 2010 the Hispanic population in the United States grew by 15.2 million, an increase of 43%. Chileans make up only 0.3% of all the Hispanics in the United States. In spite of few concentrated neighborhoods of Chileans, Arriaza (2005) claims that the communities of Chilean-Americans feel a strong sense of identity and connection.

Chileans and many other Spanish-speaking communities in the United States are maintaining Spanish by transmitting the language to their children and by sustaining frequent contact with friends and family in Spanish-speaking countries. Unless there is a large influx of new immigrants from Spanish-speaking countries in certain communities, the heritage language may not be transmitted past the third generation. The emphasis on the Spanish language in many of these communities is not on keeping it the same as the monolingual norm but on fulfilling the speakers' needs. Linguistic studies that demonstrate how the grammar changes inter-generationally in an immigrant setting provide evidence that these changes are predictable and follow certain patterns. The speakers should not be marginalized by language teachers because of changes that may not conform to textbook usage. If simplification of the grammar does occur, the semantic nuances can be compensated for and contrasted in other ways, as this thesis argues.

This chapter describes what is typical of language change in a language contact setting.

Heritage language change is a consequence of a language splitting from the source variety in time and space, as well as being affected by reduced frequency of the language in the input. This chapter will also describe previous studies on heritage language tense and aspect systems, including three studies of Mexican-Americans (Montrul 2002; Silva-Corvalán 1994) and New York Puerto Ricans (Zentella 1997). This study attempts to fit Chilean-Americans into the broader picture of heritage language tense and aspect systems and heritage language acquisition. The grammatical changes that occur in a language are not arbitrary and the findings in this study have also been found in other Spanish second generation speakers, namely in the Mexican-American community of Los Angeles (Silva-Corvalán 1994).

3.1 Language Contact and Change

If speakers of a language variety split off from the country it spoken, their variety will likely undergo divergence from the source variety. Historical linguists attempt to describe the changes that occur in a language variety due to physical isolation; from these changes they determine general principles of language change (Labov 2010). In situations of bilingualism and language contact, cross-linguistic characteristics of change emerge in one or more of the languages spoken, but typically the language most affected by contact is the secondary language or the one with fewer domains (Rosenhouse & Goral 2004). In most situations of Spanish-English bilingualism in the United States, Spanish represents the language of the home and is used in fewer domains (Rothman 2009). English in the United States is the language of public education and is used in most official registers, such as in legal institutions like courts of law. Regardless of which language children in Spanish-speaking homes learn first or whether they learn both English and Spanish simultaneously, the trend is for English to become the dominant language

within a few years of entering into public education. Complete language shift to English in the United States happens rapidly, usually within three generations (Zentella 1997). At the same time, Spanish is also being maintained in Hispanic communities in the United States (Silva-corvalán 1994).

Researchers who have studied Spanish in the United States focus on the sociolinguistic factors of bilingualism, how the lexicon and grammar changes inter- and intra-generationally, and the pragmatic and syntactic rules governing code switching. Morphosyntactic areas of the grammar, which include tense and aspect, are especially vulnerable areas for Spanish language acquisition. If children are exposed to limited Spanish input due to societal language contact factors, then this area of the grammar is susceptible to change (Guijarro-Fuentes & Clibbens 2004). This is due to the inflectional nature of Spanish verbal morphology and the semantic complexities that each morpheme encodes (such as *-í* on *com-í* 'I ate' encoding tense, aspect, person, and number).

Silva-Corvalán (1994) claims that simplification and overgeneralization of morphological forms are typical changes in the grammatical systems of bilinguals. The current study looks at simplification and/or overgeneralization of the preterit and imperfect aspectual distinction in heritage Spanish. The change represents a general process that can be explained by internal linguistic factors; that is, the change is not arbitrary because it has parallels in geographically separated Spanish-English communities. Multiple studies have documented similar verbal morphology changes in Spanish heritage speakers (Montrul 2002, 2009; Silva-Corvalán 1994; Zentella 1997).

3.2 Internal Motivations for Spanish Heritage Language Change

Changes that occur in a linguistic system due to contact with another language can be explained by internal and external motivations. Internal motivations are changes that occur independently of contact with another linguistic system. These changes happen because of processes already taking place in the language and may be accelerated in a contact situation, or are morphological changes that are not explained by transfer from the dominant language (Silva-Corvalán 1994). Externally motivated language changes produce similar linguistic systems or involve the transfer of foreign elements such as lexical items or morphosyntactic structures.

Language contact can accelerate language internal processes of change that are already being exhibited by monolingual language varieties (Silva-Corvalán 1994). For example, in Spanish there are two ways to mark the future, a morphologically bound form (23a) and a periphrastic version using *ir a* + infinitive similar to English ‘be going to’ (23b):

23. a. cantar-é
sing -1sg.FUT
‘I will sing’
- b. voy a cantar
go.1sg.PRES to sing.INF
‘I will sing’

(Stewart 1999:101)

According to Stewart (1999), in Latin American Spanish the periphrastic future is used almost exclusively. The morphological form is used chiefly for the purpose of indicating supposition or doubt but not future time. If spoken Spanish is the main input second generation bilinguals in the

United States are exposed to, they mainly hear the periphrastic future. Silva-Corvalán (1994) finds a very limited frequency of the morphological future in first generation Mexican-American bilinguals in Los Angeles and predicts the quick loss of this form in the second and third generation speakers. Another internal factor that motivates change due to language contact would be that the tenses which disappear first tend to be the most marked tenses, such as the pluperfect subjunctive in Spanish (Silva-Corvalán 1994).

Ardila (2005) analyzes the Spanish spoken in South Florida and argues that the heterogeneity in bilingualism in this region have formed a distinct Spanish dialect. He claims that non-standard Spanish dialects in the U.S. have been underrepresented in the literature due to three main factors. First, they are mainly known within their Spanish-speaking communities but not by English-speaking linguists. Second, these dialects are generally associated with poor and uneducated immigrants. Third, what he calls *Spanglish* has often been used to refer to a “deformed and corrupted Spanish,” (Ardila 2005:65). Because of possible misconceptions that language educators may have of non-standard Spanish varieties, analyzing heritage language change is significant because a large number of second generation Hispanic children are acquiring it as a home language and communicating among themselves in Spanish.

The present study adds to previous work on Spanish spoken in the United States by focusing on a group previously unrepresented in this literature, Chilean-Americans, and demonstrates how the changes found in their Spanish aspectual system fit into the larger picture of Spanish in the United States and tendencies of language change cross-linguistically.

3.3 Chilean-American Communities

Chilean-Americans have been an underrepresented group not only in linguistics, but in studies on immigrant populations of the United States. Their sense of identity and nationalism has extended to the immigrant populations in the United States and helps explain why even the relatively small

Chilean population of Las Vegas has the Chilean Association of Las Vegas (Arriaza 2005). In spite of the association, members in this community do not get together frequently and there are no concentrated neighborhoods of Chileans, a feature typical of Chilean-American communities due to their small numbers in the United States. Because of this, second generation Chilean-Americans are exposed to a different kind of language input environment than heritage speakers that live in a large heritage community, such as Mexican-Americans in Los Angeles (Silva-Corvalán 1994), Puerto Ricans in New York (Zentella 1997), and Cuban-Americans in Miami (Rothman and Rell 2005). In addition, if heritage speakers interact infrequently with other heritage speakers, then the changes that are found in their tense and aspect systems are more likely a result from internally motivated changes than from language influence from other heritage speakers.

There are currently over 68,000 Chileans living in the United States with the greatest numbers residing in Los Angeles, Miami, and New York City. There have never been concentrated Chilean neighborhoods in the U.S.; this group has tended to intermarry and reside in either generally Hispanic or European descent communities (Encyclopedia of Immigration 2011). In 2000, the number of Chileans living in Las Vegas, where the majority of participants for this study are from, was estimated to be between 500 and 1,065. Compared to the 250,574 Mexican-Americans residing in Las Vegas, this is a relatively small community. According to a 1999 survey, 70% of the Chileans living in Las Vegas belonged to the Chilean-American Association, and about 51% of Las Vegas Chileans like to communicate with other Chilean-Americans for the purposes of speaking Spanish or for other cultural activities (Arriaza 2005:296).

The current study gives insight into a small community that has relatively little interaction among themselves when compared to Hispanic communities that have concentrated neighborhoods of speakers in the United States. Many second generation Chilean-Americans do

not communicate on a daily basis with other Chileans, a statement corroborated by my own survey results, yet in general they feel pride in their language and culture. This situation leads to less Spanish frequency in second generations' input. The changes in the grammar found in the participants in this study are more likely explained by internal motivations for language change or by the external influence of English than change based on frequent interaction with other bilinguals.

3.4 Previous Studies of Heritage Speakers

Heritage speakers are bilinguals who speak a minority language in the home, typically transmitted from first generation immigrants, that is different from the language of the larger community. In the bilingual's linguistic repertoire, the minority, or heritage, language becomes secondary to the dominant language due to societal factors limiting the input the child receives in this language. In the United States, one such minority language is Spanish and the majority, or dominant language, is English. Researchers have shown that the grammar of heritage speakers can differ from the grammar of native speakers (Montrul 2002; Rothman 2008; Zentella 1997; Silva-Corvalán 1994; Silva-Corvalán 2006; Bar-Shalom & Zaretsky 2008; Albirini et al. 2011). Heritage language work in the United States has been conducted on Brazilian Portuguese (Rothman 2007), Korean (Kim et al. 2009), Armenian (Godson 2003), Chinese (He 2008), Finnish (Halmari 1997), Arabic (Albirini et al. 2011) and Russian (Bar-Shalom & Zaretsky 2008; Pereltsvaig 2005; Polinsky 2007).

Silva-Corvalán (1994) claims that divergence in the heritage language can result from either attrition or incomplete acquisition. In attrition, at one point in his/her childhood the speaker would have fully acquired the language and subsequently lost either morphosyntactic, phonological, or lexical material. If the acquisition is incomplete, the input reduction in

childhood leads to morphosyntactic structures in the grammar or their associated functions never becoming acquired (Montrul 2002). In general, all areas of the language can attrite in a first or second generation speaker (e.g. phonology, syntax, pragmatics, lexicon, and semantics) (Bar-Shalom & Zaretsky 2008). It is more difficult to test empirically whether the heritage speaker's grammar exhibits differences from the monolingual variety due to attrition or incomplete acquisition unless the study is diachronic. For example, a diachronic study comparing a bilingual's tense and aspect system at several points in childhood and then again as an adult could show whether the grammar never attained certain morphology (i.e. incomplete acquisition) or if the bilingual at one point had the morphology and then lost it (i.e. attrition). Due to the difficulty of assessing this in a synchronic study, the present study does not attempt to answer whether the change in the preterit and imperfect morphology of second generation Spanish speakers is due to attrition or incomplete acquisition. Instead, this study attempts to explain why one form would be used more than the other independently of whether the other form was incompletely acquired or acquired and then attrited.

There is extensive heterogeneity in heritage speaker proficiency. No two cases of heritage speaker backgrounds are alike and even in one family there may be siblings with very different abilities in and preferences for either language. Some people may consider themselves heritage speakers because of cultural heritage and not because they have been exposed to the language (Rothman 2009). There are also differences among speakers with respect to socioeconomic class and educational opportunities, which can affect the kind of exposure in either language (i.e. formal vs. informal, written vs. spoken). Because heritage speakers are often taught in the superordinate language in public education, i.e. English in the U.S., they generally do not develop reading and writing skills in Spanish (Rothman 2008). They are also typically not

exposed to prescriptive norms.

The changes that occur in the grammars of heritage speakers do not affect all areas of the grammar equally. Some areas seem to be more likely to change than others, such as the subjunctive mood before the indicative mood in Spanish because of the markedness and semantic complexity of the subjunctive (Montrul 2002). Research has shown that attrition affects the lexicon before the morphosyntax (Bar-Shalom & Zaretsky 2008). Montrul (2009:240) finds that Spanish adult heritage speakers have many similarities to native Spanish speakers, such as high speaking and listening abilities, native-like phonology, a large vocabulary that pertains to familiar domains, and knowledge of sociolinguistic norms. Despite these proficiencies, many heritage speakers have gaps in their grammars' morphosyntax and lexicon.

Russian, like Spanish, contains verbal morphology that distinguishes between perfectivity and imperfectivity. Studies conducted with Russian-American heritage speakers find changes in their aspectual morphology similar to those in Spanish-English bilinguals in the United States (Bar-Shalom & Zaretsky 2008). Montrul's (2002, 2009) heritage speaker participants are Mexican-American college students who have had formal instruction in Spanish. This makes it difficult to determine whether there were more differences in their Spanish before taking college-level Spanish classes than is reflected in the collected data. Zentella (1997) and Silva-Corvalán (1994) both use sociolinguistic interviews and recordings of free, informal speech as a basis for data elicitation and analysis.

3.4.1 Tense and Aspect in New York Puerto Ricans

Zentella (1997) explores the Spanish spoken by the New York Puerto Rican community inter and intra-generationally. While her main focus is to provide a qualitative sociolinguistic framework

for the norms and dialect of New York Puerto Ricans, she also analyzes and describes how the grammar differs across three generations, including first generation speakers from mainland Puerto Rico. She studies the tense, aspect, and mood system of five second generation girls by analyzing recorded forms uttered in free speech and in interviews. The forms which are reducing inter-generationally are similar to those in Silva-Corvalán's (1994) findings. This indicates that simplification of tense, aspect, and mood systems follows certain patterns in heritage speakers.

In the community Zentella (1997) studies, the use of Spanish was not restricted to a specific domain. All topics and registers were appropriate for either Spanish or English. For example, formal community gatherings were conducted in either or both languages. Children grow up in this community exposed to Spanish from birth and are expected to speak it to adults or to reply in the same language spoken to. Despite the frequent use of Spanish in the environment, by the second generation 94% of the members in the community studied were more proficient in English than in Spanish; the other 6% were considered balanced bilinguals with equal proficiency in both languages. The most striking difference found between the first generation and second generation was the morphosyntax, specifically differences in verbal morphology (Zentella 1997:179). This suggests that verbal morphology is particularly vulnerable to change in heritage speakers, even when there is high frequency in the input.

Zentella also acknowledges the heterogeneity within the Spanish of heritage speakers. The five girls whose speech she analyzed all had backgrounds in the same community yet had different proficiency levels in Spanish and exhibited slight differences in their tense, aspect, and mood systems. Zentella (1997:188) uses Silva-Corvalán's (1994) implicational scale to determine the predictability of loss in tense forms, shown below in (24). The scale is ordered in such a way that if the first (i.e. present participle) has signs of loss, all those that fall below it on

“shows the effects of incomplete acquisition, competing norms, and phonetic similarity,” (Zentella 1997:193). There is also a case of the preterit replacing the perfect (i.e. *siempre comieron* (PRET) *mucha carne* for ‘They have always eaten a lot of meat’). This is an expected case of the loss of a compound tense (the Spanish perfect construction) to a simple tense (the Spanish preterit) in language attrition or incomplete acquisition.

Zentella (1997) found the imperfect used in required contexts and an extension of their uses into expected preterit contexts. In other words, preterit morphology for her speakers has undergone attrition. Her findings of the New York Puerto Rican community are contrary to the use of the preterit and imperfect in Silva-Corvalán’s (1994) analysis of second generation Mexican-Americans in Los Angeles.

3.4.2 Tense and Aspect in Mexican-American Spanish of Los Angeles, California

Silva-Corvalán’s (1994) analyzed recorded conversations of 50 bilingual Mexican-Americans spanning three generational groups. The first group consists of first generation Mexican immigrants who had moved to the United States after the age of 11. The second group corresponds to second generation Mexican-Americans, including those who had immigrated before the age of six. For these speakers, English was primarily the dominant language. The third group is comprised of third generation Mexican-Americans who had at least one parent born in the United States. In her sample, the majority of speakers between the ages of 15-29 had taken one to two years of formal Spanish instruction but she suggests that this likely did not have a major effect on their tense and aspect systems.

Silva-Corvalán (1994:39) explains the simplification she finds in the morphosyntax of her speakers by appealing to compensatory strategies that aid in lightening the cognitive load of

juggling two separate linguistic systems. This is accomplished by two main strategies: overextension of particular tense morphology within the secondary language (example 26) and the use and/or creation of periphrastic structures for encoding tense and aspect (such as using the progressive construction instead of the imperfect).

26. El pod-ía traer-lo, pero no quiso
3sg can.3sg.IMPF bring.INF-3sgDO but not want.3sg.PERF
'He could have brought (lit.: bring) him, but he didn't want to' (expected: *haberlo traído* 'have brought')
(Silva-Corvalán 1994:40)

Since the preterit and imperfect are both used in the past tense where English only has one simple past (see example 2), they can be viewed as two forms with similar meanings and therefore vulnerable to loss in one form and semantic overextension in the other.

Silva-Corvalán's (1994) study looks at all verbal forms within the changing TAM system of the three generational groups. Significant for our purposes are her findings and analysis of the changing preterit and imperfect morphology within the second and third generation participants. She looks at the aspectual distinction within three different contexts: obligatory, discourse-pragmatic, and optional (Silva-Corvalán 1994:23). Obligatory contexts are those in which the syntactic position of the predicate and its arguments within clauses forces the choice of one verbal form over another. In an obligatory context, if the speaker uses the unexpected form it is an indication that their verbal paradigm has changed or simplified. In this case, she mainly found the imperfect replacing the pluperfect subjunctive, pluperfect indicative, or the conditional. The forms should have been required because of syntactic subordinate clause constraints, as in (27) (Silva-Corvalán 1994:23). In this example, the researcher uses the past perfect subjunctive that

should trigger either the past perfect subjunctive, past perfect indicative, or the conditional in the speaker's response. This speaker replies with the imperfect, which does not follow the obligatory constraints of tense sequences in the subordinate or consecutive clause. The English equivalent is equally marked.

27. A: ¿Y qué me dices de tu educación si tus padres se *hubieron quedado* en México?

(Past Perfect Subjunctive)

B: No *estudiaba* mucho, yo creo. (Imperfect Indicative)

A: So what can you tell me about your education if your parents *had stayed* in Mexico?)

B: lit.: 'I *didn't study* much, I think.' (Note: Italics in original)

In the case of discourse-pragmatic contexts, the interpretation of the predicate along with its arguments and adverbial expressions largely condition one verbal form over another. Though not syntactically incorrect if the unexpected form is used, native speakers generally use the form compatible with the context. When it comes to the preterit and imperfect distinction, discourse-pragmatic contexts is relevant due to the broad compatibility of imperfectivity and perfectivity with all lexical classes. In other words, context and speaker intention above all drives the use of the preterit and imperfect in the monolingual Spanish norm. Silva-Corvalán (1994:24) gives an example of a speaker using the imperfect when discourse-pragmatic rules should elicit a preterit form, shown below in (28). The argument *un accidente* 'an accident' creates a completed temporal event that is viewed as bounded and therefore the expected form for the predicate in this context should be the preterit form, *tuvo* 'he had'.

28. Iba a ser profesional, pero creo que *tenía* (IMPF) un accidente.

‘He was going to become professional, but I think he *had* an accident.’

In the third context, the use of either the preterit or imperfect form is related to knowledge of general discourse strategies. In Spanish, the preterit and imperfect have different effects of orienting events within a narrative framework. The preterit must be used for statements that are foregrounded or for events that are evaluated as a whole (Silva-Corvalán 1994:24). First generation and monolingual Spanish speakers follow this narrative strategy but Silva-Corvalán found that second generation speakers do not and frequently replace the expected preterit forms with imperfect forms. Using the unexpected form in these contexts was also an indication that the speakers’ TAM systems were not encoding the same semantic nuances as the monolingual norm.

Silva-Corvalán’s (1994) finds overextension of the preterit and subsequent simplification of the imperfect in the tense and aspect systems of second generation speakers. The imperfect has not been lost completely, however. In a small group of stative verbs the preterit has mostly stopped being produced, leaving only imperfect forms. These verbs include *estaba* ‘was’, *era* ‘was’, *tenía* ‘had’, and *sabía* ‘knew’ (Silva-Corvalán 1994:44). With non-stative and stative verbs not on the aforementioned list, the majority of her speakers expanded use of the preterit. Though Silva-Corvalán finds this to be the case in the grammars of most of her second generation speakers, high proficiency second and third generation speakers still retain the preterit forms of these verbs and use them when the context calls for the aspectual interpretation of perfectivity. Overall, for her speakers, the preterit form is more likely to be retained than the imperfect.

3.4.3 Heritage Language Tense and Aspect: Acquisition Explanation

Montrul (2002; 2009) examines Spanish heritage speaker use of the preterit and imperfect in the context of heritage language acquisition. Subjects in these studies are college level students who grew up speaking Spanish in the home and have also been formally instructed in Spanish.

Montrul reports that in L1 Spanish aspectual acquisition, the overt morphology that emerges first on predicates is the preterit, possibly due to the semantic complexity of the imperfect in Spanish.

By the age of three, Spanish speakers have productively acquired knowledge of the preterit/imperfect distinction (Montrul 2009). In one study Montrul (2002) analyzes the aspectual distinction in three groups of adult Spanish-English bilinguals: those who learned English and Spanish simultaneously in the United States from the ages of 0-3, those who learned English from the ages of 4-7, and those who moved from a Spanish speaking country between the ages of 8 and 15 and did not acquire English until then. She focuses on the morphological and semantic acquisition and attainment of the preterit and imperfect among these adult Spanish heritage speakers. She finds a correlation of aspectual use with telicity (Montrul 2002:49); 95% of the atelic predicates (activities and states) are used with the imperfect, while the preterit was mostly used with telic predicates. She finds that late L2 learners were able to resolve aspectual conflicts (i.e. states with perfective morphology and achievements with imperfective morphology) more than the other two groups. The simultaneous bilinguals had a difficult time with such atypical pairings, suggesting that they are lacking discourse-pragmatic knowledge in the Spanish aspectual distinction. The most difficult aspectual conflict for simultaneous bilinguals to resolve was states with perfective morphology. That is, most errors occurred on states that required the preterit due to context.

In a narrative elicitation task, Montrul (2009) found that 55% of all predicates produced by her speakers were in the preterit and some participants never produced the imperfect at all. Participants produced errors similar to those found by Silva-Corvalán's (1994); though not all speakers produced unexpected forms, there were cases of both the imperfect used in place of the preterit and the preterit used in place of the imperfect, shown in examples (29) and (30), respectively (Montrul 2009:251). The bolded predicate in (29) is expected to be the preterit because it is foregrounded information that also represents a temporally bounded event. The bolded predicates in (30) are expected to be in the imperfect because they represent backgrounded information that are in progress at the same time.

29. Y cortó el lobo abierto para sacar la niña, no para sacar a la abuela, y ***ponían**
(IMPF) piedras adentro del lobo

‘And he cut the Wolf open to take out the girl, no [sic] to take out the grandmother,
and they **put** stones inside the wolf.’

30. Cuando en camino de ir a la casa la abuelita, un lobo lo ***estuvo** (PRET) siguiendo y
***hubo** (PRET) una persona cortando árboles

‘When on the way to the house of the granny, a wolf **was** following her and there **was**
a person cutting trees.’

In addition, the majority of non-native like usage occurred with the imperfect (Montrul 2009). Montrul suggests the difficulty heritage speakers have with the imperfect is due to the inherent semantic complexity of one morphological form encoding several meanings. This complexity makes acquisition more difficult for heritage speakers and also explains why it is acquired after the preterit in Spanish L1 acquisition.

3.5 Summary

Since the mid-1900s, linguists have been researching the effects of Spanish in contact with English (see Nash 1970) and how the change is manifested inter-generationally. Recently researchers have begun to understand the importance of studying the heritage language in second and third generation speakers to determine tendencies of contact-induced language change and morphological and semantic universals (Silva-Corvalán 1994). Studying tendencies of heritage language change also provides valuable insight into first and second language acquisition (Montrul 2002). Tense and aspect morphology in Spanish is particularly vulnerable to change when there is reduced frequency of language input because of the semantic nuances encoded in each morphological form (Guijarro-Fuentes & Clibbens 2004). Major works on tense and aspect morphology in Spanish heritage speakers have found both imperfect replacing the preterit (Zentella 1997) and preterit replacing the imperfect (Silva-Corvalán 1994; Montrul 2009). In addition, while neither the imperfect nor the preterit has been completely lost in most heritage speakers, lexical aspect governs heritage speakers' use of overt verbal morphology more than in standard monolingual Spanish (Montrul 2009).

In general, Spanish heritage speakers have been found to pair lexical and grammatical aspect in semantic agreement: perfectivity with telic verbs and imperfectivity with atelic verbs. Montrul's speakers (2009) make use of the telic/atelic distinction; Silva-Corvalán (1994) finds a stative/non-stative distinction in her speakers; and Zentella's (1997) speakers overextend the imperfect and exhibit loss of the preterit. However, no studies have looked in-depth at the internal motivations for the change in the aspectual interpretation of perfectivity and imperfectivity in Spanish heritage speakers' grammars. My proposal is that the change can be explained explicitly by lexical aspect. The current study attempts to fill this gap in the literature. In addition, this study investigates the preterit and imperfect usage in the Spanish of Chilean-

American speakers, a group that until now has been underrepresented in the literature. This study demonstrates that the change occurs independent of the Spanish variety spoken, suggesting that the change can be explained in terms of general language principles.

CHAPTER 4 METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the data collection methodology for this study of Chilean-American heritage speakers' preterit and imperfect use. The participant requirements and social variables are discussed, in addition to the format of the questionnaire. This chapter describes the sections of the questionnaire and how predicates were categorized into Vendler's (1967) four-way classification achievements, accomplishments, activities, and states using Dowty's (1979) tests. The classification is necessary for finding correlations between lexical and grammatical aspectual use in heritage speakers' grammars.

4.1 Procedure

Data was collected on-line using a three-part questionnaire. Not all respondents answered all questions on the questionnaire but all those answered were used in the analysis. Participants were recruited for the study through the Chilean American Association of Las Vegas. The researcher has personal connections with the President of the Association in Las Vegas and was invited to a gathering for the Chilean Independence Day festival in September of 2011. People who qualified for the study were asked to provide their contact information so the researcher could send them a link to the on-line questionnaire that they could complete at a time convenient for them.

Participants were not compensated monetarily. The researcher also contacted other Chilean groups in the United States that had contact information available on-line, such as the Chilean Student Organization at the University of California, Davis and the Chilean Student Association at the University of Wisconsin, Madison. These associations then sent out a recruitment e-mail on their mailing lists. The link to the questionnaire was also distributed through organized

Chilean community sites on Facebook.⁵

The format of an electronic questionnaire offers several benefits. It can be disseminated quickly and from a distance. The questionnaire format is appropriate for written translation tasks, grammaticality judgment tasks, and morphological fill-in tasks. It can also be accessed for a long period of time and at the respondents' leisure. Open-question items do not lend themselves easily to finding answers unless respondents ask a Spanish speaker for their opinion. The directions ask respondents to avoid this and from the non-standard forms and expected heritage speaker-like responses, it can be assumed the participants responded with their own Spanish constructions and choices.

4.2 Participants and Social Variables

The participants for this study were 11 Chilean-American heritage speakers ranging in age from 16 to 44. To qualify for the study, participants were required to have grown up speaking Spanish in the home, at least one of the parents with whom they grew up had to have grown up in Chile and moved to the United States as an adult. The participants themselves had to have moved to the United States from Chile by at least the age of 13. In order to assess heritage speaker verbal production, responses were compared to those of a control group of five bilingual native Spanish speakers who grew up in Chile and either still live there or moved to the United States after the age of 20.

Out of the 11 heritage speakers, five had been born in the United States and six moved here between the ages of nine months and 13 years of age. The parents of participants all moved

5 These sites are Chile Las Vegas, found at <https://www.facebook.com/chilelasvegas>, and the Consulate of Chile in Las Vegas, found at <https://www.facebook.com/consulchile>. I am grateful to both for helping me spread the word about my questionnaire.

to the United States in their 30s and 40s. Five respondents (a19y,⁶ b25o, c29o, d16m, e19o, and f23) had mothers from Chile but fathers from elsewhere (d16m's father is from Mexico and the rest of the fathers are from the United States). Because of the small sample size, respondents are not subdivided into smaller groups based on their exposure to Spanish and/or English. Because previous studies show the importance of age of English onset, in a larger sample size it would be reasonable to assess how English onset would affect the Spanish grammar by dividing groups based on the age of immigration to the USA and the birthplace of the parents.

The first part of the questionnaire focused on eliciting general language background and social variables. This section included questions such as, “Do you speak English or Spanish with your siblings?”, “Do you enjoy speaking Spanish?”, “What age were you when you moved to the United States?”, and “How much formal education have you had in Spanish?” Most of the respondents said they spoke English with their siblings. Two stated that they mainly spoke Spanish with their siblings and one stated that English was spoken with one and Spanish with another. Second generation siblings speaking in English with each other and Spanish with their parents is consistent with Zentella's (1997) finding in the New York Puerto Rican community.

Respondent educational levels range from current high school student, to not having completed high school, to having received a Ph.D. Seven of the participants had formal instruction in Spanish, but three of them had had less than one year of instruction. One respondent (a19y) had 3-5 years of Spanish instruction and one (b25o) had 1-2 years. These respondents are also siblings. The respondent with the most explicit Spanish instruction, a19y, had several non-standard forms that are characteristic of heritage speakers and not taught in L2 classrooms. Five participants grew up in Las Vegas, Nevada; three participants grew up in Salt

6 The subjects are coded as follows (as in *a19y*): 1) The first letter represents respondent order, 2) The number represents their age, and 3) Finally, 'y', 'm', 'o', or Ø represents 'younger', 'middle', 'oldest', or only child depending on sibling order.

Lake City, Utah; one participant grew up in North Carolina; one participant grew up in Wisconsin; and one participant grew up in Sacramento, California.⁷

Because the instructions in the questionnaire were in English and the third section depended on knowledge of English to elicit Spanish sentences, only bilingual native Chilean Spanish speakers could be used for the control group. Of the native speakers, only one lives in Chile and never moved to the United States. Of the other four, one moved to the United States at 20, one at 27, one at 28, and one at 32. Table 3 shows all the demographic information supplied by the native speaker respondents.⁸

	Respondents				
	aNative34	bNative32	cNative64	dNative54	eNative34
Age	34	32	64	54	34
Age moved to the United States	28	27	32	20	NA
Currently Lives			Dixon, CF	Cedar City, Utah	Rancagua, Chile
Highest Education Level Reached		Ph.D. Candidate	Ph.D.	B.A.	M.A.
How much Spanish Spoken in Home		Always	Never, always English	Half Spanish, Half English	Always
Enjoys Speaking Spanish		Yes	Yes	Indifferent	Indifferent
How Often Spanish is Heard/Spoken Outside Home		Daily	2-3 times a week	2-3 Times a Week	Always
How Much Interaction With Chileans Outside Family		Daily	2-3 times a month	2-3 Times a Week	Always

Table 3: Sociolinguistic information of native speakers in sample

⁷ See Appendix I for the complete participant social and linguistic variables and responses.

⁸ Immigrants who have moved to a country where the language used in the majority of discourse is not their native language may experience attrition in their L1 after a certain period of time. Responses from the native control group could also be affected by attrition and therefore be more similar to heritage speakers' responses than the monolingual Chilean norm.

4.3 Closed-Question Morphological Task

The second part of the questionnaire was a closed-question section where participants were asked to choose between the preterit and imperfect forms of given predicates set within a short story, *Ricitos de Oro* (Goldilocks and the Three Bears). The context presented in the story was designed to elicit the interpretation of either the preterit or imperfect form over the other using discourse-pragmatics set up through the narrative. Due to there being a closed set of possible answers (i.e. preterit or imperfect for each predicate), respondents are obligated to focus on the difference between the preterit and imperfect. This also aids in the comparison of responses; there is a consistent range of responses that can easily be quantified. This section of the questionnaire is designed to show whether heritage speakers are using lexical class rather than context to determine the aspectual morphology chosen. Also, this section is designed to show a comparison between the consistency of heritage speakers' responses and native speakers' responses. If heritage speakers vary more than native Spanish speakers, how and why do they vary?

The short story is taken from a pedagogical website⁹ which offers the expected responses for each. The story was also used in a study regarding adult L2 Spanish speakers (Rothman 2008); this study included a native control group with consistent responses for the short story. The questionnaire emphasized that either choice was acceptable, since it was targeting natural production and use of aspect morphology. The questionnaire stated multiple times that the purpose of the study was to see how participants spoke naturally and not to determine how well they spoke Spanish.

40 of the 55 questions from the original story were included in order to reduce too many tokens of one verb. Out of the 40 questions, 15 were states, 5 were activities, 6 were

⁹ See: <http://www.colby.edu/~bknelson/SLC/ricitos1.php>

accomplishments, and 14 were achievements. The tests that are used to determine the classification of these predicates is explained in §4.3. Example (31) shows a section from the story:

31. 1. (Hubo, Había) una vez tres osos que 2. (vivieron , vivían) en el bosque: Papá Oso, Mamá Osa, y Bebé Oso. Un día Mamá Osa 3. (hizo, hacía) una sopa de arroz con pollo y 4. (puso , ponía) tres platos en la mesa.

‘1. Once upon a time there **were** three bears who 2. **lived** in the forest: Papa Bear, Mama Bear, and Baby Bear. One day Mama Bear 3. **made** a rice soup with chicken and 4. **put** three plates on the table.’

Rothman (2008) also uses this story taken from the pedagogical website to compare the use of preterit and imperfect in native Spanish speakers and two different types of Spanish L2 learners. He uses the responses from the native Spanish speakers as a control. He finds significant agreement among the native speakers’ choices. For example, (32) and (33) are claimed on the website to be acceptable when both are in the preterit or when both are in the imperfect (but said nothing about the use of preterit with one and imperfect with the other, which is what 6 of the heritage speakers, but none of the native speakers, did in the actual study). In addition, his control group’s responses agreed with the provided answers on the website. This demonstrates that the use of the preterit and imperfect is not a prescriptive difference.

32. (quisieron, querían) comer la sopa pero no
‘(they wanted PERF, they wanted IMPF) to eat the soup but’

33. (pudieron, podían) porque
'(they could PERF, they could IMPF) not because'

When both are perfective, *quisieron* 'want (3pl)' and *pudieron* 'can (3pl)', the translation is 'they tried but failed.' When both are imperfective, *querían* 'want (3pl)' and *podían* 'can (3pl)', the translation is 'they wanted to but weren't able to.' Native Spanish speakers had near to complete consensus on 53 out of the 55 tokens in this story (Rothman 2008:88). Notably, in the examples (32) and (33), the native control group in his study had 90% agreement of perfective morphology, *quisieron* and *pudieron*. The high agreement overall among the control group demonstrates that the context given by the narrative is effective for forcing either a perfective or imperfective interpretation.

4.4 Open-Question Translation Task

The third section of the questionnaire contained open-ended questions where participants were asked to translate English past tense sentences. Most of the sentences were given with context that was meant to elicit a certain form; other sentences were given without context to see what the default aspectual interpretation would be for participants. The goal was to see if heritage speakers, like monolingual speakers, were sensitive to the interaction between context and aspectual morphology, or whether lexical classification is determining the choice of the preterit or imperfect more than context. The sentences out of context do not show if the other form is unavailable, but they could show if the speakers naturally tend to prefer one form over the other; this could then be compared with the native speakers' preferences for grammatical aspect in sentences in isolation.

The third section of the questionnaire included 52 tokens: 15 of these were states, 18 achievements, 7 accomplishments, and 13 activities. The questionnaire is designed to elicit simple past tense forms in either the imperfect or preterit indicative forms. It attempts to elicit simple past tense forms by using the simple past tense form in the English question (which can be encoding perfectivity or habituality) and not by using perfect or progressive aspect. Participants generally avoided using forms other than the imperfect or preterit indicative in the open-question section. Responses with the perfect or progressive were not quantified together with preterit or imperfect tokens.

Below are two sentences (34 and 35) that were asked to be translated, the first without context and the second with context in the form of an adverbial clause that suggests a temporally bounded event. Both sentences contain telic predicates, and the expected morphological form was the preterit (and in fact, all responses for all three predicates is the preterit).

34. She **lost** the game

Native Response: Ella **perdió** el juego (PRET)

35. Pedro **robbed** a woman (yesterday) and **took** her money

Native Response: Pedro **robó** (PRET) a una mujer ayer y se **llevó** (PRET) su dinero

Several questions were chosen based on other studies that focus on usage of the preterit and imperfect in Spanish heritage speakers. Example (36) below is taken from Silva-Corvalán (1994) who found that second generation speakers used the imperfect in this sentence when the context calls for the preterit.

36. I was the only son my parents **had** (and they are too old now to have any more)

Native Speaker Response: Fui el único hijo que mis padres **tuvieron** (PRET)

Montrul (2002:42) uses example (37) to demonstrate that the preterit can be used to convey a single complete event that reached its end point in the past (example 35 above is how it was presented in this questionnaire).

37. Pedro rob-ó en el autobus

Pedro rob-3sg.PERF in the bus

‘Pedro robbed [someone] in the bus.’

Montrul (2002:42) contrasts this example of preterit use with the various uses of the imperfect, including ongoing activities, habitual action, and genericity. Her example of the imperfect used as habitual action is shown below in (38), while (39) is the parallel sentence from the current questionnaire. Predicates in both sentences are activities. I chose a different sentence because I wanted to add an adverbial clause for added context; different sentences allows for more predicate tokens, so results can be attributed to the lexical class and not the particular predicate.

38. María practica-ba tennis cuando era niña

María practice-3sg.IMPF tennis when be.3sg.IMPF child

‘María used to/would practice tennis when she was a child’

39. When I was a little girl I ran every day.

Several of the sentences were designed to contain aspectual conflicts. In other words, the predicates were telic yet the context was forcing an imperfective, unbounded, aspectual interpretation or the predicates were atelic with a perfective aspectual context. These sentences also contain adverbial expressions that tend to be associated with either the preterit or imperfect. For example, Spanish textbooks often introduce the use of the imperfect with the “trigger words” and adverbial expressions *siempre* 'always', *a menudo* 'often', and *hacía años que* 'it's been years since' (Rothman 2008). Example (40) is taken from Rothman (2008); this sentence uses a stative predicate with a time adverbial that traditionally triggers the imperfect but due to the discourse pragmatics denoted by the context, the preterit is preferred. In order to elicit this sentence, I used the English sentence in example (41) below. I changed the wording to be more accessible and closer to a statement an English speaker might say.

40. Tus padres siempre me **cayer-on** bien hasta aquel
 Your.pl parents always me.DAT fall- 3pl.PRET well until that
- día inesperado que todo sucedió
 day unforeseen that everything happened
- ‘Your parents and I always **got along** well until that unforeseen day in which it all happened.’

41. I always liked your parents (until that day when everything changed).

The ability to have passing knowledge at reading and writing Spanish was a requirement in participation in this study due to the nature of the written directions, question and response

format. In some cases, spelling discrepancies occurred in the open-ended question section of the questionnaire, but there was little confusion during coding as to what the participant intended. For example, the Spanish orthography distinguishes between /b/ and /v/. Phonetically, the sounds have two allophones, [b] syllable initially or after nasals and [β] elsewhere, most prevalent intervocalically (Schwegler et al. 2009). Respondents who have had formal education in English but not in Spanish occasionally misspelled words that contain ‘v’ or ‘b’, such as *estubo* 'was (IMPF)' for the correct spelling *estuvo*. Very few spelling errors lent to confusion in coding which morphological form was chosen; if there was any confusion the token was discarded. For example, in sentence 45 ((When John lived in another city) he spoke on the phone every day with his mother), respondent *k44o* answered *ablava cada día con su madre por telephono*. The standard Spanish spelling for the third person singular imperfect past tense form of ‘to speak’ is *hablaba*. In modern Spanish, the written ‘h’ is silent. The form *ablava* can therefore be assumed to correspond to the imperfective form and not the perfective form, *habló*.

The use of an on-line questionnaire as a data collection method is a practical way of collecting data from participants that are in a place remote from the researcher. Because of the design of the survey, not all questions had to be answered if the participant chose not to. Incomplete surveys did not pose a problem for analysis. If a participant's survey was not complete, all the responses given were factored into the analysis. In open-ended questions that ask for free translations from English to Spanish, the possibility of different verbs in the responses proved not to be a problem for analysis because in most cases (30 of the 52 tokens) the verbal lexical item given across speakers was the same (but could vary in overt morphology). An example of responses with different situation types is from the prompt shown in 42:

42. (Yesterday) I found out that you were pregnant

The predicates given in the responses ranged from *aprender* ‘learn’, *enterar* ‘hear, find out’, *saber* ‘know’, and *descubrir* ‘discover’. All are achievements but *saber*, which is classified as a state.

Classification of predicates in this study is based on the predicate given in the English prompt and properties of predicates in Spanish, taking into account their interaction with grammatical aspect. For example, when the preterit combines with *saber* ‘know’ (and a few other states like *tener* ‘to have’ and *conocer* ‘to know/to meet’), the predicate’s lexical class shifts to an achievement that marks an ingressive (Levy-Konesky & Daggett 1989). The verb *saber* in the preterit has the meaning ‘find out’, an achievement in English. All the predicates in the responses given in example 42, then, can be classified as achievements.

4.5 Questionnaire Issues

Though respondents are not controlled for outside source information in this type of data collection method, the data are considered to be uninfluenced responses. The questionnaire provided contact information in the form of an e-mail address and telephone number to be used at any time for any questions or misunderstandings. The instructions also repeatedly stated that the researcher was not interested in Spanish rules or “correct” speech. For example, the third section is introduced with the following directions:

Please translate the following sentences into Spanish. The parts in parentheses (), do not need to be translated - those are there to help you understand the meaning of the sentences to be translated. Translate the sentences how it would be most natural for you to say it. Please answer these questions with your own Spanish. In other words, don't write what you think the answer should be or what anyone around you says is the answer; write down what you come up with on your own.

Researchers have criticized data elicitation methods that rely on written translation tasks or fill-in tasks, claiming that they do not produce spontaneous speech, assumed to be more representative of the speakers' knowledge (Poplack 1983; Torres 1992). However, I have reason to believe the data are naturalistic because of certain non-standard, non-prescriptive forms given. For example, the second person singular agreement morpheme *-s* appears on all tense and aspect forms (i.e. *tu dice-s* 'you say', *tu dirá-s* 'you will say') in the indicative except for the preterit (i.e. *tu dijiste* 'you said'). Some speakers overextend this morpheme on the preterit form as well (i.e. *tu dijiste-s* 'you said') (Butt & Benjamin 2011). This non-standard person agreement form was given by more than one respondent in the data; this not only shows that participants were not concerned with prescriptive rules, but that they responded with naturalistic translations. Previous researchers have claimed that different ways of eliciting data produce different assessments of speakers' grammatical competence (Zentella 1997). Poplack (1983) claims that written translation tasks are not as effective as personal narratives for eliciting spontaneous and more naturalistic forms which speakers don't have time to reflect on. In the current study, the open-question translation task does present sentences out of a narrative context, but the forms in the responses appear to be spontaneous and naturalistic.

4.6 Classification of Lexical Classes

Various researchers have used the aspectual framework outlined by Vendler (1967) as a basis for analysis in L2 Spanish studies (Salaberry 1999; Andersen 1991). This framework is an important classification for heritage language acquisition as well (Montrul 2002; 2009). In these studies, the difference between Spanish and English lexical classification has largely been ignored. The differences cited generally have to do with how grammatical aspect interacts with lexical aspect

in Spanish in a way that English does not exhibit due to its lack of inflectional perfective and imperfective morphology. Montrul (2002:42) states, “In Spanish, as in other Romance languages, there are some stative verbs that shift to achievement (eventive) depending on the past tense form... Thus, *saber* ... is stative in the Imperfect but becomes an achievement in the Preterite.” Montrul (2002) also states that achievements in the imperfect are odd for some Spanish speakers and that for a continuous reading, speakers must use the progressive.

In order to investigate whether there is a correlation between lexical aspect and use of the preterit and imperfect, it was necessary to categorize each predicate from the data into one of the four lexical classes as described in Chapter 2. Tests can be applied to situations to classify them into one of the four types depending on their semantic interpretations. Dowty (1979) presents several tests to categorize situation types into states, activities, accomplishments, or achievements. All predicates from the question tokens were classified according to their lexical class using the following operational tests based on Salaberry (1999), who studies L2 Spanish, and Dowty (1979):

Test for Stativity: If the situation does not have a habitual interpretation (particularly in the present tense), it is a state.

Test for Activities: If the situation is not a state and ‘doing V for an hour’ means ‘doing V at all times in the hour’, then the situation is an activity (i.e. *he runs* gives a habitual interpretation, making *run* not a state and *he ran for an hour* means at all times during the hour, he was running).

Test for Telicity: If the situation is homogenous, it is atelic. If the situation is heterogenous, it is telic. In other words, the situation is telic (heterogenous) if you have stopped in the middle of V and you have still done V. If the situation is telic, it is either an accomplishment or an achievement.

Test for Achievements: If you cannot ‘spend an hour Ving’, then the situation is an achievement (i.e. **he spent an hour sitting down*). Also, if you cannot ‘stop Ving’ then the situation is an achievement (i.e. **he stopped reaching the mountain*).

Test for Accomplishments: If there is ambiguity with *almost* then the situation is an accomplishment (i.e. *he almost ran a mile* could mean he never started running a mile or he started but didn’t finish)

The application of the tests using an example from the questionnaire is shown below.

43. Papá Oso (probó, probaba) la sopa primero.

‘Papa Bear (tried (PERF), tried (IMPF)) the soup first’

First, we test for stativity. If we say “Papa Bear tries the soup first”, does this give a habitual interpretation? The answer is *yes*, the interpretation is that Papa Bear habitually tries the soup first. So, *try* or *probar* is not a state. Then, we test for telicity by asking, “If Papa Bear stopped in the middle of trying the soup, has he tried the soup?” The answer is *no*, *he has not tried the soup*, so the verb must be telic. Then, we test if the predicate is an achievement by asking, “Can Papa Bear spend an hour trying the soup first?” The answer is *no*, which means *try* must be an

achievement. The verb with its arguments were tested together in order to adequately classify them into lexical classes, since the entire predicate phrase affects the classification (Salaberry 1999).

Once all predicates were coded for lexical aspect and all responses were categorized as preterit or imperfect, quantitative and qualitative analyses of responses were undertaken.

Answers were taken out of quantification if participants used the present tense, a non-indicative mood, the perfect aspect, or indistinguishable spellings. All in all, these proved to be a small number of tokens that did not affect the data collected.

CHAPTER 5

ANALYSIS

This chapter will present a quantitative and qualitative analysis of the data collected from 11 Chilean-American heritage speakers. The quantitative analysis will supplement the qualitative analysis by specifying frequency distributions of the following variables: four lexical classes, two grammatical aspectual forms, and their usage together. These results will tell us whether speakers are using one form more than another. A large number of tokens in the questionnaire involved syntactic-semantic subtleties that a quantitative analysis would not capture (Silva-Corvalán 1994). Those are identified with a thorough contextual analysis. For example, a quantitative analysis can tell us that some states are paired with the preterit and others with the imperfect but a qualitative analysis is needed to elucidate how contextual factors (i.e. adverbial clauses, distinctions among predicates, discourse-pragmatics, etc.) affect the use of one form over the other.

The grammatical shift observed in this study is not expected to be sudden; proficient heritage speakers' grammars contain both preterit and imperfect morphology but are used differently than in native speakers' grammars. For that reason, my findings do not depend on a categorical presence or absence of either form, but rather on a careful analysis of the linguistic context in which each form is found and how the use varies among heritage speakers. A quantitative analysis is nevertheless useful in that it tells us the frequency of use of each form and whether it is the case that there is a correlation of grammatical aspect with lexical aspect.

This study attempts to answer three main questions. First, are there more preterit or imperfect forms? Second, does their use correlate with lexical aspect? Third, how do speakers resolve aspectual conflicts? For example, do heritage speakers choose the preterit or the

imperfect when habitual adverbial clauses co-occur with accomplishments and achievements? These aspectual conflicts are the primary cases that show us how heritage speakers are using grammatical aspect; if they are using an unexpected form when context calls for one or the other, are they using grammatical aspect to encode lexical aspect? Finally, which morphological past tense form do heritage speakers use for sentences in isolation (i.e. out of context)? Were the choices consistent among heritage speakers and did they differ from native speakers' responses? The results of this study inform us of whether heritage speakers are making use of a four-way lexical split, a stative/eventive split, or a telic/atelic split.

Overall, we find more use of the preterit than the imperfect. Use of imperfect morphology correlates with stative predicates, which suggests a stative/eventive split. Heritage speakers appear to be sensitive to the inherent semantics of predicates and use that information when choosing overt verbal morphology.

5.1 Results: Lexical Class and Grammatical Aspect Correlation

To address whether there were more preterit or imperfect forms and how they correlated with lexical aspect, table 4 shows simple frequency variables for native speaker performance on both tasks and table 5 shows simple frequency variables for heritage speaker performance on both tasks.

	Preterit	Imperfect	Totals
Accomplishments	39 (80%)	10 (20%)	49
Achievements	129 (98%)	2 (2%)	131
Telic Sub-Totals	168 (93%)	12 (7%)	180
Activities	25 (45%)	30 (55%)	55
States	32 (26%)	92 (74%)	124
Atelic Sub-Totals	57 (32%)	122 (68%)	179
Totals	225 (63%)	134 (37%)	359

Table 4: Lexical Class and Grammatical Aspect Variables in Overall Tokens and Individual Percentages: Native Speakers

	Preterit	Imperfect	Total
Achievements	308 (92%)	26 (8%)	334
Accomplishments	92 (77%)	27 (23%)	119
Telics Sub-Totals	400 (88%)	53 (12%)	453
Activities	70 (53%)	63 (47%)	133
States	84 (28%)	220 (72%)	304
Atelics Sub-Totals	154 (35%)	283 (65%)	437
Total	554 (62%)	336 (38%)	890

Table 5: Lexical Class and Grammatical Aspect Variables in Overall Tokens and Individual Percentages: Heritage Speakers

Comparing the frequency results between the four native speakers' tokens and the heritage speakers, we see a slight difference. There were fewer overall tokens with the native speakers. They also had a higher percentage of tokens of achievements (36% of all tokens) due to speakers who opted out of certain portions of the questionnaire, so overall there were more preterit forms. A clearer picture of trends comes from analyzing each lexical class separately. In the frequency of use of the preterit or imperfect in conjunction with lexical class, we see a

stronger correlation of lexical class with grammatical aspect. Native speakers used the imperfect more than heritage speakers with activities and states and used the preterit more than heritage speakers with accomplishments and achievements. With telic predicates the native speakers used the preterit 93% of the time and with atelic predicates used imperfective morphology 68% of the time (as compared to 88% and 65%, respectively, with heritage speakers). As said above, the overall higher frequency of preterit forms is most likely due to the high percentage of achievements in native speakers' responses.

Table 5 compares two variables, lexical class (achievements, accomplishments, activities, states) and grammatical aspect (preterit and imperfect). This table represents all 890 of the verb tokens elicited from all heritage speakers. If one verb (such as *decir* 'tell') was used in two different examples, this was counted twice. There was roughly an equal number of tokens of atelic predicates (states and activities, N=437) and telic predicates (achievements and accomplishments, N=453); however, 62% of all tokens were in the preterit and 38% of all tokens were in the imperfect, as Table 4 shows. 88% of telic predicates were in the preterit and only 12% were in the imperfect. 35% of atelic predicates were in the preterit and 65% were in the imperfect. These results show that there is a correlation between telic verbs and use of the preterit and atelic verbs with use of the imperfect. The correlation of the preterit with telic predicates (88%) was much higher than the correlation of the imperfect with atelic predicates (65%). That is, participants were not using the imperfect with atelic predicates as much as they were using the preterit with telic predicates; this is most likely due to the preterit extending into contexts where previously the imperfect was used.

Rather than correlating overt morphology with telicity, speakers could be making use of a stative/eventive split, which would be similar to Silva-Corvalán's (1994) findings. In a

stative/eventive split, the imperfect is mainly restricted to states and the preterit overextends into eventive verbs regardless of context. The data do in fact suggest a stative/eventive split, as 53% of activities are in the preterit.

For heritage speakers, 92% of achievement predicates were in the preterit and 8% were in the imperfect (see Table 5). Of all the lexical classes, this is the strongest correlation between expected lexical aspect and grammatical aspect; that is, heritage speakers used the preterit with almost all the verbs classified as achievements in this study. There was also a correlation with the preterit and accomplishments, though not as strong as with achievements; for accomplishments, 77% of verb tokens were in the preterit and 23% were in the imperfect. This is not too different from native speakers, for which 80% of accomplishments were given in the preterit and 20% in the imperfect.

To summarize, heritage speakers produced more preterit forms overall, even though half the tokens are telic and half are atelic. The only lexical class where imperfect was used more often were states (72%, as compared to 47% with activities, 23% with accomplishments, and 8% with achievements). The highest correlation was the preterit with achievements (92%). In responses, more than half of all tokens of activities were in the preterit. This makes the productive aspectual split stative/eventive, since heritage speakers are correlating the preterit with eventive predicates and are correlating the imperfect with stative predicates.

5.2 Results: Resolution of Aspectual Conflicts

The difference between lexical aspect and sentential aspect is significant when looking at aspectual conflicts. We have divided all predicate tokens into four lexical classes, depending on their inherent aspectual properties, but in everyday discourse, verbs occur in certain contexts that

affect the boundedness or unboundedness of a situation (Walker 2010). Boundedness in the present case is the grammatical aspectual counterpart to telicity because boundedness is externally marked onto the predicate and telicity is inherently encoded in the predicate (Depraetere 1995). Certain questions on the survey for this study were designed so that the predicate's telicity and the sentential aspect differed, such as *he **noticed** her every time he saw her*, which has an achievement in a habitual context. In other words, *notice* is an achievement, but the context set up in the sentence (use of *every time*) is habitual. Sentential aspect refers to how the context denotes an aspectual interpretation, such as through adverbial or subordinate clauses (Walker 2010). Heritage speakers have two choices for resolving aspectual conflicts: use the lexical aspect or the sentential aspect to determine which type of overt morphology the verb should be inflected with. For native Spanish speakers, the choice of morphology in these cases depended on sentential aspect and pragmatics. This means native Spanish speakers would use the imperfect for *notice* (i.e. *daba cuenta*) from the example above. Because the change reflected in the data is a change in flux, the respondents who provide the forms that correlate with lexical aspect and not sentential aspect in one example are not necessarily the same respondents who do so in every example. That is, there is intra speaker as well as inter speaker variation as to how forms are dealt with.

5.2.1 Methods of Resolving Aspectual Conflicts

Speakers used both methods to resolve aspectual conflicts: reliance on either the lexical aspect of the predicate or the sentential aspect and context. The greater tendency was for heritage speakers to use lexical aspect and to not necessarily make use of the context suggested by adverbial clauses when deciding whether to use the preterit or imperfect. This is demonstrated in example

(44) below:

44. I always **liked** your parents (until that day when everything changed).

Native Speaker Response: Siempre me **cayeron bien/gustaron** (PRET) tus papás.

In this example, the tokens in responses were either *caer bien* or *gustar* ‘like’, which are both states. The context here has two variables, unbounded ‘always’ and bounded ‘until that day when everything changed’. The focus is on the closed event of ‘liking your parents’ because the sentence makes explicit reference to the event’s end. This sentence then has a perfective context and the preterit is expected, given a system where context drives choice. In fact, all the native speakers used the preterit in this case. There is more variation among the heritage speakers, however. Five heritage speakers chose the preterit and four chose the imperfect.¹⁰ This example shows that almost half of the speakers are using the imperfect with a state even when the context elicits a perfective interpretation. These speakers are presumably using lexical class to determine morphology; the speakers who use the preterit could either be using context to determine the form or are turning to the preterit as a default form.

Another example where some speakers appear to make use of lexical aspect rather than sentential aspect is presented below in (45).

45. He always went to work.

The verb and its argument *go to work* are coded here as an achievement because of the initial

¹⁰ In addition, one used the present perfect, but that was not counted in the tokens because the perfect construction is outside the scope of this study.

point denoted by the action of *went to work* that has an interpretation similar to *left*, which is instantaneous and completed. The adverb *always* sententially provides a habitual interpretation by denoting that the event is repeated. The native speakers differed as to the morphology they chose; half used the preterit and half used the imperfect. In responses to (45), five heritage speakers chose the preterit and four chose the imperfect. Even with the adverb *siempre* ‘always’, which denotes a habitual context and therefore conditions the use of the imperfect, we still find use of the preterit.

Another example of an aspectual conflict within the prompt is shown below in example (46), where the lexical class is an accomplishment and therefore telic, yet the context is designed to elicit the use of the imperfect.

46. Juan painted the house every day (around when he had just bought it)

The verb and its argument *paint a house* is a typical example of an accomplishment. The use of ‘every day’ and the unbounded reference of *around when he had bought it*, suggesting the two events are happening simultaneously, are forcing a habitual interpretation. Three of the four native speakers use the imperfect in this case. For the heritage speakers, there was more variation in responses; four chose the preterit and four chose the imperfect. Even with an imperfect, unbounded context, half of the speakers still chose the preterit.

5.2.2 Default Aspectual Form

It could be that instead of using the lexical class as the determiner for grammatical aspect, the preterit is the default for some speakers. An example that supports this idea is shown below in

(47), where the verb *pensar* ‘think’ is an activity and the sentential aspect with the adverb ‘every day’ is habitual (in other words, both lexical class and sentential aspect condition the use of the imperfect).

47. I thought about you every day.

Native Speaker Responses: **Pensé** (PRET) en ti todos los días (50%) / **Pensaba** (IMPF) en ti todos los días (50%)

Native speakers used both the preterit and imperfect equally in this sentence. Heritage speakers, on the other hand, exclusively used the preterit. It could be that pragmatic knowledge suggests that this would only be said in reference to a closed, perfective event, but by looking at the lexical class and sentential aspect alone, one would predict more imperfect here.

Upon looking at further data, however, it becomes clear that heritage speakers cannot be relying solely on the preterit as a default form when there is an aspectual conflict. Example (48) contains an accomplishment within a habitual context. Similarly, example (49) contains an achievement in a habitual context, and example (50) contains an activity but within the context of a closed event.

48. Pedro would never **pass** me the ball.

Native Speaker Responses: Pedro nunca me **pasó** (PRET) la pelota (50%) / Pedro no me **pasaba** (IMPF) nunca la pelota cuando eramos pequeños (50%)

49. Maria used to **lose** her glasses all the time (until she got contact lenses).

Native Speaker Response: Maria siempre **perdía** (IMPF) los anteojos

50. I **dreamed** about the ocean every night when I lived in Arizona.

Native Speaker Responses: Todas las noches **soñaba** (IMPF) con el mar cuando vivía en Arizona (75%) / Yo **soñé** (PRET) acerca del mar todos los días cuando viví en Arizona (25%)

The sentential aspect of (48) does not force the use of the imperfect but favors it. In L2 Spanish classrooms, students are often taught that the imperfect in the past in Spanish is equivalent to the use of *would* + verb in English (Frantzen 1995). Adverbs such as *never* and *always* are often presented as triggers for imperfectivity in the past. Two of the native speakers used the preterit in (48) and two used the imperfect; their choice may differ because of the larger pragmatic interpretation. Heritage speakers, on the other hand, almost exclusively used the imperfect (seven out of nine). It could be posited that it is the use of *would* that encourages the use of the imperfect in the heritage speakers since ‘would’ is a modal and other modals in this data were coded as states, in addition to *would* denoting habituality in this context in English.

In example (49), the heritage speakers and native speakers all used the imperfect *perdía* ‘lose’. Even though *lose one’s glasses* is coded as an achievement, the habitual context suggested by *used to* and *all the time* condition the use of the imperfect. If the heritage speakers are using the imperfect here because of context, then the extending use of the preterit cannot be explained by its being the default form.

Example (50) is another indicator that speakers are not merely defaulting to the preterit when there are aspectual conflicts. In this example, the event as a whole is closed but the event implied by *dream* is an activity which is ongoing when the greater (and bounded) event of *living in Arizona* was happening. Six of the heritage speakers used the imperfect and three used the preterit. Among the native speakers, three used the imperfect and one used the preterit. The one who used the preterit is the native speaker who has lived in the United States for over 30 years and has more preterit use than any other native speaker and in unexpected places.¹¹ Example (51) shows the response of the native speaker who has not spent any time abroad (eNative34):

51. Toda-s las noche-s **soña- ba** con el mar cuando **viv-ía**
 All- Pl the-FPl night-Pl dream- IMPF.1sg with the.MS sea when live-IMPF.1sg
 en Arizona
 in Arizona

‘I dreamed of the sea every night when I lived in Arizona’ (IMPF)

It could be that the imperfect is used because the two events of dreaming and living in Arizona are happening simultaneously and continuously. All the heritage speakers used the imperfect for *vivía* ‘live’, which is the expected form because the clause represents descriptive, background information that is in progress while the event in the first clause takes place.

Below is another example of a sentence that contained an aspectual conflict between lexical aspect and sentential aspect (or context provided by the sentence).

¹¹ The first token of the second section of the questionnaire has the speaker choose between *hubo* and *había* ‘there was’ in *hubo/había una vez tres osos que* ‘once upon a time there were three bears’, where the answer is expected to be *había*, the imperfect, but this speaker (dNative54) chooses the preterit, a surprising answer.

52. (When John lived in another city) he **spoke** on the phone every day with his mother.

Native Speaker Responses: Él **hablaba** (IMPF) con su mama todos los días por teléfono (75%) / Cuando John vivía en otra ciudad él **habló** (PRET) todos los días por el telefono con ella (25%)

In this sentence, the situation type *speaking on the phone* is an activity and *every day* suggests that it was habitual. However, the clause *when John lived in another city* is meant to give a closed and completed interpretation to the event. In other words, the focus is not on looking at the internal constituency of the main clause because it happened and is no longer the case, which we know because John no longer lives in that city. In addition, the information in the main clause can be seen as foregrounded. For responses to example (52), all but one heritage speaker used the imperfect for *spoke* (i.e. *hablaba*). Though the predicate *hablar* ‘speak’ is eventive and therefore more likely to pair with the preterit, the adverbial phrase *every day* may be enough to elicit the imperfect here, especially if *hablaba* occurs frequently in the input with *todos los días* ‘every day’.

Another example that suggests heritage speakers are using lexical aspect productively to choose overt morphology is shown in (53).

53. I felt like I **had** no other choice (so I did what I had to do)’.

Native Speaker Responses: Yo sentí que no **tenía** (IMPF) otra alternativa entonces tuve que hacer lo que tenía que hacer (50%) / Sentí que no **tuve** (PRET) otra alternativa así que hice lo que tenía que hacer (50%)

The predicate *have* is a state but the context denotes a perfective interpretation because *I had no other choice* is temporally bounded by culminating at the point where *I did what I had to do* begins. Four heritage speakers produced the preterit and six produced the imperfect in this example. Half of the native speakers chose the preterit and half chose the imperfect. Most of the heritage speakers seem to be relying on the predicate type rather than the context as a whole. Because these sentences are given outside of a narrative framework, it is possible that speakers are not using the imperfect for backgrounding purposes, since backgrounding is dependent on information to be foregrounded. That is, there can be no backgrounding without foregrounding, but not necessarily vice versa. I claim that if a sentence is given outside of a narrative framework or in complete isolation, lacking any context at all, it is automatically foregrounded. This will be discussed more in §6.4.

Speakers gave a variety of responses for the prompt shown in (54). This sentence was adapted from Silva-Corvalán (1994:24), reproduced in example (55).

54. Brazil held the World Cup (la Copa Mundial) in 2000.

55. El año sesenta y nueve *tenían* (Imp) el World Cup en Toluca, en fútbol.
'The year sixty-nine they had the World Cup in Toluca, in soccer.'

Silva-Corvalán (1994) claims this is an example of the simplification of the Spanish morphological perfective/imperfective opposition. Its sentential aspect (*el año sesenta* 'the year sixty-nine') elicits a perfective interpretation, a single completed event. Her speaker, however, uses the imperfect; the main verb, *tener* 'have/hold' is a state. Like my findings, it is possible the

speaker is using this inherent lexical feature rather than the context to determine choice of morphology.

The following are the native speakers' responses; not one of them uses the expected *tuvo*, the third person singular perfective form of *tener* 'to have ('to hold' in this context)' though *bNative32* uses a similar form, *sostener*. Respondent *dNative54* uses the imperfective form of *tener*, which is unexpected.

56. Brazil sostuvo la Copa Mundial en el 2000. (bNative32)

57. Brazil ganó la Copa Mundial en el 2000. (cNative64)

58. Brazil tenía la Copa Mundial en el 2000. (dNative54)

59. Brasil ganó la copa mundial el 2000. (eNative34)

All the heritage speakers used the preterit form *tuvo*. This means they resolved the conflict using sentential aspect, even though the predicate is a state. This seems to be more of an exception, rather than the rule, in my findings.

Another prompt that presents an aspectual conflict is repeated below in (60) (see §4.1. for initial discussion). Silva-Corvalán (1994:44) presented this sentence as a case where her speaker used the imperfect where the preterit was expected.

60. I was the only son my parents had (and they are too old now to have any more).

For this example, all heritage speakers' chose the preterit. This could be due to the difference between *my parents had me* with the interpretation of a state that holds through all times and does not change or alternatively, *my parents had me* with the interpretation of giving birth. The latter would be an achievement. It is possible that the speakers interpreted it as an achievement and speakers could then rely on lexical aspect to determine which form to use (and they do ultimately choose the preterit).

5.2.3 Summary

Speakers exhibit a variety of ways of resolving aspectual conflicts. There was no example in which every heritage speaker differed from the expected response (determined either by native speaker responses or from similar examples in the literature). Sentential aspect also plays a role in the use of overt morphology; the English prompt *would* and *used to* were much more likely to elicit the imperfect than adverbial phrases such as *every day* or *always*. In addition, I claim that the preterit was not the default form used when presented with an aspectual conflict but rather speakers made use of the lexical aspect of the predicate. That is, if there was a telic situation type with a habitual or ongoing context, most speakers chose the preterit.

5.3 Results: Sentences Out of Context

This section will present and discuss the sentences from the questionnaire that were presented out of any context. Context here refers to additional clauses or adverbial information. The purpose of these sentences was to find out whether speakers would rely on lexical aspect when choosing the preterit or imperfect or if they choose one form as the default. Temporal interpretations denoted by discourse-pragmatics can depend on the sentences that come before

and after the sentence in question. Smith (1977) claims that sentences in isolation (i.e. a basic clause without grammatical or sentential aspect and only tense encoded on the verb) are vague regarding temporal specification. Smith finds that speakers who are presented with isolated sentences have a consistent way of interpreting them. If a sentence is incomplete, the speaker will try to reconcile this by interpreting the sentence as complete as possible given no further information. That is, if a native English speaker is presented with a sentence such as *she walked outside*, the speaker would most likely interpret this as a perfective event rather than ongoing, since ongoing seems to imply backgrounded information for descriptive purposes while other events not explicit in the sentence (that may be foregrounded) are occurring. Regardless of the default interpretation gleaned from a sentence out of context, both the preterit and imperfect are produced in participants' responses, but in predictable and systematic ways. In general, heritage speakers produced the preterit with eventive predicates.

(61-65) below are examples from the English prompts in the questionnaire that demonstrate sentences out of context.

61. She lost the game

Responses: Ella **perdió** (PRET) el juego/partido

62. Chris left

Response: Chris se **fué** (PRET)

63. She discovered your secret

Response: Ella **descubrió** (PRET) tu secreto.

64. Gabriel wrote a book

Response: Gabriel **escribió** (PRET) un libro

65. The child broke the window

Response: El niño **quebró** (PRET) el vidrio de la ventana

Example (64) is an accomplishment; the rest are achievements. Predicate arguments, such as *a book* in (64), along with the predicate create part of the lexical aspect and are not counted as context (see §2.2). In all the above examples, heritage speakers (and native speakers) used the preterit forms for these tokens. This tells us that at least the default form for telic sentences out of context is the preterit but it does not tell us whether the imperfect is unavailable to them.

5.4 *Ser and Estar*

The most enlightening data that informs whether heritage speakers are making use of lexical aspect comes from two sentences out of context using the predicates *ser* ‘be’ and *estar* ‘be’, shown below in (66) and (67). Heritage speakers treated these predicates differently in their responses. Even though both are states, they differ as to whether they are temporally bound or not as a default interpretation.

66. Veronica was here

67. Cristal was my favorite aunt

Example (66) elicited the preterit (example 68) from all heritage speakers but one, who used the imperfect *estaba*.

68. Veronica **estuvo** (PRET) aquí

In contrast, example (67) elicited the imperfect (example 69) from all heritage speakers but one, who used the preterit form *fue* .

69. Cristal **era** (IMPF) mi tía favorita

Even though responses almost all favored one form for the heritage speakers, native speakers exhibited more variation. Half the native speakers chose the preterit and half chose the imperfect for both examples. In fact, these two examples show the biggest difference in the data between heritage speakers' responses and native speakers' responses.

Not only do we see a difference between how heritage speakers and native speakers are translating these sentences out of context, but we also see a difference in how the two states are treated. Both *ser* and *estar* are translated to the same form in English, the copula *be* . One explanation for the semantic difference between the forms in Spanish is that *ser* represents an individual-level predicate and *estar* represents a stage-level predicate (Roby 2009). Individual-level predicates are those that in some way “belong” to the individual, whereas stage-level predicates hold for a period of time and contain a temporal constituency (Arche 2006). Example (70) shows an individual-level predicate adjective and example (71) shows a stage-level predicate adjective.

70. Jane is intelligent

71. Jane is sick

Example (70) describes a property of Jane that holds for a long period of time and is descriptive

of who Jane is (in other words, *Jane = intelligent*). Example (71) describes a temporary property that is not equated with an inherent quality of the subject.

In addition to the stage-level and individual-level distinction, analyses that distinguish between *ser* and *estar* by perfectivity and imperfectivity have existed in the literature since the early 1900s. Silva-Corvalán (1994:95) lists parameters that distinguish between *ser* and *estar* in contrasting contexts and lists *ser* with imperfective and *estar* with perfective. However, she does not correlate these properties with how the copula is changing in her speakers. The heritage speakers in this study distinguish between the two copulas along perfectivity and imperfectivity, even more so than the native speakers.

The way *ser* and *estar* are treated differently by heritage speakers suggests that speakers are distinguishing among states. This also suggests that heritage speakers are in fact sensitive to lexical aspect and are not merely defaulting to either the preterit or the imperfect.

5.5 Parallels with Russian Heritage Speakers

Studies on Russian-English heritage speakers are relevant to this study because Russian also encodes a perfective and imperfective aspectual distinction morphologically. In addition, changes similar to the findings in this study have been reported in the Russian of heritage speakers. Bar-Shalom & Zaretsky's (2008) study looks at the speech of 15 heritage speakers between the ages of 4 and 11 and find that grammatical aspect at this age is native-like with regards to morphology but not semantics. That is, the bilingual children made a few errors with perfectivity and imperfectivity contextually but not overtly (Bar-Shalom & Zaretsky 2008). In other words, they produced the correct verbal morphology but used them incorrectly according to contextual factors.

In Russian, aspectual morphology is linked to both grammatical and lexical aspect. In the American-Russian variety, heritage speakers have retained only lexical aspect and lost grammatical aspect. They use overt verbal morphology to encode lexical aspect rather than perfectivity or imperfectivity (Pereltsvaig 2005) which parallels the findings in this study. In the corpus Pereltsvaig (2005:371) analyzes, heritage speakers use aspectual morphology as expected 75% of the time. The accuracy may be due to memorized chunks, the heterogeneity of proficiency among speakers, and the fact that they do not have to rely largely on context for the frequent cases in which Standard Russian correlates telicity with grammatical aspect. When heritage speakers are diverging from the monolingual standard, Pereltsvaig (2005:389) attributes that to overt verbal morphology encoding lexical aspect.

5.6 Summary

The heritage speakers in this study are making use of lexical aspect when using overt aspectual forms. Overall, the preterit is used more than the imperfect. There is a greater correlation between the preterit and telic predicates than between the imperfect and atelic predicates, suggesting that the preterit is extending into atelic contexts where the imperfect would previously have been the preferred form.

When there is an aspectual conflict (that is, lexical class and sentential aspect have atypical temporal interpretations), the lexical aspect of the predicate is stronger than the sentential aspect for motivating the use of imperfect or preterit. I claim that for heritage speakers the context paired with lexical aspect are enough to convey the semantic aspectual information that would otherwise be encoded in the preterit or imperfect. In other words, if a speaker says ‘John ate up his cereal every morning’ and uses perfective morphology because of the nature of

the lexical class being an accomplishment in spite of the adverbial clause adding a habitual interpretation, the listener can still understand that the situation is habitual. This strategy is an efficient way of using the information provided by lexical aspect and discursive context and then encoding that information onto the overt morphology.

CHAPTER 6

MOTIVATIONS FOR THE EXTENSION OF THE PRETERIT

There are several ways to explain why heritage Spanish speakers come to overextend the preterit at the expense of the imperfect. A change in the inflectional system from two synthetic forms to one would not be unusual; Indo-European languages have a tendency to simplify morpho-syntactic elements in contact situations (Slobin 1977). The question remains as to why one form would be the extending form over another option, especially since the overextension of the same form (preterit) is found across language communities not in contact with each other (Silva-Corvalán 1994). In other words, why is it that the preterit overextends and the use of the imperfect decreases in various Spanish-English bilingual communities in the United States?

When languages come into contact with each other, there are various factors determining the direction and kinds of change involved in the two languages. For Spanish heritage speakers in the United States, Spanish is more susceptible to change than English due to the relative dominance of English and the increase of input in English and subsequent decrease in Spanish input once children enter public education (Rothman 2009). The linguistic changes that occur in a language contact situation can be explained by both internal and external motivations. Internal motivations are changes that have explanations independent of contact with another linguistic system. These changes happen because of processes already in progress in the language and are accelerated due to contact. Some changes also occur naturally in the course of language variation and may be simplifying and generalizing language specific rules (Silva-Corvalán 1994). Externally motivated language changes either work to create similar linguistic systems (such as making the aspectual system of Spanish more like English) or involve the transfer or loans of foreign elements, which can include anything from lexical items to syntactic structures.

It is difficult to pinpoint how grammatical elements such as tense and aspect in one language are affected by a contact language. If the imperfect has reduced its use from standard contexts in Spanish heritage speakers, this may not be directly due to influence from English, which has only one synthetic form in the past tense. There may be many other factors at work here, though grammatical transfer is possibly one of them. Factoring in external motivations for the overextension of the preterit is beyond the scope of this work. As for internal motivations, the interaction of perfective aspect, lexical aspect, and tense are observed cross-linguistically. This chapter focuses on how internal motivations for language change can explain the overextension of the preterit in the past tense of Chilean American heritage speakers' grammars. The chapter will focus on universal tendencies of perfectivity (§6.1 & §6.3), frequency of various tense and aspect forms in Spanish (§6.2), and properties of aspect acquisition (§6.4).

6. 1 Internal Motivations for Change in Spanish (Im)perfectivity

In discourse, speakers must balance their needs for succinct expression with listeners' needs to receive and understand the message (Slobin 1977). Proficient heritage speakers are generally understood, though certain grammatical deviations from their own standard usage are noted by monolingual native speakers (Zentella 1997). In other words, the changes that occur do not generally impede effective communication (i.e. changes in gender agreement, mood, or aspect morphology, all found in the speech of Spanish heritage speakers in the United States). Predictable and systematic internally-driven changes explain how effective communication is not impeded.

According to Silva-Corvalán (1994:92), internally motivated changes can be accounted for by two main factors. First, changes that were already in progress in the standard monolingual variety before contact are accelerated due to reduced input in the heritage language. The almost

complete loss of the morphological future to the periphrastic future in Spanish heritage speakers would be an example of such a change (see §3.2). The second factor is change accelerated by “such features as the semantic opaqueness of certain language specific forms or the relative complexity of a given paradigm,” (Silva-Corvalán 1994:92). An example of the second type is the extension of the copular *estar* ‘be’ into contexts where *ser* ‘be’ would previously be used because of the semantic opaqueness of copula use in Spanish. Silva-Corvalán’s discussion of internal motivations for language change does not account for the change in the preterit and imperfect in her speakers. The overextension of the preterit form in Spanish heritage speakers can be explained by both of these factors.

6.2 Reducing Semantic Complexity: The Imperfect and the Progressive in Spanish

Verbal morphology in Spanish is rich and has a variety of inflections that individually encode and contrast various semantic subtleties, such as imperfectivity and perfectivity. For this reason, acquisition of its verbal paradigm in a setting of reduced input or in an intensive language contact situation provides the right context for simplification, incomplete acquisition, or attrition (Guijarro-Fuentes & Clibbens 2004). Language change trends in the tense and aspect systems of monolingual Spanish speakers can help explain the decrease in use of the imperfect in the speech of heritage speakers. Spanish has four ways to construct the past tense: the imperfect, the preterit, the progressive (72 below), and the past perfect (73 below).¹² The latter two can co-occur with preterit and imperfect morphology.

¹² There is also a present perfect construction *he caminado* ‘I have walked’ that refers to an event that happened in the past but has current relevance. In some dialects, such as peninsular Spanish, this form is replacing the preterit for recent past. Because the morphology uses present tense inflection, this form will not be considered here. The present perfect’s interaction with the change in the preterit and imperfect is, however, an issue for further exploration.

72. Yo estaba/ estuve camina-ndo
 I am.IMPF/ am.PERF walk-PROG
 'I was walking'

73. Yo había /hube camina-do
 I have.IMPF /have.PERF walk-PP
 'I had walked'

The difference in the four past tenses has to do with grammatical aspect. English makes use of three of these past tenses: the simple past *I walked* the past progressive *I was walking*, and the past perfect *I had walked*.

There is the possibility that the progressive and the pluperfect constructions are taking the imperfect indicative's place in the Spanish verbal paradigm of heritage speakers. The prompt shown below in example (74) elicited three heritage speaker and two native speaker responses with the past perfect. Example (75) is one of the speaker's responses.

74. It never used to be as hot as it is now.

75. Nunca hab- ía estado tan caliente como ahora
 Never have-IMPF.3sg be.PP so hot like now (speaker *e190*)
 (lit: 'It never had been as hot as it is now')

The past perfect is unexpected because in (75) the verbal phrase *used to* tends to be a context in English that elicits the Spanish imperfect. The imperfect form and the progressive construction are both subtypes of the category imperfectivity. In Spanish, the progressive construction is more common than the imperfect form for non-habitual situations in the past tense; in addition, English has the progressive form (i.e. *was walking*) but not the imperfect form (i.e. *used to ...*) (Butt & Benjamin 2011). Spanish heritage speakers could be consolidating the forms that are

most used in the two languages in a process of adaptation; that is, this change would be an efficient way to make use of the verbal forms most available. In addition, frequency within the input must be considered. Gili Gaya (1964) reports that the preterit occurs four times as frequently as the imperfect in spoken Spanish. This suggests that all speakers are exposed to the preterit more often and heritage speakers have a higher likelihood of acquiring preterit morphology and usage than they do the imperfect.

6.3 Unmarked Aspectual Interpretations

Events that are completed are neutrally understood as having taken place in the past. Since perfectivity encodes completed events, it tends to be unmarked in the past. Imperfectivity tends to be unmarked in the present tense since it encodes ongoing or habitual events, which is generally how humans cognize events happening during the moment of utterance (Comrie 1976). For example, events in the simple present in English tend to be interpreted as habitual (i.e. *walk* in *I walk* is usually interpreted as an event that happens repeatedly, not as an event that is occurring at the moment of utterance). In Hawaiian Creole, a particle originating as the perfective aspect marker *wen* became the marker for past tense in general (Slobin 1977). Thus, we observe morphemes marking completed actions in the past developing into past tense markers. If lexical aspect conveys notions of stativity and event endpoints, then tense along with lexical aspect and adverbial phrases could be enough to encode perfectivity and imperfectivity (Silva-Corvalán 1994).

Part of the definition of a state is that it holds at all times and is a stable situation (Smith 1991). When states occur in the past tense, the unmarked interpretation is that the state no longer occurs. I predict that the states in the imperfect that remain productive will be retained due to frequency of input; the others will be used with the preterit because the past tense marking is

enough to know that the state no longer obtains. In other words, the imperfective interpretation can be gleaned from context. This could be why the imperfect form is not necessarily retained with all states.

Events (activities, achievements, and accomplishments) are distinguished from each other by features of telicity, dynamism, and punctuality. Lexical aspect has been shown to convey temporal relations in the absence of other temporal markers (Dowty 1986). I claim that these features along with context and adverbial clauses are enough to signal to a listener the aspectual distinction that would otherwise be encoded in the imperfect or preterit. The preterit ultimately overextends because it is the unmarked form in the past tense and contains less semantic complexity than the imperfect. In the following section, we examine what it is that makes the aspectual interpretation of perfectivity the most salient in the past tense and subsequently the grammatical aspect type that overextends in the grammar of Spanish heritage speakers.

6.4 Saliency, Foregrounding in Discourse, and Aspect Acquisition

The key to understanding how the use of the preterit and imperfect forms are changing in Spanish heritage speakers lies at the intersection of semantic saliency, foregrounding, and aspect acquisition. The imperfect and preterit play distinct roles in narrative frameworks; the imperfect provides background information and the preterit moves the narrative forward. If a child is exposed to limited input and they have the choice between two forms, one which provides background information and one which provides foregrounding information in a narrative, the form that encodes foregrounding would be more salient. In addition, the imperfect encodes a large range of meanings and contexts where it is used that make it more semantically complex. This complexity results in the imperfect being acquired later than the preterit (Montrul 2002). In fact, saliency and acquisition are connected. According to Slobin (1977:205), “the more salient

or basic notions can be defined as those which are earliest to develop in childhood.”

The preterit form emerges in a Spanish speaker’s grammar by age two and the imperfect does not emerge until around the age of three. If incomplete acquisition is what happens in some heritage speaker situations, then it is possible that the imperfect and the extent of its complexity of meaning does not get completely acquired; if attrition occurs, then the complexity of the imperfect in all its uses and contexts would be especially vulnerable to loss.

Lexical aspect also plays a role in tense and aspect acquisition. Cross-linguistically, sensitivity to the classification of different predicate types is acquired early by children. The classification is based on the way humans separate and cognize situations (Smith 1995). In Spanish, children acquire the preterit form first and use this form initially only with telic events (Montrul 2002). The imperfect is produced after the preterit and initially emerges only with states. This means that even from the earliest ages, lexical aspect plays a role in Spanish tense and aspect systems. Heritage speakers, in a limited input environment, may maintain and productively use this classification even after monolingual speakers no longer rely on lexical classification to determine preterit and imperfect use.

According to Slobin (1977:106), “forms which are late to be acquired by children are presumably also relatively difficult for adults to process, and should be especially vulnerable to change.” The imperfect is acquired after the preterit in Spanish and is also the form that encodes more meanings (habituality, genericity, progressiveness, backgrounding, etc) so this would make the loss of the imperfect predictable according to Slobin’s criteria. The predictability of imperfect loss is even more apparent when considering that the progressive construction remains productive in the speech of Spanish heritage speakers and that their other linguistic system, English, also contains a progressive construction but not an equivalent imperfect form. For a

heritage speaker's Spanish aspectual system, the progressive is likely to replace the imperfect since it is more analytic and periphrastic. These features make the construction more likely to be retained in a Spanish-English language contact situation (Silva-Corvalán 1994).

6.5 Summary

This chapter focuses on how internally-driven changes account for the overextension of the preterit and subsequent reduction of the imperfect in Chilean-American heritage speakers' Spanish. The systematic change happens because of reduced Spanish input in a language contact situation. The change can be explained because of universal tendencies of the interaction of perfective aspect, lexical aspect, and tense, as well as parallels in Spanish aspect acquisition and loss. In addition, considering that the progressive is more common for non-habitual past tense constructions than the imperfect in monolingual and subsequently first generation Spanish speakers, the loss of the imperfect form is predicted to be accelerated in a language contact situation. The progressive can take over the contexts where the imperfect meaning is intended and the preterit can take over all other contexts because, as I have argued above, the tense along with lexical aspect and adverbial phrases are enough to encode un(boundedness).

The preterit in Spanish is acquired earlier, suggesting that it is semantically less complex than the imperfect. Children produce the imperfect first only with states, suggesting that they are using lexical aspect productively. If heritage speakers are in a limited input environment, then the imperfect and all its semantic subtleties may not get completely acquired. Heritage speakers may then maintain and productively use lexical aspect, tense, and context to denote the aspectual interpretations associated with imperfectivity and perfectivity.

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

In this chapter I conclude the findings and analysis of the production and change of the preterit and imperfect in the Spanish of Chilean-American heritage speakers. I discuss the implications that this research has for heritage language studies, language acquisition and change, the semantics of tense and aspect, and the field of linguistics. This chapter also discusses further research raised by this analysis.

7.1 Summary

In this thesis I have demonstrated how usage of the preterit is overextending in the grammatical system of the Spanish of Chilean-American heritage speakers, leading to the subsequent loss of the imperfect. Overall, the preterit occurs more than the imperfect in heritage speakers' Spanish, and this change is explained by the semantics of lexical and grammatical aspect that internally motivate the use of overt aspectual morphology. I claim that (1) lexical aspect, rather than context, determines the use of preterit and the imperfect in heritage speakers, that (2) the use of the preterit is overextending with eventive predicates, and that (3) subsequently the use of the imperfect is becoming restricted to stative predicates. I claim that for heritage speakers the context paired with lexical aspect are enough to convey the semantic aspectual information that would otherwise be encoded in the preterit or imperfect. The preterit ultimately overextends because it is the unmarked form in the past tense and contains less semantic complexity than the imperfect. The systematic change happens because of reduced Spanish input in a language contact situation and is explained by universal tendencies of the interaction of grammatical aspect, lexical aspect, and tense, as well as parallels in Spanish aspect acquisition and loss.

Lexical aspect, the inherent semantic properties of predicates, plays a role in determining the use of preterit and imperfect morphology by heritage speakers. The choice of overt morphology in heritage speakers is becoming dependent on the lexical class of the predicate. Events are marked with the preterit and the imperfect comes to be associated only with states. Lexical aspect along with context and adverbial clauses convey the same aspectual information that is encoded by the imperfect and preterit in the monolingual norm. The fact that the preterit is the form that overextends is predictable and rooted in the semantics of perfectivity. Perfectivity is the unmarked form in the past tense and more salient due to its feature of denoting foregrounded events. If imperfectivity is unmarked for the present tense and perfectivity is unmarked for the past tense, the form that may be lost first in the past tense due to markedness would be the imperfect form. In addition, the preterit form overextends because the aspectual interpretation of imperfectivity is also encoded in the progressive construction, which is found in both English and Spanish. In Spanish, the progressive construction is more frequently used than the imperfect indicative in non-habitual contexts (Butt & Benjamin 2011). If bilingual Spanish-English heritage speakers retain the progressive and preterit in Spanish, then they are making the two linguistic systems more similar, an effective strategy in light of reduced input in Spanish.

During tense and aspect acquisition and production in Spanish, the preterit form emerges first, is less semantically complex than the imperfect, and appears in the input four times as frequently as the imperfect. For these reasons the preterit is less vulnerable to loss than the imperfect (see Slobin 1977). These facts also suggest that imperfect morphology in Spanish is more susceptible to incomplete acquisition in a reduced input environment; if the imperfect emerges after the preterit in L1 production, then it is possible that the imperfect and all the meanings it encodes does not get completely acquired. Heritage speakers, in a limited input

environment, maintain and productively use lexical aspect and contextual cues to convey the aspectual interpretation of imperfectivity and perfectivity even after monolingual speakers acquire all the uses and contexts of the preterit and imperfect and no longer rely as much on lexical class for determining preterit and imperfect use.

7.2 Implications

Understanding which areas of the grammar are affected in heritage languages informs us about properties of language acquisition and change. For example, Silva-Corvalán (1994) suggests that changes occurring in language simplification, language development, and the diachronic evolution of language are all comparable. Understanding how bilinguals compensate for reduced frequency in the secondary language and consequently how they simplify and retain certain aspects of the grammar gives insights into standard processes of language change. In addition, contact-induced innovations can tell us about cognition and cross-linguistic tendencies (such as how grammatical aspect and lexical aspect interact). The explanation for the overextension of the aspectual interpretation of perfectivity has implications for tense and aspect theory.

This study has also pedagogical implications. Studies on heritage speakers are finding that heritage speakers have different needs than second language learners because of the language knowledge with which they come to the classroom. Educators can use studies such as this one as a resource for creating heritage language programs. This is especially pertinent because of the growing numbers of heritage speakers in American classrooms. In a similar vein, heritage language maintenance programs can benefit from studies such as this one. These findings help prevent the marginalization of bilinguals who speak a minority language by demonstrating that the changes that occur are predictable and systematic, and therefore just as

viable as any other dialect of the language.

This study adds to the literature on Spanish heritage language by presenting the first study of heritage language in the Chilean-American community. This community is significantly different from more commonly studied Hispanic communities in the United States (Silva-Corvalán 1994; Zentella 1997) because there is generally less contact among heritage speakers in the Chilean-American community. The heritage speakers in this study do not live in concentrated neighborhoods of Chileans (or other Hispanic populations) and therefore the changes found in their aspectual systems are less likely to be a result of transfer or influence from other heritage speakers but rather a result of internally motivated changes.

7.3 Issues for Further Research

Many heritage language studies have explained the change in morphosyntax inter-generationally through incomplete acquisition or attrition. It is possible that the change is neither, but rather a consequence of differences in the input that heritage learners are exposed to, an issue worth further exploration (Rothman 2009). Terminology that implies deficiency such as *simplification*, *incomplete*, and *loss* might not always be the most accurate reflection of the data and could even work to marginalize speakers of these varieties. An issue for further research is an in-depth analysis of individual predicates and their frequencies with preterit or imperfect use in the input. Heritage speakers' changes could possibly be reflecting the frequency of forms in the input.

Diachronic studies on the input and production of heritage speakers' grammars is an important area for future research. A longitudinal study of heritage speakers from childhood to adulthood would inform us about the type and amount of input in the minority language and how the grammar is affected by more frequent exposure to the dominant language when entering

public education. Controlled studies of parental input in the heritage language would inform us about bilingual language development and would inform linguistic theory about the role of input for language acquisition.

In addition, parallels between heritage language change, change in endangered languages, and natural diachronic change should be investigated. How closely do the changes that occur in a reduced input environment resemble typologically common grammatical shifts in languages that evolve unimpeded by social factors? Language revitalization programs can benefit from heritage language research if they are found to undergo similar processes of change.

REFERENCES

- Albirini, Abdulkafi; Elabbas Benmamoun; and Eman Saadah. 2011. Grammatical Features of Egyptian and Palestinian Arabic Heritage Speakers' Oral Production. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 33:273-303.
- Andersen, Roger W. 1991. 'Developmental Sequences: The emergence of aspect marking in second language acquisition' in T. Huebner and C.A. Ferguson (eds.): *Crosscurrents in Second Language Acquisition and Linguistic Theories*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Antinucci, Francesco & Miller, Ruth. 1976. How children talk about what happened. *Journal of Child Language* 3:169-189.
- Arche, María J. 2006. *Individuals in Time : Tense, Aspect and the Individual/Stage Distinction*. Amsterdam, NLD: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ardila, Alfredo. 2005. Spanglish: An Anglicized Spanish Dialect. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 27.60-81.
- Arriaza, Bernardo T. 2005. The Chileans. In Jerry L. Simich and Thomas C. Wright (eds.), *The Peoples of Las Vegas: One City, Many Faces*, 289-302. Reno, Nevada: University of Nevada Press.
- Bar-Shalom, Eva G., and Elena Zaretsky. 2008. Selective attrition in Russian-English bilingual children: Preservation of grammatical aspect. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 12.281-302.
- Butt, John, and Carmen Benjamin. 2011. *A New Reference Grammar of Modern Spanish*. Oxford: Oxford University Press,
- Bybee, Joan L, Revere D. Perkins, and William Pagliuca. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Camps, Joaquim. 2005. The emergence of the imperfect in Spanish as a foreign language: The association between imperfective morphology and state verbs. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 43(3).163-192.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect: An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Depraetere, Ilse. 1995. On the Necessity of Distinguishing between (Un)Boundedness and (A)Telicity. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 18(1):1-19.
- Dorian, Nancy C. 1973. Grammatical change in a dying dialect. *Language*, 49, 413-438.

- Dowty, David R. 1986. The Effects of Aspectual Class on the Temporal Structure of Discourse: Semantics or Pragmatics? *Linguistics and Philosophy* 9(1):37-61.
- Dowty, David R. 1979. *Word Meaning in Montague Grammar*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Encyclopedia of Immigration. 2011. Chilean Immigration. Retrieved March 11, 2012, from <http://immigration-online.org/65-chilean-immigration.html>
- Frantzen, Diana. 1995. Preterite/Imperfect Half-Truths: Problems with Spanish Textbook Rules for Usage. *Hispania* 78(1).145-58.
- Gili Gaya, Samuel. 1964. *Curso superior de sintaxis española*. Barcelona: Bibliograf.
- Godson, Linda. 2003. *Phonetics of language attrition: Vowel production and articulatory setting in the speech of Western Armenian heritage speakers*. Ph.D. dissertation, UCSD.
- Guijarro Fuentes, Pedro & Clibbens, John. 2004. Tiempo y Aspecto: Diferencias entre niños bilingües y monolingües. Acta/ Precedings II Simposio Internacional del Bilingüismo, 207-222.
- Halmari, Helena. 1997. *Government and code-switching: Explaining American Finnish*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- He, Agnes W. (ed.). 2008. *Chinese as a heritage language: Fostering rooted world citizenry*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Jacobson, T. 1986. ¿Aspecto antes que tiempo? Una Mirada a la adquisición temprana del español. In J. Meisel (ed.), *Adquisición del lenguaje/ Aquisição da linguagem*. Frankfurt: Vervuert.
- Kim, Ji-Hye, Montrul, Silvina. and Yoon, James. 2009. Binding interpretation of anaphors in Korean heritage speakers. *Language Acquisition* 16, 1, 3-35.
- Krasinski, Emily. 1995. The development of past marking in a bilingual child and the punctual-nonpunctual distinction. *First Language*, 15:239-276.
- Labov, William. 2010. *Principles of Linguistic Change. Volume 3: Cognitive and Cultural Factors*. Oxford: Blackwell
- Levy-Konesky, Nancy and Daggett, Karen. 1989. *Fronteras*. Austin, Texas, USA: Holt, Rinehart and Wilson.
- Lipski, John. 2004. Is “Spanglish” the third language of the South?: truth and fantasy about U. S. Spanish. Paper presented at the 3rd Language Variation in the South (LAVIS III) conference, Tuscaloosa, AL.

- Lunn, Patricia V, and Janet A. DeCesaris. 1992. *Investigación De Gramática*. Boston, Mass., USA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Merel, Keijzer. 2010. The regression hypothesis as a framework for first language attrition. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 13:9-18.
- Montrul, Silvina. 2009. Knowledge of tense-aspect and mood in Spanish heritage speakers. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 13.239-269.
- Montrul, Silvina. 2002. Incomplete acquisition and attrition of Spanish tense/aspect distinctions in adult bilinguals. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 5(1):39-68.
- Montrul, Silvina, and Roumyana Slabakova. 2003. Competence Similarities between Native and Near- Native Speakers: An Investigation of the Preterite-Imperfect Contrast in Spanish: An Investigation of the Preterite-Imperfect Contrast in Spanish. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 25(3).351-98.
- Nash, Rose. 1970. Spanglish: Language Contact in Puerto Rico. *American Speech* 45(3/4):223-233.
- Paredes, Liliana and Vicky Nova-Dancausse. 2000. The Use of the Past Tense in the Narratives of Bilingual Children: The Acquisition of Aspectual Distinctions. In *Research on Spanish in the U.S.*, ed. Ana Roca, 228-237. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Pereltsvaig, Asya. 2005. Aspect Lost, Aspect Regained: Restructuring of aspectual marking in American Russian. In P. Kempchinsky and R. Slabakova (eds.) *Aspectual Inquiries*. Dordrecht: Kluwer: 369-395.
- Polinsky, M. 2007. Incomplete acquisition: American Russian. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics*, 14, 191–262.
- Poplack, Shana. 1983. Bilingual competence: Linguistic interference or grammatical integrity? In Elías-Olivares, L. (ed.), 107-29.
- Reichenbach, Hans. 1947. *Elements of Symbolic Logic*. Free Press, New York.
- Roby, David. B. 2009. *Aspect and the categorization of states : The case of ser and estar in spanish* John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Rosenhouse, Judith; and Goral, Mira. 2004. Bilingualism in the Middle East and North Africa: A Focus on the Arabic-Speaking World. In Bhatia, Tej K., and William C. Ritchie (eds.) 2004. *The Handbook of Bilingualism*, 835-868. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Rothman, Jason. 2009. Understanding the nature and outcome of early bilingualism: Romance languages as heritage languages. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 13.155-163.

- Rothman, Jason. 2008. Aspect Selection in Adult L2 Spanish and the Competing Systems Hypothesis when Pedagogical and Linguistic Rules Conflict. *Languages in Contrast* 8(1).74-106.
- Rothman, Jason. 2007. Heritage speaker competence differences, language change, and input type: Inflected infinitives in Heritage Brazilian Portuguese. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 11(4).359-389.
- Rothman, Jason, and Amy B. Rell. 2005. A linguistic analysis of Spanglish: Relating language to identity. *Linguistics and the Human Sciences*, 1.515-536.
- Rothstein, Susan: 2004, *Structuring Events: A Study in the Semantics of Lexical Aspect*. Blackwell Publishing, Oxford.
- Salaberry, M. Rafael. 1999. The Development of Past Tense Verbal Morphology in Classroom L2 Spanish. *Applied Linguistics* 20(2).151-78.
- Schwegler, Armin, Juergen Kempff, and Ana Ameal-Guerra. 2009. *Fontica y Fonología Españolas*. 4th ed. Wiley.
- Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 2006. On the bilingual competence of Spanish heritage speakers: Syntax, lexical-semantics and processing. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 10.37-69.
- Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 1994. *Language Contact and Change: Spanish in Los Angeles*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 1983. Tense and Aspect in Oral Spanish Narrative: Context and Meaning. *Language* 59(4):760-780.
- Slabakova, Roumyana. 2001. *Telicity in Second Language*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Slobin, Dan. I. 1977. Language change in childhood and in history. In J. Macnamara (Ed.), *Language learning and thought* (pp. 185-214). New York: Academic Press.
- Smith, Carlota. 1999. Activities: Events or States? *Linguistics and Philosophy* 22, 479-508.
- Smith, Carlota S. 1995. The Relation Between Aspectual Viewpoint and Situation Type: Aspectual Systems in Universal Grammar and in Languages of the World. *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Linguistics Society of America* 1-37.
- Smith, Carlota S. 1991. *The parameter of aspect*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Smith, Carlota S. 1977. The vagueness of sentences in isolation. *Proceedings of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 13, 568-577. Department of Linguistics, University of Chicago.

- Stewart, Miranda. 1999. *The Spanish Language Today*. London: Routledge.
- Torres, Lourdes. 1992. Code-mixing as a narrative strategy in a bilingual community. *World Englishes*, 11(2/3), 183-93.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2010. The Hispanic Population:2010. Retrieved September 24, 2011, from <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-04.pdf>.
- Vendler, Zeno. 1967. *Linguistics in Philosophy*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Walker, James A. 2010. Affairs of State: Defining and Coding Stativity in English and English-based Creole. *Aspect in grammatical Variation* 95-110.
- Zentella, Ana C. 1997. *Growing Up Bilingual: Puerto Rican Children in New York*. Oxford: Blackwell Publisher

APPENDIX I

Participant Social and Linguistic Variables

	Respondents										
	a19y	b25o	c29o	d16m	e19o	f23	g23m	h23o	i22m	j44y	k44o
Age	19	25	29	16	19	23	23	23	22	44	44
Age moved to the United States	Born in U.S.	Born in U.S.	Born in U.S.	Born in U.S.	Born in U.S.	12	4	13	11	5	9 months
Highest Education Level Reached	In College	In law school	Professional level (JD)	In 11th Grade	H.S.	H.S.	H.S.	A.A.	A.A.	Ph.D.	H.S.
City/State Raised	Las Vegas, NV	Las Vegas, NV	Las Vegas, NV	Las Vegas, NV	Las Vegas, NV	North Carolina	Salt Lake City, Utah	Salt Lake City, Utah	Salt Lake City, Utah	Wisconsin	Sacramento
How much Spanish Spoken in Home	Most of our interactions are in Spanish (i.e. Daily)	Most of our interactions are in Spanish (i.e. Daily)	Only one of my parents speaks Spanish in the home	Most of our interactions are in Spanish (i.e. Daily)	Daily but specific domains	Always, both Spanish and English	Always, both Spanish and English	S, E, most interactions are in Spanish (Daily)	Always, both Spanish and English	Spanish only with the babysitter	S, E, most interactions are in Spanish (Daily)
Siblings and their Ages	1, 25 years old	1, 19 years old	1, 23 years old	4: 11, 16, 17, 21	1, 17 years old	0	4: 10, 13, 16, 24	2: 22, 13	2: 23, 13	3: 45, 55, 57	01:23:00 AM
Speaks Which Language to Siblings	English	English	English	Spanish	English	English	English	Spanish	Spanish	Span with one, Eng with another	Eng

Respondents											
	a19y	b25o	c29o	d16m	e19o	f23	g23m	h23o	i22m	j44y	k44o
Enjoys Speaking Spanish	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Indifferent	Yes	Yes	Indifferent	Yes	Yes	Yes
Self-Rated Competency (excellent, good, limited)	Good	Excellent	Good	Limited	Limited	Excellent	Good	Excellent	Excellent	Good	Good
Considered Mother Tongue	S & E	E	E	E	NA	S & E	S	S	S	S & E	S
How Often Spanish is Heard/Spoken Outside Home	Daily	Weekly	2-3 times a month	Daily	Weekly	Daily	Daily	Daily	Weekly	2-3 times a month speak, hear weekly	Weekly
How Much Interaction With Chileans Outside Family	Never	2-3 Times a Month	Never	2-3 Times a Month	2-3 Times a Week	2-3 Times a Week	Daily	Once a Week	2-3 Times a Month	2-3 Times a Month	Once a Month
Formally Studied Spanish	3-5 Years	1-2 Years	No	No	Yes	Yes	Y, less than 1 year	No	No	Y, less than 1 year	No

APPENDIX II

Section 1: Sociodemographic Questions

For this section, I will ask you some questions about your background. Remember, all the information you provide will be kept absolutely private and anonymous. I am asking these questions to get a better understanding of the ways in which Spanish may vary in the Chilean communities in the United States. Please be as honest as you can in your answers. Feel free to skip a question you either do not know the answer to or prefer not to answer. If you don't understand a question, please try to explain the problem in the blank.

In what city and state were you born?

If you were not born in the United States, how old were you when you moved to the United States? (Please leave blank if you were born in the United States).

What city do you live in now and how many years have you lived in this city?

How old are you?

Where was your mother born? Please provide the city and country.

Where was your father born? Please provide the city and country.

If your mother was not born in the United States, how old was she when she moved to the United States? (Please leave blank if she was born in the United States)

If your father was not born in the United States, how old was he when he moved to the United States? (Please leave blank if she was born in the United States)

What languages are spoken in your home (click all that apply)?

Spanish

English

Other (Please indicate below which ones)

How often is Spanish spoken in your home?

- Always
- Most of our interactions are in Spanish (i.e. Daily)
- Once a week
- Only one of my parents speaks Spanish in the home
- Only my parents speak Spanish in the home, but I (if only child)/my siblings and I speak English
- Almost never
- Other (Please specify below)

What do you consider your mother tongue(s)?

- English
- Spanish
- Both
- Other (Please explain below)

How often outside of the home do you *speak* Spanish? You can select more than one option if you would like to add comments.

- daily
- weekly
- 2-3 times a month
- always
- never
- Other (please specify)
- Add comments (Who do you speak to outside of the home?)

How often outside of the home do you *hear* Spanish? You can select more than one option if you would like to add comments.

- daily
- weekly
- 2-3 times a month
- always
- never
- Other (please specify)

Add comments (Who do you speak to outside of the home?)

Have you ever taken a Spanish class?

- Yes
- No

Do you enjoy speaking in Spanish?

- Yes
- I don't care either way
- No

How would you rate your own ability to speak Spanish?

- excellent competence (anything you can talk about in English you can talk about in Spanish; you don't feel like you make many mistakes when speaking Spanish, if any)
- good competence (it is easy to have conversations about most things but some topics may give you problems; you might make some mistakes but you feel good about your Spanish)
- limited competence (you have a hard time getting your thoughts out and worry you make mistakes)
- Other (please specify)

How old are your sibling(s)? If you do not have any siblings, leave blank.

If you have siblings, what language do you use when speaking with them?

- English
- Spanish
- Other

What is the highest education level you have reached thus far? If you are still in school, please indicate what grade you are in now.

- High school graduate
- Bachelor's Degree
- Master's Degree
- Ph.D.

- Grade in school (i.e. 3rd grade, 6th grade, 8th grade)
- Other (please specify)

How often do you speak with Chileans that are not in your family? (In either Spanish or English)

- Never
- Less than Once a Month
- Once a Month
- 2-3 Times a Month
- Once a Week
- 2-3 Times a Week
- Daily

What do you think are the characteristics of Chilean Spanish? (Leave blank if you do not wish to comment.)

Section 2: Closed Questions

Below is part of a story that may be familiar to you in English or Spanish: Ricitos de Oro (Goldilocks and the Three Bears). For each of the sentences below, fill in the blank to the right with the verb choice in parentheses from the sentence to the left of the blank that you think sounds the most natural to you. Please only use answers that you come up with by yourself; I am interested in knowing what you think is the most appropriate answer. I am not looking for correct or incorrect answers. Leave a blank empty if you do not know which verb is correct but try to guess even if you are unsure.

Part 1, Ricitos de Oro (Goldilocks and the Three Bears)

(Hubo , Había) una vez tres osos que

(vivieron , vivían) en el bosque: Papá Oso, Mamá Osa, y Bebé Oso. Un día Mamá Osa

(hizo , hacía) una sopa de arroz con pollo y

(puso , ponía) tres platos en la mesa. Como ya

(fue, era) mediodía, los osos

(se sentaron , se sentaban) para comer porque

(tuvieron, tenían) muchísima hambre. Papá Oso

(probó, probaba) la sopa primero y

(dijo, decía) -¡Ay! ¡La sopa está muy caliente!- Entonces Bebé Oso y Mamá Osa

(quisieron , querían) comer la sopa pero no

(pudieron, podían) porque

(estuvo, estaba) tan caliente como la sopa de Papá Oso. Los tres osos

(decidieron , decidían) dar un paseo mientras

(se enfrió, se enfriaba) la sopa.

(Fue , Era) un día bonito del verano y

(hizo, hacía) sol.

Part 2, Continued: Ricitos de Oro (Goldilocks and the Three Bears)

Los osos (se divertieron, se divertían) cuando una niña perdida

(llegó, llegaba) a la casa.

(Se llamó, Se llamaba) Ricitos de Oro y

(fue, era) una chica curiosa. Ella siempre

(jugó, jugaba) cerca de su casa pero ese día

(se perdió, se perdía) en el bosque. Ricitos de Oro

(se acercó, se acercaba) a la casa y

(miró, miraba) por la ventana pero no

(hubo, había) nadie en el interior. Entonces

(abrió, abría) la puerta y

(entró, entraba) en la casa. Ricitos

(se alegró, se alegraba) cuando

(vio, veía) los tres platos de sopa. Ricitos

(se comió, se comía) toda la sopa del plato pequeño porque estaba perfecta - ni demasiado caliente ni fría.

Part 3, Continued: Ricitos de Oro (Goldilocks and the Three Bears)

(Hubo, Había) también en la casa tres sillas: una grande, una mediana, y otra pequeñita. Ricitos de Oro

(se sentó, se sentaba) en la silla de Papá Oso, la de Mamá Osa, y por fin la de Bebé Oso. Le

(gustó, gustaba) más la silla cómoda de Bebé Oso pero la silla

(fue, era) muy pequeña para ella. De repente se le

(rompió, rompía) la silla y

(se cayó, se caía) al suelo. Ella

(estuvo, estaba) muy cansada y tenía ganas de dormir. La muchacha

(se acostó, se acostaba) en las camas de Papá Oso, de Mamá Osa, y de Bebé Oso. La cama de Bebé Oso

(fue, era) tan cómoda que ella

(se durmió, se dormía) en seguida.

Section 3: Open-Ended Questions

Please translate the following sentences into Spanish. The parts in parentheses (), do not need to be translated - those are there to help you understand the meaning of the sentences to be translated. Translate the sentences how it would be most natural for you to say it. Please answer these questions with your own Spanish. In other words, don't write what you think the answer should be or what anyone around you says is the answer; write down what you come up with on your own. (Note: if your computer doesn't have accent marks, then use the vowel without the accent. This will not affect the results of the survey.)

For example:

(yesterday) I bought a rose for my girlfriend (and she was very happy).

Response: Compré una rosa para mi novia.

My dog used to be cute but now he is old and fat.

I (already) knew for weeks you were pregnant when you told everyone (that you were pregnant).

(Yesterday) I found out that you were pregnant (when your brother told me).

(When John lived in another city) he spoke on the phone every day with his mother.

I always liked your parents (until that day when everything changed).

I always ate cereal (first thing in the morning).

Pedro robbed a woman (yesterday) and took her money.

I was the only son my parents had (and they are too old now to have any more).

I felt like I had no other choice (so I did what I had to do).

Brazil held the World Cup (la Copa Mundial) in 2000.

It never used to be as hot as it is now.

I wanted to go to Chile last month but I couldn't.

I finished writing my novel (yesterday).

When I was a little girl I ran every day.

I coughed right when you said that (so I wasn't able to hear you).

They got married during the war.

She lost the game.

I sang for two hours.

Pedro was 5 years old when we moved.

He told me he hated me (when I told him I loved him).

He always went to work.

She discovered your secret.

She reached the top of the mountain (before the sun went down). ('the top' is 'la cima')

Pedro would never pass me the ball (when we were little).

Maria used to lose her glasses all the time (until she got contact lenses).

Chris left.

Juan didn't recognize me when I walked by him.

Gabriel wrote a book.

The child broke the window.

I dreamed about the ocean every night when I lived in Arizona.

My mother knocked on the door every morning at 6.

I thought about you every day.

Maria liked to run (when she was young).

Juan painted the house every day (around when he had just bought it).

He died after being in the hospital for a year.

When the bell rang everyone stood up and left the classroom.

Veronica was here.

Cristal was my favorite aunt.

The dog came home after he was missing for two days.