Variation of the Simple Present and Present Progressive Forms: A Comparison of Native and Non-native Speakers

Kimberly L. Geeslin and Stephen Fafulas
Indiana University

1. Introduction

The variable use of grammatical structures by native speakers (NS) and how second language learners (NNS) integrate this information into their evolving grammars, has been a mounting focus of second language acquisition (SLA) research (Adamson & Regan, 1991; Geeslin, 2003, 2011; Gudmestad, 2006; Preston, 1993). Empirical studies indicate that the acquisition of variable structures can be assessed in terms of the frequency of use of a form, and the linguistic and social factors that prompt their use. At the same time, these investigations reveal that the SLA of variation is essential for acquiring native-like competence. The current study adds to this literature by addressing a generally unexplored topic in the field: the use of the Spanish present progressive by English-speaking learners (Bardovi-Harlig, 2000; Fafulas, 2010).

English and Spanish differ in their expression of progressive aspect, at least in regard to present time reference (Bybee, 1995; Bybee, Perkins & Pagliuca, 1994). In Spanish, two verb forms, the simple present and present progressive, can both encode the meaning '*action in progress*' (example 1), while in English one form (*be + V-ing)* predominates (example 1b).

(1) a. Simple present verb form**:**   Mira, sale ahora el sol.
                                       Look, comes-out now the sun.
                                       (*'Look, the sun comes out now.')

    b. Present progressive verb form**:**   Mira, está saliendo ahora el sol.
                                       Look, is coming-out now the sun.
                                       'Look, the sun is coming out now.'

In addition to prescriptive accounts, sociolinguistic research on the simple present and present progressive forms has identified several linguistic variables that constrain NS selection of these forms, including: lexical aspect, co-occurring adverbs, clause type, polarity, animacy, and temporal aspect of the sentence (Cortés-Torres, 2005; Fafulas & Díaz-Campos, 2010; Fafulas & Killam, 2010; Torres Cacoullos, 2000). In contrast, research on NNS use of (present) progressive aspect is scarce. To our knowledge, only Fafulas (2010) has specifically addressed NNS use of the Spanish simple present and present progressive forms. In his study he used NNS data from a contextualized questionnaire to show that lexical aspect of the verb, semantic value of the adverb, and level of proficiency in Spanish are significant predictors of the selection of these forms. Fafulas, following previous work by Geeslin (2003) and Gudmestad (2006), focused on the predictors of the allowance of present progressive because the overgeneralization of the simple present at early stages of development obscures rules of language use, whereas an examination of the gradual extension (and possible overextension) of the present progressive into contexts formerly occupied only by the simple present at earlier stages of development shows us the path of acquiring both the present progressive and the contrast between these two forms. We build on these findings by analyzing frequency of use of the present progressive and the linguistic constraints on that use in data elicited from NS and very advanced NNS.

The data for the analysis were elicited through video-based narrations produced by 13 English-speaking NNS of Spanish and 13 NS in the same academic speech community. In the present study, a token for analysis is defined as any finite verb with present time reference and the dependent variable

in the analysis is the form produced in those contexts. We aim to uncover the factors that constrain the use of the present progressive by coding each token for a range of linguistic variables, including lexical aspect of the verb, semantics of the adverb, animacy, several characteristics of verbal objects, person/number of the verb, and clause type. Methodologically, our study contributes to the field because it employs a functional analysis (Schwenter & Torres-Cacoullos, 2008) of the SLA of variation of the present progressive and simple present forms in NNS Spanish.

2. Background
2.1. Lexical and grammatical aspect

The current study examines the role of lexical aspect, among other factors, in the selection of the simple present and present progressive forms by learners of Spanish as a second language. Evidence that lexical aspect is one of the key factors that influence NS selection of the simple present and present progressive verb forms (discussed below) in referencing the present comes from Cortés-Torres (2005), Fafulas (2009, 2012), Fafulas & Díaz-Campos (2010), Fafulas & Killam (2010), Klein (1980), Márquez-Martínez (2010), and Torres Cacoullos (2000, 2009). Because of the present study's focus on both tense and aspect, a brief overview of these concepts follows.

Tense, which locates an event on a timeline, such as past or present, is a deictic category anchored in the implied reference point at the time of speech (Comrie, 1985). This is exemplified in (2a) below. Aspect, on the other hand, refers to the temporal makeup of a verb or predicate (Comrie, 1976). Aspect can be both inherent in the lexical item (lexical aspect) or contextually-based (grammatical aspect). Lexical aspect refers to the inherent temporal makeup of a predicate, such as whether a verb depicts an action with inherent duration (*talk* or *sleep*), is punctual (*recognize* or *notice*), or has elements of both leading up to a point of culmination (*paint a painting*), and has been documented to play a fundamental role in the acquisition process (Bardovi-Harlig & Reynolds, 1995). In contrast, contextual aspect can be indicated through verbal morphology and may or may not be the same as the inherent lexical aspect of the predicate itself outside a given context. Thus, the contrast shown in (2b), is one of grammatical aspect rather than lexical aspect, because its inherent lexical aspect remains the same (note that both are in the present tense). This may present a challenge for the L2 learner of Spanish in that he/she must understand the interaction of morphologically-marked (grammatical) aspect and the inherent (lexical) aspect of the verb or predicate.

(2) a. Tense   *John runs* (present)
                           John ran (past)
     b. Grammatical Aspect   *John runs* (simple present)
                           John is running (present progressive)

Vendler (1967) categorized predicates into four aspectual classes: states, activities, accomplishments, and achievements. Three semantic features (punctual, telic, and dynamic) can be used to distinguish these aspectual classes from one another (see Table 1). Punctuality denotes something that happens instantaneously and lacks duration. Telicity is identifiable as an action with a specific beginning or endpoint. Dynamicity indicates change as well as a lack of stativity. Under this framework, stative verbs (STA) such as *querer* (to want) differ from the other three categories in that they lack dynamicity and persist over time without being affected by mental or physical action. On the other hand, activities (ACT), accomplishments (ACC), and achievements (ACH), are all dynamic. These last three aspectual classes are distinguished from one another using the features of duration and telicity. Achievements and accomplishments share the feature [+telic], while activities and states are both [-telic] and as such have no specific beginning or endpoint. Activities and accomplishments are both [-punctual], whereas achievements are [+punctual] and capture the beginning or end of an event.

Table 1: Semantic features of verbal aspectual classes

Features	States	Activities	Accomplishments	Achievements
Punctual	-	-	-	+
Telic	-	-	+	+
Dynamic	-	+	+	+

A number of studies have shown that accomplishments and achievements pattern together, (see Mourelatos, 1978) indicating that the feature [+telic], which these two categories share, is likely to be the important feature in predicting certain linguistic behavior. In the current study we follow this convention for classifying predicates, which is summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: Examples of verbal aspectual classes

	English	Spanish
STATIVE	know, believe, want	*saber, creer, querer*
ACTIVITY	walk, sing, play	*caminar, cantar, jugar*
TELIC	sing a song, wake up, arrive	*cantar una canción, despertarse, llegar*

Along with Vendler, Dowty (1979) is an oft-used source for distinguishing lexical aspectual classes. Dowty presents the relationships between lexical aspect types within a decompositional theory, holding that aspectual types are analyzable as combinations of lexical aspectual primitives. More specifically, Dowty presents a calculus for combining primitive state predicates with the primitives DO, BECOME, and CAUSE. We concur with Dowty's (1979) argument that aspectual categories should not be determined based solely on the verb, but rather in conjunction with their arguments (co-occurring sentential elements). However, one drawback to Dowty's method (and Vendler's) as it relates to the present study, is that the tests used to tease apart differing classes rely on the use of progressive morphology. For example, in distinguishing between states/non-states, Dowty explains that states should disallow progressive morphology as in (3). However, progressives can appear with states (example 4) in what Torres Cacoullos (2000: 216) calls *experiential* uses, those where a speaker expresses their attitude toward a new situation.

(3) *Non-stative predicates*   *Stative predicates*
    Juana está comiendo.   **Juana está teniendo una casa.*
    'Juana is eating.'   *'Juana is having a house.'

(4) *Últimamente, Pepa está teniendo problemas de salud.*
    'Lately, Pepa is having (experiencing) health problems'.

Dowty claims that achievements are not subject to the progressive/non-progressive test, but as Binnick (1991) observes, the progressive occurs with achievements in repeated events (5), or to focus on the preliminary stages of an event (Smith, 1991), as in (6).

(5) *Están construyendo nuevos edificios cerca del centro comercial.*
    'They are constructing new buildings near the city center.'

(6) *El partido está comenzando ahora.*
    'The game is starting now.'

Although we recognize the importance of the work by Dowty (1979) the particular structure we examine in the current study has led us to depart from this literature in one important way: we render all verbal predicates in the infinitival form prior to classification of lexical aspect precisely because it would be improper to use verbal morphology as both a determinant for classification and the dependent variable in the same study. This measure allows us to apply an objective coding scheme that is truly independent of our dependent variable.

2.2. Spanish and English progressive aspect

In English, the predominant way of encoding progressive aspect in the present is with the construction: auxiliary + present participle (*be* + *V-ing*). Spanish also has a periphrastic construction,

estar + V-*ndo*[1], which is very similar in its range of use to its English equivalent, although not completely identical. Where the two languages differ is that Spanish allows the possibility of using either the simple present or the present progressive form to express progressive aspect. Importantly, while both English and Spanish show a preference for the use of the simple present verb form for habitual meaning, in Spanish the simple present form may also encode progressive meaning (but see Fafulas, 2012 and Torres Cacoullos, 2008, 2009 for a discussion on the change in aspectual domain of the Spanish progressive).

There is not a consensus as to the interchangeability of the simple present and present progressive forms in Spanish. Westfall (1995) holds that in Spanish these two verb forms are compatible, that the duration of one is not less than the other, and that semantically they are the same. Bardovi-Harlig (2000: 212) states that the Spanish progressive (*Juan está cantando* 'Juan is singing') can be expressed without loss of progressive meaning with the non-progressive (*Juan canta*), whereas English obligatorily uses one form. Comrie (1976) asserts that the simple present can replace the present progressive without excluding progressive meaning in Spanish. Koontz-Garboden (2004: 1294) states that while the two Spanish verb forms overlap in meaning, in that both can be used with progressive aspect, they only overlap in truth-conditional meaning partially: 'The progressive interpretation tends to be the only interpretation available for the present progressive, but the simple present also has a habitual interpretation that tends to be the only way of expressing habitual meaning'. Similarly, Butt & Benjamin (2000) declare that while the present progressive form adds a nuance to present progressive contexts, it does not substantially differ in meaning from the simple present, resulting in a virtual interchangeability of these constructions. There are also several authors who argue that the present progressive and simple present forms are not semantically equivalent (see Lamanna 2008 for a detailed review). For example, King and Suñer (1980) hold that the progressive emphasizes the overt, ongoing development of an event, while the simple present lacks such a focus. In those contexts where a simple present replaces a present progressive, King and Suñer (1980: 227) claim that "(l)ost is the slow-camera effect, the unraveling of the activity in front of our eyes; lost is precisely what the progressive conveys: the event as overt, on-going activity". Rallides (1966: 107-9) also maintains that there is an important difference in meaning between the simple present and present progressive forms; namely an aspectual opposition between repetitive/non-repetitive (continuous) events. Squartini (1998: 145) reviews a number of previous works asserting that the simple present form is congruent with individual-level predicates and habituals while the progressive is not, making it more temporally restricted. In light of this controversy, one can see the importance of the function-based analysis of variation and, thus, in the current study we analyze the predictors of the forms produced in contexts of action in progress, rather than predictors of two forms that are purported to convey equivalent meaning. In so doing, we employ a variationist framework in order to uncover the internal and external motivators leading to the selection of the simple present or present progressive form in present time narratives.

3. Previous Studies

3.1. Previous research on NS variation of the Spanish simple present and present progressive forms

A pioneering empirical study on the Spanish present progressive is Klein (1980), who compares the relative frequency of use of the simple present and present progressive forms for 8 Spanish monolinguals and 10 Spanish-English bilinguals, all of Puerto Rican descent, who all live in New York City (NYC). She elicited data through a semi-structured oral interview and a picture description task conducted in Spanish, which the investigator translated into English and then judged for grammaticality. Klein holds that English has a more precise grammatical system, using only the present progressive for reference to action simultaneous with speech time, while Spanish is ambiguous

---

[1] Spanish in fact has a considerable inventory of verbal forms which are used in periphrastic constructions and can express progressive aspect (Torres Cacoullos, 2000). While we did consider this fact, and recognize that it merits an entire investigation of its own, we limit ourselves to the *estar* + V-*ndo* construction given that it is the most commonly used periphrasis in present day Spanish and that almost all empirical L1 research on the simple present/present progressive distinction has focused exclusively on this form (for a notable exception see Torres Cacoullos, 2001).

given that the simple present can refer to actions that are both simultaneous with speech time and habitual. Further, Klein argues that because English is the dominant and prestigious language of NYC, the bilinguals may interpret the English system as not only the more precise, but also the more correct of the two and, thus, decrease their use of the simple present form. Her results show that the Spanish monolinguals used the simple present form (26%, n=63/241) significantly more than the bilinguals (6%, n=18/287) in reference to actions simultaneous with speech time. Klein concludes that the data point toward indirect transfer in that the bilinguals are (subconsciously) aligning their L1 with the L2. In other words, in reference to actions simultaneous with speech time, the bilinguals employ the present progressive form more than the monolinguals given that the present progressive form aligns the Spanish system more closely with the English one without affecting grammaticality from the perspective of monolingual Spanish norms. While the study shows an increase in use of the present progressive among bilinguals, it does not account for the factors underlying NS variation of these forms. Furthermore, it is not clear whether the two groups of speakers were evaluated in similar contexts. In a related study, Cortés-Torres (2005) analyzes the use of the simple present and *estar* + V-*ndo* forms in 30 sociolinguistic interviews of monolingual and bilingual Spanish speakers living in Puerto Rico. Her results indicate that the *estar* + V-*ndo* form is favored in limited duration contexts with activity verbs, while the simple present form appears in habitual contexts with stative verbs. In progressive contexts, her results indicate that the simple present form occurred 76% (489/642) of the time and the *estar* + V-*ndo* form occurred 24% (153/642) of the time. However, given that the participants were of unequal socioeconomic status, of differing ages, and interviewed with different levels of formality, it is not possible to evaluate the extent to which external factors may have obscured the variation in question.

A study specifically aimed at identifying the contexts of variation between the present progressive and the simple present in Spanish is Fafulas & Díaz-Campos (2010). In this study the authors employ a more controlled method of data collection than was used in Klein (1980) or Cortés-Torres (2005), reporting on results from 10 monolingual Spanish and 10 bilingual Spanish-English speakers. The elicitation instrument, a 20-item contextualized questionnaire, was designed as a way to present participants with identical contexts by which to evaluate their use of these forms (see Geeslin 2011 for a detailed review of this methodology). The contextualized questionnaire instrument was designed so that all combinations of the categories of each of the independent variables were represented. These linguistic variables include verbal aspectual category (stative, activity, accomplishment, achievement) and semantic value of the adverb (habitual or immediate). Each item provided two sentences that were identical except for the verb form, where one sentence contained a present progressive form and the other contained a simple present form. Participants were asked to indicate a preference for one sentence or the other, or to indicate that both were permissible (i.e., that this context was variable for that participant). Unlike sentence-level fill-in questionnaires, each item was presented in a discourse-level context making it possible to code objectively for the context rather than having to subjectively evaluate speaker interpretation or intent. Moreover, this task allows participants to indicate that certain contexts are variable, rather than forcing a choice between two forms. The relative predictive power of the independent linguistic variables and the extralinguistic variables of bilingualism and gender were analyzed with the statistical program GoldVarb X (Sankoff, Tagliamonte & Smith, 2005). Their analysis examined predictors of the 'both' response, and showed that acceptability of both forms (i.e., variation) occurred in very specific environments, predominantly with telic verbs. When the authors combined the progressive responses with the 'both' responses, their findings indicated that the monolinguals accepted use of the present progressive form in 40.6% of the contexts provided, a higher than expected number given that previous studies such as Cortés-Torres (2005) reported a 22% usage rate for the progressive form. This finding led the authors to conclude that the use of the present progressive form is more widespread in Spanish monolingual communities than previously believed (as proposed by Fafulas, 2012; Quesada, 1995 and Torres Cacoullos, 2000, 2008). In part, this result is due to the fact that the authors tested both contexts of immediate, as well as extended, time reference. Importantly, other factors aside from bilingualism were found to be significant predictors of the use of the forms under investigation. That is, stative verbs showed almost categorical pairing with the simple present form, while dynamic verbs (actions, achievements, and accomplishments) all demonstrated greater variability (i.e., favored the 'both' response more strongly). What is most relevant to the current study is the fact that semantics of the adverb and lexical-aspectual class were

significant factors in predicting the use of the simple present and present progressive forms in controlled contexts.

3.2. Previous research on NNS variation of the Spanish simple present and present progressive forms

Owing largely to the initial work of Andersen (1986, 1991) and Andersen and Shirai (1994, 1995), a plethora of studies has investigated learner development of the tense-aspect system under what is commonly referred to as the aspect hypothesis[2]. The basic tenant of this hypothesis is that the inherent lexical aspect of verbs and predicates influences learner development of tense-aspect morphology. The majority of studies employing this framework have focused on the development of morphological '*pastness*' (imperfective vs. perfective) (Andersen, 1986; Bardovi-Harlig, 1998). These investigations have unveiled an associative bias in the distribution of verbal morphology and lexical type among language learners, which can be summarized by the following generalizations: preterit morphology occurs most often with telic verbs, imperfect morphology most often with states, and progressive morphology most often with activities (Bardovi-Harlig, 2000). These studies have greatly enhanced our overall understanding of the SLA of tense and aspect in Spanish (Andersen, 1986; Cadierno, 2000; Hasbún, 1995; Liskin-Gasparro, 2000; Lubbers-Quesada 2004; Montrul & Salaberry, 2003; Ramsay, 1990; Salaberry, 1999). In contrast, however, only minimal attention has been paid to the acquisition of present progressive aspect or a learner's means of expressing *action in progress at the present moment*. For instance, in the Romance languages, to our knowledge only Giacalone Ramat (1995) has studied the (Italian) progressive under the aspect hypothesis. In the concluding sections of her comprehensive monograph on tense and aspect in SLA, Bardovi-Harlig (2000) reports that studies focusing exclusively on the progressive are still rare.

To date, the only study we are aware of that examines NNS use of the Spanish present progressive in light of NS variation is Fafulas (2010). The participants from his study were 24 speakers from the same academic speech community in the United States (6 low-intermediate learners, 6 high-intermediate learners, 6 advanced-learners, and 6 native-speakers). The data were elicited using a contextualized questionnaire (cf. Geeslin, 2003) designed to represent all combinations of the categories of the independent linguistic variables verbal aspectual category (states, activities, achievements, accomplishments) and semantic value of the adverb (adding either a habitual or immediate reading to the context). The statistical analyses revealed that the verbal aspectual class of achievements strongly favored the 'both' response while activities and states disfavored permissibility of both forms, and were strongly associated with the simple present (states) or present progressive (activities) in Spanish. Regarding the factor group semantic value of the adverb, adverbs of immediacy (*ahora* 'right now') strongly favored selection of the present progressive form while adverbs of habitualness disfavored the present progressive form. Fafulas' findings were largely in line with the predictions of the aspect hypothesis which state that activity verbs most often associated with the present progressive form. Most importantly, learners showed sensitivity to both grammatical and inherent lexical aspect, as expected in native-like grammars (Cadierno, 2000; Liskin-Gasparro, 2000).

The preceding review indicates that there are many remaining questions about the use of present progressive aspect by NNS. For example, Fafulas (2010) is based on a controlled elicitation measure and no previous study has examined learner production of this form. In addition, the small size of the participant pool in the highly advanced and NS groups makes detailed comparison between these groups somewhat difficult. Finally, because the elicitation instrument was designed to examine the effects of only two independent linguistic variables, as is appropriate for this type of instrument, it is difficult to expand the analysis of that dataset to include additional linguistic factors. Thus, the current study seeks to build on the work of Fafulas by examining the production of these forms by highly advanced NNS and NS, evaluating both frequency of use of forms produced in 'action in progress' contexts and the range of factors that predict such use.

4. The current study

The current study was guided by the following questions:

---

[2] See Bardovi-Harlig (2000) for a comprehensive review of tense and aspect studies from a functionalist perspective.

For both native and advanced non-native speakers,

1. In present time narratives, what is the frequency of use of *estar* + V-*ndo* and simple present forms?
2. What linguistic variables constrain the use of these forms?

4.1. Participants

The first participant group consisted of 13 NNS of Spanish (L1 English), all graduate students and instructors of university-level Spanish. Eight were male and 5 were female, and they ranged in age from 22 to 35 years (*m*=26.9 years). All participants had lived in a Spanish-speaking country (Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Mexico, Nicaragua and Spain) for a length of time ranging from three months to 11 years (*m*=14.1 months) and had studied Spanish formally between three and 17 years (*m*=8.79 years). On a discrete-item grammar test, described below, the NNSs scored between 17 and 25 out of a possible 25 points (*m*=21.7).

The second participant group was comprised of 13 NS of Spanish who were graduate students and instructors of undergraduate-level Spanish courses residing in the United States at the time of the study. Seven were female and 6 were male, and they ranged in age from 24 to 37 (*m*=29.8). Their countries of origin included Argentina (two males), Chile (one female), Colombia (one female and one male), Ecuador (one female), Mexico (one male), Puerto Rico (one female), Spain (two females and one male), the United States (one male of Mexican descent), and Uruguay (one female). Their scores on the same grammar test that the NNS took ranged from 22 to 25 (*m*=23.7). We included our own NS group in order to have an accurate representation of speech norms particular to this university speech community. The range of countries of origin of the NS also reflects the diversity of input the NNS have received through abroad experiences and contact with NS in the United States. Since both participant groups completed the same narration task, all speakers had the same opportunities for language use. Importantly, due to the variable nature of the grammatical structure under analysis, coupled with the paucity of studies regarding NNS use of the progressive, it was essential to have a baseline by which to evaluate language usage in this speech community (cf. Geeslin, 2003). The characteristics of both participant groups are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Participant groups of the current study

Group	Gender	Age	Origin & Years of study	Proficiency (out of 25)
NNS	5 (fem.) / 8 (male) total = 13	(*m*=26.9)	Average study abroad (14 months) Average Spanish Inst. (8.8 years)	*m*=21.7
NS	7 (fem.) / 6 (male) total = 13	(*m*=29.8)	Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Puerto Rico, Spain, US, and Uruguay	*m*=23.7

4.2. Data elicitation

Each participant completed three tasks. The descriptions of the participants in the previous section were taken from a background questionnaire which elicited social and language learning characteristics. The second task was a discrete-item, multiple-choice grammar test that examined knowledge of various components of Spanish grammar. This instrument took the form of a story in which multiple-choice items surveying commonly-taught grammatical structures, such as the preterit/imperfect contrast and the use of subjunctive, object pronouns and *gustar*-type verbs, were embedded. Based on the results reported in the description of the participants above, we note that the NS group did not score perfectly on the grammar test, but there are important differences between the two groups. These differences are seen in the fact that the range of scores for the NNS was larger than that of the NS, and that the mean score of the NS was higher than that of the NSS. For this reason, we refer to our participant group as "highly advanced", rather than "near-native" although we suspect that some of our NNS participants are much closer to near-native than others.

The final task was a digitally-recorded video-narration activity. Participants watched the Pear Story (http://www.pearstories.org/) video, which is a movie that contains sound but no dialogue. In this video, a man harvesting pears along a path encounters several passers-by, each of whom interacts in some way with the man or the pears themselves as they pass. Participants watched the video and were

asked immediately afterwards to re-tell the story they had just watched, including as much detail as possible. For most participants the resulting narration was a primarily present-time narrative, and only those narratives that included present time reference were included in the current analysis. These narratives were recorded in a language laboratory with a head-mounted microphone.

4.3. Data coding and analysis

The digitally-recorded video re-tells were transcribed. We then identified all finite verb forms in the present-time narratives and tabulated the range and frequency of all verb forms produced. After this initial tabulation, we defined a token for analysis as a finite verb form produced in a context with present time reference. We limited our analysis to two variants of our dependent variable: present tense forms and *estar* + V-*ndo* forms. This was done to keep our analysis in line with previous sociolinguistic research, although we acknowledge that it would also be valuable to perform other types of analyses that include a broader range of forms produced (e.g., other auxiliaries with V–*ndo*). The tokens were then coded for six independent linguistic variables, each of which was motivated by previous research. Because the coding of each may not have been uniform across studies, we sought to define them in such a way that they could be objectively coded and replicated by other researchers. The first factor, the accompanying adverb, categorized the presence or absence of an adverb and the semantic nuance added to the predicate in each case (locative, temporal, sequential, etc.). The second factor, lexical aspect, assessed the inherent semantics of the verb in light of the predicate of which each verb was a part. That is, we viewed the predicate as a whole, including the verb, direct object and modifier in categorizing each token. Because of the disagreements inherent in the literature regarding lexical aspect and the consequent difficult nature of this variable, we checked our coding with two trained linguists[3], and inter-rater reliability was assured. The categories of this factor were stative, activity, and telic verbs (achievements and accomplishments). The third factor, clause type, distinguished subordinate clauses from other types of clauses (independent, coordinate, simple). Fourthly, we coded for the animacy/inanimacy of the subject. We also coded for grammatical person and number of the verb form (e.g., first person singular, third person plural). Lastly, we included an analysis of the object in each clause, considering whether it was direct/indirect, its position (pre or post-posed), whether it was a full NP or pronoun, and whether it was singular or plural. Table 4 summarizes the coding scheme for the independent linguistic variables.

After we coded each token for the factors described above, we conducted a series of quantitative analyses. Following conventions in SLA and sociolinguistics, we first created cross-tabulations for the distribution of the present progressive and simple present for both participant groups to determine whether the rates of use of these forms were statistically different for the NS and the NNS. Next, for each participant group we created cross-tabulations for each independent variable and the dependent variable along with chi-square tests (X^2) in order to determine whether apparent correlations reached statistical significance. Finally, we conducted a regression analysis for each participant group aimed at uncovering the predictors of the dependent variable. Qualitative comparisons of the significant factors were then made between the two speaker groups in order to gain a more detailed understanding of the similarities and differences between the two groups.

---

[3] We are indebted to Jason Killam and Scott Lamanna for their assistance with the coding of this variable as well as their informative discussions on lexical aspect and the syntax of Spanish.

Table 4. Coding scheme used for dependent variable (simple present and *estar + V–ndo*)

Variable	Categories	Example
Forms (dep. Var.)	Present Indicative	*Y el hombre recolecta las peras* 'The man is gathering/gathers pears'
	Present Progressive	*Y el hombre está recolectando las peras* 'The man is gathering/gathers pears'
Adverbs/ verbal modifiers	Locative (e.g., aquí)	*El hombre está ahí recolectando peras* 'The man is there gathering pears'
	Sequential (después)	*Y después las pone en el cesto* 'And then he/she puts them in the basket'
	Other (temporal, etc.)	*Ahora la muchacha se va* 'Now the girl is leaving'
	None	*El hombre está recolectando peras* 'The man is gathering pears'
Clause type	Subordinate	*Yo creo que el los conoce* 'I believe that he knows them'
	Other	*Seguirá recolectando peras mañana* 'He/she will continue gathering pears tomorrow'
Aspect	Stative	*Y él se siente avergonzado* 'And he feels embarrassed'
	Activity	*El recolecta las peras cuidadosamente* 'He gathers the pears carefully'
	Telic	*El coloca el cesto en la bicicleta* 'He places the basket on the bike'
Animacy	Animate subject	*El hombre está observando a los chicos* 'The man is observing the boys'
	Inanimate subject	*La bicicleta se cae* 'The bicycle falls'
Person/ number	1st person singular/plural	*Veo/vemos a los hombres* 'I see/we see, the men'
	2nd person singular/plural	*Ves/ven a los hombres* 'You (sing/plural) see the men'
	3rd person singular/plural	*Ve/ven a los hombres* 'He/she sees, they see, the men'
Object type	Direct	*Veo al hombre* 'I see the man'
	Indirect	*Le da la mochilla a la chica* 'The him/her, he/she gives the bag to the girl'
Object form	Full NP	*Veo a las peras ahí* 'I see the pears there'
	Pronoun	*Las veo ahí* 'Them I see (f) there'
Object position	Pre-posed	*Lo llama con un silbido* 'He/She calls him (m) with a whistle'
	Post-posed	*Llama al hombre con un silbido* 'He/She calls the man with a whistle'
Object number	Singular	*El hombre pone la pera en el cesto* 'The man puts the pear in the basket'
	Plural	*El hombre pone las peras en el cesto* 'The man puts the pears in the basket'

5. Results

We began our analysis with a tabulation of the full range of forms produced in the video re-tells. In Table 5 we display the overall distribution of forms found in the corpus of oral narratives. The data reveal that the NS and NNS produced a similar quantity and range of forms. In total, the NNS produced 757 tokens and the NS 713. In both cases nearly 80% of the total forms were present tense tokens. Table 5 indicates that the NNS and NS produced an almost identical number of simple present tokens, 527 (69.7%) in the case of the non-natives and 502 (70.4%) for the natives. Nevertheless, their frequency of use of the *estar +V-ndo* form was somewhat different. The remainder of our analysis will focus on the differences in this distribution and the linguistic factors that predict such use.

In order to examine more closely the distribution and use of the present progressive forms for NS and NNS, we performed several statistical tests. Prior to doing so, however, we chose to eliminate the first person forms from our analysis. We did so because we found no *estar + V-ndo* forms for either group in the first person and because these forms often fulfilled a different function. The first person forms were most often used to add a comment outside the narrative, rather than to advance the action of the video re-tell itself and, thus, fell outside our desired scope of analysis. Table 6 reflects this change in the number of tokens and provides the summary of frequency of use of both forms for each participant group. A chi-square test of this distribution by group further indicates that the distribution between the simple present and present progressive forms for the two groups is, in fact, statistically different. What remains unknown, however, is whether these differences in frequency are coupled with

differing constraints (or different relative weight of constraints) on use or whether the NNS are simply applying the same rules of use with greater frequency. In order to corroborate the hypothesis that NNS are overusing this form, it must be demonstrated that they not only use the forms more often, but that they also do so in ways that are not target-like.

Table 5. Distribution of forms produced in present-time video re-tells for NNS and NS

	Non-native		Native	
Forms	#	%	#	%
Estar + V-*ndo*	75	9.9	28	3.9
Non-canonical base + V-*ndo*	4	0.5	9	1.3
Gerund without base	10	1.3	14	2
Haber	15	2	18	2.5
Imperfect	16	2.1	16	2.2
Imperfect progressive	1	0.1	9	1.3
Other base + V-*ndo*	10	1.3	27	3.8
Past perfect	4	0.5	8	1.1
Present indicative	527	69.6	502	70.4
Present perfect	16	2.1	22	3.1
Present subjunctive	4	0.5	11	1.5
Simple past	67	8.9	39	5.5
*Other	8	1.0	10	1.4
TOTAL	757	100	713	100

*Other = past progressive, pluperfect, imperfect subjunctive, imperfect, morphological and synthetic future & conditional

Table 6. Distribution of *estar* +V-*ndo* forms relative to present indicative

	Estar + V-*ndo*		Present Indicative		Total
	#	%	#	%	
Non-natives	75	13.3	487	86.7	562
Natives	28	5.5	477	94.5	505

Note: $X^2 = 18.56$, *df* = 1, Cramer's V = 0.13, p<0.001

In order to examine the predictors of use of the present progressive forms, we performed individual cross-tabulations and chi-square tests for each independent variable for both participant groups. The results of this series of tests are summarized in Table 7, which indicates the level of significance of each correlation as well as the direction of the effect for each independent variable.

Table 7. Summary of effects for all linguistic factors by each group

	Non-natives		Natives	
	Significant?	Description	Significant?	Description
Adverbs	*Yes	*Estar* + -*ndo* with locatives	No	Also highest with locatives but not significantly so
Animacy	**Yes	*Estar* + V-*ndo* with animate subjects	No	*Estar* + V-*ndo* with animate subjects but not significant
Aspect	***Yes	*Estar* + V-*ndo* with activity verbs	***Yes	*Estar* + V-*ndo* with activity verbs
Clause type	***Yes	*Estar* + V-*ndo* with subordinate clauses	***Yes	*Estar* + V-*ndo* with subordinate clauses
Person & number	No		No	
Object form	***Yes	*Estar* + V-*ndo* with full NPs	***Yes	*Estar* + V-*ndo* with full NPs
Object type	***Yes	*Estar* + V-*ndo* with direct objects	***Yes	*Estar* + V-*ndo* with direct objects
Object number	***Yes	*Estar* + V-*ndo* with plural objects	***Yes	*Estar* + V-*ndo* with plural objects
Object position	***Yes	*Estar* + V-*ndo* with post-posed objects	***Yes	*Estar* + V-*ndo* with post-posed objects

Note: * = p<.05, **=p<.01, ***=p<.001

What is immediately apparent in Table 7 is a striking similarity between the two groups regarding the linguistic factors which constrain their use of the *estar* +V-*ndo* form. That is, when considering all nine individual statistical tests for each of the linguistic factors for which we coded (see appendix for results of each individual statistical test), only two differences between the NNS and NS emerge: their pairing of the *estar* +V-*ndo* form with adverbs, and the favoring effect of animate subjects for the present progressive. The results for the other linguistic variables indicate that both groups show a tendency to pair the present progressive form with activity verbs and in subordinate, rather than in main clauses. Further, for both groups, the variable person and number did not reach statistical significance. Lastly, the variables related to the verbal object show a similar pattern for both groups in that *estar* +V-*ndo* is more likely to appear with direct objects that are post-posed, plural and take the form of a full NP. In fact, even in the two cases where differences in significance were found, the trends for both groups are in the same direction. Thus, for both the NNS and NS animate subjects and locative adverbs favor the *estar* +V-*ndo* form even though these patterns do not reach statistical significance for the NS. Thus, the overall result of these tests is that NNS use of *estar* +V-*ndo* is conditioned by the same factors as those of the NS. The implications of these effects will be further discussed in the following section.

Following the cross-tabulations and chi-square tests for each independent variable, two forward stepwise logistic regression analyses we performed, one for the NS group and one for the NNS. These tests allow us to examine the relative importance of each of these independent variables on the dependent variable when considered in a single predictive model. Table 8 summarizes the results from the regression test run for each of the two participant groups. What Table 8 reveals is that lexical aspect and clause type are the two most significant predictors of *estar* +V-*ndo* for both groups. For the NS, the position of the object, its singularity/plurality, and whether it is realized as a full NP or pronoun, are also included in the model as having predicative power in the selection of the *estar* +V-*ndo* form, although they do not reach statistical significance. As for the NNS, the only further significant predictor of the present progressive form for this group is whether the object is singular or plural. The implications of these results will be addressed in the next section, in light of the research questions that guided the present investigation.

Table 8. Summary of predictive models for *estar* +V-*ndo* by each group

	Non-natives	Natives
Adverb		
Animacy		
Aspect	***X	***X
Clause type	***X	***X
Person (V)		
Object: pre/post		X
Object: sing/plural	**X	X
Object: full NP/pronoun		X
Object: direct/indirect		

Note: X indicates a significant predictor of the dependent variable in the regression model for that participant group, * = p<.05, **=p<.01, ***=p<.001.

For NNS: -2 Log likelihood = 256.05, Model χ^2 = 185.57, *df* =6, *p*<.00, Nagelkerke R^2 = .52, percent predicted = 91.5%.

For NS: -2 Log likelihood = 123.28, Model χ^2 = 115.73, *df* =8, *p*<.00, Nagelkerke R^2 = .543, percent predicted = 95.5%.

6. Discussion

It will be recalled that we originally set out to identify the frequency and distribution of the simple present and present progressive forms in a corpus of present tense oral narratives produced by a group of native and non-native Spanish speakers from the same community. By combining methodological tools from the fields of SLA and sociolinguistics, we uncovered the linguistic motivators driving selection of one or the other form in similar contexts. We will address our results for both frequency of use and constraints on use and then assess the implications of our findings for both language learning and language use in general.

Our results indicate that when our analysis was limited to only present indicative and *estar* +V-*ndo* forms produced in contexts of present-time reference, the NNS use the latter form with significantly greater frequency than the NS do. Nevertheless, the analyses of the influence of each of the independent linguistic variables showed that the constraints on the use of the present progressive for our two participants groups are quite similar. In fact, even those variables that did not reach significance for NS in the individual chi-square tests, animacy and the presence and type of adverb, showed the same tendencies in both datasets. The regression analyses also show common patterns for NS and NNS, such as the predictive importance of lexical aspect and the type of clause. They do, however, identify differences in the relative importance of the features of the verbal objects in predicting the use of the present progressive. The NNS model shows that the number of the object is a highly significant factor in the predictive model, whereas the NS model includes number of the object in addition to the position and form of the object and none of these factors is as highly significant as number is in the NNS model. Still, an overall examination of the results for frequency, individual effects of each independent variable and the predictive models for each speaker group show more commonalities than differences. The remainder of the discussion will focus on the implications and explanations of these findings.

One key difference between our participant groups was that the NNS tendency to use the *estar* + V-*ndo* form with locative adverbs reached significance whereas the same trend, although present for NS, was not significant. Interestingly, the result for the NNS corresponds with the results of previous L1 sociolinguistic research on present progressive/simple present variation, as well as the diachronic evolution of the Spanish *estar* + V-*ndo* construction. That is, the origins of the *estar* + V-*ndo* periphrasis can be traced back to the locative function of *estar* 'to be', originally *stare* 'to stand' in Latin, which denotes the location of a subject in a particular place (Bybee et al., 1994; Torres Cacoullos, 2000). Over time, and due to frequency of use, this particular locative function weakens and the construction extends to take on the broader meaning of "ongoing action". Taking into account this diachronic development, the majority of the L1 sociolinguistic research carried out on the present progressive/simple present alternation has included locative adverbs as an independent variable and shown locative adverbs to strongly favor pairing with the *estar* + V-*ndo* form (Cortés-Torres, 2005; Fafulas & Killam, 2010; Torres Cacoullos, 2000, 2009). What is interesting is that our learners seem to display the same effects of grammaticalization as NS in other studies (Bybee et al., 1994; Hopper and Traugott, 2003), but our NS do not. It may be the case that the failure on the part of NS to show this effect is connected to the nature of the task itself, where the action is commonly known and clearly located in the video, thereby requiring fewer adverbial tools. This could be tested through comparison to data elicited from this same participant pool using other measures. We do believe that our NNS results are consistent with Andersen's (1984) one-to-one and multifunctionality principles, which explain the one-to-one mapping between locative adverbs and the *estar* + V-*ndo* form that our NNS show. Taken together, our results for NS and NNS imply that in order to move toward a completely native-like pairing of the *estar* + V-*ndo* form with adverbs, learners of Spanish may need to permit a broader range of adverbs with the present progressive form, similar to the NS of our corpus.

Another important finding, the results for animacy, is best explained in conjunction with the results for lexical aspect. That for the NNS and NS participant groups, both animate subjects and activity verbs favor the *estar* +V-*ndo* form can best be explained by the fact that the expression of progressive aspect is typically associated with dynamic events, which are generally acted out by animate agents (Bybee et al., 1994; Torres Cacoullos, 2000). Regarding clause type, the higher use of *estar* +V-*ndo* in subordinate clauses as evidenced by both groups, falls out from the function of the progressive, commonly used as a mechanism to create a 'temporal frame' around another situation (Jesperson, 1931; Torres Cacoullos, 2000). This further explains why these two factors were the most significant predictors in both regression models and why they were included in the models for both NS and NNS. Thus, for these trends, our NNS demonstrate that they are sensitive to the same constraints as NS on the use of the present progressive form.

The fact that the person and number of the verb form was not a statistically significant predictor of use for either group is best explained by considering the nature of the task itself, rather than the way in which these speakers might use the present progressive in other contexts. It will be recalled that participants narrated what they saw in a video, which was largely comprised of 3rd person singular and plural referents. Moreover, the only first person forms that were produced fulfilled the function of adding comments outside the re-tell context and were, thus, qualitatively different from the third

person forms and excluded. Thus, the analysis of the person and number variable was actually an analysis of the differences between third person singular forms and third person plural forms and, previous literature does not predict differences between the two. In order to test the influence of this variable in a future study in a way that is compatible with the predictions from previous literature, different elicitation tasks will need to be employed, such as a sociolinguistic interview or dyad discussion, which would present more opportunities for 1st and 2nd person verbal forms that fulfill the same functions as the third person forms to which they were compared.

The final group of variables, which described the verbal objects, demonstrated a correlation between *estar* +V-*ndo* and post-posed objects, direct objects, plural objects and full NPs for both groups. In part, this result falls out from the morphosyntactic structure of Spanish itself. That is, given that SVO is the unmarked word order for Spanish transitive constructions (Clements, 2006), it is expected that objects will be marked post-verbally. However, the finding that learners showed a stronger pairing of *estar* + V-*ndo* with singular objects than NS (see appendix 8) requires further consideration. This could be correlated with a difference between NNS and NS regarding aspectual marking and object type. NS employ progressive morphology with telic verbs when accompanied by a plural NP but not a singular one, while learners allow progressives with telic verbs regardless of whether the object is singular or plural. Thus, in marking a verb such as *poner* 'to put/place' in the phrase '*El hombre pone/está poniendo la(s) pera(s) en el canasto* 'The man is putting/puts the pear(s) in the basket', learners are not sensitive to the fact that the singularity/plurality of the object may change the aspect of the verb from an activity to a telic event and subsequently trigger the use of the simple present form. The dynamicity of the verb itself may override other contextual effects to which NS are sensitive.

Taking into account these findings, we propose that the prototype for the *estar* +V-*ndo* present progressive form is one of: [+] animate subjects, [+] dynamic predicates (particularly activity verbs), [+] subordinate clauses, and [+] plural/full/direct/NPs. One key difference between our groups was that the NNS group does not include the form and the position of the verbal object in their predictive model and, thus, the prototype for our NNS differs in this way. Based on the findings in previous sociolinguistic studies, we further predict that our NS prototype would change to include features of the locative adverbial on a different type of task and that the NNS group may also come to demonstrate a weaker effect for locative adverbials on this particular task as acquisition progresses. Nevertheless, the most striking fact about our NS prototype is precisely how closely it resembles the results for the NNS as well.

One of the most significant findings of our study is in regard to the *overuse* of the present progressive form by learners of Spanish as a foreign language. While researchers have hypothesized that learners of Spanish typically overuse the present progressive form (cf. Butt & Benjamin, 2000) the analysis of our data show that NNS use of this form is in fact similar to NS use. That is, we would not conclude that our data are suggestive of overgeneralization (Ellis, 1994) given that the use of present progressive by learners in our study was constrained by the same predictive factors identified for NS of Spanish. Thus, our statistical models showed that the very advanced learners of our study in fact possess a similar prototype for the *estar* +V-*ndo* to the native speakers. This finding highlights the importance of using statistical techniques in order to uncover the linguistic motivators governing use of a form rather than relying on an analysis of frequency of use of a form alone.

To conclude this section, and connect our research on the present progressive *estar* +V-*ndo* form in Spanish to research on the L2 acquisition of variable structures in general, we believe the most important finding our data show is that learners of Spanish are indeed capable of acquiring the complex set of constraints underlying NS use of the simple present and present progressive verb forms. The individual chi-square tests, which show the same direction of effects for NS and NNS, indicate that the NNS have acquired the constraints to some degree and have made the appropriate associations between the *estar* +V-*ndo* forms and the categories of those independent variables. Thus, the remaining challenge for NNS is simply to adjust the relative importance of each constraint so that it more closely matches the predictive model for the NS. In other words, our NNS are quite far along in the acquisition process and display a remarkable similarity in their pairing of each verbal form with the same specific constraints as the NS. Thus, our research represents one more instance where learners are capable of re-adjusting their morphological and semantic mappings to the input by which they are surrounded (Geeslin, 2011; Geeslin and Gudmestad, 2010; Montrul & Slabakova, 2003).

7. Conclusion

Informed by previous sociolinguistic research, we analyzed a corpus of oral narratives produced by 13 non-native and 13 native speakers of Spanish in order to better understand the frequency and predictors of use of the *estar* +V-*ndo* and simple present forms in Spanish for NS and advanced NNS. Our findings indicate that the *estar* +V-*ndo* form is prototypically associated with animate subjects, dynamic predicates, subordinate clauses, and with plural/full/direct/NPs. One key finding in our study was that even though the NNS group used the *estar* +V-*ndo* form with significantly greater frequency than the NS, the NNS demonstrated sensitivity to the same constraints as NS, both in terms of associations and the direction of the effects, and the only remaining challenge is to adjust the relative importance of these constraints according to NS norms of use. A secondary finding, which we believe to be associated with the task itself, is that the NNS still need to move away from a one-to-one mapping of locative adverbs with the *estar* +V-*ndo* form, to one which permits a wider range of adverbs with the present progressive form, in order to pattern similarly to native speakers. Because the presence of locative adverbs has been shown to favor NS use of this form as well, we suspect that our narrative elicitation task played an important role in discovering this difference between NS and NNS. In sum, our NS and NNS differ significantly in the frequency with which the progressive forms are used but very little in the manner in which these forms are employed.

The primary goal of this study was to add to the single existing study on the use of the present progressive in L2 Spanish by examining a larger group of learners at the advanced level on a production task (rather than a more controlled elicitation task). Although we have met this goal, demonstrating that highly advanced learners differ in the relative strength of some constraints but not in the overall sensitivity to those constraints, much work still remains. Our results for the effects of locative adverbs demonstrate the importance of continuing this line of research with additional tasks in order to ascertain whether the NS here show a lack of sensitivity to this constraint as a result of the characteristics of the re-tell task or whether the findings in previous sociolinguistic research may actually vary across participant groups. Likewise, it will be important to determine what the earlier stages of acquisition for the present progressive look like so as to understand more clearly which constraints are universal, which are acquired over time and which are late-acquired. Finally, it is nearly always the case that as one codes data new variables emerge and old ones are refined and we expect that future research will uncover additional independent variables that provide further detail of the use of the present progressive for both NSs and NNSs of Spanish.

Appendix

Table A1. Distribution of *Estar* + V-*ndo* forms for non-natives and natives by adverbs

	Non-natives				Natives			
	Estar + V-*ndo*		Pres. Ind.		*Estar* + V-*ndo*		Pres. Ind.	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Locatives	21	24.1	66	75.9	7	10.1	62	89.9
Sequential	5	8.6	53	91.4	0	0	48	100
Other	7	9.1	70	90.0	2	2.2	87	97.8
No adverb	42	12.4	298	87.6	19	6.4	280	93.6

Table A2. Distribution of *Estar* + V-*ndo* forms for non-natives and natives by animacy

	Non-natives				Natives			
	Estar + V-*ndo*		Pres. Ind.		*Estar* + V-*ndo*		Pres. Ind.	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Animate	72	15.1	406	84.9	27	6.2	411	93.8
Inanimate	3	3.6	81	96.4	1	1.5	66	98.5

Table A3. Distribution of *Estar* + V-*ndo* forms for non-natives and natives by aspectual class

	Non-natives				Natives			
	Estar + V-*ndo*		Pres. Ind.		*Estar* + V-*ndo*		Pres. Ind.	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Activities	63	84	85	17.5	26	92.9	84	17.6
States	0	0	138	100	1	0.9	109	99.1
Telic	12	4.3	264	95.7	1	0.4	284	99.6

Table A4. Distribution of *Estar* + V-*ndo* forms for non-natives and natives across clause type

	Non-natives				Natives			
	Estar + V-*ndo*		Pres. Ind.		*Estar* + V-*ndo*		Pres. Ind.	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Subordinate	42	29.6	100	70.4	22	17.7	102	82.4
Not subordinate	33	7.9	387	92.1	6	1.6	375	98.4

Table A5. Distribution of *Estar* + V-*ndo* forms for non-natives and natives by verbal person and number

	Non-natives				Natives			
	Estar + V-*ndo*		Pres. Ind.		*Estar* + V-*ndo*		Pres. Ind.	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
3p. plural	11	13.4	71	86.6	6	5.4	105	94.6
3p. singular	64	13.3	416	86.7	22	5.6	372	94.4

Table A6. Distribution of *Estar* + V-*ndo* forms for non-natives and natives by form of object (Full vs. pron)

	Non-natives				Natives			
	Estar + V-*ndo*		Pres. Ind.		*Estar* + V-*ndo*		Pres. Ind.	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Full NP	44	30.8	99	69.2	20	19.0	85	81.0
Pronoun	5	15.6	27	84.4	2	3.1	62	96.9
Other	7	4.7	142	95.3	2	1.3	148	98.7
None	19	8.0	219	92.0	4	2.2	182	97.8

Table A7. Distribution of *Estar* + V-*ndo* forms for non-natives and natives by type of object

	Non-natives				Natives			
	Estar + V-*ndo*		Pres. Ind.		*Estar* + V-*ndo*		Pres. Ind.	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Indirect	4	19.0	17	81.0	0	0	28	100
Direct	45	29.2	109	70.8	22	15.6	119	84.4
Other	7	4.7	142	95.3	2	1.3	148	98.7
None	19	8.0	219	92.0	4	2.2	182	97.8

Table A8. Distribution of *Estar* + V-*ndo* forms for non-natives and natives by number of the object

	Non-natives				Natives			
	Estar + V-*ndo*		Pres. Ind.		*Estar* + V-*ndo*		Pres. Ind.	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Singular	25	22.5	86	77.5	5	4.5	105	95.5
Plural	24	37.5	40	62.5	17	28.8	42	71.2
Other	7	4.7	142	95.3	2	1.3	148	98.7
None	19	8.0	219	92.0	4	2.2	182	97.8

Table A9. Distribution of *Estar* + V-*ndo* forms for non-natives and natives by position of the object

	Non-natives				Natives			
	Estar +-*ndo*		Pres. Ind.		*Estar* +-*ndo*		Pres. Ind.	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Preposed	4	13.3	26	86.7	2	3.0	65	97.0
Postposed	45	31.0	100	69.0	20	19.6	82	80.4
Other	7	4.7	142	95.3	2	1.3	148	98.7
None	19	8.0	219	92	4	2.2	182	97.8

Table A10. *Results of χ² Tests for All Linguistic Variables for Advanced Learners*

Variable	χ²	df	Small Cells?	Cramer's V
Adverbs	*11.388	3	No	* 0.14
Animacy	**8.16	1	No	**0.12
Aspect	***149.86	2	No	***0.52
Clause type	***43.29	1	No	*** 0.28
Person & number	.000	1	No	.001
Object form	***53.24	3	1	*** 0.31
Object type	***49.71	3	1	*** 0.30
Object number	***55.93	3	No	***.32
Object position	***54.79	3	1	***.31

Note. *= *p* < .05, ** = *p* < .01, *** = *p*<.001. N=562

Table A11. *Results of χ² Tests for All Linguistic Variables for Native speakers*

Variable	χ²	df	Small Cells?	Cramer's V
Adverbs	7.83	3	3	.13
Animacy	2.42	1	1	.069
Aspect	***87.94	2	No	***0.42
Clause type	***46.69	1	No	*** 0.30
Person & number	.005	1	No	0.003
Object form	***36.47	3	1	*** 0.30
Object type	***38.05	3	1	*** 0.28
Object number	***70.38	3	1	***.37
Object position	***48.53	3	1	***.31

Note. *= *p* < .05, ** = *p* < .01, *** = *p*<.001. N=505

References

Adamson, H. Douglas & Vera Regan. (1991). The acquisition of community speech norms by Asian immigrants learning English as a second language. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 13 (1). 1-22.

Andersen, Roger. (1984). The one to one principle of interlanguage construction. *Language Learning, 34,* 77–95.

Andersen, Roger. (1986). El desarrollo de la morfología verbal en el español como segundo idioma. In Jurgen Meisel (Ed.), *Adquisición de lenguaje/Aquisição da linguagem* (pp. 115-138). Frankfurt, Germany: Vervuert.

Andersen, Roger. (1991). Developmental sequences: The emergence of aspect marking in second language acquisition. In Charles Ferguson & Thomas Huebner (Eds.), *Second language acquisition and linguistic theories* (pp. 305-324). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Andersen, Roger. (2002). The dimensions of pastness. In R. Salaberry & Y. Shirai (eds.), *The L2 acquisition of tense-aspect morphology* (pp. 79-105). Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Andersen, Roger & Shirai, Yasuhiro (1994). Discourse motivations for some cognitive acquisition principles, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition 16* : 133-156.

Andersen, Roger. & Shirai, Yasuhiro (1995). The Acquisition of Tense-Aspect Morphology: A Prototype Account. *Language*, Vol. 71, No. 4, pp. 743-762.

Bardovi-Harlig, Kathleen & Reynolds, Dudley. (1995). The Role of Lexical Aspect in the Acquisition of Tense and Aspect. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*, 107-131.

Bardovi-Harlig, Kathleen. (1998). Narrative structure and lexical aspect: Conspiring factors in second language acquisition of tense aspect morphology. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 20*, 471-508.

Bardovi-Harlig, Kathleen. (2000). *Tense and aspect in second language acquisition: Form, meaning, and use*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Binnick, I. Robert (1991). *Time and the verb: A guide to tense and aspect*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Butt, John and Benjamin, Carmen. (2000). A *New Reference Grammar of Modern Spanish*. London: Arnold.

Bybee, Joan L. (1995). Spanish tense and aspect from a typological perspective. In P. Hashemipour, R. Maldonado and M. van Naerssen (eds.) *Studies in language learning and Spanish linguistics in honor of Tracy Terrell*. San Francisco: McGraw Hill. 442-457.

Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins & William Pagliuca. (1994). *The evolution of grammar: tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cadierno, Teresa. (2000). The acquisition of Spanish grammatical aspect by Danish advanced language learners. *Spanish Applied Linguistics, 4*, 1-53.

Clements, J. Clancy. (2006). Primary and secondary object marking in Spanish. In J.C. Clements & J. Yoon (Eds.), *Functional approaches to Spanish syntax: Lexical semantics, discourse and transitivity* (pp. 115-133). London: Palgrave.

Comrie, Bernard. (1976). *Aspect*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Comrie, Bernard. (1985). *Tense*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cortés-Torres, Mayra. (2005). ¿Qué estás haciendo?: La variación de la perífrasis estar + ndo en el español puertorriqueño. *Selected Proceedings of the 7th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*. 42-55.

Dowty, David. (1979). *Word meaning and Montague Grammar*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Reidel.

Fafulas, Stephen. (2009). Sobre la variación de las formas sintéticas y analíticas en el español; Paper presented at the 62nd Annual Kentucky Foreign Language Conference; University of Kentucky; Lexington, KY; April 17.

Fafulas, Stephen. (2010). The Acquisition of a Morphosyntactic Variable in Spanish: The Analytic and Synthetic Verb Forms of Present Progressive Aspect. *IULC Working Papers Online*: Indiana; Volume (9).

Fafulas, Stephen. (2012). Nuevas perspectivas sobre la variación de las formas *presente simple* y *presente progresivo* en español y en inglés. *Spanish in Context* 9(1), 58-87.

Fafulas, Stephen & Jason Killam. (2010). Sociolinguistic Predictors of Use of the Present Simple and Present Progressive Forms in the Spanish of Caracas, Venezuela. 7th Annual Graduate Student Conference on Luso-Brazilian and Hispanic Literature, Linguistics, and Culture. Indiana University. March 25.

Fafulas, Stephen & Manuel Díaz-Campos. (2010). Variación morfosintáctica y lenguas en contacto: Las formas analíticas y sintéticas del presente progresivo en el español monolingüe y bilingüe. *Boletín de Filología*. Tomo XLV, Número 2, pp. 71-89.

Geeslin, Kimberly. (2000). A new approach to the second language acquisition of copula choice in Spanish. In Ronald Leow & Cristina Sanz (Eds.), *Spanish applied linguistics at the turn of the millennium: Papers from the 1999 CLASP* (pp. 50-66). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Geeslin, Kimberly. (2003). A comparison of copula choice in advanced and NS Spanish. *Language Learning, 53*, 703-764.

Geeslin, Kimberly. (2006). Linguistic contextual features and variation in L2 data elicitation. In Carol Klee & Timothy Face (eds.), Selected proceedings from the 7th Conference on the acquisition of Spanish and Portuguese as a first and second language, pp. 74-85. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Geeslin, Kimberly. (2011). The acquisition of variation in second language Spanish: How to identify and catch amoving target. *The Handbook of Hispanic Sociolinguistics*, Manuel Díaz-Campos (ed.). Oxford: Blackwell

Geeslin, Kimberly & Aarnes Gudmestad. (2010). An exploration of the range and frequency of occurrence of forms in potentially-variable structures in second language Spanish. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 32(3), 433-463.

Giacalone-Ramat, Anna. (1995). Tense and aspect in learner Italian. In Pier Marco Bertinetto, Valentina Bianchi, Östen Dahl, & Mario Squartini (Eds.), Temporal reference, aspect, and actionality, Vol. 2. Typological perspectives. Torino: Rosenberg & Sellier.

Gudmestad, Aarnes. (2006). L2 Variation and the Spanish subjunctive: Linguistic features predicting mood selection. In Carol Klee & Timothy Face (Eds.), *Selected proceedings from the 7th CLASP (*pp. 170-184). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Hasbún, Leyla. (1995). The role of lexical aspect in the acquisition of the tense/aspect system in L2 Spanish. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Hopper, Paul & Elizabeth Traugott. (2003). *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jespersen, Otto. (1931). *A modern English grammar on historical principles.* Part IV: Syntax, Vol. 3. London: George Allen & Unwin.

King, Larry and Margarita Suñer. (1980). The meaning of the progressive in Spanish and Portuguese. *The Bilingual Review/La Revista Bilingüe* 7.222-238.

Klein, Flora. (1980). A quantitative study of syntactic and pragmatic indications of change in the Spanish of bilinguals in the U.S. In Labov, William. (Ed.), *Locating Language in Time and Space.* Academic Press, New York, pp. 69–82.

Koontz-Garboden, Andrew. (2004). Language contact and Spanish aspectual expression: a formal analysis. *Lingua*, 114, 1291–1330.

Lamanna, Scott. (2008). Usage of Imperfect and Imperfect Progressive Verb Forms in Spanish as a Majority and Minority Language: Is There an Effect for Language Contact? In *Selected Proceedings of the 10th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*, ed. Joyce Bruhn de Garavito & Elena Valenzuela, 251-264. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Liskin-Gasparro, Judith. (2000). The use of tense-aspect morphology in Spanish oral narratives: Exploring the perceptions of advanced learners. *Hispania*, 83, 830–844.

Lubbers-Quesada, Margaret. (2004). Present and imperfect for past description in Spanish narratives. In Michel Achard and Suzanne Kemmer (eds.), *Language, Culture and Mind*, Stanford: CSLI Publications, 329-344.

Márquez-Martínez, Miguel. (2009). La perífrasis estar + ndo en puertorriqueños bilingües con residencia en Estados Unidos. *Boletín de Filología de la Universidad de Chile*, Vol. 44*, No. 2*, pp. 119-134.

Montrul, Silvina. & Salaberry, Rafael. (2003). The development of tense/aspect morphology in Spanish as a second language. In Barbara Lafford & Rafael Salaberry (Eds.), *Spanish second language acquisition* (pp. 47-73). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Montrul, Silvina & Slabakova, Roumyana. (2003). Competence similarities between native and near-native

speakers: An investigation of the Preterite/Imperfect contrast in Spanish. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 25 (3), 351–398.

Mourelatos, Alexander. (1978). Events, processes, and states. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 2: 415–434.

Preston, Dennis. (1993). Variationist linguistics and second language acquisition. *Second Language Research* 9(2). 153-172.

Quesada, J. Diego. (1995). Estar + -ndo y el aspecto progresivo en español, *Iberoromania* 42, 8-29.

Rallides, Charles. (1966). Differences in Aspect Between the Gerundive Forms and the Non-Gerundive Forms of the Spanish Verb. *Hispania* 49.1: 107-14.

Ramsay, Violeta. (1990). Developmental stages in the acquisition of the perfective and the imperfective aspects by classroom L2 learners of Spanish. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, Eugene.

Salaberry, Rafael. (1999). The development of past tense verbal morphology in classroom L2 Spanish. *Applied Linguistics*, 20, 151-178.

Sankoff, David, Sali Tagliamonte & Eric Smith. (2005). *GoldVarb X: a variable rule application for Macintosh and Windows*. Department of Mathematics, University of Ottawa, and Department of Linguistics, University of Toronto.

Schwenter, Scott & Rena Torres Cacoullos. (2008). Defaults and interdeterminacy in temporal grammaticalization: The 'perfect' road to perfective. *Language Variation and Change 20*. 1-39.

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

Squartini, Mario. (1998). *Verbal periphrases in Romance: Aspect, actionality, and grammaticalization.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Torres Cacoullos, Rena. (2000). *Grammaticization, Synchronic Variation, and Language Contact: A study of Spanish progressive -ndo constructions*. Amsterdan/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Torres Cacoullos, Rena. (2001). From lexical to grammatical to social meaning. *Language in society* 30, 443-78.

Torres Cacoullos, Rena. (2008). La evolución de *estar* + V-*ndo* hacia expresión obligatoria del aspecto progresivo en español. In Concepción Company Company y José G. Moreno de Alba (eds.), *Actas VII Congreso Internacional de Historia de la Lengua Española*, Arco Libros.

Torres Cacoullos, Rena. (2009). Variation and grammaticisation: the emergence of an aspectual opposition. In Stavroula Tsiplakou, Marilena Karyolemou & Pavlos Pavlou (eds.), *Studies in Language Variation: European Perspectives II*, 215-224. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Vendler, Zeno. (1967). *Linguistics in Philosophy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Westfall, Ruth, (1995). Simple and Progressive Forms of the Spanish Past Tense System: A Semantic and Pragmatic Study in Viewpoint Contrast. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Texas, Austin, Austin, TX.

Selected Proceedings of the 14th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium

edited by Kimberly Geeslin and Manuel Díaz-Campos

Cascadilla Proceedings Project   Somerville, MA   2012

Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at www.lingref.com. Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Geeslin, Kimberly L. and Stephen Fafulas. 2012. Variation of the Simple Present and Present Progressive Forms: A Comparison of Native and Non-native Speakers. In *Selected Proceedings of the 14th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*, ed. Kimberly Geeslin and Manuel Díaz-Campos, 179-196. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #2664.