Online Supplementary Materials for *The Aspect Hypothesis and the Acquisition of L2 Past Morphology in the Last 20 Years*

(Bardovi-Harlig & Comajoan, 2020)

Table 1. Studies Addressing the Aspect Hypothesis from 1999 to 2019 Included in the Review

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Study | L1 | L2 | Learner proficiency | Task | Target | Focal AH hypothesis (1, 2, 3, 4) | Consistent with the AH[[1]](#footnote-1) | Additional considerations |
| Ayoun & Salaberry (2008) | French | English | Senior year in high school in France | Written personal narrative and cloze passage | Past tense forms | 1 | + | Task differences (states in the narrative task were marked with past more frequently than telic verbs) |
| Bardovi-Harlig (2012) | Mixed | English | Beginner to low-advanced(longitudinal, 16 learners) | Daily journals, compositions, oral and writtennarratives, and oral interviews | Progressive | 3 | +/– | Progressive did not ultimately expand to achievements but rather to other meanings within the activity category. |
| Camps (2005) | English | Spanish | First-year university students  | Written personal narrative | Preterite and imperfect | 1, **2** | + | The state category was not homogeneous. |
| Chan, Finberg, Costello & Shirai (2012) | Italian, Punjabi | English | 0.5 to 2 years of residence in the UK (longitudinal, naturalistic learning) (4 learners) | Oral interviews and retellings (European Science Foundation study) | Past and past progressive | 1, 3 | + | Past (*-ed*) occured with achievements; progressive (*-ing*) occured with activities (across category analysis); also use of progressive in all dynamic categories |
| Collins (2002) | French | English | Low to high | Study 1: Cloze (replication); Study 2: Cloze + preference task (written) | Simple past | **1, 3** | + | L1 influence |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Study | L1 | L2 | Learner proficiency | Task | Target | Focus | +/- AH | Additional considerations |
| Collins (2004) | French, Japanese | English | Upper begging and intermediate, divided into 6 groups | Written cloze; partial replication of Collins (2002) | Past, progressive, perfect, base | 1 | + | L1 influence |
| Comajoan (2005) | English | Catalan | Beginner | Oral retellings and conversations | Perfective and imperfective  | 1, **2** | + | Task differences |
| Comajoan (2006) | English | Catalan | Beginner | Oral narratives (from videos and storybooks) | Perfective and imperfective  | 1, 2 | + | Task differences, individual differences |
| Comajoan & Pérez Saldanya (2005) | English | Catalan | Beginner | Oral Retellings | Perfective and imperfective  | 1, 2 | + | Narrative discourse grounding |
| Deshors (2018) | French (A), Published work (B) | English | upper intermediate-advanced | Written corpus data comprised of argumentative essays and critiques of literary texts  | Present perfect and simple past | 1, 3 | +/– | Achievements were inflected with present perfect, but accomplishments were not; influence of French *passé compose* was weak on learner English; task effects. |
| Diaubalick & Guijarro Fuentes (2017) | German (A), Romance (French, Portuguese, Italian) (B) | Spanish | B1, B2, C1 (CEFR) (low-intermediate; high-intermediate; advanced) | Grammaticality judgments and written production task (contextualized narrative with adverbials)  | Interpretation of perfective and imperfective | 1, 2, 3 | – | Individual differences (even with native speaker controls), role of adverbials, L1 differences |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Study | L1 | L2 | Learner proficiency | Task | Target | Focus | +/- AH | Additional considerations |
| Domínguez et al. (2013) | English | Spanish | Beginner, intermediate, and advanced | Oral (a) personal narrative,(b) guided impersonal narrative,(c) impersonal narrative,(d) written sentence interpretation task | Perfective and imperfective | 1, 2 | – | Emergence was determined by the state vs. event distinction. |
| Fessi (2016) | Arabic | Spanish | B1, C1 (CEFR) | Written “Little Red Riding Hood” narrative from picture prompts | Perfective and imperfective | 1, 2 | –  | L2 transfer, discourse grounding. Imperfect was used in high proportion in achievements. |
| Fuchs & Werner (2018) | [+ progressive]Chinese, Japanese, Spanish (A); [−progressive] (Hebrew, German, Polish) (B) | English | Not specified;8-19 years old (corpus data)  | Short essay, written (from corpus) | Progressive with statives | 3, **4** | + | L1 influence |
| Giacalone Ramat (2002) | German, English | Italian | Beginning- intermediate | German L1: guided conversational interview with personal narratives and film retells; English L1: 2 film retells | Imperfect | 2 | + | L1 influence |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Study | L1 | L2 | Learner proficiency | Task | Target | Focus | +/- AH | Additional considerations |
| González & Quintana (2018) | English, Dutch | Spanish | A2 | Written video retell, 20 minutes, in class | Preterite, Imperfect, and Present Perfect | 1, 2 | – | L1 influence |
| Howard (2004) | English | French | Advanced | Oral interview | Perfective and imperfective | 1, 2 | + | Grounding in narratives (foreground and background) |
| Izquierdo (2009) | Spanish | French | Beginner-intermediate, 120 hours of French instruction | Written cloze passage (short narratives) | Perfective and imperfective | 1, 2 | + | L1 influence  |
| Izquierdo & Collins (2008) | English, Spanish | French | Low-intermediate | Written cloze passage (short narratives) and retrospective interview | Perfective and imperfective | 1, 2 | + | L1 and instruction influence |
| Izquierdo & Kihlstedt (2019) | Spanish | French | Beginner (A2) and intermediate-advanced (B1), and advanced (B1) | Written narrative retellings | Imperfective | 2 | + | Imperfect was mostly associated with states (and to a lesser extent with activities); task differences; differences according to functions of imperfective |
| Kim (2012) | English | Korean | Learner proficiency | Task | Past (*-ess*) and progressive (*-ko iss-* in both progressive and resultative) | **1, 3** | + | Longitudinal case study of two learners; progressive *-ko iss-* appears before resultative; Korean resultative is more restricted than Japanese ­-*te iru*. |
| Labeau (2005) | English | French | Beginner, intermediate, and advanced university students | Written and oral narratives and written cloze test | Perfective and imperfective | **1, 2,** 3, and 4 | +/– | Perfective forms were used in all aspectual categories; a number of other variables were considered. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Study | L1 | L2 | Learner proficiency | Task | Target | Focus | +/- AH | Additional considerations |
| Lee & Kim (2007) | Mixed (mostly, heritage learners) | Korean | Beginner and intermediate | Written sentence-picture interpretation task, written cloze task with pictures  | Progressive and resultative markers | 3 | + | Learner differences; input frequency; L1 influence |
| McManus (2013) | English, German | French | Year-1 and Year-4 university students | Picture-based oral narrative (Domínguez et al., 2013) | Perfective and imperfective | 1, 2 | – | Prototypical combinations were more common at higher than lower levels; task differences |
| Muñoz & Gilabert (2011) | Catalan-Spanish | English | Beginner to high-intermediate | Oral interview, picture-elicited oral narrative | Progressive | 3 | – | Learners used more progressive forms with accomplishments than with activities at the lower levels; task differences |
| Rastelli & Vernice (2013) | English | Italian | 2nd- and 3rd-semester university students studying abroad | Written descriptions | Perfective and imperfective | 1 | + | L2 learners marked telicity compositionally rather than morphologically. |
| Ryu, Horie, & Shirai (2015) | Japanese | Korean | Beginner, intermediate, and advanced | Written sentence interpretation task with pictures, and written production task | Imperfective aspect markers | 3 | +/– | L1 influence; task influence; multiple factors to account for tense-aspect (input frequency, instruction) |
| Salaberry (2000; 2008) | English | Spanish | Beginner, intermediate, intermediate-high, and advanced | Written narrative, cloze, editing task, and joint writing task | Perfective and imperfective | 1, 2 | – | Learners used perfective morphology in all lexical categories in the early stages (perfective as default marker); task differences |
| Salaberry (2002) | English | Spanish | 3rd and 6th semester university students | Written cloze passages from literature; one original passage testing non-prototypical associations  | Perfective and imperfective | 1, 2 | +/– | Both 3rd & 6th semester learners showed influence of lexical aspect, but 6th semester showed greater influence; transfer from English, instruction  |
| Study | L1 | L2 | Learner proficiency | Task | Target | Focus | +/- AH | Additional considerations |
| Salaberry (2005) | English-Spanish bilinguals? | Portuguese | 1st-semester university accelerated course and 3rd-semester | Written forced-choice verb-selection task  | Perfective and imperfective | 1, 2 | + | Imperfective spread to other categories earlier than perfective; L1 influence |
| Salaberry (2011) | English | Spanish | 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th semester university | Discourse-based forced-choice task | Perfective and imperfective | 1, 2 | + | Discourse grounding as a major intervening variable; prototypical combinations were more common in later than in beginning stages of acquisition. |
| Sugaya & Shirai (2007) | + Prog (English), −Progressive (German, Russian, Ukrainian, Bulgarian) | Japanese | High and Low groups, based on production, like Bardovi-Harlig (1998) | Oral picture description; written acceptability judgment task (untimed) | Progressive and resultative meanings of the imperfective *-teiru* | 3 | + | L1 transfer; task differences |
| Tong & Shirai (2016) | Learners of Chinese in U.S. universities (unspecified L1) | Chinese | 2nd- and 3rd-year university students | Written judgment tests | Progressive and imperfective markers | 1, 2, **3** | +/– | Proficiency differences; default marker for progressive |
| Vraciu (2013) | French | English | Advanced (C1 and C2) | Oral narrative (open book) | Past forms | 3 | – | Learners used progressive with activities and accomplishments; learner differences |
| Zhao & Shirai (2018) | Arabic | English | Low, intermediate-advanced  | Written cloze test and oral personal narrative (Ayoun & Salaberry, 2008) | Simple past | 1 | + | Task differences; states were marked for past. |

*Note.* Boldface in the hypothesis column reflects the focal hypothesis/es tested.

Table 2. Studies addressing language transfer within the Aspect Hypothesis

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Study | L1 (A) | L1 (B) or comparison | L2 | Proficiency | Task | Target | Results regarding transfer |
| Ayoun & Salaberry (2008) | French |  | English | Senior year in high school in France | Written personal narrative and cloze passage | Perfective and imperfective (past) | Very little L1 influence |
| Chan, Finberg, Costello, & Shirai (2012) | Italian | Punjabi | English | 0.5 to 2 years of residence in the UK (naturalistic learning) | Oral interviews and retellings (ESF study) | Simple past and past progressive | Supports AH (hypotheses 1 & 3); insufficient data to test transfer |
| Collins (2002) | French | Bardovi-Harlig & Reynolds (1995) | English | Low to high | Study 1: Cloze; Study 2: Cloze + preference task (written) | Simple past | L1 influence does not override AH; perfect is an alternative to simple past. |
| Collins (2004) | French | Japanese | English | Upper beginning and intermediate divided into 6 groups | Written cloze; partial replication of Collins (2002) | Past, progressive, perfect, and base | AH predictions prevail over transfer. |
| Deshors (2018) | French | Published work | English | upper intermediate-advanced | Argumentative essays and literary texts from corpora (written) | Present perfect and simple past | Influence of French *passé composé* was weak; targetlike use; task effects |
| Diaubalick & Guijarro-Fuentes (2017) | German | Romance (French, Portuguese, Italian) | Spanish | B1, B2, C1 (CEFR) (low-intermediate; high-intermediate; advanced) | Grammaticality judgments and written production task (contextualized narrative with adverbials) | Interpretation of perfective and imperfective | No direct transfer of present perfect, but results did not align with AH; individual differences  |
| Fessi (2016) | Arabic | L2 French | L3 Spanish | B1, C1 (CEFR) | Written modified “Little Red Riding Hood” narrative from picture prompts | Perfective and imperfective | Correct answers came from French; no negative transfer from English |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Study | L1 (A) | L1 (B) or comparison | L2 | Proficiency | Task | Target | Results regarding transfer |
| Fuchs & Werner (2018)  | +progressiveChinese, Japanese, Spanish | [−progressive] (Hebrew, German, Polish) | English | Not specified;8-19 years old (corpus data)  | Short essay, written (from corpus) | Progressive with statives | Use of progressive with states < 1%; speakers of nonprogressive languages were significantly more likely to produce TL progressives than speakers of [+progressive] languages |
| Giacalone Ramat (2002) | German  | English | Italian | Beginning-intermediate | German L1: guided conversational interview with personal narratives and film retells; English L1: 2 film retells | Imperfect | Results confirmed both the universality of the AH and L1. Longitudinal data from German learners showed greatest use of imperfect with statives, then activities; the 4 English L1 learners showed greatest use of imperfect with statives. |
| González & Quintana (2018) | English | Dutch | Spanish | A2 (CEFR) | Written video retell, 20 minutes, in class | Preterite, imperfect, and present perfect | Only Dutch L1 used present perfect in perfective contexts; English L1 used preterite for imperfect contexts; Dutch learners used imperfect more often. L1 transfer and inherent aspect at work. |
| Izquierdo (2009) | Spanish |  | French | Beginner-intermediate, 120 hours of French instruction | Written cloze passage (short narratives) | Perfective and imperfective  | Lexical semantics matters; transfer from L1 but mostly for prototypical combinations |
| Izquierdo & Collins (2008) | English | Spanish | French | Low-intermediate | Written cloze passage (short narratives) and retrospective interview | Perfective and imperfective | Aspect (punctuality and non-dynamic duration) more important than L1 similarities/differences |
| McManus (2013) | English | German | French | Year-1 and Year-4 university students | Picture-based oral narrative; written sentence interpretation task | Perfective and imperfective | Predicted to *not* be significantly different by the AH; prediction upheld |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Study | L1 (A) | L1 (B) or comparison | L2 | Proficiency | Task | Target | Results regarding transfer |
| Salaberry (2005) | English | L2 Spanish | L3 Portuguese | 1st-semester university accelerated course and 3rd-semester | Written forced-choice verb-selection task | Perfective and imperfective | L2 can transfer perfective-imperfective contrast successfully to L3. |
| Sugaya & Shirai (2007) | [+Progressive](English) | [−Progressive] (German, Russian, Ukrainian, Bulgarian) | Japanese | High and Low groups, based on production, like Bardovi-Harlig (1998) | Oral picture description/ acceptability judgment task (untimed) | Progressive and resultative meanings of the imperfective *-teiru* | L1 effect on progressive; progressive low proficiency group used more progressive than nonprogressive group; AH supported; lexical class influenced alternatives |

Table 3. Studies of the Aspect Hypothesis with Comparisons of Production Tasks

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Study | Tasks | Goal: Study task effects, collect additional data | Findings relevant to the AH |
| Ayoun & Salaberry (2008) | (a) Personal narratives(b) Cloze passage  | Task effects | Both tasks supported the AH. |
| Bardovi-Harlig (2012) | Conversational interviews, personal narratives, impersonal narratives (film retells), journal entries, compositions (longitudinal) | Additional data | Progressive starts in activities expanding to other meanings in activities; no non-prototypical extensions to achievements |
| Camps (2005) | (a) Personal narratives(b) Impersonal narrative (Salaberry, 1999, 2000) | Task effects | More imperfect in personal narratives; facilitates testing the spread of imperfect |
| Chan et al. (2012) | Oral interviews and retellings (European Science Foundation longitudinal study) | Additional data | Core predictions of the AH supported: past (*-ed*) occured with achievements; progressive (*-ing*) occured with activities. |
| Comajoan (2005) | (a) Impersonal narratives; (b) conversations | Additional data | More imperfective in conversations; facilitates testing the spread of imperfect |
| Comajoan (2006) | Different impersonal narratives | Additional data | Narratives differ according to stimuli. |
| Domínguez et al. (2013) | (a) Personal narrative(b) Guided impersonal narrative(c) Impersonal narrative | Additional data | (a) and (c) pattern similarly, showing AH distribution; (b) tests and shows imperfect with telic, lower use of perfective with atelics |
| Labeau (2005) | (a) Impersonal narrative(b) Cloze passage | Task effects | Different analyses presented |
| Muñoz & Gilabert (2011) | 1. Interview
2. Open-book picture retell
 | Task effects | Task had an effect: more accomplishments in narrative; more activities in interview |
| Salaberry (2002) | (a) Written cloze passages (literature); (b) Original passage testing non-prototypical associations  | Additional data | Results not reported separately |
| Zhao & Shirai (2018) | (a) Personal narratives(b) Cloze passage (from Ayoun & Salaberry, 2008) | Task effects | Personal narrative supported the AH, cloze did not |

1. Consistency with the AH was determined from the overall discussion of the results provided within each study. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)