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This dissertation investigates how social networks influence understandings, judgments, and uses of L2 pragmatics. The pragmatic target is the particle hasta ‘until’ as it is used orally and in writing to mark inception with and without negation in Spanish. This study examines how L2 students of Spanish understand, judge, and use hasta when they are members of social networks in university Spanish classes based on (a) pedagogy practice, (b) class level, and (c) mode of expression, and when, outside of university Spanish classes, they are integrated into social networks that involve exposure to different dialectal varieties of Spanish.
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This study contributes to (1) Spanish pragmatics, by showing that (a) pragmatic
change can be built on semantic and syntactic interaction, (b) NPI formation in Spanish can be affected by the scope of negation, and (c) aspectual markers in Spanish can derive from contextually-influenced verbal situations and may be dialect-specific; (2) Spanish sociolinguistics, by demonstrating that (a) there is value in using network analysis to study language variation and change in Spanish, (b) approaching Spanish L2 classrooms as social networks is worthwhile, and (c) social network analysis may provide a viable alternative or complement to SLA approaches in the study of L2 pragmatics in Spanish; and (3) Spanish L2 pedagogy, by highlighting (a) the didactic importance of influencing student ideologies toward L2 pragmatics, (b) that students might benefit from being introduced to L2 pragmatics at the beginning stages of their Spanish language study, and (c) the need for teachers of L2 Spanish to revise currently held expectations for appropriate student understandings, judgments, and uses of L2 pragmatic forms.
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CHAPTER I

RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND REVIEW OF LITERATURE

1.0 Introduction

Social network analysis has proven to be a valuable tool in linguistic research on different language-related matters. A number of authors, for instance, have examined the role of social network ties in relation to language use (cf. Raschke, Wei & Lee, 2002; Wiklund, 2002) and communicative competence (cf. Smith, 2002). Others have investigated the role that social networks may play in different language processes related to language change, such as language maintenance, loss, and shift (cf. Edwards, 1994; Fishman, 1991; Hulsen, De Bot & Weltens, 2002; Kloss, 1966; Milroy, 2001; Stoessel, 2002; Zentella, 1997). As De Bot and Stoessel state in their introduction to Language change and social networks (2002, p. 2), “social-network analysis aims at getting nearer to the individuals’ behavior in order to understand language use.”

Social networks of students studying a given second language can be very informative when it comes to observing language use in a certain social context. Ingrid Wiklund (2002), for instance, studied social networks of immigrant students at two upper-secondary schools in Sweden in order to examine the relationship between social networks and the language proficiencies of their members. Even though the results of the study led the author to believe that L2 proficiency tends to be greatly affected by social networks, she expressed the need for more extensive studies to confirm such influence.
Kees de Bot and Saskia Stoessel (2002) agreed with Wiklund on this point, emphasizing the need for future studies to explore the effects that social networks may have within different language processes (p. 5).

The present study contributes to research on the effects that social networks can have on language variation and change. In particular, this dissertation investigates how social networks influence the understandings, judgments, and uses of contextual meanings in Spanish as a second language, in other words, L2 pragmatics. The pragmatic target is the particle hasta (‘until’) as it is used orally and in writing to mark inception, when accompanied by negation, as in general Spanish, and when negation is absent, as in the Spanish dialects of Mexico, Central America, and Ecuador (henceforth MCAE Spanish dialects) where hasta can mark inception in an affirmative sentence, as in example (1):

(1) El concierto se celebra hasta las diez. (The concert takes place at ten.)

In example (1), hasta is used to indicate that the concert will not start any earlier than 10 o’clock. This construction, typical in MCAE Spanish dialects, resembles the usage of hasta in general or, in other words, non-MCAE Spanish¹ within a negative sentence as illustrated in example (2):

(2) El concierto no se celebra hasta las diez. (The concert does not take place until ten.)

¹ Throughout this dissertation, the terms “general Spanish” and “non-MCAE Spanish” are used interchangeably.
To the best of our knowledge, no study to date has examined the effects of social networks on the understanding, judgment, and use of hasta. Our dissertation investigates how hasta is understood, judged, and used by students of Spanish as a second language when (1) they are members of social networks in university Spanish classes where MCAE hasta is modeled but not explained, vs. where non-MCAE hasta is modeled and both MCAE and non-MCAE usage is explained, vs. a control group; (2) they are members of social networks in university Spanish classes where students study beginner’s level Spanish vs. where they study intermediate level Spanish; (3) they are members of social networks in university Spanish classes where there is an emphasis on oral expression, written expression, or both; and (4) outside of university Spanish classes, they are integrated into social networks that involve exposure to MCAE vs. non-MCAE Spanish. In addition, we examine how participants’ understandings, judgments, and uses of hasta are affected by their ages, genders, and by the length of time during which they have been studying Spanish. Throughout this investigation, we try to answer the following seven general research questions:

(1) Will pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of hasta be affected by explicit instruction about hasta or by exposure to its modeling? If so, how?

(2) Will pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of hasta be affected by students’ class level? If so, how?

(3) Will pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of hasta be affected by the difference in the nature of social ties that may exist among members of classroom networks with emphases on different modes of expression in classroom practices? If so, how?
(4) Will pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of \textit{hasta} be affected by the nature of network pressures that students face, outside of university Spanish classes, as members of social networks that may involve exposure to MCAE vs. non-MCAE Spanish dialects? If so, how?

(5) Will pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of \textit{hasta} be affected by research participants’ ages? If so, how?

(6) Will pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of \textit{hasta} be affected by research participants’ genders? If so, how?

(7) Will pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of \textit{hasta} be affected by the length of time during which research participants have been studying Spanish? If so, how?

This study consists of five chapters. The current chapter, besides presenting the object of the dissertation, reviews the literature dealing with \textit{hasta} and the literature dealing with social network theory. Section 1.1 presents a background on \textit{hasta}, including subsections about definitions, uses, and the structural distribution of \textit{hasta} in general, as well as subsections about historical development and dialectal descriptions of affirmative inceptive\(^2\) \textit{hasta}. Section 1.2 focuses on social networks with subsections that review the literature dealing with the concept of social networks in general, the use of social network analysis in class settings, as well as its use outside the classroom context.

\(^2\) Throughout this dissertation, both “MCAE \textit{hasta}” and “affirmative inceptive \textit{hasta}” are used to refer to \textit{hasta} marking inception in an affirmative sentence in the Spanish dialects of Mexico, Central America, and Ecuador. The latter term is used in those sections of the dissertation where \textit{hasta’s} syntactic and pragmatic functions are at issue.
The rest of this dissertation is organized as follows. Chapter 2 presents a pragmatic analysis of affirmative inceptive *hasta*, including sections on cooperative discourse, lexical aspect, and negation in Spanish. Chapter 3 details the methodology that was used in this study. This chapter includes descriptions of the practices used in sociolinguistic interviews with members of pre-existing social groups designed to gather comparable data on how students understood, judged, and produced the target variable *hasta* in different situations. Chapter 3 also describes how the concept of social networks was adapted to fit the context of the current study. Chapter 4 presents quantitative data gathered from linguistic tasks and questionnaires administered during the interviews. This chapter also describes the statistical analysis, which correlates measures of participants’ understandings, judgments, and uses of the linguistic variable *hasta* with seven extralinguistic variables chosen in accordance with the research questions described above: pedagogy practice, class level, language modality, Spanish dialectal exposure, age, gender, and length of time during which study participants had been studying Spanish. The correlations found lead to the conclusions presented in chapter 5. These conclusions provide further insights into the sociolinguistic factors that influence students’ understandings, judgments, and uses of contextual meaning in Spanish.

### 1.1 Background on *hasta*

Before analyzing how *hasta*, the pragmatic target of this study, is understood, judged, and used by students of Spanish as a second language, it is important to first review the various usages of *hasta* in the Spanish language. Section 1.1.1 presents the different possible definitions and meanings of *hasta* in Spanish. Section 1.1.2 reviews the structural and functional distribution of *hasta* in Spanish. Section 1.1.3 examines the
historical development of the affirmative inceptive use of this lexeme\(^3\) in the MCAE Spanish dialects. Section 1.1.4 reviews a series of studies that describe affirmative inceptive \textit{hasta} dialectally and socially.

### 1.1.1 Definitions and exposition of basic contextual meanings of \textit{hasta}

According to the dictionary of the \textit{Real Academia Española} (2001), the lexeme \textit{hasta} can convey three meanings. It first can be used as a preposition identifying a limit referring to time, actions, quantities, or spaces as in example (3):

\begin{enumerate}
    \item \textit{Hablaron hasta las diez.} \hfill (3)
\end{enumerate}

\begin{description}
    \item [\textit{Hablaron hasta las diez.}] speak-pret.3\textsuperscript{rd}.pl. until the ten ('They spoke until ten.')
\end{description}

In example (3) \textit{hasta} functions to set a time limit beyond which the action of speaking did not continue. The object of the preposition \textit{hasta} in this example is a simple noun phrase; however, as discussed further in 1.1.2 below, \textit{hasta} can set limits in noun clauses too, as in example (4):

\begin{enumerate}
    \item \textit{Estudiaron hasta que se durmieron.} \hfill (4)
\end{enumerate}

\begin{description}
    \item [\textit{Estudiaron hasta que se durmieron.}] study-pres.3\textsuperscript{rd}.pl. until that CL(3\textsuperscript{rd}.sg) sleep-pret.3\textsuperscript{rd}.pl. ('They studied until they fell asleep.')
\end{description}

Used as part of an adverbial clause, combined often with the adverb \textit{cuando} ('when') or with a gerund, the second meaning of \textit{hasta} is similar to \textit{inclusive} ('even'), as illustrated in example (5).

\begin{enumerate}
    \item \textit{Se rie hasta cuando duerme.} \hfill (5)
\end{enumerate}

\begin{description}
    \item [\textit{Se rie hasta cuando duerme.}] CL (3\textsuperscript{rd}.sg.) laugh-pret.3\textsuperscript{rd}.sg. even when sleep-pret.3\textsuperscript{rd}.sg. ('He laughs even when he is sleeping.')
\end{description}

\(^3\)Throughout this dissertation, \textit{hasta} is referred to as a lexeme when its syntactic and pragmatic functions are not at issue.
In example (5) *hasta*, combined with the adverb *cuando*, does not set any limits, but rather acts as an intensifier to indicate that it is unexpected for someone to be laughing while sleeping.

The third meaning is characteristic nowadays mainly of MCAE Spanish dialects. In these areas, *hasta*, used as an adverb or as a preposition, can indicate the inception of affirmative verbal situations, as illustrated in examples (6) and (7):

(6) *Hasta que termine el semestre venderemos estos libros.*
until that end-pres.subj.3\textsuperscript{rd}.sg. the semester sell-fut.1\textsuperscript{st}.pl. these books
(‘When the semester ends we will sell these books.’)

(7) *La tienda abre hasta las nueve.*
the store open-pres.3\textsuperscript{rd}.sg. until the nine
(‘The store opens at nine.’)

In example (6) *hasta* heads an adverb phrase whose object is a noun clause; the phrase suggests that the selling begins, rather than ends, at the end of the semester. In example (7), *hasta* heads a prepositional phrase whose object is a simple noun phrase. In this example, *hasta* functions to set nine o’clock as the starting time for the store to open. These meanings of *hasta* exist in general Spanish as well but do not frequently occur in affirmative verbal situations like (6) and (7).

### 1.1.2 Structural and functional distribution of *hasta*

It is obvious from the simple exposition of different contextual meanings of *hasta* given in 1.1.1 that this lexeme can appear in various different syntactic contexts, and that distinct meanings can arise in different contexts, as evidenced in examples (3) – (7). In the present section, some additional examples are considered in order to look further in depth at the different functions related to the different structures in which *hasta* is used. We examine some of the common structures in which *hasta* appears in general Spanish
today and then attempt to establish a possible origin of affirmative inceptive *hasta* in section 1.1.3. In the examples of general Spanish that follow, *hasta* appears in both independent and subordinate clauses, with and without negation. In example (8), for instance, *hasta* makes a temporal reference in a main clause with a negated verb, setting a limit on the action of ‘not going out’ and hence implicating that four o’clock is the time when the action of going out began.

(8) *No salimos hasta las cuatro.*

not go out-pret.1st.pl. until the four

(‘We did not go out until four o’clock.’)

The object of the preposition *hasta* in example (8) is a noun phrase just like in example (9) below. In example (9), however, *hasta* is used with an affirmative verb and the temporal reference that this preposition makes marks the end of the stay in Rome.

(9) *Estaremos en Roma hasta el domingo.*

be-fut.1st.pl. in Rome until the Sunday

(‘We will be in Rome until Sunday.’)

*hasta* can refer to a time limit when it heads a subordinate clause as well, with or without negation in the main clause, as shown below in examples (10) and (11).

(10) *No trabajaron hasta que atardeció.*

not work-pret.3rd.pl. until that get dark-pret.3rd.sg.

(‘They did not work until it got dark.’)

(11) *Estudiaron hasta que llamó Mariela.*

study-pret.3rd.pl. until that call-pret.3rd.sg. Mariela

(‘They studied until Mariela called.’)

In example (10), *hasta*, whose object is a noun clause, is accompanied by an affirmative verb in the dependent clause. The fact that the verb in the main clause is negated implicates that the action of working began at dusk because *hasta* puts a time limit on ‘not working’. In example (11), however, *hasta*, whose object remains a subordinate
noun clause just like in example (10), is accompanied by an affirmative verb in both the main and the dependent clauses, suggesting that the action of studying stopped when Mariela called.

In summary, both a noun phrase and a subordinate noun clause can be objects of hasta. When the main verb is affirmative, as in examples (9) and (11), hasta marks the time limit of the action in question. When the main verb is negated, however, as in examples (8) and (10), hasta can emphasize the inception of the action.\(^4\)

As mentioned above, in MCAE Spanish dialects, the lexeme hasta can refer to the inception of an action in affirmative verbal situations as well as negative ones. Therefore, in these geographical areas, hasta as used in examples (9) and (11) can refer to the beginning, rather than the end, of the action in question. That is, in such areas example (9) can implicate that Sunday is the beginning of the stay in Rome, and example (11) can implicate that studying started when Mariela called. We examine the development of this usage further in section 1.1.3. The rest of the current section lays the groundwork for such a development in the structures and functions of hasta in general Spanish.

When hasta heads a subordinate noun clause in a given sentence (i.e., hasta makes a clausal reference) and is accompanied by a negated verb in the main clause, two possibilities can be observed in general Spanish regarding the verb that follows hasta in

\(^4\) As is discussed later in the dissertation, this inceptive discourse function of hasta may be the result of a multistep pragmatic process. When the main verb is negated, as in examples (8) and (10), hasta sets a limit on the time during which the action in question does not happen. That is, in example (8) hasta marks the end of ‘not going out’ and in example (10) it marks the end of ‘not working’. In both cases, the resulting conversational implicature that arises is actually inceptive. We argue below that generalization of this conversational implicature with a certain class of verbs, over time, may have led to the pragmatic reinterpretation of hasta as an aspectual marker in certain dialects of Spanish.
the subordinate clause: the verb, besides being affirmative like in example (10), at other
times appears negated, as illustrated below in example (12).

\[(12) \text{No trabajaron hasta que no atardeció.} \]
\[
\text{not work-pret.3rd.pl. until that not get dark-pret.3rd.sg.}
\]
\[
\text{('They did not work until it got dark. / They did not work so long as it had not gotten dark.' )}
\]

In both examples (10) and (12), \textit{hasta} implicates the inception of the action of working.
In example (12), however, an additional negative adverb \textit{no} appears in the subordinate
clause without semantically affecting the meaning of the sentence. Pragmatically,
however, the second adverb \textit{no} may serve to clarify the meaning of the sentence by
reinforcing the implicature that work only started once it got dark. In order to see how
the appearance of this second \textit{no} is related to the discourse functions of \textit{hasta}, and more
importantly, in order to see how the second \textit{no} specifically relates to the usage of \textit{hasta} in
affirmative inceptive verbal situations, an in-depth pragmatic analysis of affirmative
inceptive \textit{hasta} is given in chapter 2. For the remainder of Section 1.1, the discussion
focuses on some additional possible explanations regarding the formation and linguistic
description of affirmative inceptive \textit{hasta}.

It is important to note that speakers often treat utterances like those in example
(10) and example (12) as interchangeable. In other words, when the main clause is
negated, in subordinate clauses headed by \textit{hasta} there is fluctuation between the use of
negation and the lack thereof. We believe such fluctuation may be symptomatic of the
ambiguous scope of negation originating in the matrix clause. Furthermore, we believe
that the presence of a second \textit{no} in such subordinate clauses may have in turn contributed
to changes in the lexical aspect of the matrix verb itself in some cases, allowing for
inceptive readings of \textit{hasta} in particular verbal situations. In the next section, we present
our theory that the development of hasta into a preposition that can implicate inception in affirmative verbal situations may have been driven precisely by the interaction between the lexical aspect of the matrix verb and the scope of negation of the adverb no in the main clause. This newly found discourse function of hasta in subordinate clauses with temporal reference may have later been generalized to structures in which hasta formed part of a main clause as shown in example (9). This possible origin of affirmative inceptive hasta is explained in more detail in the next section, which looks into the historical development of affirmative inceptive hasta. Specifics regarding lexical aspect and the scope of negation, as well as the eventual reinterpretation of hasta as an aspectual marker, are given further in chapter 2.

1.1.3 Historical development of affirmative inceptive hasta

In the present section, we will consider various possible explanations for the development of affirmative inceptive hasta in the MCAE Spanish dialects. Section 1.1.3.1 focuses on explanations given in previous research. Section 1.1.3.2 briefly examines negation in subordinate clauses in an attempt to lay a foundation for a possible link between such clauses and the inceptive discourse function of hasta. We believe that the development of hasta into a preposition that can now mark inception in affirmative verbal situations in the MCAE Spanish dialects may be partially linked to the changes that negation structures have undergone during the evolution of the Spanish language.

1.1.3.1 Explanations of affirmative inceptive hasta in previous research

As early as (1938), Cuervo offered a possible explanation regarding the formation of what we have called affirmative inceptive hasta. When examining characteristics of
the Spanish spoken in Central America, Cuervo considered (1938, p. 262) affirmative inceptive *hasta* to be the consequence of a fusion process. This process alters a word or construction by fusing elements of different origins resulting in the formation of expressions that deviate from previous norms. Therefore, he believed that a construction like that in example (13) below could have originated from the fusion of constructions like (14) and (15):

(13) *Hasta las dos abrieron.*
    until the two open-pret.3^rd^.pl.
    (‘At two they opened.’)

(14) *Hasta las dos no abrieron.*
    until the two not open-pret.3^rd^.pl.
    (‘Until two they did not open.’)

(15) *A las dos abrieron.*
    at the two open-pret.3^rd^.pl.
    (‘At two they opened.’)

In the same manner, according to Cuervo, the construction in example (16) could be the result of (17) and (18) fused together:

(16) *arroz de leche*
    rice of milk
    (‘rice pudding’)

(17) *arroz con leche*
    rice with milk
    (‘rice pudding’)

(18) *sopa de leche*
    soup of milk
    (‘milk soup’)

Two decades after Cuervo’s research, an alternative potential etymology for the construction of affirmative inceptive *hasta* was offered by Francisco Santamaría (1959) in the *Diccionario de Mejicanismos*. He claimed that the development of *hasta* into a
preposition that marks inception without the aid of negation stemmed from the fact that
*hasta* was often used alongside the negative adverb *no*, as illustrated earlier in examples
(8), (10), and (12). The frequent association with negated situations may have led *hasta*
to acquire a negativity of its own. According to this theory, this possible new feature of
the preposition could have led to the loss of *no* and, therefore, may have played a role in
the development of the affirmative inceptive use of *hasta*.

Kany (1969) also offered another perspective on the development of affirmative
inceptive *hasta*, seeing this construction as simply the omission of the negative adverb *no*
from the construction *hasta* + temporal expression + negated verb. He noted (p. 429) that
this omission is more frequent when *hasta* precedes a verb and less frequent (but still
occurring) postverbally, as illustrated in the following examples:

(19a) *Hasta las diez no saldré.*
    until the ten not go-out-fut.1st.sg.
    (‘Until ten I will not go out.’)

(19b) *Hasta las diez saldré.*
    until the ten go-out-fut.1st.sg.
    (‘At ten I will go out.’)

(20a) *No saldré hasta las diez.*
    not go out-fut.1st.sg. until the ten
    (‘I will not go out until ten.’)

(20b) *Saldré hasta las diez.*
    go out-fut.1st.sg. until the ten
    (‘I will go out at ten.’)

For Kany, preverbal positions such as in example (19) favored the omission of *no,*
leading him to believe that this might have been the initial position from which the
adverb *no* began to disappear. This process could have occurred concurrently to, or could
have been motivated by, the loss of *no* in certain other expressions. As Santamaria before
him, Kany, too, pointed out (p. 430) that, historically, some expressions came to acquire a permanent negative meaning in Spanish, for the simple reason of frequently appearing in negated sentences. Kany focused on such expressions in preverbal position in independent clauses. According to his view, no would have become redundant, unnecessary, and destined to disappear from use altogether in such cases. For Kany, the process that modified expressions like (21a) and (22a), leading to expressions like (21b) and (22b), could have fueled analogical change in the use of hasta as well:

(21a) No tengo nada.
    not have-pres.1st.sg. nothing
    (‘I do not have anything.’)

(21b) Nada tengo.
    nothing have-pres.1st.sg.
    (‘I have nothing.’)

(22a) No lo visto en mi vida.
    not acc.3rd.sg. have–pres.1st.sg. see-part. in my life
    (‘I have not (ever) seen him in my life.’)

(22b) En mi vida lo visto.
    in my life acc.3rd.sg. have-pres.1st.sg. see-part
    (‘Never in my life have I seen him.’)

In examples (21a) and (22a) the expressions nada (‘nothing’) and en mi vida (‘never in my life’) are used post-verbally. When the above-mentioned expressions switched to a pre-verbal position, having acquired permanent negative meaning, the adverb no became unnecessary and disappeared altogether, as shown in examples (21b) and (22b). Consequently, by analogy, constructions such as the one given in (23a) could have given way to constructions such as the one given in (23b):

(23a) No iremos hasta las nueve.
    not go-fut.1st.pl. until the nine
    (‘We will not go until nine.’)
(23b) *Hasta las nueve iremos.*
until the nine go-fut.1st.pl.
(‘We will go at nine.’)

Kauffman (1973) also commented on how negation in Spanish has come to include expressions that used to be affirmative but have over the years acquired permanent negative valence. Kauffman pointed out that “*nada* [‘nothing’] originally meant *cosa nacida* [‘thing born’], *nadie* [‘nobody’] meant *persona nacida* [‘person born’], and *jamás* [‘never’] meant *ya más* [‘already more’]” (1973, p. 161). So, when we say

(24) *No entiendo nada.*  
not understand-pres.1st.sg. nothing  
(‘I do not understand anything.’)

etymologically we are saying

(25) *No entiendo cosa nacida.*  
not understand-pres.1st.sg. thing born  
(‘I do not understand born thing.’)

Such expressions became permanently negative because they were often associated with negative concepts. The same tendency characterizes the expressions given in examples (26), (27), and (28).

(26) *En toda la noche.*  
in all the night  
(‘All night long.’)

(27) *En mi vida.*  
in my life  
(‘In my life.’)

(28) *En el mundo.*  
in the world  
(‘In the whole world.’)
Kauffman (1973) noted that when these expressions are used in a pre-verbal position they acquire a negative meaning, therefore making the use of the negative adverb no unnecessary. Consider the expression given in (29) below:

(29) *En toda la noche paró de llorar.*

in all the night stop-pret.3rd.sg. of cry-inf.

(‘He did not stop crying all night long.’)

In example (29), the expression *en toda la noche* implicates the negativity of the verb *paró*. Therefore, the sentence has a negative sense even though, lexically, there is no negative adverb. The fact that implicated negativity may be linked to pre-verbal position reinforces the analogy in the process that may have led to initial preverbal use of hasta in affirmative verbal situations. As discussed above, it has been claimed that especially when hasta precedes the verb, the omission of the adverb no appears to be favored (Kany, 1969, p. 429). We return to the importance of implicated negativity in chapter 2.

Lope Blanch (1993) firmly believed that this construction is a matter of Hispanic origin, especially if we take into consideration the broad geographical extension of the phenomenon. Lope Blanch mentioned (p. 165) that, as early as 1867, Cuervo documented this phenomenon as part of the everyday language of Bogotá. Felix Carrasco, as cited in Lope Blanch (1993, p. 165), suggested that the roots of this phenomenon can be found in Peninsular Spanish itself. Carrasco was inclined to make this supposition because of evidence of affirmative inceptive hasta in several Spanish texts. One of these texts is *Tercera parte de la tragicomedia de Celestina*, by Gaspar Cuervo (1938) and Zamora Vicente (1967) (cf. Section 1.1.4) are two of the few authors who list Colombia, besides Central America and Mexico, as a region where hasta is used in the affirmative inceptive way. The rest of the aforementioned authors, as well as the dictionary of the Real Academia Española (2001), list Ecuador instead. This dissertation joins the majority in considering only Mexico, Central America, and Ecuador as the main regions where affirmative inceptive hasta is used.
Gómez de Toledo (1536). An excerpt taken from this text (p. 139) is given in example (30), which illustrates the affirmative inceptive usage of *hasta* in the Peninsular Spanish of the sixteenth century:

(30) **Poncia:**

\[\textit{Algo es lo que yo digo.}\]

Something be-pres.3\textsuperscript{rd}.sg. neut. that I say-pres.1\textsuperscript{st}.sg.

\[\textit{Déxate de apercebir essa artillería de parlamento,} \]

stop-I.+CL(Acc.2\textsuperscript{nd}.sg.) of warn-inf. that-fem. artillery of speech

\[\textit{pues en ausencia no le satisfazes, que cuando esté presente tienes tiempo de soltar los tiros.}\]

well in absence not CL(Dat.3\textsuperscript{rd}.sg.) satisfy-pres.2\textsuperscript{nd}.sg. that when be-subj.pres.3\textsuperscript{rd}.sg. present have-pres.2\textsuperscript{nd}.sg. time of release-inf.

(`What I am saying has some truth to it. Stop that artillery of words, because in absence you don’t affect him, when he is present you will have time to fire words at him.’)

**Polandria:**

\[\textit{Hasta oy vi a persona hablar tan cerrado} \]

until today see-pret.1\textsuperscript{st}.sg. PA person speak-inf. so heavy (accent)

\[\textit{como tú.}\]

like you.

(`I have never, until today, seen a person speak with as heavy of an accent as you do.’)

In example (30) the expression *hasta oy* (‘until today’) is used with an affirmative verb to indicate that today is the first time that Polandria has seen a person who speaks like Poncia. In other words, she has never seen such a person before.
Mark Davies, in the *Corpus del Español* (2002-), documented the same usage of *hasta oy* in the 1620 Spanish text *El nacimiento de la verdad*, written by Juan Cortés de Tolosa, as given in the excerpt below:

(31) Sintió muchíssimo verse desnudar y que una señora tan principal lo mandasse,
y mucho más la causa por que no era admitida, y que los criados la maltratassen,
y diciéndola: ¡Vaya la Verdad mucho en hora mala,
que hasta oy vimos casa donde viviesse que todos no muriessen de hambre y anduviesen desnudos!

(‘[Truth] felt very sorry to be seen getting undressed and that such an important madam would have ordered it, and even more the cause for which it was not admitted, and that the servants would mistreat her by saying: Damn the truth, so much in the wrong time, we have never, until today, seen a house where she had lived and where everyone would not die of hunger or would not walk in the nude.’)

In example (31), just like in (30), *hasta* marks the inception of an affirmative verbal situation. Despite the presence of this construction in the Peninsular Spanish of the 16th and 17th centuries, Carrasco believed that such innovative usage might have been just one possibility in Peninsular Spanish, a pragmatic feature whose further development was somehow arrested in Castilian Spanish. This short-lived peninsular usage, however,
may have found favorable conditions to develop further in certain dialects of the American continent, where it was eventually transformed into something characteristic of those regions.

1.1.3.2 Negation in subordinate clauses and a potential alternative explanation of affirmative inceptive hasta

In delineating a potential track for the development of affirmative inceptive hasta, several authors mentioned in Section 1.1.3.1 (cf. Kany, 1969; Kauffman, 1973; Santamaría, 1959) drew attention to the gradual disappearance of negation usage with lexemes like nada, en mi vida, etc., when they moved to sentence-initial position. These authors saw this stage of negation evolution as potentially having also affected the structures in which hasta is accompanied by the negative adverb no. As illustrated above, in certain dialects of Spanish, main clause negation has disappeared altogether in sentences where hasta has an inceptive function. Chapter 2 offers pragmatic analysis of this function, including a theory of its potential origin; the present section lays some groundwork for chapter 2.

Our theory is that affirmative inceptive hasta may have originated in sentences like that in example (10) where hasta heads a subordinate clause and where the verb in the main clause is negated. In such sentences, as our analysis in the following chapter demonstrates, the scope of negation may extend to the matrix verb alone or it may reach as far as the verb following hasta in the subordinate clause. In turn, hasta may display either inceptive or terminative discourse functions in relation to the matrix verb. We propose below that the ambiguous interpretation of the scope of negation and the resulting ambiguity of the functions of hasta are linked, in particular, to changes in the
lexical aspect\(^6\) of the negated verb in the main clause. In order to lay a structural foundation for our theory that the scope of negation of the adverb *no* in the main clause may have played a pivoted role in the historical development of affirmative inceptive *hasta*, the rest of the current section examines historical accounts of affirmative inceptive *hasta* in linguistic contexts where *hasta* heads a subordinate clause and where both the verb in the main clause and the verb in the subordinate clause are negated.

When describing how negation evolved in Spanish, Llorens (1929) pointed out two characteristics of Spanish negation that were shared by other languages as well. First, Old Spanish endured a weakening of negation followed later by a process of reinforcement (just like in Latin the old form of negation *ne* progressively weakened and then led to the rise of the newer negative adverb *non*). Second, as also mentioned by Santamaría (1959) and Kany (1969) above, a series of words and expressions that originally had positive meanings acquired permanent negativity over the years because of their frequent use in contexts of negation, for example, *nadie* (‘no one’), *nada* (‘nothing’), *en mi vida* (‘never in my life’), and so forth (p. 15). More importantly, Llorens observed that, in some of the earliest writings in Spanish, there was already fluctuation in the use of *no* following *hasta* in dependent clauses that expressed future temporal references (cf. example 12 above and the related discussion in 1.1.2). He

\(^6\) With regard to lexical aspect in Spanish, as Chapter 2 demonstrates, certain verbs can be interpreted as having, besides other temporal features, an instantaneous temporal character that leads to a change of state. In such cases, the instantaneous temporal feature of the verb can limit the scope of negation of the adverb *no* in the main clause to just the matrix verb and only allow for an inceptive interpretation of *hasta*. If interpreting the verb as instantaneous, however, is not the only possible reading of the lexical aspect of the main verb, that is, if the verb can have duration, then there may be room for two different interpretations of the scope of negation, with two correspondingly different readings of the discourse functions of *hasta* (inceptive or terminative). In such cases, a second negative adverb *no* may often appear in the subordinate clause following *hasta* as a pragmatic addition to reinforce the implicature that *hasta* marks just the inception of the verbal situation in the main clause.
illustrated his observation (p. 182) with two examples from the *Fuero Juzgo*, a codex of
Spanish laws enacted in Castile in 1241 by Fernando III:

(32) (*F. Juzgo* 2, 5, 18)

\[Quel \textit{príncipe} \textit{no debe atoller á nenguno omne} \]
that prince not must-pres.3rd.sg. devest-inf. PA no one man

de su casa su ondra ni su servicio
of his house his honor neither his service

\[fasta que \textit{non sea provado del pecado...} \]
until that not be-pres.subj.3rd.sg. prove-part. of the sin...

(‘The prince must not divest any man of his house, honor or service until
he is proven guilty / so long as he is not proven guilty...’)

(33) (*F. Juzgo* 9, 1, 2)

\[y \textit{el iuez tengua en guarda á aquel} \]
and the judge have-pres.subj.3rd.sg. in custody PA that

\[que \textit{lo vende... fasta que venga} \]
who acc.3rd.sg. sell-pres.3rd.sg. until that come-pres.subj.3rd.sg.

\[el \textit{sennor del siervo}. \]
the master of the servant

(‘The judge should retain in custody the person who sells him the
servant... until the master of the servant arrives.’)

In examples (32) and (33), \textit{hasta (fasta)} heads subordinate clauses that refer to future
actions, with and without negation present (both in the main and the subordinate clause, respectively).

Four decades after the work of Llorens, Hanssen (1966), too, attested superfluous
negation to be very common in dependent clauses, especially following verbs that express

---

7 These numbers represent the subsections of the *Fuero Juzgo*: libros (‘books’), títulos (‘titles’), and versos
(‘verses’) respectively.
fear, avoidance, prohibition, or doubt, and common when preceded by some form of
comparison or by words such as otro (‘other’), hasta (‘until’), or antes (‘before’).
Henssen pointed out (p. 273) that, in all of these cases, negation need not be present. He
believed that this redundancy stemmed in Spanish from an analogy between two different
structures such as those illustrated in examples (34) and (35) below:

(34) No ceno hasta que Mariela vuelva.
not dine-pres.1st.sg. until that Mariela return-pres.subj.3rd.sg.
(‘I will not have dinner until Mariela returns.’)

(35) No ceno mientras Mariela no vuelva.
not dine-pres.1st.sg. while Mariela not return-pres.subj.3rd.sg.
(‘I will not have dinner as long as Mariela has not returned.’)

In examples (34) and (35) both hasta and mientras head subordinate clauses that
implicate Mariela’s return as the moment when eating started. In other words, the action
of not eating has lasted as long as Mariela has not returned. The presence of the second
negative adverb no in the subordinate clause headed by mientras may have caused its use
in subordinate clauses headed by hasta, too, as shown in the example below:

(36) No ceno hasta que Mariela no vuelva.
not dine-pres.1st.sg. until that Mariela not return-pres.subj.3rd.sg.
(‘I will not have dinner until Mariela returns. / I will not have dinner as
long as Mariela has not returned’)

Therefore, the redundant presence of the second adverb no in the subordinate clause
headed by hasta in example (36) could have developed as a result of the analogy between
constructions such as those in examples (34) and (35). We suspect that this fluctuation in
negation in subordinate clauses headed by hasta, as observed by Llorens (1929) and
Hanssen (1966), may be linked, in part, to the development of utterances where hasta is
used in the affirmative inceptive way, though neither author actually commented on
affirmative inceptive hasta.
As mentioned above, *hasta* is commonly used to set a limit on the duration of action in the independent clause. That is, in sentences like examples (34) and (36) *hasta* sets a limit on ‘not eating’. If Mariela’s return is the end point of the ‘not eating’ period, the conversational implicature that arises is that her return simultaneously / also represents the starting point of the period of eating. In other words, the conversational implicature associated with *hasta* is inceptive and the proposition explicated in the subordinate clause specifies the point / moment of inception of the verb in the main clause. In fact, we believe that the affirmative inceptive usage of *hasta* may have developed primarily in utterances where *hasta* heads a subordinate clause with the main verb being negated, and may have later been applied analogically to utterances where *hasta* is part of an independent clause.

To summarize, we propose that a redundant *no* may appear in the subordinate clause following *hasta* to disambiguate the scope of negation of the negative adverb *no* in the main clause, hence clarifying the lexical aspect of the matrix verb and giving rise to the inceptive function of this preposition. In some dialects, in such linguistic contexts, *hasta* may have acquired a negative valence of its own due to its frequent use with the (superfluous) negative adverb *no*, similar to the process that lexemes like *nada* and *nadie* underwent. This acquired negative valence may have rendered the use of *no* unnecessary when *hasta* occupied a pre-verbal position in an independent clause. Therefore, the same *hasta* that was originally part of the subordinate clause and that may have acquired inceptive functions in sentences where the main verb was negated may have evolved to display inceptive features in affirmative verbal situations as well. Pragmatic analysis
supporting this theory is given in chapter 2. The next section details the dialectally restricted use of affirmative inceptive hasta.

1.1.4 Dialectal and sociolinguistic descriptions of affirmative inceptive hasta

In a review of the Spanish dialects spoken in the Americas, Alonso Zamora Vicente (1967) briefly pointed out (p. 439) that in Mexico, Colombia, and Central America, hasta at times does not refer to the ending limit of time or action, but rather to the starting point, as in example (37) below.

(37) Hasta febrero empezó a nevar.
until February begin-pret.3rd.sg. to snow-inf.
(‘It began to snow in February.’)

It goes without saying that affirmative inceptive hasta can create ambiguities for those who are not familiar with this peculiar construction. Kany noted (1969, p. 431) that the situation becomes more complex when, within the same country, hasta can be used with or without a negated verb to denote the inception of a verbal situation. Kany experienced this first hand at a school in a Mexican city where he noticed the following ad in writing:

(38) Las solicitudes de reinscripción serán recibidas únicamente hasta el 15 de febrero.
the applications of reenrollment be-fut.3rd.pl. accept-part.
only until the 15 of February
(‘The applications for reenrollment will be accepted only until February 15.’)

In example (38), according to the affirmative inceptive usage of hasta that is common in Mexico, February 15 would have been the first day for accepting applications. To the author’s surprise, however, that day was the deadline! When he inquired about how the school was able to avoid ambiguities, the reply he was given was:
(39) En cualquier momento pueden acercarse a la ventanilla y preguntar.

in any moment be able to-pres.3rd.pl. approach oneself-inf. to the window and ask-inf.

(‘They can approach the window and ask at any time.’)

Lipski (1994) attested the affirmative inceptive usage of hasta when he documented such usage in the Spanish dialects of Central America. In some of the examples of spoken Spanish he provided, hasta is combined with adverbs as well, as illustrated in example (40) below:

(40) ¿Hasta cuándo viene el jefe?

until when come-pres.3rd.sg. the boss

(‘When does the boss arrive?’) (p. 260)

Despite the evidence of the inceptive use of hasta in affirmative verbal situations in the MCAE Spanish dialects, it has to be noted that this distinctive feature of the preposition in question has not developed uniformly within the above-mentioned dialects. According to Lope Blanch (1993), this construction is not as common in educated language as it is in the vernacular, even though it is slowly being incorporated into that speech modality as well. Lope Blanch hypothesized (p. 189) that this phenomenon is still developing and has not taken a final shape yet. This theory was based on the insecurity demonstrated by many Mexicans when employing the structure in their everyday language. Because the specialized use of hasta often alternates with the use that this preposition has in general Spanish, we cannot say that the affirmative inceptive use has been established as the regional norm; however, we can say that such usage represents a competing norm in the region.

For Lope Blanch, the extension of usage of hasta and the fact that this usage is slowly being adopted in educated speech as well suggest a possible future
standardization. Given the fact that all living languages change over time, the development of the affirmative inceptive usage of *hasta* may indeed be an indication of a possible change in progress that is occurring in Spanish. Because language changes tend to first develop at an individual level, social network influence, as mentioned above in the introduction, may be of great importance when trying to understand how this innovative feature of *hasta* is understood, judged, and used by speakers of Spanish. Furthermore, this understanding and usage may have important implications for the future evolution of affirmative inceptive *hasta*.

As mentioned above, the affirmative inceptive usage of *hasta* in Peninsular Spanish has not been maintained in the same manner as it has been in the MCAE Spanish dialects. One possible explanation for this difference could be that regional linguistic influences in the Americas helped solidify this usage. In other words, contact with the indigenous languages that are spoken alongside Spanish in the areas where affirmative inceptive *hasta* is prevalent may have played a role in the historical development and maintenance of affirmative inceptive *hasta* in America.

The influence of indigenous languages on Spanish is generally most evident in the lexical and phonetic characteristics of the Spanish spoken in the Americas. Hurley (1995), however, has shown that Amerindian languages have influenced the pragmatics of Spanish as well, when he studied the influence of Quechua on the Spanish of Otavalo, Ecuador. The author was particularly interested in researching request formulations. As Hurley found out (p. 42), although *poder* (‘to be able’) appears very frequently in general Spanish as part of request-formulation strategies, only 2 percent of the Otavalo residents who were interviewed used *poder* when making a request. In the Spanish of Otavalo, the
use of imperatives was the request strategy of choice. The author believed that this difference in request formulations was due to the fact that, in Quechua, requests are carried out mainly via the use of imperatives. Furthermore, in that language the verb corresponding to *poder* is not used as a modal verb and, thus, is not part of request formulas.

In addition to noting the higher frequency of use of imperatives and the considerable decrease in use of *poder* when making requests in Spanish, Hurley pointed out (p. 50) two other possible examples of Quechua influence on the pragmatics of Spanish in Otavalo as well. First of all, besides using standard forms of imperatives, Spanish speakers from Otavalo also used the future tense as imperatives. Of course, such usage is not uncommon in general Spanish and, thus, “future imperatives” do not represent any transfer of structures from Quechua. As a matter of fact, Toscano Mateus, as cited by Hurley (1995, p. 45), pointed out that Old Spanish often employed the future tense to convey an authoritarian command. In the Spanish of Otavalo, however, the future imperatives were considered to be more polite, and they contrasted with the standard imperatives inasmuch as the future imperatives were to be carried out at a later point in time, instead of right away. Therefore, the future imperatives have assumed a specialized discourse function and may occur with greater frequency in the Spanish of Otavalo than in other dialects. Secondly, Hurley noted the use of the verb *give* as a modal verb along with a gerund to express indirect requests. The latter strategy is illustrated in example (41), provided by Hurley (p. 48):

(41) Déme haciendo un sanduche. [sic]
give-I.+CL(Dat.1<sup>st</sup>.sg.) do-ger. a sandwich
(‘Do me the favor of making me a sandwich.’)
The findings discussed above led the author to believe that contact with Quechua has indeed had an effect on the pragmatics of the Spanish spoken in Otavalo, Ecuador.

Virginia Zavala is another author who has attested the influence of Amerindian languages on the pragmatics of Spanish. Zavala (2001) investigated the role of *pues* (‘well’) as a discourse marker in the Spanish spoken in a province of the Central Peruvian Andes. During the sociolinguistic interviews that she conducted with Quechua-Spanish bilingual individuals, Zavala observed that, in Andean Spanish, *pues* was not used at the beginning of utterances with the meaning of ‘therefore’, ‘well’, or ‘because’ as in general Spanish. Instead, the author found (p. 1005) *pues* to be used at the end of utterances to confirm or clarify what had previously been said. In the following example that Zavala provided (p. 1006), *pues* appears turn-finally to confirm a previous utterance:

(42) **IVER:** Y tus padres, tus abuelos, ¿también and your parents your grandparents also
vivían en la comunidad?
live-imperf.3rd.pl. in the community
(‘And your parents, your grandparents, did they also live in the community?’)

**PEDRO:** Sí.
yes
(‘Yes.’)

**IVER:** ¿En esa misma? 
in that-fem. same
(‘In that same one?’)

**PEDRO:** Sí, en esa misma pe.9
yes in that-fem. same
(‘Yes, in the same one pe.’)

---

8 Zavala considers Andean Spanish to be a dialect that has resulted from the contact of Spanish with Quechua and Aymara – the two main Amerindian languages spoken in the Andean region.
9 *Pues* in Andean Spanish is pronounced as [pe] or [pes].
Zavala believed (p. 1016) that the use of *pues* in Andean Spanish at the end of utterances to confirm or clarify what was previously said in a conversation was due to the influence of the function of Quechua evidentials, among them the suffix \(-mi\). Quechua speakers employ these particles in their discourse to validate previously-mentioned utterances, just like Quechua-Spanish bilinguals employ *pues* in Andean Spanish.

As Silva-Corvalán (1986, 1994) has pointed out, in language contact situations, changes occurring in a language often have to do with internal linguistic motivations. She believes, however, that even if changes in a language are not externally motivated, that is, they do not originate as a result of contact with another language, language contact can serve to accelerate them. To date, none of the authors who have documented the use of affirmative inceptive *hasta* has related the affirmative inceptive features of this lexeme to influences from Amerindian languages. Based on Silva-Corvalan’s theory, however, it is possible that the indigenous languages in contact with MCAE Spanish dialects may have played a role in accelerating the evolution of affirmative inceptive *hasta.*

1.2 Social networks in and outside the classroom

As mentioned above, one of the goals of this study is to contribute to research on the effects that social networks can have on language variation and change, focusing on students who are enrolled in university (L2) Spanish classes. This study considers classrooms to be a type of social network. As a result, the students’ membership in social networks in different university Spanish classes is examined as a factor that may possibly influence the students’ understandings, judgments, and uses of L2 pragmatics. The

---

10 Though it is beyond the scope of this dissertation to explore such influence, further research is warranted in this regard.
impact of integration into social networks outside of the classroom is examined as well. This section first presents a brief overview of how the concept of social network was developed. Secondly, based on specific research questions of this dissertation, a series of studies are examined concerning the application in sociolinguistic research of social network analysis in and outside of class settings. A statement of hypotheses follows. The contribution of this section to the dissertation is to provide a theoretical background of the concept of social network that is central to the study, in order to better understand how social networks relate to language processes.

1.2.1 The concept of social network

When examining the social system of Bremnes, a parish in Norway, Barnes (1954) distinguished three types of fields: the social field based on territory, the field related to the industrial system and the field that was composed of the ties of friendship that people in Bremnes shared (p. 43). He was particularly interested in this last field. He imagined the individuals of this Norwegian parish as a set of points. These points were joined by lines that represented the ties of friendship and / or acquaintance that existed between the individuals. This kind of social field, where a particular person has a certain number of social contacts, and where these individuals interact with other individuals, came to be known as “social network”. Barnes coined in this way a concept that later would be applied in various fashions to many disciplines by researchers around the world.

Mitchell (1969, p. 2) had in mind a vision similar to that of Barnes when he spoke of the social network as “a specific set of linkages among a defined set of persons, with the additional property that the characteristics of these linkages as a whole may be used to interpret the social behavior of the persons involved.” These linkages, representing the
different types of social relationships that a given group of people has been able to create and establish with other individuals, can have different characteristics and, therefore, can form social networks of different natures.

Barnes (1969) found it useful to distinguish between total and partial networks. The total network would be composed of all the possible social connections among members of a given community. The partial network, however, would be “any extract of the total network based on some criterion applicable throughout the whole network” (p. 57). The particular criterion on which a given partial network is based will depend on the nature of the linkages that compose the total network. Examples of partial social networks could include networks based on religious observance, political affiliation, professions, and so forth. From this distinction that Barnes proposed, we can deduce that any study that employs the concept of social network when examining a given population (or a population based on a common characteristic of the linkages) focuses on a partial network. The reason for not focusing on the total network is that no single characteristic can apply equally to all the linkages, and neither can a given total social network be composed of only one type of linkage. Epstein (1969, p. 111) chose to refer to partial networks as “effective networks”, pointing out the connectedness that characterizes them. The rest of the network he called the “extended network”, which together with the effective network formed the total social network. Weimann (1989, p. 190), on the other hand, wrote of personal or egocentric networks that “are anchored on a specific individual (or a node that may be an organization, a culture, or any social entity).”
1.2.2 Social network studies relevant to this dissertation’s research questions and potential results

According to Milroy (1987, p. 35), in studies that involve the examination of a given social network, it is crucial that “the unit of study is the pre-existing social group, rather than the individual as the representative of a more abstract social category.” This premise is particularly important because it allows the researcher to examine the characteristics of the linkages that exist naturally among members of a particular network in order to discover any effects that they might have on a given process that is being studied.

One pre-existing social group that has been analyzed from a social network perspective is a class of students at a school. Studies have shown (cf. Félix-Brasdefer, 2007; Kurata, 2007; Palfreyman, 2006; Russo & Koesten, 2005; Shen et al., 2008) that in any given classroom network, the linkages that students share as members of the same classroom network influence them as individuals in a variety of contexts. In particular, Hyltenstam and Stroud, as cited by Wiklund (2002, p. 57), stated that “individuals in a network influence each other linguistically.” In any given classroom network, therefore, the students’ language performance may be affected in one way or another by the kind of linkages that they share with each other as members of that particular network. Theoretically, the nature of ties in a given kind of classroom network will influence the language performance of its members.

One kind of social networks observed for this dissertation are classroom networks where students were exposed to just modeling of a form of hasta or to both modeling of a form of hasta and to explicit instruction about hasta usage. In order to see what the effects of pedagogy practice might be on students’ pragmatically appropriate
understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta* (cf. research question # 1), this dissertation examines classroom networks where participating students were taught by teachers who modeled either general Spanish or a Spanish dialect in which usage of *hasta* in the affirmative inceptive way is common. If pedagogy practice does indeed make a difference, then the Spanish instructors (who just modeled a form of *hasta* or both modeled a form of *hasta* and instructed about *hasta* usage within the classroom social networks that were observed in this study) may have played a role in students’ L2 linguistic development.

As past research has shown (cf. Palfreyman, 2006), students studying a second language often look for potential language learning resources within a given social network. In his study, for instance, David Palfreyman looked at how social networks influenced English learning among women who were students at a university in the United Arab Emirates. Palfreyman specifically examined the accessibility and use of learning resources. Language proficiency was not directly measured. In this particular case study, social networks were one of the learning resources to which these women had access. When these women shared strong ties with other English-speaking network members, the latter individuals would often be seen as potential resources of English learning.

Besides the strong connection with other social network members, another important factor in identifying learning opportunities was the perceived command of English of network members. The study’s participants would often resort for help to network members who were known to be highly skillful and knowledgeable in English, regardless of the strength of ties that they shared as members of the same social network.
Therefore, the perceived knowledge of English of other members carried greater weight than the strength of network ties when the women observed had to decide which social network member could be seen as a resource for learning English.

Palfreyman’s study carries important potential implications for this dissertation. Given the instructors’ attributed language knowledge, based on Palfreyman’s findings, in the classroom networks examined for this dissertation it may be expected that participating students will have seen their Spanish instructors as potential resources of language learning in the classroom. This possibility is reinforced by basic tenets of both social network theory and L2 acquisition theory. From social network theory (cf. Milroy, 1980) it is known that pressures exerted from the ties that students and teachers share as members of the same classroom network may help percolate teachers’ ways of speaking and, thus, influence students linguistically. In addition, prevailing L2 acquisition theory (cf. Krashen, 1982) holds that students’ L2 proficiencies tend to be affected positively by meaningful interaction, especially when the L2 input they receive is of a slightly higher level than their linguistic competence. Given the fact that, in an L2 classroom, teachers are a main source of both L2 input and interaction, it may also be expected that the Spanish dialects in which students were instructed and the Spanish dialects that the teachers modeled in class will have influenced the students’ ways of speaking in Spanish, in particular, how the students understood, judged, and used hasta. Along this line of thinking, we predict that modeling of Spanish dialects where affirmative inceptive hasta is common will have had a greater effect on student ways of speaking than direct instruction about said dialects. This prediction is based on the fact that classes where students are exposed to comprehensible input (and interaction) in the target dialects
(modeling affirmative inceptive *hasta*) are environments conducive not only to learning about affirmative inceptive *hasta* but also to language acquisition\(^{11}\) of affirmative inceptive *hasta*.

Another kind of social networks observed for this dissertation are classroom networks in beginner’s and intermediate level university Spanish courses. Specific courses were chosen to examine any possible effects that class level might have on the students’ pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta* (cf. research question # 2). Previous sociolinguistic research, such as the cross-sectional study conducted by Félix-Brasdefer (2007), has looked into the relationship between students’ class level and their L2 pragmatic development.\(^{12}\) In said study, the author observed American L2 students of Spanish in university classrooms of beginning, intermediate, and advanced levels of instruction. The focus of that investigation was students’ development of pragmatics, requests in particular, across different levels of university Spanish classes.

With request strategies of native speakers of Spanish in mind, Félix-Brasdefer expected the students’ strategy of choice to be that of using direct requests and conventional indirect requests in informal and formal situations, respectively. The data analysis showed a high preference for direct requests by beginner students in any kind of conversational situation. This usage, however, seemed to decrease drastically across

\(^{11}\) Language acquisition is different than language learning insofar as research (c.f. e.g., Krashen and Terrell, 1983; Lee and VanPatten, 2003) has shown that, among other outcomes, students who receive comprehensible input and participate in meaningful interaction in the L2 display more native-like understandings, judgments, and uses of the L2 than students who instead receive only instruction about L2 structures.

\(^{12}\) Said relationship was not examined from a social networks perspective. This dissertation, however, considers classrooms to be a kind of social network.
levels, with the advanced students using the least amount of direct requests. On the other hand, the use of conventionally indirect requests was associated with higher course levels, with the beginner students using the least amount of said requests. This change in preference across class levels for a specific request strategy led Félix-Brasdefer to surmise that increased language proficiency across levels of instruction could have an impact on the students’ development of L2 pragmatics.

Félix-Brasdefer’s findings carry important implications for the current investigation. If, indeed, individuals’ amount of language proficiency plays an important role in the development of their L2 pragmatics across distinct levels of instruction, and if students enrolled in intermediate level university Spanish classes can be expected, on the whole, to have greater proficiency than their counterparts in entry level university Spanish classes, then it may be hypothesized that study participants who are members of classroom social networks in intermediate level Spanish courses might understand, judge, and use hasta in pragmatically more appropriate ways than their counterparts in entry level Spanish courses. As a result, one might see a difference in understandings, judgments, and uses of hasta.

Besides looking into the possible effects that pedagogy practice and class level might have on students’ pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of hasta, as research question # 3 states, this dissertation also considers how L2 pragmatics may be affected by the difference in the nature of social ties that may exist among members of classroom networks with emphases on different modes of expression in

---

13 Félix-Brasdefer’s study did not employ any language proficiency test to measure students’ proficiency across class levels. The author, however, pointed out (p. 260) that placement in a particular language course is a criterion often used as an indicator of students’ level of pragmatic competence in a L2. Therefore, Félix-Brasdefer’s study presumed that students’ proficiency increased across class levels.
classroom practices (oral expression, written expression, or both). The particular relationship that might exist between learners’ language use and the types of interaction that learners have with other social network members was recently explored by Naomi Kurata (2007) when she examined the social networks of students studying Japanese as a second language in an upper-intermediate level class at an Australian university.

Kurata discovered (2007, p. 3) that close and collaborative interaction between the learners who participated in the study and their network peers played an important role in creating more L2 learning opportunities. Consequently, these opportunities affected the learners’ language choices in communicating with others and therefore had an impact on their L2 Japanese use or lack thereof. Based on Kurata’s conclusions, our hypothesis is that if close and collaborative interaction between learners and their network peers does indeed play an important role in creating L2 learning opportunities, then the different modes of expression among the classroom network members observed for this dissertation will have caused the students to have different types of learning opportunities and even different sorts of interactions with each other. In addition, the different modes of expression will have been associated with differing degrees of collaboration among members of the different classroom social networks. As a result, from classroom networks with primarily written modes of expression to classroom networks with primarily oral modes of expression, one might expect to find differences in how students understand, judge, and use *hasta*. More specifically, given the differences in interaction type and the resulting expected differences in L2 learning opportunities, study participants who are members of classroom social networks with primarily oral modes of expression will understand, judge, and use *hasta* in pragmatically more appropriate ways
than their counterparts in classroom social networks with primarily written modes of expression.

To recap, the aforementioned studies carry important implications for this dissertation. Félix-Brasdefer’s findings could be evidence of the impact that L2 class level may have on the development of L2 pragmatics. Palfreyman’s study, on the other hand, leads us to surmise that classroom instructors may play an important role in influencing the linguistic behavior of students who are members of a particular classroom social network. Furthermore, results from Kurata’s study, which stresses the importance of interaction type among network members, support the claim made by Hyltenstam and Stroud regarding the linguistic influence that network members have on each other. In particular, Kurata’s findings are important because they support the theory proposed in this dissertation that, depending on the nature of social ties, students’ membership in a particular classroom network may possibly influence their understandings, judgments, and uses of L2 pragmatics.

Even though the current study focuses only on a specific aspect of L2 understanding, judgment, and usage, the above-cited research lends support to this investigation in suggesting that the characteristics of the social networks to which students belong may well have an effect on their social and linguistic behavior in general.\textsuperscript{14} In particular, aspects of the students’ understandings, judgments, and uses of

\textsuperscript{14} As a matter of fact, recent investigations have expanded the study of classroom social networks to online learning environments as well. Authors such as Russo and Koesten (2005) have looked at how the kind of linkages and the patterns of interaction that existed among students of online classes affected the students’ learning. These authors concluded that the positions that students occupied within the social networks of their online classes strongly influenced these individuals’ cognitive learning in particular.

Similarly, Shen et al. (2008) have observed online classrooms in order to examine any possible influence that network ties may have on students’ sense of community. These authors found out that sense of community, as measured by the amount of interaction among network members, influenced student
Spanish as a second language may be influenced by students’ perception of their teachers as the best language learning resources in their classroom network, by their class level, and by the types and amount of interaction that exist among members of the same classroom social network. Details regarding how the concept of social network has been operationalized to fit the context of the current study are given in chapter 3 in an explanation of the methodology that was used. Table 1 below presents a summary of the first three research questions and the respective hypotheses:

Table 1: Research questions (1-3) and respective hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ</th>
<th>Will pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of <em>hasta</em> be affected by Explicit instruction about <em>hasta</em> or by exposure to its modeling? If so, how?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>The Spanish dialects that the teachers modeled in class and explanations about MCAE <em>hasta</em> usage will both influence the students’ ways of speaking in Spanish, in particular, how the students understand, judge, and use <em>hasta</em>. Modeling of MCAE <em>hasta</em> will have a greater effect on students’ ways of speaking than will direct instruction about usage of <em>hasta</em> to mark inception with and without negation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Will pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of <em>hasta</em> be affected by students’ class level? If so, how?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>A greater L2 proficiency that may characterize students enrolled in intermediate level university Spanish classes, as opposed to students in entry level university Spanish classes, will result in differences in the development of students’ L2 pragmatics. Study participants who are members of classroom social networks in intermediate level Spanish courses will understand, judge, and use <em>hasta</em> in pragmatically more appropriate ways than their counterparts in entry level Spanish courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ</td>
<td>Will pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of <em>hasta</em> be affected by the difference in the nature of social ties that may exist among members of classroom networks with emphases on different modes of expression in classroom practices? If so, how?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>From classroom networks with primarily written modes of expression to classroom networks with primarily oral modes of expression, there will be differences in how students understand, judge, and use <em>hasta</em>. Students in classroom networks with primarily oral modes of expression will understand, judge, and use <em>hasta</em> in pragmatically more appropriate ways than students in classroom networks with primarily written modes of expression.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

motivation, which, in turn, affected student learning. Even though online classroom social networks are not the focus of this dissertation, these findings are important to the current investigation because they reinforce the fact that the ties that link individuals within a given classroom social network affect these individuals’ behaviors in one way or another. Further research is needed to determine whether (and how) membership in online classroom social networks affects students’ linguistic performance and L2 pragmatics in particular.

How each of these hypotheses was operationalized and tested quantitatively is detailed in a later section of the dissertation.
1.2.3 Social networks outside of class settings

All of the above-mentioned studies showed that, as in any other type of social network, in classroom networks, the nature and the extent of linkages that exist among members of a given group are of great importance. These ties tend to influence in numerous ways the individuals whom they bind. It needs to be noted, however, that members of a classroom social network do not share social ties exclusively with each other. As complex individuals, students also belong to social networks that extend beyond the classroom setting. Consequently, students who are members of a classroom social network are affected not only by the linkages that they share with students of the same class, but also by other linkages that tie them to different social networks outside the classroom.

An important study that looked at the influence of ties that link members of a given social network (in a non-classroom setting) was Milroy’s now classic Belfast study (1980) that examined the communities of Ballymacarrett, Hammer, and Clonard. Over an extended period of time, Milroy observed the use of certain phonological variables by members of these communities in relation to the ties they shared with each other within each community. In applying the concept of social network, Milroy calculated a network strength score for each of the individuals who participated in the study. This score represented the participants’ degree of integration into the social network in question. Milroy’s investigation showed that the kind and number of network ties that linked members of the same network did, indeed, influence the way that they spoke (p. 154). She concluded (p. 160) that such influences responded to the pressures that network ties tend to exert on members whom they link.
As mentioned in the introduction of this chapter, this dissertation explores, among other issues, the possible ways in which pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta* may be affected by the nature of network pressures that students face outside of university Spanish classes, as members of social networks that may involve exposure to MCAE vs. non-MCAE Spanish dialects (cf. research question # 4). Review of the literature reveals that there is precedent for examining the influence of social networks outside the classroom on student language use. Indeed, Wiklund (2002) discovered a relationship between student language performance and the characteristics of the ties that linked said students as members of outside-of-class social networks. In particular, Wiklund studied the extended social networks of immigrant students who attended two upper-secondary schools in Sweden.

Wiklund pointed out that, in some areas where the population consisted mainly of immigrants, the study participants (and their families in general) did not interact with the Swedish population as much as they did with other immigrant families (of their own ethnic group or that of another non-Swedish ethnicity) in the community. The author discovered that the L2 proficiency of these immigrant students was greatly affected, both positively and negatively, by the ties they shared with other members of their extended networks. Especially those study participants who shared more and stronger ties with social network members of Swedish descent had better understandings, judgments, and uses of sophisticated words and advanced linguistic structures, both in written and oral modes of expression. The same tendency of higher L2 proficiency was discovered for network members who simultaneously shared ties with both Swedes and individuals of other ethnicities different from their own. Wiklund’s findings regarding the effects that
students’ outside-of-class network ties may have on L2 proficiency\textsuperscript{16} carry important implications for this dissertation’s investigation of classroom social networks. Wiklund’s findings lead us to surmise that the network ties that students share as members of social networks outside of university Spanish classes where affirmative inceptive use of \textit{hasta} is common may affect the degree to which these students understand, judge, and use \textit{hasta} in the affirmative inceptive way.

To recap, evidence from studies like that of Milroy (1980) and Wiklund (2002) strongly suggests that membership in any given social network can greatly affect individual ways of speaking.\textsuperscript{17} This effect is due in particular to the pressures that individuals feel from the network ties that link them as members. In social networks of students studying a second language, students have been shown to have been affected by the pressures of ties that link them to members of outside-of-class networks that involve L2 exposure. Our theory is that, pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments,

\textsuperscript{16} It should be noted here that the L2 proficiency of the study participants was not actually measured for our dissertation. We presume, however, that L2 proficiency is related to the use and understanding of affirmative inceptive \textit{hasta}. Just like in Wiklund’s study the ties that students shared with network members of Swedish ethnicity affected the understandings, judgments, and uses of sophisticated words and advanced linguistic structures in the L2, the network ties that students in the current investigation share as members of social networks outside of university Spanish classes where MCAE and non-MCAE uses of \textit{hasta} are variable will affect these students’ pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of \textit{hasta}.

\textsuperscript{17} How ties of social networks outside of classroom settings affect the individuals’ linguistic behavior was also examined by Raschke, Wei, and Lee (2002) when they looked at the language choices of 34 Chinese children in the Tyneside Chinese community in England. The authors discovered (p. 22) that network ties strongly predicted the use of Chinese, English, or a mix of both. They noted (p. 23) that the pressure exerted within peer networks was greater than the pressure perceived from ties that linked the children to non-peer individuals (regardless of family ties). The peer pressure led these children to conform to group norms that held English as the increasingly preferred language choice.

Even though the current study does not examine language choice, Raschke, Wei, and Lee’s conclusions carry important implications for this dissertation. Just like in the above-mentioned study the participants’ language choice was influenced by pressures perceived from other network members, the students observed in this dissertation may favor either a general Spanish dialect or a dialect where \textit{hasta} is used in the affirmative inceptive way depending on the nature of the network pressures that they face in their own peer relations. The nature of network pressures that students in the current investigation face outside university Spanish classes may very well incline them to lean towards following the linguistic norms of general Spanish or the linguistic norms of the MCAE Spanish dialects. In turn, such dialect choices may affect the students’ understandings, judgments, and uses of \textit{hasta}.
and uses of *hasta* may be affected by the nature of network pressures that students face, outside of university Spanish classes, as members of social networks that may involve exposure to MCAE vs. non-MCAE Spanish. Table 2 below presents research question 4 as well as its respective hypothesis:  

Table 2: Research question 4 and respective hypothesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>Will pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of <em>hasta</em> be affected by the nature of network pressures that students face, outside of university Spanish classes, as members of social networks that may involve exposure to MCAE vs. non-MCAE Spanish dialects? If so, how?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>The network ties that students share as members of social networks outside of university Spanish classes where MCAE and non-MCAE uses of <em>hasta</em> are variable will affect how these students understand, judge, and use <em>hasta</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In sum, in examining how participants understand, judge, and use *hasta* in Spanish, the current study takes into account not only social influences that may arise from the participants’ membership in specific classroom social networks, but also influences that may arise from participants’ membership in social networks outside the classroom. The way in which this study’s participants understand, judge, and use *hasta* may be influenced by ties that link them to different types of social networks, both within and outside of class settings. The study’s participants may feel the different pressures exerted by these linkages and may, therefore, conform to differing degrees to the linguistic norms of multiple social networks.

Finally, our study takes into account any effects that research participants’ ages, genders, and length of time studying Spanish may have on their understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta*. In the case of age we assume the null hypothesis. In the

---

18 How this hypothesis was operationalized and tested quantitatively is detailed in a later section of this dissertation.
case of gender, we follow common sociolinguistic research expectations, which espouse that women are more often linguistically conservative than men. In the case of length of time studying Spanish, we assume that appropriate student understandings, judgments, and uses of L2 pragmatics increase over time. Table 3 below presents a summary of the last three research questions and the respective hypotheses.  

Table 3: Research questions (5-7) and respective hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ</th>
<th>Will pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of <em>hasta</em> be affected by research participants’ ages? If so, how?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Research participants’ ages will not affect their understandings, judgments, and uses of <em>hasta</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ</th>
<th>Will pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of <em>hasta</em> be affected by research participants’ genders? If so, how?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Participants’ genders will have an effect on how they understand, judge, and use <em>hasta</em>. Male participants will display pragmatically more appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of MCAE <em>hasta</em> than female study participants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ</th>
<th>Will pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of <em>hasta</em> be affected by the length of time during which research participants had been studying Spanish? If so, how?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>A greater L2 proficiency that may characterize students who have been studying Spanish for a longer time, as opposed to students who have been studying Spanish for a shorter period of time, will result in differences in the development of students’ L2 pragmatics. Study participants who have been studying Spanish the longest will understand, judge, and use <em>hasta</em> in pragmatically more appropriate ways than participants who have been studying Spanish for shorter periods of time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At this point of the dissertation we have described the various meanings and uses of *hasta*. In addition, we have also looked into the most common structures and functions in which *hasta* appears and we have suggested a possible origin of the affirmative inceptive use of this lexeme in certain dialects of the Spanish language. In order to better understand this use in discursive contexts, we now follow up with a pragmatic analysis of affirmative inceptive *hasta*. Our analysis is the topic of the next chapter.

---

19 How these hypotheses were operationalized and tested quantitatively is detailed in a later section of this dissertation.
CHAPTER II

PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF AFFIRMATIVE INCEPTIVE HASTA

2.0 Introduction

As previously discussed, the development of hasta into a preposition that, in the MCAE Spanish dialects, could implicate inception in affirmative verbal situations may have been driven by the interaction between the scope of negation of the adverb no in the main clause and the lexical aspect of the matrix verb. This chapter considers contextual meaning in more detail where hasta is concerned. Section 2.1 reviews the Cooperative Principle proposed by Grice (1975), in order to have a better understanding of how conversation participants reach inferential conclusions during communication with each other. Section 2.2 begins by briefly examining general rules of negation in Spanish in order to see how such rules can affect scope of negation in a given sentence. The section then focuses on the pragmatic implicatures and entailments of the utterances that contain affirmative inceptive hasta in an effort to better understand the origins of affirmative inceptive hasta. Section 2.3 looks at verbal lexical aspect and its interaction with the scope of negation, as well as how said interaction results in hasta marking inception in affirmative verbal situations. The contribution of the current chapter to the dissertation is to provide a more detailed examination of the factors that contribute to the pragmatic functions of hasta, in order to support the theory presented in chapter 1 regarding the origin of the affirmative inceptive use of the preposition in question.
2.1 Cooperative Principle

As mentioned in chapter 1, the function of *hasta* in a sentence where the matrix verb is negated may be the result of an interaction between the scope of the negative operator *no* in the main clause and the lexical aspect of the matrix verb itself. Interpretations of both the scope of negation and verbal lexical aspect are determined partly by the interlocutors’ points of view. Before examining in detail the possible interpretations that may affect the functions of *hasta* in a given sentence, it would be beneficial to examine how, by observing the Cooperative Principle, conversation participants are drawn to certain interpretations of a given statement.

The Cooperative Principle was coined by Paul Grice (1975), who pointed out that human communication is characterized by the efforts that conversation participants make to maintain a common purpose or a mutually accepted direction. In doing so, participants tend to observe a general principle of cooperation that Grice formulated as follows: “Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged” (p. 26). Within this principle, Grice distinguished (pp. 26-27) several maxims and supermaxims that, in turn, are grouped under four categories as shown in Table 4 below. Observation of the Cooperative Principle leads the conversation participants to reach certain inferential conclusions about what speakers may suggest when uttering a statement in relation to a particular context. Grice called the suggested meanings of a given utterance “conversational implicatures.”
Table 4: Supermaxims and maxims of the Cooperative Principle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Supermaxim</th>
<th>Maxim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Quantity   |                                                                           | 1. Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange).  
2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required. |
| Quality    | 1. Try to make your contribution one that is true.                       | 1. Do not say what you believe to be false.  
2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence. |
| Relation   |                                                                           | 1. Be relevant.                                                       |
2. Avoid ambiguity.  
3. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).  
4. Be orderly. |

More specifically, conversational implicatures are suggested meanings that are not required to be true. In other words, conversational implicatures can be cancelled. The following is an example of a statement and a conversational implicature that a speaker may make:

(43) A: Will Lucy plant any flowers this year?  
    B: Lucy loves gardening. +> ‘Lucy will plant some flowers.’

When uttering the statement ‘Lucy loves gardening’ in the context of example (43), speaker B may implicate that Lucy will plant flowers at some point in time. This conversational implicature, however, can be cancelled without contradicting the fact that Lucy is fond of gardening. We can easily say that ‘Lucy loves gardening, but she will not plant any flowers; she will plant vegetables instead’ or ‘Lucy loves gardening, but she will not plant any flowers because she does not have a backyard.’

Conversational implicatures differ from traditional semantic entailments, which are a statement’s suggested meanings that have to be true. Entailments deriving from a statement, unlike conversational implicatures, cannot be cancelled without contradicting the statement itself, as illustrated below:
In example (44), ‘Brenda made a pecan pie’ is a conversational implicature and it does not have to be true in order for the statement ‘Brenda brought a pecan pie’ to remain true. Brenda could have bought the pie, instead of making it herself. If we tried, however, to cancel the entailment ‘The pie Brenda brought has nuts in it’, that is, say that the pie Brenda brought does not have any nuts in it, we would be suggesting that pecans are not a type of nuts. Therefore, the entailment cannot be cancelled without contradicting the statement from which it has derived.

Perceptions of the conversational implicatures that arise from certain statements during a conversation exchange generally depend on how the conversation participants interpret such statements, based on a specific context. Depending on the context, a given utterance may carry more than one implicature at a time. At times, a conversational implicature $Y$ derived from a particular utterance $X$ evolves to become the default implicature of the statement in question, thus, resulting in a generalized conversational implicature. In other words, one may say that $X$ would normally suggest $Y$. Example (45) below, for instance, shows how the same utterance can generate, in theory, more than one implicature, and that, given contextual knowledge of cultural practices in the U.S. workplace, one of the possible implicatures becomes the clear default reading.

(45) A: Is it possible to meet with the manager right now?
   B: It is lunch hour. $\Rightarrow$ ‘You cannot meet with the manager now.’
   $\Rightarrow$ ‘You may still be able to meet with the manager.’

In example (45), speaker B may suggest either that a meeting with the manager is impossible at that moment or that said meeting may still be a possibility if the manager is in the office. In 2012 U.S. English, interlocutor A would, most likely, interpret speaker
B’s statement as a negative answer, that is, a meeting with the manager would be unlikely, given the general tendency of U.S. employees to take a break from work during lunch hour.

Moving on to an example in Spanish that contains hasta, one can see how, in theory, interlocutors can make different inferences from the same utterance and, thus, can interpret the functions of hasta in different ways.

(46) No condujeron hasta que llegó el verano.  
not drive-pret.3rd.pl. until that arrive-pret. 3rd.sg. the summer  
(‘They did not drive until summer arrived.’)

In example (46)\(^\text{20}\) above, the verb in the main clause is negated and, thus one may gather that the action of driving did not last until the arrival of summer. On the contrary, in such a reading the action of driving terminated sometime other than when summer arrived. Other interlocutors may see hasta in the example above as setting a limit on the time during which the action in question does not happen. In other words, in example (46), hasta can also mark the arrival of the summer season as the end of the ‘not driving’ period. The resulting conversational implicature suggests that the arrival of summer is actually the time when the driving begins. This inceptive implicature may be generalized over time and, thus, may become the default interpretation of the functions of hasta in a linguistic context like that presented in example (46). At times, generalization of conversational implicatures may be fueled, in particular, by the lexical aspect of a certain class of verbs, as will be detailed later in this chapter. For now, we will revisit the topic of negation and take a closer look at some of the features of negation in Spanish,

---
\(^{20}\) Example (46) has a negative adverb no in the main clause just like examples (8) and (10) analyzed at the beginning of chapter 1.
especially rules of negation and what determines its scope, in order to see how the scope of negation could potentially relate to the development of affirmative inceptive hasta in the MCAE Spanish dialects.

2.2 Negation in Spanish and pragmatic justification of affirmative inceptive hasta

In chapter 1 we examined how, over time, lexemes like nada, nadie, en mi vida, and so forth gradually lost the need to be accompanied by negation when used in preverbal positions. Authors as diverse as Santamaría (1959), Kany (1969), and Kauffman (1973) suggested that, by analogy, hasta may have done so as well.

As Stevens (1991, p. 310) pointed out, in Spanish, “the requirement for negation of a proposition is that there must be one and only one negatively-charged element before the verb. This element may be either a Negative Polarity Item, such as ninguno, or the overt negation word no.” This rule of negation would lead one to conclude that, in most

\[ \text{Negation} = \text{Negative Polarity Item} \lor \text{Negative Word} \]

21 Negative Polarity Items are constituents whose use in a given sentence is conditioned by the presence of a negated verb. In Spanish, however, a Negative Polarity Item in a preverbal position does not require the use of a negated verb.

22 It should be noted that such norms of negation are not practiced in several contact varieties of Spanish, in which the use of one or more Negative Polarity Items along with the negative adverb no in preverbal position is not uncommon. As a matter of fact, such usage of negation has been documented by various authors. In particular, Usher de Herreros, as cited by Klee and Lynch (2009, p. 162), observed the use of negative adverb no alongside other negative words in preverbal position in the Spanish dialect of Paraguay, as shown in example (47) below:

\[
(47) \text{Nunca no descansó mientras vivió.} \\
\text{Never not rest-pret.3}^{\text{rd}}.\text{sg. while live-pret.3}^{\text{rd}}.\text{sg.} \\
\text{('He/she never rested while he/she lived.')}
\]

Klee and Lynch noted that an equivalent structure was common in Guarani and that contact of Spanish with Guarani may have led to the above-mentioned negation usage in the Spanish of Paraguay as well.

On the other hand, while examining innovative characteristics of Catalan Spanish, Vann (2009a, p. 160) documented not only the use of Negative Polarity Items alongside no in preverbal position, but also the use of Negative Polarity Items in a post verbal position in the absence of a negative adverb no preceding the verb, as illustrated below in examples (48) and (49) respectively:

\[
(48) \text{Nadie no lo diría.} \\
\text{nobody not CL(Acc.3}^{\text{rd}}.\text{sg.) say-cond.3}^{\text{rd}}.\text{sg.} \\
\text{('Nobody would say it.')}
\]
varieties of Spanish, only examples (50) and (51) would be acceptable and that example (52) would appear rather ungrammatical:

(50) No habla ninguno.

not speak-pres.3rd.sg. no one

(‘No one speaks.’)

(51) Ninguno habla.

no one speak-pres.3rd.sg.

(‘No one speaks.’)

(52) *Ninguno no habla.

no one not speak-pres.3rd.sg.

(‘No one does not speak.’)

Steinberg (1991, p. 291) attested the same rule when describing the negative adverb no as the default negative word that has to precede a finite verb in a negative sentence in the absence of other negatives. If hasta has indeed acquired negativity in certain dialects

Vann noted that such usage is a constitutive linguistic norm in Catalan Spanish that at times may also carry important extralinguistic information (cf. Vann 2009b for extended discussion).

23 It is important to point out that, even in those varieties of Spanish in which ninguno would not be used in most contexts with the negative adverb no in a preverbal position, there are contexts in which such usage could occur grammatically. Imagine, for instance, the following talk exchange:

(53) A: - ¿Quién en tu casa no habla chino?

who in your house not speak-pres.3rd.sg. Chinese

(‘Who in your house does not speak Chinese?’)

B: - Ninguno.

(‘No one.’)

A: - ¿Verdad? ¿Ninguno no habla chino en tu casa?

really no one not speak-pres.3rd.sg. Chinese in your house

(‘Really? No one does not speak Chinese in your house? / There is no one who does not speak Chinese in your house?’)

B: - En mi casa todos hablamos chino.

in my house all speak-pres.1st.pl. Chinese

(‘In my house all of us speak Chinese.’)

In the situation illustrated above, the Negative Polarity Item ninguno is used with the negative adverb no in a preverbal position to emphasize the fact that nobody is a non-speaker of Chinese in that particular house.
over the course of time (just like en mi vida ‘in my life’, en toda la noche ‘all night long’, etc.) then, when used in preverbal position as a Negative Polarity Item it should reject the use of no like ninguno does in example (52). Yet it does not always do so; in other words, hasta has not acquired complete negativity like the above-mentioned expressions. Consider that in dialects where the use of affirmative inceptive hasta has been documented, sentences like example (54) are not considered ungrammatical.

\[(54) \overline{\text{Hasta}} \, \text{las diez no iré.} \]
\[\text{not (until) the ten not go-fut.1\textsuperscript{st}.sg.}\]
\[\text{‘(Not) Until ten I will not go.’}\]

Moreover, both Lope Blanch (1993) and Kany (1969), as mentioned in earlier paragraphs, have attested the uses of hasta given in both examples (54) and (55), sometimes even in the same region.

\[(55) \overline{\text{Hasta}} \, \text{las diez iré.} \]
\[\text{not (until) the ten go-fut.1\textsuperscript{st}.sg.}\]
\[\text{‘Not until ten I will go. / I will go at ten.’}\]

An examination of the derivation of sentences like those in (54) and (55) sheds light on this situation. Posit for a moment that the deep structure of both (54) and (55) is that given in (56) below, where the prepositional phrase is base generated within the verb phrase. Through simple movement and elimination transformations, example (56) can easily become example (54) or example (55).

\[(56) [\text{No}] [\text{iré}]_V \, [\text{hasta [las diez]}_\text{NP}]_PP]_V1]_VP \]
\[\text{not go-fut.1\textsuperscript{st}.sg. until the ten}\]
\[\text{‘I will not go until ten.’}\]

\[
^{24}\text{As will be explained later in this chapter, we believe that hasta, as used preverbally in examples (54) and (55), may have retained a negative valence that was absorbed from the negative operator no when hasta was base-generated in post verbal position. From this point of the dissertation on, negation bars will be used to represent negative valence.}\]
In dialects where *hasta* is said to have acquired negativity of its own, derived sentences like that given in example (54), even though still common, appear on the surface to deviate from the standard norms of negation, given the fact that usually only one negative word tends to precede the verb in a Spanish sentence. For these dialects, however, sentences like example (54) may simply represent a fossilized usage that was once characteristic of an evolutionary stage\(^{25}\) that later led to the development of affirmative inceptive *hasta* as used in example (55). In other words, in certain dialects, within structures like that in example (56), *hasta* may have absorbed a negative valence for often being used alongside no (just like *nada*, *nadie*, *en mi vida*, etc.). This potential negative valence of *hasta* may have been retained even when *hasta* moved to preverbal position, as shown in example (54). This retained negativity may have caused *hasta*, at a later stage of development, to act like a Negative Polarity item and lose the need for negation altogether when in preverbal position, as used in example (55). The fact that examples like (54) and (55) sometimes are used interchangeably even in the same region shows that *hasta* cannot be fully considered a Negative Polarity Item just yet. In the MCAE Spanish dialects, however, *hasta* appears to be evolving towards acquiring a negative valence of its own.

Besides the possibility that the usage of *hasta* in an inceptive way may have been

---

\(^{25}\) Granda and Choi, as cited by Klee and Lynch (2009, p. 162), pointed out that in Medieval Spanish it was common for negative pronouns like *nada*, *nadie*, and so forth, to be used before a negated verb. Klee and Lynch noted (p. 162) that, according to Keniston, negative pronouns were already being used as Negative Polarity Items by the sixteenth century. The Medieval negation structures, however, may have remained in use in certain regions during the colonial era, as evidenced by the Spanish of Paraguay. Because *hasta*, in certain dialects, may resemble negative words like *nada*, *nadie*, and so forth, this preposition may have been used, at some point, with a negative charge before a negated verb (cf. example (54)) as part of a larger paradigm in the development of negation in Spanish. Though outside the scope of this dissertation, further investigation is warranted in this regard.
affected in part by co-occurring processes that transformed other negative structures, earlier in the dissertation, we proposed that a partial role may have been played by the ambiguous nature of the scope of the negative adverb no present in the main clause of a sentence where hasta heads the subordinate clause. As Steinberg (1991, p. 291) pointed out, when a finite verb is negated by a negative word that immediately precedes the verb phrase, negation has scope over the whole verb phrase. In the case of a non-finite verb being negated within a verb phrase, the scope of negation is restricted to what follows the negative word. For instance, there is a difference in the scope of negation in examples (57) and (58):

(57) A Juan no le interesaba ver el partido de fútbol.
      PA Juan not CL(dat.3rd.sg.) interest-imperf.3rd.sg. see-inf. the
      game of football
      (‘Juan was not interested in watching the football game.’)

(58) A Juan le interesaba no ver el partido de fútbol.
      PA Juan CL(dat.3rd.sg.) interest-imperf.3rd.sg. not see-inf. the
      game of football
      (‘Juan was interested in not watching the football game.’)

In example (57) the negative adverb no has scope over interesaba, ver, el partido and fútbol, that is, we can see what Juan was not: interested in seeing the football game. In example (58), however, interesaba remains outside the scope of negation and, thus, we understand that it was in Juan’s interest not to do something: watch the football game.

Even though in the above-mentioned examples negation has syntactic scope over more than one of the constituents that follow it, during a conversation, a statement like that in example (57) may be interpreted in various particular ways by conversation
participants. In other words, interlocutors may restrict or expand the pragmatic scope of negation based on how they understand the unmarked statement. In example (57), for instance, interlocutors may interpret pragmatic scope as only affecting a certain constituent or a combination of them. In that regard, some of the possible interpretations of said example could be:

(57a) Juan was not INTERESTED in watching the football game.  
He was DELIGHTED to.

(57b) Juan was not interested in WATCHING the football game.  
He wanted to RECORD it.

(57c) Juan was not interested in watching THE FOOTBALL game.  
He wanted to watch GOLF instead.

(57d) Juan was not interested in watching the football GAME.  
He wanted to watch the football PRACTICE.

Just like in example (57), in a sentence like that given in example (59) below, no negates a finite verb and negation potentially has syntactic scope over part(s) or all of the rest of the sentence, (i.e., the negative adverb no can potentially negate trabajamos, hasta and las once in various combinations).

(59)  No trabajamos hasta las once.  
not work-pres.1pl. until the eleven  
(‘We do not work until eleven.’)

Therefore, by stating the sentence in (59), speakers could make multiple implicatures as illustrated by the semantic structures below:

---

26 It is important to note, therefore, that not all pragmatic readings of a given statement derive from distinct syntactic structures.

27 As mentioned earlier, pragmatic scope of negation in an unmarked statement varies based on the interlocutor’s point of view and, therefore, does not always uniquely match the syntactic scope of negation in that same statement. In a statement like example (59), for instance, only some of the illustrated readings correspond to distinct syntactic diagrams. For instance, the reading in (a) corresponds to a syntactic diagram like [[no [[trabajamos], ] [hasta las once]]_{pp}], and the reading in (g) is just one of the possible readings deriving from a syntactic diagram like [[no [[trabajamos hasta las once]]_{v1}]_{pp}}.
In the examples given in (59) the scope of negation difference could result in at least seven different possible conversational implicatures: In (59a), *no* has scope only over *trabajamos*, implicating the subject does something else until 11:00. In (59b), *no* has scope only over *hasta*, implicating work starts at 11:00. In (59c), *no* has scope only over *las once*, implicating the subject works until sometime other than 11:00. In (59d), *no* has scope over both *trabajamos* and *hasta*, suggesting as in (59a) the possibility that the subject does something else besides work, but also suggesting that the subject does this other thing not until 11:00, but rather, from 11:00 on. In (59e), *no* has scope over
*trabajamos* and *las once* implicating the subject does something besides work and also that the subject does this other thing until sometime other than 11:00. In (59f), *no* has scope over *hasta* and *las once* suggesting that the subject starts work at some time other than 11:00. In (59g), *no* has scope over the entire verb phrase, including *trabajamos*, *hasta* and *las once*. What is being implicated in this case is that the subject does something other than work, not until sometime other than 11:00.

All of the seven suggestions potentially deriving from example (59) are conversational implicatures and, as such, they can be cancelled without any contradiction. For instance, the subject in example (59a) could very well be doing nothing at all until 11:00 (implicature (a) is cancelled). The same subject could also be working neither until 11:00 nor since 11:00 (implicature (b) is cancelled). The fact that the sentences in (59a-g) are not entailments means that they do not have to be true. The multiple implicatures deriving from (59) and the fact that all of these implicatures are easily cancelable allow the conversation participants to infer what they believe to be most relevant to a particular context, assuming at the same time that the speaker who uttered the statement in (59) has done so in accordance with the Cooperative Principle.

When *hasta* occupies a preverbal position as in example (60) below,

(60) *Hasta las once no trabajamos.*
    until the eleven not work-pres.1st.pl.
    (‘Until eleven we do not work.’)

on the surface *no* appears to have scope only over *trabajamos* leading us to infer, as in example (59a), only that the subject does something else until 11:00. *Hasta*, though clearly not a full Negative Polarity Item as discussed above, may still in some ways act
like a partial Negative Polarity Item in certain dialects, however. In other words, for some speakers *hasta* may carry a negative valence though on the surface it does not fall under the syntactic scope of *no*, as illustrated by example (61) below.

\[(61) \textit{Hasta las once no trabajamos.} \quad \text{not (until) eleven not we work (‘Not UNTIL eleven we do not WORK.’)}\]

Because both *hasta* and *trabajamos* carry negation in (61), as indicated by capital letters in the gloss, the secondary conversational implicature of (59d) may still be recoverable. In other words, example (61) suggests, like (59d), that the subject does something other than work and, as well, that the subject does this other thing not until 11:00, but rather, from 11:00 on.

This implicature follows when postulating that examples like (61) correspond to the semantic structure of (59d) and that, syntactically, (59d), (60) and (61) all share the same deep structure, from which both (60) and (61) are derived via a simple movement transformation, as illustrated in (62) below:

\[(62) \left[ \left[ \text{hasta las once} \right]_{pp} \left[ \text{no} \right] \left[ \text{trabajamos} \right]_{v} \left[ t \right] \right]_{vp} \]

During this movement transformation, just like in examples (54) and (61) discussed above, in some cases *hasta* may have retained and carried over a negative valence absorbed while still under the scope of negation of *no* in (59). At a later stage of transformation, if *hasta* has partially assumed the characteristics of a Negative Polarity Item, it may have lost the need to be used alongside the negative operator *no* just like in example (63) below.
In example (63) negation has only been applied to *hasta* suggesting that we work not UNTIL, but rather, STARTING at 11:00.

Though the meaning of ‘doing something else at 11:00 other than work’ may be implicated in (59d) and (61), the suggested meaning of doing something else at 11:00 besides work cannot be implicated once *hasta* is preverbal and of negative polarity in (63) as it can in example (61). In example (61), the verb *trabajamos* falls under the scope of the negative adverb *no*, which is in preverbal position. In example (63), however, the absence of a negative adverb makes it impossible for *trabajamos* to be negated. Therefore, in example (63) the implicature that ‘we are not working at 11:00’ is lost.

Suppose that example (63) corresponds to the alternate derivation posited in (64) below, in which the scope of the negative adverb *no* falls unambiguously on only the prepositional phrase headed by *hasta*, which then moves out of the verb phrase with negative polarity.

$$(64) \begin{array}{c} \overset{\text{[hasta las once]_i}}{[\text{[no]}_i \text{[trabajamos]} [\text{t]_i \text{]_vp}}} \end{array}$$

Such a structure would explain how, when the prepositional phrase moves to a preverbal position, as in example (63), *hasta*, in some dialects of Spanish, may carry over the negative valence it came to possess while under the scope of the negative adverb *no* in (64). In other words, postverbal *hasta* may absorb a negative charge under the scope of
the adverb no.\footnote{While, diachronically, we postulate at first only a partial absorption that would have corresponded to co-occurrence of negatively charged hasta and surface no (leading to relics such as the examples given in (54) and (61)), synchronically, the evolutionary stages may be seen as conflated by transformations into complete pragmatic absorption, leading to the surface elimination of no.} The absorbed negativity is carried over and retained by hasta even after the movement transformation that the prepositional phrase undergoes. Pragmatically depleted, the negative adverb no itself may then undergo a transformation of elimination that makes it structurally impossible for the verb trabajamos to fall under the scope of negation. The elimination of the negative operator no, with its negativity retained and embedded in preverbal hasta, may result in hasta becoming a Negative Polarity Item “in the making” in some dialects of Spanish.

As mentioned earlier, in example (60) trabajamos falls under the scope of negation. By uttering a sentence like that in (60), a speaker may suggest that the subject does something else until 11:00 besides work. By extension, the speaker might also suggest that the subject works from 11:00 on. Both of these suggested meanings are implicatures and can be easily cancelled without contradicting the statement that the subject does not work until 11:00. Thus, one can say that the subject in (60) did not do anything at all until 11:00 and that the subject did not work even from 11:00 on. In example (63), however, the suggested meaning that the subject works from 11:00 on is an entailment and, thus, cannot be cancelled. In other words, one cannot say that the subject in (63) does not work because that would contradict the statement itself.

Based on the Cooperative Principle, speakers’ contributions to a conversation should be relevant and unambiguous in order for interlocutors to make relevant and unambiguous interpretations of the information exchanged. By uttering a statement like (60), a speaker may suggest that the subject works starting at 11:00, due to the fact that...
hasta, on the surface, does not fall under the scope of negation. In the MCAE Spanish dialects, however, conversation participants may consider hasta a lexeme that carries a negative valence. Consequently, in these dialects, example (60) may at times be interpreted like example (61), in which both hasta and trabajamos are negated, although the implicature that work starts at 11:00 is not possible in (61) as it is in (60). In other words, an unmarked statement like hasta las once no trabajamos (‘until 11:00 we do not work’), can be interpreted in two different ways depending on whether or not one considers hasta to be negatively charged. Therefore, by uttering the same unmarked statement mentioned above, some speakers may implicate that the subject is working at 11:00 and some other speakers may implicate that the very same subject is doing something else besides work starting at 11:00.

Interpretations of the information exchanged in (60) are likely to be ambiguous at best and potentially in conflict at worst. By uttering (63), however, the speaker can only implicate that the subject works starting at 11:00. This particular meaning is an entailment and, as a result, has to be true. Therefore, in the MCAE Spanish dialects, both statements (60) and (63) can implicate that the subject works starting at 11:00 but only (63) unambiguously entails such information. As a result, in these dialects where preverbal hasta may carry a negative valence, conversation participants may feel it is irrelevant for the verb trabajamos to be negated if the speaker’s intent is to relay information about when work started. Therefore, the distinction between implicature and entailment may play a role in the loss of no with preverbal hasta when this preposition displays inceptive functions given the speaker’s presumed adherence to the Cooperative Principle. Thus, the scope of negation and the resolution of conflicting conversational
implicatures through entailment may both lead to the elimination of the adverb *no* and to the ‘affirmative inceptive’ use of *hasta*. To complicate matters, said conversational implicatures can as well be affected in part by the lexical aspect of verbs, as detailed in the following section.

### 2.3 Verbal lexical aspect

As detailed earlier in Section 2.1, during a conversation, speakers can generally be expected to adhere to the maxims of the Cooperative Principle. Based on the talk exchange in which conversation participants are engaged, statements may be interpreted in different ways, therefore leading to conversational implicatures. In statements where *hasta* is used with a negated verb in the main clause, speakers may make several conversational implicatures based on how they interpret the scope of negation. In turn, such implicatures may lead to opposite interpretations of the functions of *hasta* (inceptive or terminative). We believe that, in addition to the ambiguous scope of negation, the lexical aspect of the matrix verb plays an important role in generating such implicatures. Before we examine how the functions of *hasta* are determined by the interaction of the scope of negation and verbal lexical aspect, let us first look at what is generally understood by the latter concept.

Vendler (1967) proposed the idea that verbal situations can be classified into categories based on the way that they “presuppose and involve the notion of time” (p. 97) – in other words, their lexical aspect. Four were the categories that Vendler proposed: activities (events that can terminate at any time without resulting incomplete, such as *listen to music* or *drive*), accomplishments (events that need to be fully completed in order to say that they happened, as in *plant a tree* or *listen to a song*), achievements
(events that have an instantaneous character and result in a change of state, as in *wake up* or *arrive*) and states (events that represent a state of being, as in *love* or *believe*).

In each of the sentences below (examples (65) and (66a)), *hasta*, followed by an affirmative verb, heads a subordinate clause in a sentence that has a negated verb in the main clause.

(65) *No me desperté hasta que salió el sol.*
    (I did not wake up until the sun rose.)

(66a) *No dormí hasta que paró de llover.*
    (I did not sleep until it stopped raining.)

As we will see below, the lexical aspect of the verbs in the main clauses of these examples is an important component of their meanings.

In example (65) the verb *despertarse* (‘to wake up’) is an achievement, and in example (66a) the verb *dormir* (‘to sleep’) is an activity verb. In both example (65) and example (66a) the verb in the main clause is negated. Example (65) lets the reader understand that the action of waking up did not happen until the sun rose. Therefore, the sunrise marks the moment when the achievement of waking up resulted in a change of state: the state of being asleep changed into the state of being awake, with *hasta* marking the beginning point of the new state (that of being awake). From example (66a), on the other hand, we may gather that the action of sleeping did not last until the moment the rain stopped. On the contrary, in such a reading the action of sleeping terminated some time other than when the rain stopped. Therefore, *hasta* in example (66a) does not necessarily mark the inception of the action of sleeping; rather, it can also be interpreted in terms of the end of the time interval for *dormir*. 
Unlike example (65), sentences like that in (66a) can be ambiguous. In (66a), if the scope of the sentence initial negative adverb *no* is seen as reaching into the subordinate clause headed by *hasta*, we understand that the action of sleeping lasted until sometime other than when the rain stopped. Such a reading is diagrammed in (66b).

(66b) [[No [dormí] [hasta que paró de llover.]]]

(‘I did not sleep UNTIL IT STOPPED RAINING.’)

If *no*, however, modifies only the matrix verb *dormir*, then *hasta* can be seen more clearly as marking the inception of the action of sleeping, as diagrammed below in (66c).29

(66c) [[No [dormí] [hasta que paró de llover.]]

(‘I did not SLEEP until it stopped raining.’)

This second interpretation stems from the fact that speakers may interpret certain activity verbs as achievements, therefore attributing an instantaneous temporal feature to the activities.30 For instance, the activity verb *dormir* in (66a) can very well be interpreted as the achievement verb *dormirse* (‘to fall asleep’), in which case we gather that *hasta* marks the moment the rain stopped as the inception of the action of sleeping. Other activity verbs, such as *cocinar* (‘to cook’), *hablar* (‘to speak’), *limpiar* (‘to clean’), and so forth, may acquire that instantaneous temporal feature when they are interpreted as *empezar a cocinar* (‘to begin to cook’), *empezar a hablar* (‘to begin to speak’), and *empezar a

29 Alternatively, that the subject did something else besides sleep until the rain stopped. (This reading also goes with the diagram in (66c)).

30 According to Smith (1997), lexical aspect, besides presenting a situation from a particular point of view, also conveys temporal information to a particular utterance. For Smith, temporality is “the way situations unfold in time” (Introduction, p. 13), having to do with the beginning and end points of a time interval, the duration of a situation, its dynamism, or lack thereof.
limpiar (‘to begin to clean’). As a result, a sentence like that in example (66a) would carry the same ambiguities if we substituted the verb dormir with comer, hablar, or limpiar. These ambiguities would not be present in sentences like that shown in example (65), where the main verb despertarse is an achievement (because achievements can not have duration). Verbal situations that are included in this category of lexical aspect, such as empezar (‘to begin’), llegar (‘to arrive’), ganar una carrera (‘to win a race’), encontrar (‘to find’), reconocer a alguien (‘to recognize somebody’), and so forth, have instantaneous temporal properties and always result in a change of state. Hasta, therefore, in sentences like (65), can only reflect inceptive properties, and, thus, the scope of the negative adverb no in the main clause can only extend to the achievement matrix verb.

The unambiguous reading of example (65) is diagrammed in (65a):

\[
(65a) \left[ \left[ \text{No} \right] \left[ \text{me} \right] \left[ \text{desperté} \right] \right] \\
(\text{not CL(1\text{st}.sg.) wake up-pret.1\text{st}.sg.}) \\
\left[ \text{hasta que salió el sol.} \right] \\
(\text{until that come out-pret.3\text{rd}.sg. the sun}) \\
(‘\text{I did not WAKE UP until the sun rose.’})
\]

It would seem rather ungrammatical if one were to interpret the scope of the negative adverb no, in example (65), as reaching into the subordinate clause headed by hasta, as diagrammed in (65b) below.

\[
(65b) *\left[ \left[ \text{No} \right] \left[ \text{me desperté} \right] \left[ \text{hasta que salió el sol.} \right] \right] \\
(‘\text{I did not wake up UNTIL THE SUN ROSE.’})
\]

Such a reading would suggest that the action of waking up lasted until some time other than when the sun rose. It would be impossible for hasta to mark the end of the duration
of the verb it modifies in sentences like (65), given the fact that the matrix achievement verb is of instantaneous character and therefore has no duration.

Activity verbs, however, are not the only verbs that, when negated, can lead to ambiguous interpretations in sentences where hasta makes a temporal reference. Examples (67a) and (68a) below present situations when the negated verb in the main clause is an accomplishment and a state, respectively:

(67a) *No hice las maletas hasta que viniste.*
not do-pret.1st.sg. the suitcases until that come-pret.2nd.sg. ('I did not pack the suitcases until you came."

(68a) *No creyó en Dios hasta que nació su hijo.*
not believe-pret.3rd.sg. in God until that be born-pret.3rd.sg. his son ('He/she did not believe in God until his/her son was born."

Just like in (66a), in examples (67a) and (68a) as well, the function of hasta will depend on the relationship between the scope of negation and the interpretation of the lexical aspect of the verb in the main clause. In example (67a), for instance, given the fact that the verbal situation *hacer las maletas* (‘to pack the suitcases’) is an accomplishment, we understand that the action has to be completed in order for us to say that we packed the suitcases. In other words, accomplishments have punctual properties but, unlike achievements, the punctual properties of accomplishments refer generally to the terminus of the actions in question, and accomplishments can have duration as well. Therefore, hasta can reflect terminative properties by marking the completion (or end point) of the duration of the action in the main clause. In such a reading, the scope of the negative adverb no would be seen as reaching into the subordinate clause, as illustrated by the bracketing below:

(67b) [[No] [[hice las maletas] [hasta que viniste.]]]
(not do-pret.1st.sg. the suitcases) (until that come-pret.2nd.sg.)
Example (67b) would suggest that packing, which might well have started at some earlier point in time, was completed / accomplished only when the other person arrived (i.e., interpreted as terminar de hacer las maletas (‘to finish packing the suitcases’). The accomplishment verb, however, may acquire additional punctual properties if we interpret it as empezar a hacer las maletas (‘to begin to pack the suitcases’). In such cases, the verb phrase will pattern additionally as an achievement verb and, thus, hasta will reflect the inceptive function. Such a reading is diagrammed in (67c) below:

(67c) [[[No] [hice las maletas]] [hasta que viniste.]]  
(not do-pret.1st.sg. the suitcases) (until that come-pret.2nd.sg.)  
(‘I did not PACK THE SUITCASES until you came.’)

The meaning gathered by interlocutors in example (67c) is that the subject may have been doing something else until the moment marked by hasta in the subordinate clause or, alternatively, that the subject started packing the suitcases at the moment marked by hasta and completed it shortly thereafter.

In example (68a), on the other hand, the verb in the main clause is a state verb and, as such, lasts for a certain time interval. If the scope of the negative adverb no in the main clause is seen as reaching into the subordinate clause headed by hasta, the meaning we gather is that the state of believing in God lasted until sometime other than when the son was born, as diagrammed below in (68b).

(68b) [[[No] [creyó en Dios]] [hasta que nació su hijo.]]  
(not believe-pret.3rd.sg. in God until that be born-pret.3rd.sg. his son)  
(‘He/she did not believe in God UNTIL HIS/HER SON WAS BORN.’)
If the negative adverb *no*, however, has scope only over the matrix state verb, as shown in (68c) below, the verb *creer* may be interpreted as *empezar a creer* (‘to begin to believe’). In such case, *hasta* will be seen as marking the inception of the state of believing.\(^{31}\)

\[
(68c) \text{[[[No][creyó en Dios]] [hasta que nació su hijo.]]} \\
\text{(not believe-pret.3\textsuperscript{rd}sg. in God) (until that be born-pret.3\textsuperscript{rd}sg. his son)} \\
\text{(`He/she did not BELIEVE IN GOD until his/her son was born.`)}
\]

In sum, in sentences where *hasta* heads a subordinate clause and the main clause has a negated activity, accomplishment, or state verb that can, at times, be interpreted with an instantaneous temporal feature, *hasta* can be interpreted as having either inceptive or terminative functions. The intent to avoid this ambiguity\(^{32}\) may lead to utterances like that in example (66d) below.

\[
(66d) \text{No dormí hasta que no paró de llover.} \\
\text{not sleep-pret.1\textsuperscript{st}sg. until that not stop-pret.3\textsuperscript{rd}sg. of rain-inf.} \\
\text{(`I did not sleep until it stopped raining. / I did not sleep so long as the rain had not stopped.`)}
\]

The only structural difference between (66a) and (66d) is the presence of a negative adverb *no* in the subordinate clause headed by *hasta*. Taken literally, it may seem that the subject of the sentence only slept while the rain did not stop, when, in fact, what was preventing the action of sleeping was the rain itself. While multiple interpretations of (66d) are still possible, we submit that the most appropriate interpretation stems from a reading in which the second negative adverb must be seen as semantically vacuous. We believe that the second *no* in sentences such as (66d) has pragmatic import, however.

\(^{31}\) Alternatively, that the subject did something else besides believe in God until his/her son was born. (This reading also goes with the diagram in (68c)).

\(^{32}\) As illustrated in example (65), said ambiguity is not present in sentences where *hasta* heads a subordinate clause and the main clause has a negated achievement verb. Said class of verbs displays an instantaneous temporal feature (without duration) and leads to a change of state. Therefore, *hasta* can only exhibit an inceptive function by marking the beginning point of the new state.
As discussed earlier in this chapter, based on what determines the syntactic scope of negation, in (66d) the second no would seemingly have scope over the verbal phrase that follows (i.e., paró de llover). If the two negations were pragmatically related, however, then the scope of the matrix no could be interpreted more locally, without extending to the subordinate clause; in other words, the default interpretation of its scope could be limited to the main clause, including the matrix verb dormir. As a result, the pragmatic scope of the negative adverb no in the main clause might end up disambiguated, eliminating one of the potential readings of example (66a): the terminative reading diagrammed in (66b). The narrowed scope of negation would then leave no room for ambiguous interpretations of the lexical aspect (activity or achievement) of the matrix verb dormir. This verb would then most likely be interpreted as an achievement verb (just like in (66c)), in which case hasta would be seen as marking the inception of the action referred to in the main clause.

To recap, in unmarked sentences like (66a), (67a), and (68a), the ambiguity of the scope of negation in the main clause may lead to ambiguous interpretations of the lexical aspect of the matrix verb if said verb is an activity, state, or accomplishment, given the fact that said classes of verbs can also be interpreted as achievements. In turn, the function of hasta may be interpreted as either inceptive or terminative, leading, thus, to another ambiguity. The use of the superfluous no in the subordinate clause headed by hasta, even if semantically vacuous, may be deemed appropriate by some speakers in order to clarify the scope of negation of the matrix no and to highlight the instantaneous
temporal features of the matrix verb. As a result, in (66d) the most likely pragmatic reading of hasta reflects inceptive properties.

Despite the semantic emptiness of negation in subordinate clauses of structures like (66d), such usage of the adverb no is apparently not uncommon to judge by usage examples given in popular dictionaries of Spanish, as illustrated below in example (71), taken from Diccionario panhispánico de dudas (2005, p. 335), and example (72), given in The Oxford Spanish Dictionary (2003, p. 424).

(71) No se fue hasta que (no) llegó su padre.

not CL(3rd.sg.) go-pret.3rd.sg. until that (not) arrive-pret.3rd.sg.

‘He did not leave until his father arrived. / He did not leave so long as his father had not arrived.’

In order to verify this possible pragmatic function of the superfluous no, several native speakers of Spanish were asked to consider the examples below:

(69) No dormí hasta que llegaste;

not sleep-pret.1st.sg. until that arrive-pret.2nd.sg.

me desperté una hora antes.

CL(1st.sg.) wake up-pret.1st.sg. one hour earlier

(‘I did not sleep until you arrived; I woke up one hour earlier.’)

(70) Anoche no dormí hasta que no llegaste.

last night no sleep-pret.1st.sg. until that no arrive-pret.2nd.sg.

¡No me hagas esperar tanto!

not CL(Acc.1st.sg.) make-imper.2nd.sg. wait-inf. so much

(‘Last night I did not sleep until you arrived. Do not make me wait so much!’)

When asked about the use of no in the subordinate clause of example (70), they felt that it was necessary to emphasize the fact that the action of sleeping only started when somebody else finally arrived. In example (69), however, they thought it was clear that the person did indeed sleep and that the statement was commenting on the duration of such action. Hence, they did not feel it necessary to use negation in the clause headed by hasta.
(72) No  se     acuesta                      hasta que (no)
    not  CL(3rd.sg.)  go to bed-pres.3rd.sg.  until  that (not)

    termine               de     leerlo.
    finish-subj.pres.3rd.sg.  of  read-inf.+acc.3rd.sg.

(‘He will not go to bed until he has read it. / He will not go to bed so long
as he has not read it.’)

The negative adverb no in the subordinate clauses of (71) and (72) is described
as optional in these and other dictionaries, most likely due to the fact that, semantically, it
is not needed.34

Similar use of negation, where a seemingly unnecessary negative adverb no can
have pragmatic import (as proposed earlier in the analysis of example (66d)), has also
been documented by Schwegler (1996, p. 253) in the Spanish dialect of the Dominican
Republic. Schwegler documented a peculiar form of double negation that is prevalent in
informal speech as shown in example (74), provided by the author himself:

(74) A: ¡Ahora sí vamos a comer aguacates!
    now  yes  go-pres.1st.pl. to eat-inf. avocados
(‘Now we are going to eat avocados!’)

B: ¡Aquí no hay [aguacates] no!
    here  not  be-pres.impers. [avocados]  not
(‘Here, no, there are no avocados!’)

34 It needs to be pointed out that this superfluous no often occurs in subordinate clauses headed by hasta
that refer to actions expressed by verbs in subjunctive. In these situations, the verb in subjunctive refers to
an unrealized potentiality in relation to the moment of speaking. Thus, speakers may at times deem it
necessary to use the second adverb no as an additional reinforcement of irrealis mode. Nevertheless, such
clauses do not require secondary negation, as illustrated in the example (73) provided by Dozier and Iguina
(1999):

(73) No me iré hasta que me
digas tu secreto.
not CL(1st.sg.)  go-fut.1st.sg.  until  that CL(dat.1st.sg.)
tell-subj.pres.2nd.sg.  your  secret
(‘I will not leave until you tell me your secret.’) (p. 216)
"No es la temporada."  
not be-pres.3rd.sg. the season  
(‘It is not the season.’)

As illustrated above, the first utterance of speaker B includes two negative adverbs *no* that enclose the predicate. The first *no* in *no hay [aguacates] no* would be sufficient to inform us that there are no avocados and, thus, an additional negative adverb would be semantically unnecessary. The second adverb *no* may, therefore, carry some pragmatic nuances. Schwegler (p. 287) saw this double negation as an element that the speaker uses not just to inform, but also to contradict someone’s false presupposition at the same time. In example (74), speaker A presupposes that there are avocados and that they will eat some. Therefore, speaker B finds it necessary not only to inform that there are no avocados (first negative adverb *no*), but also to correct the presupposition that there are avocados available to eat (second negative adverb *no*).

Despite it being common, however, double negation in Dominican Spanish does not replace single negation. In the second utterance, speaker B uses only one negative adverb *no* due to the fact that he is simply informing the other speaker that it is not avocado season. There is no indication that speaker A presupposes that it is, in fact, time to harvest avocados. Therefore, double negation is not used because speaker B does not need to correct any false presuppositions. Thus, double negation in the Dominican Republic, even though semantically unnecessary, can be seen to serve a highly specialized and important pragmatic function at the level of conversational implicature.

A similar type of negation that is semantically unnecessary in Spanish is observed in the discourse particle *no, sí* explored by Busquets, Koike and Vann (2001). The authors analyzed a series of recorded dialog excerpts where the discourse particle *no, sí*
appeared in natural conversation. Given the fact that the negative particle *no* did not convey any semantically negative meaning to some of the utterances that they analyzed, Busquets, Koike, and Vann looked to the pragmatic functions of *no, sí* when trying to analyze its use as a discourse particle in Spanish. Example (75) below, presented by these authors (p. 702), illustrates the use of *no, sí* as a discourse particle with clear pragmatic implicatures:

(75) I: *O sea, ¿no tienes una buena opinión de los catalanistas?*  
(‘So, you don’t have a good opinion of the Catalanists?’)

X: *No, sí sí, de los catalanistas sí, o sea yo soy catalanista.*  
(‘No, I do! Regarding the Catalanists definitely, I mean, I am a Catalanist.’)

In example (75), the interviewer (I) asked a negated question that generated a negative implicature. Busquets, Koike, and Vann (2001), demonstrated that, by responding with *no, sí*, informant (X) was able to disagree with the negative implicature and correct the implicated expectation of the proposition expressed by the interviewer. In other words, the negative adverb *no* uttered by (X) does not mean that he does not have a good opinion of the Catalanists. The function *no* in *no, sí* in (75) is, rather, to reject (I)’s implicature that (X) does not have a good opinion of the Catalanists. Busquets, Koike, and Vann considered this use of *no* as a way for the speaker to acknowledge “that some negative element has been perceived by ‘mirroring the negativity’ of the implicature” (p. 706).

Similar “mirroring” effects can be seen in examples (74) and (66d) as well. In these examples, the semantically unnecessary negative adverb *no* responds, respectively, to a conversational implicature in either the interlocutor’s previous conversational turn (example (74)), or in a previous clause of the speaker’s same utterance (example (66d)). This last form of mirroring, which might be described as “self-mirroring,” is not directly
parallel to the sort of mirroring discussed above. In the examples from Dominican and Catalan Spanish, examples (74) and (75), respectively, the negativity mirrored by the semantically-unnecessary *no* is discourse-based. This negative adverb mirrors a negative or false implicature made by an interlocutor in a previous conversational turn. In example (66d), on the other hand, the superfluous *no* mirrors the negativity of an implicature resulting from the negated verb in the main clause of the very same sentence and, therefore, represents an utterance-based mirroring of negativity.

Taken together, the examples seen so far suggest a relationship between the function of *hasta* and the structure of the sentences in which it appears. Given the fact that the lexical aspect of the verbal situation in the main clause seems to be crucial to the meaning(s) we garner from a given utterance, and given that this lexical aspect can be affected by prepositional phrases and adverbial phrases headed by *hasta*, we submit that *hasta* may be an aspectual marker. Koike (1996, p. 268) defined an aspectual marker as “a tool that aids the listener in processing the information that the narrator is trying to convey.” As an aspectual marker *hasta* will, therefore, mark the aspect of the verbal situation it modifies. In example (64), for instance, the *hasta* phrase modifies the verb *despertarse*, which, according to Vendler’s classification, is an achievement verb. Due to the instantaneous nature of the achievement lexical aspect, *hasta* can only mark the beginning point of the new state of being awake. In examples (66a), (67a), and (68a), however, *hasta* can mark either the end or the inception of the verbal situation of sleeping, packing the suitcases, and believing in God, respectively. The ambiguous nature of the functions of *hasta* in the above-mentioned examples is due to the fact that *hasta* reflects the ambiguous interpretation of both the scope of negation of the negative
adverb *no* in the main clause as well as the aspect of the verbal situations *dormir*, *hacer las maletas*, and *creer en Dios*.

To review, as discussed above, in general Spanish, when *hasta* heads a noun phrase in an affirmative main clause, it can act as a preposition that marks the end point of the action in question (cf. example (9)). If the main clause, however, contains a negated activity verb that can also be interpreted as an achievement, like *salir* (‘to go out’) in example (8), then *hasta* can function as an aspectual marker that signals the achievement reading.\(^{35}\) Additionally, as also discussed above, in general Spanish, when *hasta* is part of a subordinate clause in a sentence where the main verb is affirmative, just like when heading a noun phrase, *hasta* marks the end of the action (cf. example (11)).

When the main verb is negated, however, interaction between the scope of negation and lexical aspect can potentially alter the functions of *hasta*. If the negated verb in the main clause is an activity, state, or accomplishment that can also be interpreted as an achievement, *hasta* can be interpreted as marking either an ending limit (cf. examples (66b), (67b), and (68b)) or the inception of an action (cf. examples (66c), (67c), and (68c)), due to ambiguities in the scope of negation and the nature of the lexical aspect of the verb in the main clause. In such cases, mirrored negation may appear in the subordinate clause headed by *hasta* (cf. example (66d)) in order to clarify the intended scope of the first negative adverb *no* and the lexical aspect of the matrix verb, disambiguating, in turn, the function of *hasta* (i.e., clarifying that *hasta* is to be

---

\(^{35}\) This reading, in addition to being inceptive, can be considered punctual as well, given Carlota Smith’s (1999) revision of Vendler’s classification of verb types, in which she added distinguishing temporal features to the categories that Vendler originally proposed. For instance, Smith considered activity verbs as having, among others, durative temporal features and achievement verbs as having instantaneous temporal features (p. 481).
interpreted as only marking the inception of the main action). Table 5 below presents a
summary of the aspectual functions of hasta by negation (rows) and syntax (columns):

Table 5: Aspectual functions of hasta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negation</th>
<th>Syntax</th>
<th>HASTA + noun phrase</th>
<th>HASTA + subordinate noun clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative main verb</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marks the end of the action (cf. example (9)).</td>
<td>Marks the end of the action (cf. example (11)).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Negated main verb         |        | Marks inception of the action (cf. example (8)). | a) Sets limits if the action is interpreted as just an activity, state, or accomplishment (cf. examples (66b), (67b), and (68b)).
|                           |        |                     | b) Marks inception if the action is an achievement or may be interpreted as such (cf. examples (65), (66c), (67c), and (68c)). A superfluous no may appear in the subordinate clause to reinforce this reading. |

As mentioned at the beginning of this section, the reason for examining the common structures in which hasta appears in general Spanish was to focus on the different functions related to these structures. Understanding the functions of hasta may give us a better understanding of how affirmative inceptive hasta, as used in the MCAE Spanish dialects, could have developed over time. If we look back at examples (65), (66c), (67c), and (68c), it is clear that it is the lexical aspect of the matrix verb – achievement or able to be interpreted as such – that makes it possible for hasta to mark inception. Therefore, we propose that affirmative inceptive hasta may have originated specifically with achievement verbs and later extended to other classes of verbs that may be interpreted as such. In utterances like example (65), for instance, the only possible interpretation of hasta is that of marking the inception of the (achievement) action in the
matrix clause. In statements like (66a), (67a), and (68a), the main verb does not belong to the verb class of achievements. Due to the flexible scope of negation, however, such verbs may be interpreted as achievements (cf. e.g., (66c), (67c), and (68c)) by conversation participants. In turn, the conversational implicature that arises is that hasta marks the inception of the action represented by the negated verb in the main clause. This conversational implicature may have been generalized over time, thus making the inceptive reading the default interpretation of the functions of hasta when this lexeme heads a subordinate clause in a statement where the matrix verb is negated.

It is particularly a structure like that in example (66d) that we believe to be one of the possible constructions from which affirmative inceptive hasta developed historically. Given the fact that the second adverb no in (66d) is semantically unnecessary, speakers may consider utterances like (66a) and (66d) to be functionally related and interlocutors may use either one of these structures to reflect inceptive properties of hasta, especially because the perceived function of hasta in these examples is the result of the individual’s interpretation of both the aspect of the main verb as well as the scope of negation of the no in the main clause.

In sum, we believe that the development of hasta into a preposition that marks inception of an action in affirmative verbal situations may have been the result of several processes occurring consecutively or concurrently to each other. In situations where hasta heads a subordinate clause and the verb in the main clause is negated, the functions

---

36 Of course, though they may generate similar implicatures, they are not interchangeable at all. Example (66d) may be seen to be more forceful pragmatically, because, as discussed above, the mirrored negativity disambiguates the scope of negation of the negative operator no in the matrix clause. As mentioned in section 2.2, conversation participants generally try to adhere to the Cooperative Principle and, thus, try to avoid ambiguity in the statements they utter.
of this preposition may be interpreted as terminative or inceptive. Depending on the way in which one interprets the scope of negation of the adverb *no* in the main clause, lexical aspect may be interpreted to highlight either the beginning or end point of a time interval. The simultaneous influence of the scope of the negative adverb *no* in the main clause and the lexical aspect of the main verb may have contributed to *hasta*’s development as an aspectual marker. As such, *hasta* can, in some dialects, now reflect both inceptive and terminative properties in the same verbal situation and may create ambiguities, as analyzed in section 1.1.2. In order to clarify the aspect that *hasta* marks, a superfluous *no* may appear in the subordinate clause. The presence of this second negative adverb may contribute to the default interpretation of the pragmatic scope of the first negative operator and, in doing so, may disambiguate the lexical aspect of the matrix verb. Consequently, the superfluous *no* makes it possible for *hasta* to be interpreted as marking only the inception of the action in the main clause. This inceptive reading may be generalized over time by becoming the default interpretation of the function of *hasta* in certain contexts. Therefore, due to such generalization of the inceptive properties of *hasta*, in both examples (66a) and (66d) *hasta* might be interpreted as only marking the inception of the verbal situation in the main clause.

In the MCAE Spanish dialects, *hasta*, in example (66a), may have absorbed negativity while under the scope of negation of the negative operator *no*. Such negative valence may have been carried over when the prepositional phrase headed by *hasta* moved to preverbal position. In other words, in a statement like *Hasta que paró de llover no dormí*, while *dormir* is negated because it falls under the direct surface scope of *no*, *hasta* may yet retain the negative charge it absorbed when it was base-generated in post
verbal position. If in the above-mentioned Spanish dialects *hasta* is considered a partial Negative Polarity Item (i.e., requires the presence of *no* only when used post verbally), then the negation of the matrix verb may be rejected altogether. The result would be an utterance where *hasta* marks inception in an affirmative verbal situation. This newly-found feature of *hasta* in certain Spanish dialects may have later extended to utterances where this lexeme is part of a main clause.\(^{37}\)

The pragmatic analysis of affirmative inceptive *hasta* was presented in this chapter in order to support the theory presented in chapter 1 regarding a potential origin of said construction. Because this dissertation investigates factors that may influence the understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta* by students of Spanish as a second language, we will now follow up with a detailed description of the methodology that was used in this study in order to gather comparable data on how students understood, judged, and used *hasta* in different situations. Such account is the topic of the next chapter.

\(^{37}\) It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to explore this development any further here. Suffice it to say that, as this chapter has demonstrated, the development of affirmative inceptive *hasta* may likely have pragmatic motivations. Further research is warranted in this regard.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter discusses the methodology that was employed to select appropriate research participants and subsequently collect the data necessary for this investigation. Section 3.1 details the process of selecting the research participants. Section 3.2 describes how the participants were identified as members of specific social networks in and out of class settings. Section 3.3 explains the details of the data collection procedures. Subsections included in Section 3.3 discuss the materials that were used to elicit data from the participants: two oral tasks, two written tasks, and a background questionnaire. The subsections about the linguistic tasks that were used in this investigation also discuss the purpose for choosing such tasks and how they were carried out by the participants. Section 3.4 details the expected findings based on the methodology that was used. The discussion in Section 3.4 includes an explanation of the seven extralinguistic variables that are examined, the expected relationship between the linguistic and the extralinguistic variables, and a statement of hypotheses.

3.1 Selection of research participants

The selection of the classes from which the research participants would be recruited was based on the following predetermined criteria: (1) Spanish classes with modeling but not explanation of MCAE \textit{hasta}, Spanish classes with modeling of non-MCAE \textit{hasta} and explanation of both MCAE and non-MCAE usage, and a control group;
(2) Spanish classes of beginner’s and intermediate level of instruction (1000 level vs. 3000 level); and (3) Spanish classes where there was an emphasis on oral expression (conversation course), written expression (composition course), or both (basic skills introductory course). In all, nine types of classrooms were selected for recruitment visits. To fulfill the predetermined criteria, three different types of classrooms were chosen for each of the following courses: SPAN 1000 (basic introduction), SPAN 3160 (composition), and SPAN 3170 (conversation). After a brief description of the student sample, we return to the differences among the three types of classrooms per course in 3.1.2 and again in 3.2.1.1.

3.1.1 The student sample

Before beginning to recruit participants for the study, it was necessary for the research project to be reviewed by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at the university under consideration (project number 07-12-06) in order to ensure that this investigation was compliant with university policies and federal regulations. Said Review Board approved the project along with the consent form that was to be distributed to potential research participants during the recruitment process. This document explained in detail the risks that participants might incur, in what ways they could benefit from the research, as well as how confidentiality would be maintained (cf. Appendix A). Prior to the classroom visits, the researcher also met with each of the instructors teaching the selected classes in order to explain the study and to obtain the instructors’ permission to visit said classes.

Each of the classroom visits, which took place at the beginning of class time and lasted between twenty and thirty minutes, was scheduled at a time and day when such
visits would cause the least inconvenience for both instructors and students. In other words, the recruitment visits were not to be carried out on a day when students had a scheduled test or an oral presentation. During these visits, the researcher briefly described the project to the students and pointed out that their participation was needed in order for the study to be carried out. Students were also informed that the project had already been reviewed and approved by the university’s Human Subjects Institutional Review Board in order to make sure that the proposed study complied with established regulations for research that involves human subjects.

After handing out a consent form to each of the students who were present, the researcher continued to explain that the individuals electing to participate in this study would each meet alone with the researcher outside of class for a sociolinguistic interview. Said interview would last approximately 60 minutes and it would consist of completing two oral tasks, two written tasks, and a background questionnaire. The researcher then described the general format and nature of the tasks that would be completed during the interviews. Students were also informed that, should they elect to participate in the study, they would be audio recorded for the first oral task. As for the purpose of this study, the researcher only related that students’ participation would contribute to a study that aimed at investigating how students of Spanish as a second language understood, judged, and used pragmatic forms. Students were not informed that the target being studied was \textit{hasta}. The researcher made it clear that the project and the tasks to be completed by research participants during the sociolinguistic interviews were not related to the daily classroom activities. As a result, students’ class grades and their relationships with the instructor or the university itself would not be affected by students’ decisions regarding
participation in the study. Furthermore, all the information and data collected from the
interviews would be confidential and the answers would be coded in order for the
participants’ names not to be disclosed.

Students were then told that, should they decide to participate in the study, they
needed to sign a consent form as an indication that they had understood the project
requirements and that they were electing to participate of their own free will. Signed
consent forms could be returned within the week to respective classroom instructors who
would then submit said forms to the researcher. In the end, the researcher invited
students to ask questions or request information that would help them make an informed
decision regarding participation in the study.

The researcher was able to recruit 27 student volunteers from the classroom visits
that took place during the semester of Spring 2008. This initial sample was composed of
3 students from each of the 9 classrooms that were originally selected for recruitment
visits. After receipt of signed student consent forms, the participants were scheduled for
their individual sociolinguistic interviews. The data collected from the 27 participants
were later compiled and coded in order to be used for the statistical analysis.

After careful examination of the data, the number of variables taken into
consideration and the research questions that this dissertation intended to answer, it
became evident that the existing data were insufficient in order to carry out the desired
analyses. Therefore, it was crucial that more participants be recruited. Before resuming
classroom visits, the researcher, in consultation with a statistician, calculated the
minimum number of participants needed to perform the desired statistical tests. The
recruitment process would have to continue during the semester of Fall 2008. All the
steps that were described above in relation to the initial classroom visits and the subsequent sociolinguistic interviews would be repeated in the same manner.

As mentioned earlier, the nature of Spanish courses that could be included in this study was very specific and was based on class level, pedagogy practice, and mode of expression. Due to such restrictions, the recruitment of participants depended not only on the availability of sufficient student volunteers, but also on the availability of the above-mentioned types of Spanish courses in a given semester. During the second round of recruitment, the investigator was able to visit only 8 of the 9 types of classrooms needed for the study, due to the lack of availability of a beginner’s Spanish class (SPAN 1000) where MCAE *hasta* was modeled. During Fall 2008, 40 additional students volunteered to participate in the study. This group included 5 students from each of the 8 classes visited by the researcher. In order to have the same number of participants in each of the 9 types of Spanish classrooms included in the study, it was necessary that 5 more individuals be recruited from a SPAN 1000 course where students received modeling of MCAE *hasta*. These last 5 student volunteers were recruited during the semester of Spring 2009. Before visiting that class, the researcher first had to apply for a continuing review from the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board in order to be able to continue collecting data beyond the one-year time limit of the initial approval. The data collection process was finalized in the semester of Spring 2009.

The overall sample of self-recruited participants was composed of 72 students whose first language was English and who were enrolled in one of the following three Spanish courses at a Midwestern university during the semesters of Spring 2008, Fall 2008, and Spring 2009: SPAN 1000 (beginners), SPAN 3160 (intermediate composition),
and SPAN 3170 (intermediate conversation). The instructors teaching these classes did not participate in the research as investigators. Students who during data collection were simultaneously enrolled in both SPAN 3160 and SPAN 3170 were not part of this research project either.

3.1.2 Classrooms and courses

Three different types of classrooms were included in the study for each course (SPAN 1000, SPAN 3160, and SPAN 3170). One type of classroom per course was taught by a Mexican national who involuntarily modeled MCAE usage of hasta without any explicit instruction about such usage or even about the existence of such usage. A second type of classroom per course received a mini lesson on the different meanings and uses of hasta including MCAE hasta. Such lessons did not include focused practice. In an effort to avoid any involuntary modeling of MCAE hasta in this cohort, only classes whose instructors were not native speakers of MCAE Spanish and whose instructors had not studied abroad in any of the MCAE regions were selected for participation in the study. The only form of hasta modeled in these classrooms was non-MCAE hasta. The purpose of having this second type of classroom per course was to see if (and how)

38 Due to lack of availability of instructors who were nationals of Ecuador or Central America, it was impossible for this project to include a cohort of students who received involuntary modeling of affirmative inceptive hasta from natives of the above-mentioned regions.
39 Though no extended observation was carried out, this dissertation assumes that the native Mexican instructors model affirmative inceptive hasta not only orally but also in writing. Furthermore, the researcher does not exclude the possibility that students participating in this study might have had previous classroom exposure to modeling of affirmative inceptive hasta as well. Such information was collected (as part of the background questionnaire discussed in 3.3.3) and used in the construction of the index variables discussed in 3.4.
40 This study did not investigate whether said instructors were members of social networks outside university Spanish classes where hasta may have been used in the affirmative inceptive way. The researcher recognizes that not being able to account for such potential exposure may be a weakness in the study.
knowledge of dialectal pragmatic usages of hasta would influence the understandings, judgments, and uses of this preposition by students of Spanish. Such classrooms could contrast with those taught by Mexican nationals – classes where the students received no explicit instruction regarding MCAE hasta but were exposed to the involuntary modeling of MCAE hasta by their instructors.

The final three types of classrooms per course served as control groups. These groups were taught by an instructor who was not Mexican, Central American, or Ecuadorian, and students in these sections received modeling of non-MCAE hasta but no explicit instruction about any meanings or uses of hasta. This study did not assess the participants’ pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of hasta before the students received modeling of or explicit instruction on hasta. Thus, by not following a pretest / posttest format, this study should not be construed, methodologically, to be an investigation designed to measure second language acquisition, and its findings ought not be confused as such. Instead, the methodology described above was designed to measure any possible influence that specific social factors may have on the participants’ understandings, judgments, and uses of contextual meanings in Spanish. In particular, this study’s goal was to investigate how participants’ membership in given social networks affected them linguistically, as measured by the participants’ understandings, judgments, and uses of hasta. It was particularly for this sociolinguistic purpose that several types of Spanish classrooms per course were included in this study.

41 Due to the insufficient number of native Mexican instructors available, it was impossible for this project to include a cohort of students who received both explicit instruction and modeling of affirmative inceptive hasta.
The researcher chose two different levels of Spanish courses (1000 vs. 3000) in order to test the influence of class level on the use of MCAE hasta. The purpose of choosing three different types of classrooms per course at each of the above-mentioned levels was to see how understandings, judgments, and uses of hasta would be affected by modeling and direct instruction at each level. In addition, the levels chosen were also courses where students are usually exposed to different emphases in teaching. The course chosen at the 1000 level, for instance, is a course in which students receive a balance of oral and written tasks in order to have daily practice of both oral and written skills. The SPAN 3160 courses, besides requiring a higher level of grammatical proficiency than SPAN 1000 courses, focus entirely on composition and therefore the students are mainly exposed to written tasks. These students are not exposed to or involved in oral language tasks as much as their counterparts in the other 3000 level course included in the study, SPAN 3170. SPAN 3170 is a conversation class, where students mainly receive practice in oral, rather than written, language skills.

The diversity in teaching levels / emphases illustrated in the courses selected for inclusion in this study operationalizes our research questions of (1) whether, and in what ways, explicit instruction about hasta or exposure to its modeling affects the degree to which students understand, judge, and use hasta, (2) whether, and in what ways, class level of instruction affects the understandings, judgments, and uses of hasta, and (3) whether, and in what ways, the fact that students were exposed to and practiced different skills (oral, written, or both) affects their understandings, judgments, and uses of hasta.

Because this dissertation investigates specific social network attributes that may influence student understandings, judgments, and uses of hasta, it was important to, first
of all, identify the types of social networks in which the students were members. Such is
the topic of the next section, which explains how the concept of social network was
utilized as a methodological tool in our study.

3.2 The concept of social network in the present study and identification of
participants as members of particular social networks in and outside of class
settings

As previously discussed in chapter 1, the social network types that are of interest
to this investigation (in examining how participants’ network membership could
potentially influence participants’ understandings, judgments, and uses of L2 pragmatics)
are classroom social networks and social networks that extend beyond the classroom
setting. Discussion in this section will detail how these two discrete types of social
networks were theoretically conceived and how participants were identified as members
of the respective networks. In class settings, based on the predetermined criteria
discussed in Section 3.1, this study distinguishes the following types of classroom social
networks: (1) classroom social networks based on pedagogy practice, (2) classroom social
networks based on class level, and (3) classroom social networks based on mode of
expression. Participants’ memberships in these classroom social networks are discussed
below in subsection 3.2.1. As for the social networks outside of class settings, this study
focuses on social networks that may have exposed the participants to different dialectal
varieties of Spanish, as discussed in subsection 3.2.2.

3.2.1 Social networks in class settings

Students enrolled in a specific L2 classroom are considered to form a type of
community whose members share certain connections. Among all the kinds of linkages
that students could possibly share as members of classroom networks, this study is interested in the ties that are a function of the type of class in which the students were enrolled. Classes that were included in the current project to investigate understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta* were pre-existing social groups in the sense that they were not created ad hoc for the purposes of the study. The participants in this study were enrolled in pre-existing university courses that provide distinct levels of instruction and forms of interaction in Spanish and, therefore, the participants were considered to be members of different social networks of students who were all studying Spanish as a second language in classes at a Midwestern university. In this section, we examine each of the different types of classroom social networks that was included in the study. Section 3.2.1.1 examines classroom networks based on pedagogy practice. Section 3.2.1.2 focuses on classroom networks based on class level. Finally, section 3.2.1.3 looks at classroom networks based on mode of expression.

Before we continue, it is important to point out that this study focuses on students’ memberships in different classroom networks, each of which is based on different linkage characteristics. The particular kind of ties that students share with the other members of their classroom network is a function of the type of classroom network (cf. predetermined criteria discussed above) of which they are members. This relationship is particularly important because these specific ties may, in turn, affect the language performance of the members who share them. Membership in a particular classroom network creates certain kinds of ties among members. Different kinds of ties in each type of classroom network may tend to exert differential pressures over network members, influencing them to conform differently to the linguistic norms of each type of classroom network.
In order to assess individuals’ degree of integration into a given social network, one would commonly measure the density and multiplexity of network ties by assigning scores to the number and types of links shared by network members. By definition, the degree of integration of individuals into a specific social network is a function of the kind and number of ties that they share with other network members. Sociolinguists have been particularly interested in different measures of these ties (Milroy, 1987). Density is an indication of the percentage of the actual ties that bind members of a given social network in relation to the overall number of possible ties that exist within that same network. Multiplexity, on the other hand, represents the percentage of the actual simultaneous ties that are shared between the same network members in relation to the overall number of possible simultaneous ties that exist within that network.

For this investigation, the degree of integration of individual students into the different classroom networks included in the study was not formally assessed (by measures of the density and multiplexity of student network ties or otherwise). Rather, as discussed above, membership alone in particular classroom networks was all that we focused on, given the distinct nature of social ties in each type of classroom in which the participants were enrolled. In other words, our methodological interest in the social ties formed in classroom networks (and in their linguistic consequences) was limited to the known pedagogical design and subsequent / concomitant interactional practices that generally characterize each network included in the study. Future research may be warranted to include in-depth individual measurements of density, multiplexity, and / or integration with regard to the different kinds of classroom networks investigated in this study.
design and interactional practices of each type of classroom gave us basis to assess
generalized participant exposure to such practices for the purpose of this study.

For instance, when looking at classroom social networks based on mode of
expression, SPAN 3170 classroom networks share ties that are generally thought to be
dense and/or multiplex. Student members of said networks need to express themselves
constantly in oral form and thus, by design, they tend to interact intensively with each
other on a daily basis. In a SPAN 3160 classroom network, however, members do not
interact with each other as often or as intensively as their counterparts do in a SPAN 3170
class because 3160 students tend to express themselves in written form. Consequently,
ties between and among student members of 3160 classroom networks can generally be
expected to be less dense and multiplex than those of their counterparts in 3170
classroom networks. Members of SPAN 3160 classroom networks, therefore, may feel
less pressured to conform to group interactional linguistic norms than do members of
SPAN 3170 classroom networks. SPAN 1000 classroom networks are characterized by a
relative balance between oral and written modes of expression. In these networks,
members express themselves in written form but they also have opportunities to interact
with each other orally on a daily basis. Thus, we presume that, due to the distinct kinds
of social ties that theoretically should result from different modes of expression, on the
whole members of SPAN 1000 classrooms may face more network pressure to conform
to the linguistic norms of group interaction than do members of SPAN 3160 classrooms,
but less such pressure than do members of SPAN 3170 classroom networks.  

43 Precisely because density, multiplexity, and individual integration were not measured quantitatively for
the classroom networks, our research cannot account for individual variation in this regard within a
particular classroom network. Future research on this issue may be warranted.
3.2.1.1 Classroom networks based on pedagogy practice

As mentioned earlier, for each of the Spanish courses that were included in this study (SPAN 1000, SPAN 3160, and SPAN 3170) one type of classroom had instructors who modeled non-MCAE hasta and presented a lesson about both MCAE and non-MCAE usage of hasta. A second type of classroom had instructors who involuntarily modeled MCAE hasta without giving any explicit instruction as to its usage or existence, and the third type of classroom represented the control groups. Based on pedagogy practice, this study can therefore distinguish three different kinds of social networks in university Spanish classes: (1) social networks where student members are exposed to modeling of MCAE hasta (without receiving any explicit instruction about such usage), (2) social networks where student members receive modeling of non-MCAE hasta and explicit instruction about both MCAE and non-MCAE usage, and (3) social networks where student members are part of the control group.

Pedagogy practice is significant because different practices may relate to different sorts of ties that link classroom network members. As Palfreyman (2006) observed (cf. chapter 1), student participants may see their Spanish instructors as a potential resource of language learning. As members of classroom networks, students may feel pressured to conform particularly to the linguistic norms propagated by their instructors. Such pressure, in turn, may help percolate teachers’ ways of speaking and may, therefore, influence students linguistically. In classroom networks where instructors model MCAE hasta, student members are exposed to linguistic norms of Spanish dialects where MCAE hasta is common. Based on Palfreyman’s findings, if students are drawn to conform particularly to teachers’ ways of speaking, then student members of the above-mentioned
classroom social networks may be expected to exhibit greater pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta* than student members of the control group.

On the other hand, in classroom networks where students are exposed to explicit instruction about the usage of *hasta* in the MCAE Spanish dialects, students’ ways of speaking in Spanish (in particular, how the students understand, judge, and use MCAE *hasta*) may not be influenced in the same fashion (or at all). We believe that L2 students who only have knowledge of the affirmative inceptive feature of *hasta* (but who do not receive any modeling of such usage) will not understand, judge, and use MCAE *hasta* as appropriately as do L2 students in classroom networks exposed to modeling of said usage. Students may still feel pressured to conform to the linguistic norms propagated by their instructors. Linguistic norms in this cohort, however, do not include regular or natural usage of MCAE *hasta*. Therefore, without pressure to adhere to linguistic norms in their classroom network that include MCAE *hasta* usage, students’ linguistic behavior, in particular, their understandings, judgments, and uses of MCAE *hasta*, may be different in this cohort in comparison to the cohort of students who received modeling of said usage, all other things being equal.

As discussed in chapter 1 (cf. Palfreyman’s study), given the role of teachers as resources in classroom networks, classes where students are exposed only to instruction concerning the usage of *hasta* in the MCAE Spanish dialects (but are not directly exposed to such usage via comprehensible input and interaction in said dialects) are environments conducive to learning about MCAE *hasta*. Therefore, despite the fact that in this cohort students are not pressured to conform to classroom linguistic norms that include any regular usage of MCAE *hasta*, we expect students to still display some degree of
understandings, judgments, and uses of MCAE hasta. We expect such understandings, judgments, and uses to be of a lower degree than the understandings, judgments, and uses displayed by student members of classes that provide involuntary teacher modeling of MCAE hasta. Furthermore, all other things being equal, we believe that the cohort of students who are only explicitly taught about the use of this preposition in the MCAE Spanish dialects may show more appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of MCAE hasta than do students who are part of the control group.

In the classroom networks that serve as a control group, the linguistic norms to which network members feel pressured to adhere do not include regular exposure to MCAE hasta (through modeling) nor any mention of the existence of such usage (through explicit instruction). Therefore, we do not expect said students’ linguistic behavior, in particular, their understandings, judgments, and uses of MCAE hasta, to be influenced by their membership in classroom networks that serve as a control group.

3.2.1.2 Classroom networks based on class level

Another particular kind of classroom network membership that is of interest to this study is membership based on class level. When considering class level, this study distinguishes two cohorts: (1) members of classroom networks that link beginning-level students (students enrolled in a SPAN 1000 class) and (2) members of classroom networks that link intermediate-level students (students enrolled in a SPAN 3160 class or a SPAN 3170 class). The reason for considering students from SPAN 3160 and SPAN 3170 together is that these classes are both considered to be an intermediate level of instruction in Spanish, as opposed to SPAN 1000, which is a beginners’ level class.
Class level is important because it relates to linguistic content, linguistic norms, and the social ties that link network members in each classroom. As Garton, Haythornthwaite, and Wellman pointed out (1997), in a given social network, social ties between network members are characterized by, among other things, distinctive content. The aforementioned authors described the content of network relations as the resources that are exchanged among social network members. Such resources may, of course, be linguistic in nature. In the case of the university classroom social networks under consideration in this study, we consider the social ties that link beginning-level students to be different from the social ties that link intermediate-level students. These ties are different in part due to the difference in the nature of the linguistic content, actually conveyed through the social ties, to which students are exposed as members of classroom social networks at different levels of instruction and from which students correspondingly form (and practice) distinct linguistic norms in Spanish. Therefore, class level may influence the kind of linguistic behavior to which members of the different classroom networks are pressured to conform precisely as a result of the differential nature of linguistic content conveyed through the social ties that respectively bind the members of the classroom networks at each level.

This differential nature of linguistic content naturally leads to differences in linguistic norms and, presumably, even to differences in grammatical proficiency at each level. In other words, given differences in linguistic content, if members of classroom networks are to influence each other linguistically in Spanish, the linguistic norms of Spanish that they may be pressured to observe in SPAN 1000 classroom networks are likely to be different than the linguistic norms of Spanish that members of SPAN 3160
and SPAN 3170 classroom networks propagate.\textsuperscript{44} The type of linguistic norms of Spanish that students observe in classroom networks at each level, themselves based on the linguistic content uniquely exchanged through distinct kinds of social ties in the different classroom networks as explained above, may in turn influence how students understand, judge, and use L2 pragmatics.

Theoretically, the differential nature of linguistic norms at each level may relate to the grammatical proficiency that students are generally expected to have at different levels. In SPAN 1000 classrooms, for instance, students are generally expected to have less grammatical knowledge than do students in SPAN 3160 / 3170 classrooms. As Kasper (2001) observed, results from research on the relationship between grammar and pragmatics have led a group of researchers to firmly believe that grammar precedes pragmatics. Furthermore, Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei, as stated by Witten (2002), suggested that students need to have a certain amount of knowledge of L2 grammar in order to understand, judge, and use L2 pragmatic forms. In other words, understandings, judgments, and uses of L2 pragmatics may be dependent, to a certain extent, on students’ L2 grammatical proficiency. If Kasper as well as Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei are correct, then students who are members of SPAN 3160 and 3170 classroom networks where hasta usage is taught or MCAE hasta is modeled could be expected to understand, judge, and use hasta in more pragmatically appropriate ways than students of SPAN 1000 classroom networks where hasta usage is taught or MCAE hasta is modeled (cf. Félix-Brasdefer’s

\textsuperscript{44} As discussed above, such linguistic norms are formed on the basis of the linguistic content that is commonly used in classroom social networks based on class level. SPAN 1000 classroom networks, for instance, are generally characterized by the use of beginners’ level Spanish, whereas SPAN 3160 and SPAN 3170 classroom networks are generally characterized by the use of intermediate level Spanish.
study on the relationship between students’ class level and their L2 pragmatic development discussed earlier in chapter 1). Even though members of SPAN 1000 classrooms where hasta usage is taught or MCAE hasta is modeled may not achieve a high level of grammatical proficiency in their classrooms, we do believe that they will be able to understand, judge, and use hasta appropriately to some extent. 45

3.2.1.3. Classroom networks based on mode of expression

The last type of classroom network membership considered in this study (for potentially having an influence on the kind of ties among student members) is a membership based on mode of expression. Bearing in mind said membership characteristic, this study distinguishes three kinds of social networks in university Spanish classes: (1) classroom networks where there is an emphasis on oral expression (SPAN 3170), (2) classroom networks where there is an emphasis on written expression (SPAN 3160), and (3) classroom networks where there is an emphasis on both of these modes of expression (SPAN 1000). Based on the type of interaction that is characteristic of each of the above-mentioned classroom social networks, student members can be expected to share specific kinds of ties with each other. The nature of ties in a given kind of network will, in turn, influence the linguistic performance of its members.

45 Indeed, Witten (2002) can attest to this position. She conducted a study among students of Spanish at beginning levels aimed at discovering the effects of input enhancement and interactive video viewing on L2 students’ awareness and use of pragmatic forms in Spanish. Even though her study did not consider classrooms from a social network perspective, Witten’s research led to conclusions that can support the present study. Results from the tasks that Witten administered led her to believe that even students who have beginners’ level language proficiency are able to achieve a certain level of understandings, judgments, and uses of pragmatic forms in Spanish. Another important finding from Witten’s study concerned the fact that test group participants demonstrated a higher degree of understandings, judgments, and uses of Spanish pragmatic forms in written tasks than in oral ones. The author attributed this finding to the time that is needed for L2 students to integrate and process knowledge (p. 227).
SPAN 3170, for instance, is a conversation class in which students interact orally with each other on a daily basis. The linkages that exist among members of SPAN 3170 classroom networks are of a different nature than those of students who are enrolled in a SPAN 3160 class, which is a composition class. In SPAN 3160 classroom networks, students do not interact orally with each other on a daily basis as they do in a SPAN 3170 class. Instead they mainly express themselves in written form. SPAN 1000 is a basic introduction to Spanish class in which the linkage characteristics of the classroom networks resemble the linkages of both of the previously-mentioned classroom networks, because there is an emphasis on both written and oral modes of expression in class.

Mode of expression is of considerable significance in the context of classrooms as social networks. As mentioned earlier, students’ linguistic performance will be affected by the nature of ties that characterize the classroom network in which students are members. These ties exert pressure on the network members they link, encouraging certain linguistic behaviours. Therefore, based on the different nature of social ties presumably present in classroom networks with different modes of expression, membership in SPAN 3160, SPAN 3170, or SPAN 1000 classroom networks may variably influence the amount of exposure that students have to different linguistic behaviors.

In a SPAN 3170 classroom, for example, network members communicate mainly in oral form and, by design, have more spoken interaction with each other than do members of SPAN 1000 or SPAN 3160 networks. Furthermore, the sort of interaction that exists among students of SPAN 3170 is of multiple natures, because of the various tasks and roles of interaction that they have to carry out as part of the curriculum.
Therefore, due to close and collaborative interaction with each other, students of SPAN 3170 have a substantial amount of exposure to other members’ oral language performance, which, theoretically, should lead to high levels of network pressure exerted upon them and, in turn, to measurable influences on their language performance (cf. Kurata’s study discussed in chapter 1). Therefore, we suspect that membership in classroom networks where there is an emphasis on oral modes of expression may have a positively oriented linear relationship with the understandings, judgments, and uses of L2 pragmatics as measured by the understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta* in classroom networks that either teach its usage or model MCAE *hasta*.

In contrast, students of SPAN 3160 classes should, theoretically, have less pressures exerted upon them by other members of their classroom network due to the lower degree and sort of interaction that an emphasis on written mode of expression implies. We therefore suspect that such students may exhibit a relatively lower degree of understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta* than members of SPAN 3170 classroom networks all other things being equal. Following this logic, in SPAN 1000 classroom networks, the degree and sort of interaction among members should theoretically be higher than in SPAN 3160 classrooms but lower than in SPAN 3170 classrooms. In turn, we suspect that, in SPAN 1000 classroom networks, all other things being equal, the level of understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta* may be higher than in SPAN 3160 classrooms but lower than in SPAN 3170 classroom networks.

### 3.2.2 Social networks outside of class settings

Besides membership in a particular classroom network, there may be other types of social network membership that influence the students’ understandings, judgments,
and uses of L2 pragmatics. The students participating in this study, as complex individuals, are members of various other types of social networks that are not limited to the classroom context. It is possible that the participants are exposed to Spanish in other social situations that form part of their daily lives. Because this study tried to account for a wide variety of possible social influences on the participants’ understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta*, it was important to look into out-of-classroom networks as well.

For this study, it was of particular interest to examine social networks that exposed the participants to different dialectal varieties of Spanish. Therefore, for each participant in the study, relative integration into two dialectally different egocentric social networks was measured quantitatively: (1) non-classroom social networks that exposed ego to MCAE Spanish, and (2) non-classroom social networks that exposed ego to non-MCAE Spanish. The researcher was interested in measuring the degree of participants’ integration into these out-of-classroom networks. Just like in classroom networks, participation in any of these non-classroom networks would create certain kinds of social ties among members, ties that could pressure members to conform to group linguistic norms. The more integrated the participants were in these networks the more their linguistic performance could be influenced.

If we look, for instance, at the social networks outside of class that expose ego to MCAE Spanish, forms of potential integration for participants in this study abound. At some point previous to our data collection, participants could have had tutors or teachers of MCAE Spanish. They could have Mexican, Ecuadorian, or Central American relatives, or neighbors of that descent who sometimes speak Spanish. Participants could
also be tied to such networks for having studied or spent significant time in the above-mentioned regions at some point in their lives. Each of these single ties could exert measurable pressure on the network members. More ties between ego and other network members would result in higher degrees of integration into the network, and, consequently, greater amounts of pressure experienced by ego to conform to group linguistic norms. Therefore, we suspect that the more ties participants have to networks that expose them to MCAE Spanish, the more pragmatically appropriate their understandings, judgments, and uses of MCAE *hasta* will be.

On the other hand, participants might have ties that link them to non-classroom networks that only expose them to non-MCAE Spanish. In this case, we expect the students’ understandings, judgments, and uses of MCAE *hasta* to be negatively influenced by this particular network membership. It is also possible that participants could simultaneously be members of both kinds of non-classroom networks. They could have Mexican neighbors who sometimes speak Spanish, and also have Hispanic relatives that are not Mexicans, Ecuadorians, or Central Americans. In such a scenario, ties from both networks could exert opposing pressures on the members who, in turn, might conform variably to the linguistic norms of both social networks. Depending on the relative integration of each participant into each of the non-classroom networks, the linguistic performance of each participant could be affected more by one network than the other. The members could also experience balanced pressures, and therefore, balanced influences on their linguistic performance, if they were to maintain the same amount of ties to both kinds of networks simultaneously.

To summarize, students of Spanish who participated in the current study can be
identified simultaneously as members of multiple classroom and non-classroom social networks. In classroom settings student participants were seen as members of social networks characterized by (1) differences in pedagogy practice, (2) differences in class levels of instruction, and (3) emphases on different modes of expression. In a non-classroom context, student participants were seen as members of two types of networks: (1) social networks that expose students to MCAE Spanish and (2) social networks that expose students to non-MCAE Spanish. As members of any of the above-mentioned networks, student participants are thought to be linked to other network members by particular kinds of social ties that are characteristic of that social network. Said network ties will exert pressure upon members to conform to the network’s linguistic norms. Depending on the amount and nature of network ties, as well as the type of linguistic norms to which members are exposed, students may be influenced linguistically to varying degrees. As a result, students’ understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta* may be affected variably as well.

### 3.3 Procedure of data collection

In order for the investigator to be able to gather the data necessary to analyze understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta* by L2 students of Spanish at the selected university, the participants were interviewed individually outside of class. These sociolinguistic interviews are the subject of the current section. All the interviews were scheduled at the earliest convenience of the participants after the investigator obtained their consent to participate. The process of acquiring said consent is detailed in section 3.3.1.
The participants from classes that had received explicit instruction but no involuntary modeling of the use of MCAE hasta were interviewed last. The interviewing was done this way with the purpose of allowing these students some time to process what they learned about uses of hasta after the project had been advertised and the signed consent forms had been acquired. During each of the three rounds of data collection (i.e., Spring 2008, Fall 2008, and Spring 2009), the participant recruitment was not completed until about the second month of the semester. As a result, there was time for a build up of social pressures to conform to group linguistic norms in the classrooms where students received inadvertent modeling of MCAE hasta.46

Each sociolinguistic interview lasted between thirty minutes and one hour, and each involved the completion of the four linguistic tasks as well as the background questionnaire. The participants first completed the two oral tasks (cf. Appendices 2 - 6); then they continued with the two written tasks (cf. Appendices 7 – 9), as detailed in subsections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2, respectively. The elicited responses, though not spontaneous, were chosen with the expectation that they would provide easily quantifiable and comparable results. Participants were told that they could not use a dictionary or ask the interviewer about the English translation of any Spanish words. The background questionnaire (cf. Appendix J), detailed in subsection 3.3.3, was reserved for the end of the interview. This order was observed in the hopes that the interviewees might be less apt to recognize the variable hasta or the Mexican, Ecuadorian, or Central American

46 Students enrolled in classes where MCAE hasta was modeled, theoretically, were exposed to this particular use of the preposition from the very beginning of the semester. Instruction in MCAE hasta, however, did not start until after the recruitment process was completed.
dialect as the objects of this investigation. In turn, their answers would be kept as natural as possible.

3.3.1 Oral tasks

The linguistic tasks that students performed first were the oral tasks. The participants were told that they would be audio recorded only for the first oral task. For the second oral task, the individuals would have to listen to several short texts in order to then answer a series of questions. They were allowed to listen to the texts only once, and they were not permitted to use a dictionary or ask the researcher to translate any word or expression that was unknown to them.

The first oral task was designed as a discourse completion test. As Márquez Reiter and Placencia (2005, p. 225) observed, the discourse completion test, which was originally developed to investigate patterns of the linguistic realization of speech acts, has been one of the most often used research instruments in the collection of elicited data. In this study, for the first oral task, the participants did not have to complete a scripted dialog. Instead, they were read several incomplete sentences and were asked to complete them out loud with a positive or negative verb as appropriate. This task was audio recorded in order for the investigator to be able to access the data at a later time if needed. The sentences varied. Half of them began with a prepositional phrase headed by hasta but lacking an independent clause at the end. The other half of the sentences ended with such a prepositional phrase, but those sentences were missing an independent clause in the beginning. The participants had to fill in the independent clauses. In between the sentences that contained the variable in question, the task contained sentences designed as distractors in order to call less attention to hasta, with the hope that this mixture would
make participant answers more natural. There were no “correct” answers on this task. Rather, the investigator was interested in seeing if students would use a negative or a positive verb with *hasta* in order to mark the inception of an action. Sentences containing the variable *hasta* that were completed with an affirmative achievement verb were seen as potential indications that the participants understood this preposition in the affirmative inceptive way.47

The second oral task was designed as a matched guise. This method was first designed by Wallace Lambert in a 1960 study (Lambert, 1967) that aimed at assessing the impression that the interviewees (residents of Montreal) had of other Canadians who spoke French or English. This technique involves subjects who listen to several texts read by the same person mixed in with readings by other people. The texts can be in different languages, as in Lambert’s first study, or in different dialects, or simply differ in the use of a single variable that is the object of a particular investigation. The idea is for

47 As discussed earlier in chapter 2, only achievement verbs refer unambiguously to the beginning of a verbal situation, given the fact that said class of verbs displays only instantaneous temporal features (without duration). Therefore, participant selection of affirmative achievement verbs to accompany *hasta* in Oral Task #1 strongly suggests pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of affirmative inceptive *hasta*. The use of a negated achievement verb alongside *hasta* would suggest that participants understand, judge, and use *hasta* according to the pragmatically appropriate linguistic norms of non-MCAE Spanish dialects, where inceptive *hasta* does not occur with affirmative verbs.

Activity, accomplishment, and state verbs, on the other hand, can display both duration and instantaneous temporal features. In other words, participant selection of an affirmative activity, accomplishment, or state verb to accompany *hasta* in Oral Task #1 would not unambiguously suggest that students understood, judged, and used *hasta* as it is used in the MCAE Spanish dialects. The use of said classes of verbs with *hasta* would have to be analyzed based on context. If the activity, accomplishment, or state verbs were negated and the context unambiguously suggested that *hasta* marked inception of the verbal situation, we would gather that participants understood, judged, and used *hasta* as it is used in non-MCAE Spanish dialects. Suppose, however, that participants used the activity verb *dormir* affirmatively in both sentence 4 and sentence 5 of Oral Task #1, that is, *Duermo hasta encontrar mi libro* and *Duermo hasta la hora de cenar*. In such a scenario, only in the first sentence would *hasta* likely be seen as unambiguously marking the inception of *dormir*, given that it would be unlikely for someone to be sleeping while looking for the book and then wake up upon finding it. Sentences where the students’ aspectual marking in Oral Task #1 was ambiguous were not included in the statistical analyses, given the fact that in such cases it was impossible for the researcher to verify from recordings if participants understood, judged, and used *hasta* in such sentences to mark inception or termination of the verbal situation in question.
the listeners not to be aware of the fact that the same individual is speaking more than once. As Lambert proved by using this technique, the listeners may actually judge the same speaker differently on two separate readings, based on the speech they hear.

For the present research investigating understandings, judgments, and uses of hasta, three Mexican natives of the same gender, region, and approximate age were audio recorded prior to the interviews. Two of these Mexican natives each read two texts in Spanish that were identical save for the use of hasta. The third Mexican native read the exact same text twice with no use of hasta (cf. Appendix D). This person served as a control for the experiment. The first Mexican native read Texts # 1 and # 4. These texts were identical save for the use of hasta. Text # 1 employed MCAE hasta; that is, the preposition was used with an affirmative verb to mark the beginning of an action. In Text # 4 hasta was replaced by a las (‘at’), maintaining in this fashion the same meaning and time reference for each action. The second Mexican native read Text # 2 and Text # 5. These texts were exactly the same and had no use of hasta. This person served as a control for the experiment. Text # 3 and Text # 6, which were read by the third speaker, were identical except for their use of hasta. Text #3 employed non-MCAE hasta (i.e., hasta was accompanied by a negative verb to implicate inception), whereas Text # 6 employed MCAE hasta. The methodological purpose of including Text # 1, Text # 4, Text # 3, and Text # 6 was to see if participants would judge the readers differently based on the ways that inception of a given verbal situation was marked in each text pair. The purpose of employing MCAE hasta twice in this test (Text # 1 and Text # 6) was to be able to contrast in separate text pairs (a) participants’ judgments of affirmative inceptive hasta with their judgments of inception with hasta in a negated verbal situation (cf. Text

# 3), and (b) participants’ judgments of affirmative inceptive *hasta* with their judgments of inception with no *hasta* usage at all (cf. Text # 4). The text pairs were created in such a way that a different person read each text pair and, within each text pair, the same person read both texts. Furthermore, in both Texts # 1 and # 6, where *hasta* was used in the affirmative inceptive way, the lexical aspect of the verbs that accompanied *hasta* could display unambiguous instantaneous temporal features and, therefore, all cases of *hasta* in these texts could reflect inceptive properties. The way in which texts were ordered was meant to keep the participants from realizing that they were actually listening to only three readers not six.

Before recording the speakers for the matched guise experiment, the investigator interviewed several Mexican natives to verify the design of the texts that employed MCAE *hasta*. Said individuals were asked (orally) whether the way in which sentences were worded in Text # 1 and Text # 6 would be considered acceptable by Mexican natives, and also what time reference they understood for the verbal situations in question. Their answers suggested that the texts in question employed *hasta* as it is often used in the Mexican dialect of Spanish.\footnote{Despite this confirmation, we have to keep in mind that, in general, language use differs from language attitudes, that is, people do not always talk the way they say or think they talk. Consequently, self-reported linguistic data are considered to be a reflection of a person’s language attitudes rather than a reflection of that person’s actual language use. Therefore, we can say that, for the current study, the above-mentioned Mexican natives’ attitudes toward affirmative inceptive *hasta* were positive.} For the verbal situations in Text # 1 where *hasta* was employed in the affirmative inceptive way, the Mexican natives indeed understood the time reference given in Text # 4 where *hasta* was replaced by the expression *a las*. Furthermore, the time references that they understood in Text # 3,
where *hasta* appears with negative verbs to mark inception, were the same as the time references of verbal situations in Text # 6 where MCAE *hasta* was employed.

After the students listened to each audio recorded speaker, the recordings were paused and the students had to answer a series of questions. The questions that they had to answer inquired about their impression of the speaker’s economic status (lower class, working class, middle, upper middle, and upper class), the speaker’s level of education (grades 1-12, college, or graduate school), the speaker’s profession (dishwasher, plumber, grade school teacher, accountant, or brain surgeon), and the speaker’s nationality (i.e., whether or not the speaker was a native speaker of Spanish). The participants also had to rate the speaker’s Spanish in terms of correctness (1-5, where 1 represented “incorrect” and 5 stood for “correct”). The participants were not audio recorded for this task. This task was designed with the purpose of finding out how the students would judge the speakers that they listened to, based on the use of the variable *hasta*, though the students did not know that. Subconsciously, if the students judged MCAE *hasta* as incorrect Spanish, they might be inclined to think that the speaker was not native, that he/she belonged to a lower class level, and/or had completed fewer grades in school. On the other hand, if, subconsciously, students judged use of *hasta* in general Spanish to be correct they might be inclined to think that the speaker had a profession related to a higher economic status and had a higher level of education. Based on the use of the variable *hasta*, the same speaker, for instance, could be thought of as a dishwasher or as a brain surgeon.
3.3.2 Written tasks

The first written task that had to be completed was composed of a series of sentences. Some of the sentences contained *hasta* and others did not (cf. Appendix G). Sentences without *hasta* were meant to distract the participants from the focus of the exercise. For each sentence, the participants had to answer three questions. First, the participants were asked to judge the grammaticality or lack thereof of each of the sentences. This question was a form of what is known in linguistic research as an acceptability judgment task. As Gass and Mackey put it (2005, p. 49), acceptability judgment tasks consist of asking study participants whether or not a particular L2 statement is acceptable.\(^{49}\)

In the second component of Written Task # 1, participants were asked how many native speakers of Spanish might say each sentence according to the following scale:

1. No native speaker of Spanish would say it.
2. Some native speakers of Spanish could say it.
3. Many native speakers of Spanish could say it.
4. Every native speaker of Spanish would say it.

Rating scales have long been used in sociopragmatics and interlanguage pragmatics as a research tool. As Márquez Reiter and Placencia noted (2005, p. 224), “rating scales are particularly useful in assessing the strength of feeling, attitudes, and/or judgements…” that the research participants might have.

In the end, the participants were asked to each give a judgment about when they thought the action happened in the sentences provided (approximate time frame where applicable). The purpose of the judgments, unknown to participants, was for the

\(^{49}\) Often acceptability judgment tasks are called grammaticality judgment tasks. In other words, the study participants are asked whether a particular L2 statement is grammatical (instead of acceptable), as was the case in the current investigation.
investigator to be able to examine the participants’ understandings of \textit{hasta}. This method of eliciting statement interpretations was developed by Elizabeth Bates and Brian MacWhinney (1982) under the term “Competition Model.” According to these authors, the way in which individuals interpret a given statement depends on the linguistic cues that the context provides, such as intonation, word order, and so forth, as well as the importance that the individual gives to each of the cues. As a result, the linguistic cue that is deemed to be of the highest importance will be the one to determine which way the statement will be interpreted. In the case of Written Task \#1, this study’s participants could interpret \textit{hasta} as marking the inception or the terminus of the verbal situation in question depending on what linguistic cue(s) drew their attention the most (e.g., the presence/absence of negation in the main clause, the lexical aspect of the matrix verb, etc.).

The first written task served to provide data regarding both language attitudes and language understanding. Q1 (Is the sentence grammatical?) and Q2 (How many native speakers might say this sentence?), for instance, related to language attitude. For a sentence containing MCAE \textit{hasta}, a participant who answered “grammatical” or “every native speaker of Spanish would say it” was considered to judge this construction in a different way than a participant who answered “not grammatical” or “no native speaker of Spanish would say it” for that same sentence. Q3 (When does the action in sentence happen?) was used to assess participants’ understanding of \textit{hasta}. In each of the sentences a verbal situation unfolded in relation to a specific time reference, for example, a certain hour, day, month, event, etc. If in a sentence where \textit{hasta} was used with an affirmative verb participants considered the given time reference to be the beginning of
the verbal situation (rather than its end point), this perception was seen as a potential indication that these participants considered _hasta_ to mark the inception of the affirmative verbal situation and that they might understand _hasta_ in the affirmative inceptive way. For instance, in regards to sentence # 6 _Venderemos estos libros hasta que termine el semestre._ (‘We will sell these books (until) / (when) the semester ends.’), some of the participants’ answers to Q3 were “before the semester ends” or “during the semester.” In such cases, the investigator considered the participants to understand _hasta_ as marking the end point of the verbal situation in the matrix clause. On the other hand, for answers such as “when the semester ends” or “at the end of the semester,” the investigator considered the participants to understand _hasta_ as it is used in MCAE Spanish dialects.

The second written task was a translation exercise. The students were given a group of sentences in English that they had to translate into Spanish using the preposition _hasta_ (cf. Appendix I). The purpose of this task was to analyze the participants’ production of _hasta_. In order to make the elicited responses as natural as possible, the participants were not told what the definition of _hasta_ was in standard Spanish or what it could implicate in certain Spanish dialects. The sentences in English presented situations in which actions were to happen at certain times. These sentences did not contain the preposition _until_, since the presence of that word could have affected the verb construction (affirmative vs. negative) that students used in translation. Therefore, in order to communicate in Spanish the same idea that the sentences conveyed in English and use the preposition _hasta_, the students would have to rethink the sentences and
It was hoped that the translation of this reconception into Spanish would then show the participant’s use of the variable hasta through the selection of an affirmative or negative verbal situation. After completing the oral and written tasks, the participants were asked to fill out a background questionnaire as explained in more detail in subsection 3.3.3 below.

3.3.3 Background questionnaire

For the current study, in an out-of-classroom context, the investigator was interested in determining whether the participants were integrated more into social networks involving MCAE Spanish or more into social networks involving non-MCAE Spanish. For this purpose, the participants were asked to complete a background questionnaire (cf. Appendix J). Brown, as cited by Gass and Mackey (2005, p. 92), defined questionnaires as “any written instruments that present respondents with a series of questions or statements to which they are to react either by writing out their answers or selecting them among existing answers.” The majority of the answers that this study’s participants were asked to provide in the background questionnaire were relevant to the extralinguistic variable relating to Spanish dialectal background.

The participants, besides providing general information such as age, gender, and the languages that they speak fluently, had to indicate the various types of exposure that they had had to the Spanish language. They were provided with a list of situations of

---

50 For instance, a sentence like “They will call tonight after 8 p.m.,” in order to accommodate standard hasta usage, could be reconceived as “They will not call until 8 p.m.” and translated as “No llamarán hasta las ocho de la noche.” If participants understood hasta as it is used in MCAE Spanish dialects, the above-mentioned sentence, if reconceived at all, could be reconceived as “They will call tonight at 8 p.m.” and translated as “Llamarán esta noche hasta las ocho.”
exposure to non-MCAE Spanish as well as exposure to MCAE Spanish. These situations pertained to families, school, jobs, travel, social life, and leisure time. The participants had to select all the situations that applied to them. The background questionnaire also inquired about the length of time during which students had studied Spanish (time was given in increments of two years), as well as the frequency of their use of Spanish outside of class. The self-reported data concerning the students’ non-classroom social networks were used to assess participants’ relative integration into social networks that provided out-of-class exposure to the Spanish dialects of interest to this study (MCAE vs. non-MCAE dialects of Spanish).\textsuperscript{51}

As discussed above, studies have shown that the language of individuals who are members of social networks is influenced by the linguistic norms that are shared and propagated within those networks. Therefore, in the case of the current investigation, those individuals who have more ties to networks including Mexicans, Ecuadorians, or Central Americans could theoretically display better understandings, judgments, and uses of MCAE \textit{hasta} than do individuals who have less ties to such networks.

After all the sociolinguistic interviews were conducted, the collected data were coded and analyzed through several statistical tests. Said statistical tests and the results they yielded are discussed in chapter 4. Before focusing on the data analysis, it is important to first detail the expected findings based on the methodology that was followed for the current study.

\textsuperscript{51} These were not truly comprehensive measures of network integration given that this study did not assess the total network population for the non-classroom social networks of which the study participants were members. Furthermore, in comparison to observed data, the accuracy of self-reported background data is generally questionable because it is often difficult and, at times, impossible, to verify. Nevertheless there is still sociolinguistic value in such data (Silva-Corvalán, 2001), which many sociolinguists regularly collect and utilize in sociolinguistic research.
3.4 Expected findings

As mentioned earlier, this study examines how different social network relations influence the understandings, judgments, and uses of contextual meanings in Spanish as a second language by focusing on student membership in classroom networks based on pedagogy practice, class level, and mode of expression. Furthermore, this study also investigates the influence of out-of-classroom social networks that expose the participants to different dialectal varieties of Spanish. This section presents the extralinguistic variables and summarizes what they represent in the study. For each extralinguistic variable, a hypothesis is offered regarding its relationship to understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta*.

The first extralinguistic variable, called “pedagogy practice,” represents membership in classroom social networks where MCAE *hasta* is modeled but not explained vs. where non-MCAE *hasta* is modeled and usage of both MCAE and non-MCAE is explained vs. a control group. Our first hypothesis is that, due to the mechanisms behind the spread of language use in social networks (as discussed in 3.2.1.1 and also earlier in 1.2.2), explicit instruction about MCAE *hasta* will influence appropriate student understandings, judgments, and uses of MCAE *hasta*, but to a lesser degree than modeling of said preposition does. In classroom networks where teachers regularly model MCAE *hasta*, student members are pressured to conform to linguistic norms that include such usage. In classrooms where there is no sustained teacher modeling of MCAE *hasta*, the linguistic norms propagated by the instructors do not include regular usage of MCAE *hasta*. Consequently, students who are members of these networks will not, in their classrooms, be exposed to nor feel pressure to conform to
linguistic norms that do include such usage. Nevertheless, despite this lack of pressure, classrooms in which students are only instructed about the MCAE usage of *hasta* remain conducive to learning about such usage. As a result, we expect student members of classroom networks who are explicitly taught about MCAE *hasta* to display some degree of its understandings, judgments, and uses. As for the control group, where MCAE *hasta* is not modeled nor explicitly taught, students’ understandings, judgments, and uses of said feature of the preposition in question may not be influenced at all by classroom social network membership. In the control group, linguistic norms to which network members are pressured to adhere do not include MCAE *hasta*, nor is there any pedagogical environment to facilitate learning about such usage.

The second extralinguistic variable, called “class level,” represents participant enrollment in beginner or intermediate level Spanish classes. The codes for the two variants of this variable will be discrete and binary. Our second hypothesis is that, because of the relationship that may exist between grammatical proficiency and understandings, judgments, and uses of L2 pragmatics (in relation to linguistic content, linguistic norms, and social ties as explained in section 3.2.1.2), students studying Spanish as a second language in a higher class level will be equipped with a higher level of readiness for pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta*. Therefore, all other things being equal, we expect relatively less pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta* by students who are enrolled in the beginning level university Spanish courses where *hasta* is taught or where MCAE *hasta* is modeled when compared to the students enrolled in the intermediate level university Spanish courses where *hasta* is taught or MCAE *hasta* is modeled.
The third extralinguistic variable, called “language modality,” represents membership in classroom social networks in which there is an emphasis on oral expression vs. written expression vs. both written and oral expression. Our third hypothesis is that from classroom networks with primarily written modes of expression to classroom networks with primarily oral modes of expression there may be differences in how students understand, judge, and use hasta all other things being equal. We expect that pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of hasta will be most prevalent in classes where the emphasis is on oral expression and either (1) MCAE hasta is modeled or (2) usage of both MCAE and non-MCAE hasta is taught. Given the close and collaborative interaction that characterizes classroom networks with an emphasis on oral mode of expression (cf. section 1.2.2 and 3.2), members of said networks will feel more pressured to conform to their networks’ linguistic norms than members of classroom networks with an emphasis on written mode of expression. In turn, students enrolled in said classes may understand, judge, and use hasta in pragmatically more appropriate ways than do their counterparts who are enrolled in classes where there is an emphasis on other modes of expression (written or a combination of both oral and written modes of expression). In classroom social networks where there is an emphasis on written modes of expression (SPAN 3160 classroom networks) and either (1) MCAE hasta is modeled or (2) usage of both MCAE and non-MCAE hasta is taught, students’ understandings, judgments, and uses of MCAE hasta may be the least prevalent. Spoken interaction among students in this cohort is thought to be scarce and members generally interact with each other less frequently and / or less intensively than do members of SPAN 3170 classroom networks due to the emphasis on written expression. As a result,
social ties between and among student members of SPAN 3160 classroom networks are
generally less dense and multiplex in nature than the social ties that bind their
counterparts in 3170 classroom networks. In turn, members of 3160 classroom networks
will feel less pressured to conform to group linguistic norms than do students who attend
SPAN 3170 classes. As for members of SPAN 1000 classroom networks where either (1)
MCAE hasta is modeled or (2) usage of both MCAE and non-MCAE hasta is taught, our
hypothesis is that, in this cohort, students may feel more network pressure to conform to
group linguistic norms than do members of SPAN 3160 classroom networks but less
network pressure to conform to group linguistic norms than do members of SPAN 3170
classroom networks. In particular, we expect student members of SPAN 1000 classroom
networks to display understandings, judgments, and uses of hasta that are more
pragmatically appropriate than those of student members of SPAN 3160 classroom
networks but less pragmatically appropriate than the understandings, judgments, and uses
of hasta among student members of SPAN 3170 classroom networks.

The fourth extralinguistic variable relates to the participants’ Spanish language
backgrounds. This variable, called “Spanish dialectal exposure,” represents self-reported
data that students provided regarding relative exposure to different dialects of Spanish in
various family, school, work, and social environments. Our fourth hypothesis is that
integration into social networks that provide exposure to MCAE Spanish outside of
university Spanish classes will correlate positively with pragmatically appropriate
understandings, judgments, and uses of MCAE hasta (cf. earlier discussion in 3.2 and
1.2.2). Conversely, integration into social networks that provide exposure to non-MCAE
Spanish will correlate negatively with pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of MCAE *hasta*.

The remaining three extralinguistic variables do not relate to students’ memberships in particular social networks, but are commonly used in sociolinguistic studies. More specifically, the fifth extralinguistic variable taken into consideration in this study relates to participants’ ages. Our fifth hypothesis is that participants’ ages will not have any effect on their pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta*. The sixth extralinguistic variable relates to participants’ genders. We expect male study participants to display more pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of MCAE *hasta* than female study participants, given that female individuals often tend to use prestige language forms more often than male individuals do. The last extralinguistic variable represents the length of time during which participants had been studying Spanish. We expect longer times studying Spanish to, on the whole, correlate with greater L2 proficiencies such that, the longer students study Spanish the more they will understand, judge, and use *hasta* in pragmatically appropriate ways.

As mentioned earlier, the purpose of this chapter has been to delineate the methodology that was employed in this study. In so doing, this chapter has discussed how the participants were selected and identified as members of specific classroom and non-classroom social networks. In addition, the data collection procedures have been detailed, including a description of the materials that were used to elicit the necessary data. This chapter has also detailed the extralinguistic variables to be examined as well as the expected findings. It is now time to present the collected data, a summary of data
coding, and, finally, a description of the quantitative analyses performed. Such are the topics of the next chapter.
CHAPTER IV

QUANTITATIVE DATA AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

4.0 Introduction

This chapter presents quantitative data gathered from study participants as well as the statistical analysis of these data. Section 4.1 specifies the variables that were conceptualized for this study and what said variables represent. Section 4.2 gives a breakdown of how the collected data were encoded, and later entered in a Microsoft Excel 2003 spreadsheet, in order to be conceived as variables. Section 4.3 describes the reliability analysis and how several index variables were constructed based on results from said analysis. Key variable tables are given in section 4.4. Finally, section 4.5 presents the regression analyses that were performed using SPSS 15.0 for Windows. Said analyses correlate measures of participants’ understandings, judgments, and uses of hasta with seven extralinguistic variables chosen in accordance with the research questions described in chapter 1: pedagogy practice, class level, language modality, Spanish dialectal exposure, age, gender, and length of time during which participants had been studying Spanish. Conclusions drawn from the results of the statistical analyses follow in chapter 5.

4.1 Variables and the concepts that they represent

As discussed earlier in chapter 3, the university Spanish classes that were selected for inclusion in this investigation differ in (a) the way in which hasta was presented to the
students (hasta usage taught vs. MCAE usage modeled vs. neither one), (b) levels of instruction (beginners’ vs. intermediate level), and (c) predominant modes of expression within the classroom (oral vs. written vs. a balanced combination of both modes). In addition, this study examines participants’ exposure to different dialectal varieties of Spanish in out-of-class settings, participants’ age and gender, as well as the length of time during which participants had been studying Spanish.

As a result, in accordance with the research questions that were posed in chapter 1, this study distinguishes the following seven independent variables:

(1) Pedagogy practice, representing membership in classroom social networks where the use of affirmative inceptive hasta was modeled vs. where both MCAE and non-MCAE usages of hasta were explained vs. a control group where affirmative inceptive hasta was neither modeled nor explained.

(2) Class level, representing participant enrollment in beginner or intermediate level university Spanish classes.

(3) Language modality, representing membership in classroom social networks in which there was an emphasis on oral expression vs. written expression vs. both written and oral expression.

(4) Spanish dialectal exposure, relating to participants’ relative exposure to different dialects of Spanish in various family, school, work, and social environments.

(5) Age of individuals who participated in the study.

(6) Gender of individuals who participated in the study.
(7) Length of time during which study participants had been studying Spanish. All of the above-mentioned independent variables were analyzed as possible predictors of the dependent variables, as discussed below.

Given the fact that this study explores understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta* in Spanish, the dependent variables constructed for the analysis were related to comprehension, production, and judgment of the pragmatic target in question. The creation of the dependent variables was based on the nature of the linguistic tasks that were used by the researcher to collect the necessary data. As detailed in the accounting of the methodology of this study (cf. chapter 3), each of the four linguistic tasks (two oral tasks and two written ones) was designed to reflect how *hasta* was understood, judged, and used, by student members of the selected classroom social networks. Based on what was measured by participants’ answers to the tasks completed during the data collection, this study distinguishes the following five dependent variables:

1. Oral production (as measured by Oral Task # 1), representing the ways in which study participants completed sentences containing the target pragmatic variable *hasta* when they expressed themselves orally.

2. Judgment of oral usage (as measured by Oral Task # 2), representing the ways in which study participants judged oral usage of *hasta*.

3. Judgment of written usage (as measured by Written Task # 1, questions A and B), representing the ways in which study participants judged written usage of *hasta*.

---

52 The variables of Spanish dialectal exposure, age, gender, and length of time during which participants had been studying Spanish represent self-reported data that research participants provided when completing the background questionnaire.
(4) Comprehension of written usage (as measured by Written Task # 1, question C), reflecting the degrees to which study participants understood written usage of *hasta*.

(5) Written production (as measured by Written Task # 2), representing the ways in which study participants used *hasta* when they expressed themselves in writing.

It is important to note that the data collected from Written Task # 1 were used to reflect two separate dependent variables. Also, it is important to point out that, for each of the tasks carried out during the individual sociolinguistic interviews, only part of the collected data was used to construct the above-mentioned dependent variables. Construction of said variables is discussed later in this chapter. For now, a description follows regarding the ways in which we coded each of the variables that were used for the statistical analyses in this study.

### 4.2 Coding of variables distinguished in this study

When coding the data numerically, it was important that every task be examined individually in order to take into account what the task was assessing as well as to ensure consistency of interpretation throughout. If a task, for instance, was designed as a multiple choice questionnaire, it was important for all the questions within that task to have the same coding scale. A uniform scale would facilitate the potential creation of a larger index variable when analyzing the data. In addition, the interpretation of codes had to be uniform throughout all tasks. For example, it was decided that higher code numbers would be interpreted as reflecting (a) students’ use of affirmative verbs to mark inception with *hasta* (Oral Task # 1), (b) a more positive attitude toward oral and written usage of MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta* (Oral Task # 2 and Written Task # 1, questions (a) and (b)), (c) students’ understanding of *hasta* as marking inception in a given verbal situation
(Written Task # 1, question (c)), and (d) students’ use of hasta to mark inception in an affirmative verbal situation (Written Task # 2). On the other hand, lower code numbers would be interpreted as reflecting students’ use of negated verbs to mark inception with hasta, a less positive attitude toward oral and written usage of MCAE and non-MCAE hasta, students’ understanding of hasta as marking the ending point of a given verbal situation, and students’ use of hasta to mark inception in a negated verbal situation. A summary of the numerical codes that were used can be found in Appendix K.

4.2.1 Coding of independent variables

Out of the seven independent variables that were taken into consideration for the statistical analyses, six (namely pedagogy practice, class level, language modality, age, gender, and length of time during which research participants had been studying Spanish) shared a similar nature of coding in regards to the numbers that were used and the simplicity that coding of these variables presented. Spanish dialectal exposure, on the other hand, was a more complex variable to code. This section reviews coding procedures for each independent variable, one by one.

The first independent variable that this study takes into account is pedagogy practice. As discussed earlier, this variable was used to predict the degree to which understandings, judgments, and uses of hasta would be affected by teacher modeling, explicit instruction, or by neither modeling nor instruction (control). We expected explicit instruction about hasta usage to influence appropriate student understandings, judgments, and uses of affirmative inceptive hasta to a lesser degree than modeling of said feature did. In regards to the control group, where said feature of the preposition in question was not modeled nor explicitly taught, we did not expect to see any influence on
students’ understandings, judgments, and uses of affirmative inceptive *hasta*. Given these expectations for this independent variable, a code of (3) was assigned to each member of the classrooms that received modeling of affirmative inceptive *hasta*. A code of (2) was assigned to each member of the classrooms that received explicit instruction in *hasta* usage. Finally, a code of (1) was assigned to all members of the control group.

In terms of class level, this study distinguishes two different levels when looking at SPAN 1000, SPAN 3160, and SPAN 3170 courses at the university under consideration. More specifically, SPAN 1000 is considered to be a beginner’s level course while SPAN 3160 and SPAN 3170 are both considered to provide intermediate level instruction in Spanish. We expected students enrolled in intermediate level university Spanish classes to understand, judge, and use *hasta* in pragmatically more appropriate ways than their counterparts in beginner’s level Spanish courses. Given these expectations for this independent variable, a code of (1) was assigned to each member of the SPAN 1000 classrooms, whereas a code of (2) was assigned to each member of the SPAN 3160 and SPAN 3170 classrooms.

The third independent variable included in the analysis was language modality. This study examined three different types of classrooms in regards to language modality: (1) classrooms where there was an emphasis on oral modes of expression (SPAN 3170), (2) classrooms where there was an emphasis on written modes of expression (SPAN 3160), and (3) classrooms where there was an emphasis on both oral and written modes of expression (SPAN 1000). Codes (1), (2), and (3) were used to represent the variants of this variable. As discussed earlier in chapter 3, we expected pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta* to be most prevalent in classes where *hasta*
usage was taught, where MCAE hasta was modeled, and where the emphasis was on oral expression. Furthermore, we expected appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of hasta to be the least prevalent in classrooms where there was an emphasis on written modes of expression, all other things being equal. As for classrooms where hasta was taught, where MCAE hasta was modeled, and where there was a balanced emphasis on both oral and written modes of expression (SPAN 1000), we expected understandings, judgments, and uses of hasta to be more pragmatically appropriate than in SPAN 3160 classrooms (emphasis on written expression) but less pragmatically appropriate than in SPAN 3170 classrooms (emphasis on oral mode of expression). Following this line of thinking, for this independent variable, a code of (3) (the highest number) was assigned to each student enrolled in a SPAN 3170 classroom. A code of (2) was assigned to each student enrolled in a SPAN 1000 classroom. Finally, a code of (1) (the lowest number) was assigned to each student enrolled in a SPAN 3160 classroom.

The fourth independent variable was related to participants’ Spanish dialectal exposure. This variable was constructed based on the data collected from the background questionnaire, as discussed below. Furthermore, this variable was conceived as an indicator of the participants’ degree of integration into out-of-classroom social networks involving exposure to MCAE Spanish dialects as well as exposure to non-MCAE Spanish dialects. In order to assess the degree of integration, the background questionnaire contained two identical lists of ten social situations that provided potential exposure to Spanish. The two lists appeared in separate columns, side by side. The left column (cf. Appendix J) represented social situations that exposed research participants to non-MCAE Spanish dialects. The right column represented social situations that exposed
research participants to MCAE Spanish dialects. Study participants were instructed to select, in each column, all the situations that applied to them. Each of the situations of exposure to different dialects of Spanish was later assigned a numerical score. Each situation that exposed participants to non-MCAE Spanish dialects was coded as (-1), whereas each situation that exposed participants to MCAE Spanish dialects (where affirmative inceptive hasta is common) was coded as (+1). It is important to keep in mind that, to varying degrees, it was possible for study participants to be members of either of the above-mentioned non-classroom social networks or to have relative ties to both of these networks simultaneously.

In regards to the independent variable of gender, the researcher used codes (1) and (2) to represent female and male participants, respectively. The codes that were assigned for the independent variable of age varied among study participants, given the fact that said codes represented the participants’ actual ages (in years), as reported on the background questionnaire.

The last of the independent variables was related to the length of time during which participants had been studying Spanish. Codes (1) through (6) were used to represent the variants of said variable. A code of (1) was assigned to participants who had been studying Spanish for a total of one to two years. A code of (2) was assigned to participants who had been studying Spanish for a total of three to four years. A code of (3) was assigned to participants who had been studying Spanish for a total of five to six years. A code of (4) was assigned to participants who had been studying Spanish for a total of seven to eight years. A code of (5) was assigned to participants who had been studying Spanish for a total of nine to ten years. A code of (6) was assigned to participants who had been studying Spanish for a total of eleven to twelve years.

53 Gender represents categorical data and, thus, the code numbers assigned to this variable are generally arbitrary. For our study, however, the higher number was assigned to male participants following our research hypothesis for gender, explained in chapter 1, and consistent with the coding methodology explained in the introduction to section 4.2.
total of seven to eight years. A code of (5) was assigned to participants who had been studying Spanish for a total of nine to ten years. Finally, a code of (6) was assigned to participants who had been studying Spanish for more than ten years.

Before we move on to explaining the way in which the dependent variables of this study were coded, it is important to note that the background questionnaire also inquired about the frequency with which research participants used Spanish outside of class. This category was initially conceptualized to be used as an independent variable and was, therefore, coded. During preliminary statistical tests, however, it became evident that there were no significant differences among students in regards to what they reported as frequency of Spanish use outside of class. As a result, the researcher chose not to include said variable in the analysis, and, therefore, coding of the frequency with which study participants used Spanish outside of class is not discussed here.

4.2.2 Coding of dependent variables

The first dependent variable to be discussed is oral production, as measured by Oral Task # 1. As described earlier in this dissertation, this task was similar to a discourse completion test with the exception that students who participated in this study were asked to complete several incomplete sentences, instead of a scripted dialog. The researcher’s focus was on the kind of verb that students would use to complete the sentence, that is, an affirmative or a negated verb. For statistical purposes, the researcher chose to use the following codes for this task: (-1), (0), and (1). A code of (-1) was assigned to each sentence that study participants completed with a negated verb. The use of a negated verb was seen as a potential indication that students were interpreting hasta according to the linguistic norms of non-MCAE Spanish dialects. A code of (0) was
entered for no verb usage at all and for sentences where study participants provided no answers whatsoever. For each sentence that the students completed using an affirmative verb that unambiguously marked the inception of the affirmative verbal situation, a code of (1) was assigned. This code was seen to potentially indicate that students were interpreting *hasta* according to the linguistic norms of MCAE Spanish dialects. Caution, however, was needed in coding the affirmative verbal situations individually.

As discussed in chapter 2 and also in footnote 47, the lexical aspect of the matrix verb plays an important role in determining if *hasta* marks the beginning or the end point of a verbal situation. Some classes of verbs can display both durative and instantaneous features, therefore creating ambiguities regarding the interpretation of the aspect marked by *hasta* (i.e., inceptive or terminative). The answers given to Oral Task #1 included verbal situations belonging to different classes of lexical aspect, including achievements, activities, accomplishments and states. Of all of these verb classes, only achievement verbs unambiguously display instantaneous temporal features. In other words, achievements cannot display duration in any context, and only achievements refer unambiguously to the beginning of a verbal situation. The rest of the verb types (activities, states, and accomplishments) can create ambiguities, thus making it difficult to interpret the aspect marked by *hasta* (beginning or end point of a verbal situation).

Before coding the answers recorded for Oral Task #1, one by one, the researcher took into account the potential ambiguities, or lack thereof, of the distinct verbal situations used by each study participant to complete each individual sentence in Oral Task #1. Therefore, a code of (1), representing the use of *hasta* in an affirmative inceptive way, was only assigned to contexts that unambiguously suggested that *hasta*
was indeed marking inception of the verbal situation in question. These contexts included, first of all, achievement verbal situations. As for the other verb classes, the researcher analyzed the sentences based on context. Sentences where the students’ aspectual marking in Oral Task #1 was ambiguous were coded as (0) to represent inconclusive data, given the fact that in such cases it was impossible for the researcher to verify from recordings if participants had used *hasta* to mark inception or termination of the verbal situation in question. A code of (0) was also assigned to (a) data that contained no verbal situations and (b) missing data in situations where participants did not provide any answers at all.

The second dependent variable used in the statistical analyses is judgment of oral usage of *hasta*, as measured by Oral Task #2. As discussed in chapter 3, for Oral Task #2, student participants had to listen to six pre-recorded texts read by three native Spanish speakers. Of these texts, one included non-MCAE usage of *hasta*, two texts employed *hasta* in the affirmative inceptive way common to MCAE Spanish, and the remaining three texts had no use of *hasta* at all. Of the three texts with no *hasta* usage, two texts were used as control and one text used *a las* (‘at’) to mark inception of the verbal situation in question. Student participants had to answer six questions after listening to each of the texts (cf. Appendix F). For each question, student participants had to choose from a series of predetermined answers (ranging between 2 and 14 possible answer choices per question).

Before mathematically constructing any of the dependent variables based on data gathered from the specific linguistic tasks, which, in turn, consisted of several sentences or questions each, we had to consider the potential for creating index variables to be used
later on in the statistical analyses. For instance, if, within a certain task, five sentences were used to measure a given dependent variable, those sentences could be seen as five individual measures of the dependent variable. If, however, the five sentences were shown to measure essentially the same construct, a single index variable could be created by grouping the five individual indices.\textsuperscript{54}

In the case of Oral Task # 2, to allow for the potential, during statistical analysis, to create an index variable from the six questions, the researcher had to make sure that answers on Oral Task # 2 were coded with a uniform scale. Originally, the scales of the questions of Oral Task # 2 varied throughout the task. Question 1 had a 2-token scale, questions 2, 3, and 5 had a 5-token scale, question 4 had a 14-token scale, and question 6 had a 3-token scale. During the statistical analysis, however, multiple different scales like the ones originally present in the questions of Oral Task # 2 would not allow the researcher to easily consider all six questions together in the analysis. Therefore, several scale adjustments were made during the coding of Oral Task # 2.

When making scale adjustments, it is always important to preserve as much information as possible from the raw data. In order to make the scale uniform for all six questions, the number of tokens per question would have to be reduced to only two, given the fact that a two-token scale was the lowest of all scales present throughout the task. A two-token scale, however, would result in varying degrees of loss of information from the questions that presented a wider range of possible answer choices. For instance, question # 4, which inquired about the speaker’s level of education, had a 14-token scale. If these

\textsuperscript{54} Creation of the index variables used in the statistical analyses is detailed in section 4.3.
fourteen answer choices were regrouped into only two possible choices, important distinctions might be missed and, thus, the interpretation of the results could be affected. The same would be the case, although to a lesser degree, for the data collected from the rest of the questions whose original scale had more than two tokens.

Another possibility was to adjust the scales to five tokens each, given the fact that the majority of the questions in Oral Task # 2 had five possible answer choices. In order for all six questions to be more uniform, the researcher regrouped the 14 possible answer choices for question # 4 as follows: grades 1-3, grades 4-6, grades 7-9, grades 10-12, and college/graduate school. As a result, question # 4 was reorganized on a 5-token scale on par with questions 2, 3 and 5. As for questions 1 (with a two-token scale) and 6 (with a three-token scale), a five-token scale could not be achieved by regrouping the possible answer choices. Instead, the scale adjustments for these questions were done via the code numbers that were chosen, as explained below.

Uniform code numbers were assigned to participants’ answers on questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 of Oral Task # 2 to facilitate later comparison and potential aggregation during statistical analysis. For question # 1, a code of (1) was used when research participants answered “no” and a code of (5) was used when the answer was “yes.” For question # 2, codes ranging from (1) to (5) represented profession choices given in the questionnaire with (1) representing the dishwasher and (5) representing the brain surgeon. For question # 3, the existing numbered scale was used ((1) = incorrect Spanish and (5) = correct Spanish). For the speaker’s level of education (question # 4), grades 1-3 were coded as (1), grades 4-6 were coded as (2), grades 7-9 were coded as (3), grades 10-12 were coded as (4), and college/graduate school was coded as (5). As for question # 6,
which inquired about speaker’s place of residence, a code of (1) represented rural areas, a
code of (3) represented urban areas, and a code of (5) represented suburban living. In
cases when study participants did not select any answers, no numerical codes were
assigned. Instead, a blank space was used in the Excel spreadsheet.

The third dependent variable identified in this study is comprehension of written
usage of *hasta*, as measured by Written Task # 1. This task presented study participants
with a series of sentences in Spanish where inception was marked with MCAE and non-
MCAE *hasta*. For each individual sentence, participants had to answer three questions
designated as (a), (b), and (c), respectively, according to a scale or options given. Only
question (c) of Written Task # 1 was designed to assess the degree to which participants
understood written usage of inception marked with MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta*. Said
question asked participants to decide when the verbal situation unfolded in each sentence,
in relation to a specific time reference given. In turn, their answers would be an
indication of how the participants understood the written usage of *hasta* (i.e., if they
understood *hasta* to mark inception or the end point of the given verbal situation). A
code of (-1) was assigned to each answer that indicated that participants had understood
*hasta* to mark the end point of a matrix verbal situation. If participants’ answers
indicated that they had understood *hasta* to mark inception in a matrix verbal situation, a
code of (1) was used. For instance, in sentence # 1 – *No puedo verte hasta octubre.* (‘I
cannot see you until October.’) – where inception is marked with non-MCAE *hasta*, if a
participant’s answer to question (c) was “October” a code of (1) was assigned. However,
if a participant answered “before October” a code of (-1) was assigned. In several cases,
answers given by study participants were irrelevant or inconclusive with regard to a time
reference of when the action happened. For instance, in sentence #6 – *Venderemos estos libros hasta que termine el semestre.* (‘We will sell these books *(until) / (when)*^55 the semester ends.’) – some of the participants’ answers to question (c) were “fall / winter” or “semester.” In such cases, it was impossible for the investigator to decide if participants understood *hasta* as marking the inception or the termination of the affirmative verbal situation unfolding in the sentence. As a result, a code of (0) was assigned to such answers. As with Oral Task #1, a code of (0) was also entered for sentences where study participants provided no answers whatsoever.

As for the remaining questions of Written Task #1, questions (a) and (b) specifically, study participants were asked to judge the grammaticality of sentences (yes = grammatical and no = ungrammatical), as well as assess how many native speakers might say those sentences (none, some, many, or every native speaker). Questions (a) and (b) of Written Task #1 were related to judgment of written language, that is, the fourth dependent variable included in the analysis. In other words, the above-mentioned questions measured how study participants judged written usage of *hasta*.

In regards to question (a), a code of (1) was used when participants answered “yes” in judging the sentence’s grammaticality. When participants chose “no” as an answer, a code of (0) was used. As for question (b), some adjustments in scale were needed in order to appropriately code and accurately interpret the raw data. Originally, the four possible answers to Written Task #1 question (b) were scaled using numbers (1),

---

^55 As explained in Appendix H, alternate translations of *hasta* have been added here to accurately capture in English the meaning of MCAE *hasta*. In English the preposition “until” does not mark inception of an affirmative verbal situation. The alternate translation “when” more accurately reflects in English translation the aspectual properties of *hasta* in MCAE Spanish.
(2), (3), and (4) representing “no native speakers,” “some native speakers,” “many native speakers,” and “every native speaker,” respectively. As with Oral Task #2, for Written Task #1 question (b) as well, adjustments in scale were necessary in order to facilitate the potential creation of a more general index variable that would combine questions (a) and (b) together. Given the fact that question (a) had a two-token scale, the possible answer choices for question (b) were regrouped to reflect only two possible categories: “many or every native speaker of Spanish would say it” and “some or no native speakers of Spanish would say it.” Answers to question (b) of Written Task #1 were coded using numbers (0) and (1). A code of (1) was assigned for either of the first two answer options mentioned above, whereas a code of (0) was assigned for either of the last two answer options. For both question (a) and question (b), when study participants did not select any answers, a code of (0) was assigned.

The last dependent variable to be distinguished in this study is written production, as measured by Written Task #2. The purpose of said task was to examine how students who participated in the study used hasta when they expressed themselves in writing. The series of English sentences presented in Written Task #2 had to be translated into Spanish using the preposition hasta. Depending on how participants understood, judged, and used the preposition in question, they could mark inception using hasta in an affirmative verbal situation or in a negated one. Answers that contained a negated verb were coded with a (-1). In regard to cases when participants used an affirmative verbal situation alongside hasta, however, caution was needed in the interpretation of such usage as affirmative inceptive hasta. As with Oral Task #1, the researcher had to analyze each answer individually based on the lexical aspect of the verbal situation. A code of (1) was
used for all answers that contained an affirmative verb where *hasta* unambiguously marked the beginning of the verbal situation. Said answers primarily included sentences in which achievement verbs were used. When an activity, state or accomplishment verb was used, the context of the sentence itself determined in each case whether the verbal situation could display instantaneous or durative temporal features. In turn, *hasta* was interpreted to mark inception or termination of the verbal situation accordingly. In such cases, the code of (1) was assigned only to affirmative non-achievement verbs that unambiguously displayed instantaneous temporal features. Answers on Written Task # 2 in which aspectual marking was potentially ambiguous were coded as (0) to represent inconclusive data, given the fact that in such cases it was impossible for the researcher to verify if participants had used *hasta* to mark inception or termination of the verbal situation in question. A code of (0) was also used to represent sentences that were left blank or that were completed without using any verbal situation at all.

After finalizing the coding of the data collected from study participants during the individual sociolinguistic interviews, an Excel spreadsheet was compiled. Later, said spreadsheet was imported into SPSS for the statistical analyses, which are detailed later in this chapter.

### 4.3 Construction of index variables used in the analyses

As discussed so far, all five dependent variables used in this study were measured via linguistic tasks that were completed by research participants in both oral and written form. On the other hand, the variables of Spanish dialectal exposure, age, gender, and length of time during which participants had been studying Spanish were measured via a background questionnaire that research participants completed during the sociolinguistic
interview. Before moving on to the actual statistical analyses and before even mathematically constructing the above-mentioned variables, it was important for the researcher to assess the internal consistency of the tasks used. In other words, the researcher had to determine the degree to which each individual sentence or question within a given task measured the same construct.

For instance, Oral Task #1 was designed to measure participants' oral production. If, statistically, the ten questions included in this task could be demonstrated to measure essentially the same construct, then they could be grouped into a single, more general index variable, instead of being treated as ten separate variables. The same reasoning would apply to the questions of each of the other tasks as well. In order to assess the degree of internal consistency of the items comprising each task, Cronbach's alpha (i.e., the reliability coefficient) was computed for each task, as detailed below.

Once the Excel data file was imported into SPSS, the researcher proceeded with computing the reliability coefficient for oral production. Oral Task #1, which was designed to assess the dependent variable of oral production, consisted of 15 sentences. Of these sentences, only ten measured participants' actual use of affirmative or negated verbs alongside hasta when they expressed themselves orally (The other 5 sentences did not contain any hasta and were meant to distract study participants.). Therefore, only those ten sentences (specifically sentences 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, and 14) were checked for internal consistency. The resulting alpha value was .706. The reliability analysis for Oral Task #1 also revealed that the highest alpha value for said task was achieved if only nine of the above-mentioned sentences were taken into consideration, as shown in Table 6 below:
Table 6: Cronbach’s alpha for Oral Task # 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.733</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, a value of .6 or higher for the reliability coefficient is considered to represent good internal consistency in quantitative sociolinguistic research. Given the possibility that higher alpha values may yield stronger regression models, the researcher decided to consider only sentences 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, and 14. A Cronbach’s alpha value of .733 indicates that these nine sentences from Oral Task # 1 measure essentially the same construct. As a result, said sentences were combined into a larger index variable, titled “Oral production.”

The next task to be checked for internal consistency was Oral Task # 2. As mentioned earlier, for this task, participants had to answer a series of questions for each of six prerecorded texts read by native speakers of Spanish. Oral Task # 2 was designed to assess how study participants judged oral usage of *hasta*. Cronbach’s alpha was computed for questions 1 - 6 for each of the six texts to which the participants listened. The initial analysis yielded very low alpha values indicating that, within each of the six texts, questions 1 - 6 were not statistically consistent in regards to what they measured. Therefore, more Cronbach’s alpha tests were needed in order to test the reliability of different combinations of said questions for each text. After such tests, it was determined that, for each of the six texts, only questions 2 - 5 presented levels of internal consistency sufficiently high enough to warrant aggregation into a single, more general index variable. Results from said reliability tests are given in Tables 7 - 12 below.
Table 7: Cronbach’s alpha for Text # 1 (MCAE usage of *hasta* to mark inception)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.551</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Cronbach’s alpha for Text # 2 (control)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.590</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Cronbach’s alpha for Text # 3 (non-MCAE usage of *hasta* to mark inception)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.749</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Cronbach’s alpha for Text # 4 (*a las* used to mark inception)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.681</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Cronbach’s alpha for Text # 5 (control)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.543</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Cronbach’s alpha for Text # 6 (MCAE usage of *hasta* to mark inception)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.723</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results from the reliability analyses, reported in Tables 7 through 12 above, show that the Cronbach’s alpha value for Texts 3, 4, and 6 of Oral Task # 1 is either close to .7 or above said value. In other words, for each of the above-mentioned texts, student answers to questions 2-5 can be considered internally consistent with each other, and the questions themselves can be considered, effectively, to have measured one and the same underlying construct, warranting the creation of an index variable for each text. As for Texts 1, 2, and 5, the respective reliability coefficients approach the value of .6 (the value that is generally considered to represent good internal consistency) closely enough to allow for the creation of more general index variables as well; however, given the borderline alpha values, we must be cautious in our later interpretation of the regression models in which these index variables appear. Following reliability analysis, codes for participant responses to the four individual questions pertaining to each individual text were aggregated into a single index variable per text. We decided to use the following subclassifications to refer to these index variables: “Judgment of oral usage: inception with MCAE hasta (Text # 1 only)”; “Judgment of oral usage: control 1 (Text # 2 only)”; “Judgment of oral usage: inception with non-MCAE hasta (Text # 3 only)”; “Judgment of oral usage: inception with a las (Text # 4 only); “Judgment of oral usage: control 2 (Text # 5 only)”; “Judgment of oral usage: inception with MCAE hasta (Text # 6 only).”

As discussed so far, student responses on Oral Task # 1 represented their oral production of affirmative or negated verbs used with hasta, whereas student responses on Oral Task # 2 represented their judgments of oral usage of hasta. In the case of Written Task # 1, study participants’ responses could be seen as assessing both judgment (from
participants’ answers to questions (a) and (b)) and comprehension\(^{56}\) (from participants’ answers to question (c)) of written usage of \textit{hasta}. Said task comprised 15 sentences, divided equally among sentences designed as distractors, sentences that employed MCAE \textit{hasta}, and sentences that employed non-MCAE \textit{hasta}. Each sentence was followed by three questions that study participants had to answer according to a scale or a series of options given. As mentioned above, questions (a) and (b) were designed to assess how study participants judged written usage of \textit{hasta}.

Of all the sentences in Written Task # 1, sentences 1, 4, 7, 11, and 14 included usage of non-MCAE \textit{hasta}. Several Cronbach’s alpha tests were performed in order to test the reliability of participant judgments relating to different combinations of the above-mentioned sentences. After such tests, it was determined that only participant judgments of sentences 11 and 14 presented levels of internal consistency sufficiently high enough to warrant aggregation into a single, more general index variable, which we decided to call “Judgment of written usage of non-MCAE \textit{hasta}.” Said sentences yielded an alpha value of almost .6 as shown in Table 13 below.

Table 13: Cronbach’s alpha for Written Task # 1, questions (a) & (b), judgments of sentences 11 and 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.597</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{56}\) We realize that the assessment of “comprehension,” for question (c) of Written Task # 1, may not be unique to this task, given the fact that, for each of the administered linguistic tasks, study participants needed to first comprehend the use of \textit{hasta} in order to later produce it or express their judgment of such usage in spoken or written Spanish. In other words, on some level, student responses to all of the linguistic tasks reflected, directly or indirectly, their comprehension of \textit{hasta}. The design of Written Task # 1, question (c), however, specifically aimed to directly measure student’s comprehension of \textit{hasta}, hence our use of the label “comprehension.”
On the other hand, sentences 2, 6, 9, 12, and 15 included usage of MCAE *hasta*. For these five sentences, only participant judgments of sentences 2, 9, and 12 showed acceptable internal consistency. Yielding a Cronbach’s alpha value of .699, as shown in Table 14 below, participant judgments of said three sentences were combined into a single, larger index variable, which we decided to call “Judgment of written usage of MCAE *hasta*.”

Table 14: Cronbach’s alpha for Written Task # 1, questions (a) & (b), judgments of sentences 2, 9, and 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.699</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The other construct that Written Task # 1 was designed to measure was comprehension of written usage of *hasta*. More specifically, question (c) of this task was aimed at assessing how study participants understood written usage of *hasta*. The coefficient of reliability was computed for responses to question (c) for sentences 2, 6, 9, 12, and 15, which all employed MCAE *hasta*. The results of this analysis are given in Table 15 below.

Table 15: Cronbach’s alpha for Written Task # 1, question (c), participant responses to sentences 2, 6, 9, 12, and 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.741</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With an alpha value of .741, we can say with a high degree of confidence that question (c) measured essentially the same construct for sentences 2, 6, 9, 12, and 15. Therefore,
student responses to question (c) for these five sentences were grouped into a larger index variable, which we decided to call “Comprehension of written usage of MCAE hasta.”

The last coefficient of reliability that was computed for Written Task # 1, part (c), was the one checking for internal consistency among sentences 1, 4, 7, 11, and 14, which all employed non-MCAE hasta. Judging from a considerably high value of .873 for the reliability coefficient, as shown in Table 16 below, sentences 1, 4, 7, 11, and 14 are essentially the same in regards to the underlying construct that they measured. Therefore, rather than considering responses to these sentences as five separate variables, we decided to combine the responses into a single, larger index variable, which we named “Comprehension of written usage of non-MCAE hasta.”

Table 16: Cronbach’s alpha for Written Task # 1, question (c), participant responses to sentences 1, 4, 7, 11, and 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.873</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, the last Cronbach’s alpha was computed to measure the internal consistency of the responses given for Written Task # 2. Said task only contained five sentences, and it was designed to assess the way in which study participants used hasta when they expressed themselves in writing. The reliability analysis assessed the degree to which the five sentences of Written Task # 2 were considerably similar in regards to the construct that they measured, that is, written production of hasta. The results from the reliability test are given in Table 17 below. With an alpha value of .825, we can be confident that the five sentences from Written Task # 2 do not need to be considered as 5 separate variables. Therefore, they were grouped into a larger, more general index.
variable, which we decided to call “Written production of hasta.”

Table 17: Cronbach’s alpha for Written Task # 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.825</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned at the beginning of this section, Spanish dialectal exposure was an independent index variable that was based on data gathered from the background questionnaire. More specifically, as discussed in section 4.2.1., said independent variable was measured via the social situations that participants selected on the background questionnaire, social situations which represented potential exposure to both MCAE and non-MCAE Spanish dialects.

We assume that said social situations are similar in nature and that they measure essentially the same construct as far as relative Spanish dialectal exposure is concerned. Therefore, no Cronbach’s alpha value was calculated for the variable in question. Following established practice in social network analysis, we simply summed the codes assigned to the specific exposure situations that each participant selected, thus building a single index score per study participant. In this way, it was possible to measure relative exposure to MCAE vs. non-MCAE Spanish. For instance, overall positive sums were interpreted as an indication of a higher degree of relative exposure to MCAE Spanish dialects. Overall negative sums indicated a higher degree of relative exposure to non-MCAE Spanish dialects. A score of zero would theoretically indicate equal exposure to both of the Spanish varieties in question (or no exposure to either.)
In terms of network ties, each student’s sum reflects not only that student’s relative exposure to Spanish, but also that student’s relative integration into different social networks outside the classroom at the time of data collection. Integration of a participant into MCAE Spanish networks outside the classroom would be relatively high if the participants were exposed to MCAE Spanish in various different types of social situations. Some of the participants, for example, could work with Mexicans, Ecuadorians, or Central Americans, could have Mexican, Ecuadorian, or Central American neighbors, and might also socialize with Mexican, Ecuadorian, or Central American friends. Each of these single ties that a given participant had to other members of Mexican, Ecuadorian, and Central American social networks would raise the individual’s integration into MCAE social networks. Nevertheless, if said individual also had a high minus partial sum for integration into non-MCAE networks outside the classroom, the resulting relative integration suggested by the (near) zero sum of the network addends could approach equality. Thus, each participant attained an index score (with a scalar range of (-10) to (+10)) that could be interpreted as a measure of relative exposure to MCAE vs. non-MCAE Spanish as a result of relative integration into MCAE vs. non-MCAE social networks outside the classroom.

After constructing the index variables that were based on the coded data collected from the linguistic tasks and from the background questionnaire that study participants completed, the researcher computed variable frequencies as a way to examine the general distribution of data. Key variable tables are presented in the next section.
### 4.4 Variable tables

Variables discussed so far in this chapter have been divided into two major groups: variables constructed based on the data collected from linguistic tasks and the background questionnaire (all of the dependent variables as well as the independent variables of Spanish dialectal exposure, age, gender, and length of time during which participants had been studying Spanish) and variables representing factors that were chosen to be examined as possible predictors of the dependent variables (the rest of the independent variables). The variable tables presented below report the computed frequencies for the following key variables: Spanish dialectal exposure, oral production, judgment of oral usage of MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta*, judgment of written usage of MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta*, comprehension of written usage of MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta*, and written production of *hasta*.

Table 18: Spanish dialectal exposure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>95.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>98.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 18 we can observe that about 15% of study participants had a relative exposure score of 0 and were, therefore, theoretically equally exposed to both MCAE and non-MCAE Spanish dialects or not exposed at all to either. The majority of participants were more integrated into social networks that exposed them to MCAE Spanish dialects (cf. positive scores).

In regards to oral production, Table 19 shows that the number of study participants who, when expressing themselves orally, mainly used affirmative verbs to mark inception of a verbal situation (as in MCAE Spanish dialects) was roughly equal to the number of students who mostly used negated verbs. A small percentage of individuals displayed a balanced use of affirmative and negated verbs to mark inception of a given verbal situation.

Table 19: Oral production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>95.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As for the way in which participants judged the oral use of inception with MCAE *hasta*, Table 20 below displays relatively high scores. Theoretically, the lowest possible score for this variable is 4 (if participants have an extremely negative attitude towards the use of MCAE *hasta*) whereas the highest possible value is 20 (if participants display an extremely positive attitude towards the use of MCAE *hasta*). Given the fact that the actual observed values range between 7 and 20, with only one value below 10, we can deduce that study participants judged the oral use of MCAE *hasta* in a very positive way.

Table 20: Judgment of oral usage: inception with MCAE *hasta* (Text # 6 only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study participants displayed similar positive attitudes toward oral usage of

---

57 Even though both Text # 1 and Text # 6 employed MCAE *hasta*, we used data from only Text # 6 to represent the dependent variable of judgment of oral usage of inception with MCAE *hasta*. This was due to the fact that, of the two MCAE *hasta* texts, only Text # 6, and not Text # 1, was read by the same speaker that also read Text # 3, which used non-MCAE *hasta*, and we wanted to contrast MCAE and non-MCAE usage via the matched guise test. Moreover, no significant differences were found between participants’ judgments of oral usage of inception with MCAE *hasta* (in just Text # 1) and their judgments of oral usage of inception with *a las* (in Text # 4, read by the same speaker as Text # 1, cf. section 4.5.1).

58 Each of the texts used in Oral Task # 2 had 4 questions with 5 possible answers each. The answers were coded using numbers (1) - (5). Therefore, the lowest potential score for each text was 4 points and the highest potential score per text was 20.
inception with non-MCAE *hasta*. As reported in Table 21 below, the lowest value observed for this variable is 9, indicating that participants’ attitudes toward oral usage of inception with non-MCAE *hasta* were slightly less negative than their attitudes toward oral usage of inception with MCAE *hasta* (Text # 6 only). Judging by the four highest peak values reported in Tables 20 and 21, we can deduce that the individuals who displayed highly positive attitudes toward oral usage of inception with MCAE *hasta* were greater in number than those who displayed the same highly positive attitudes toward oral usage of inception with non-MCAE *hasta*.

Table 21: Judgment of oral usage: inception with non-MCAE *hasta* (Text # 3 only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In regards to written usage of MCAE *hasta*, from Table 22 below, we can see that participants’ attitudes were not very positive. About 17% of participants had a score of 0 (the lowest possible) indicating that they considered all sentences as ungrammatical and possibly not characteristic of native speakers of Spanish.
Table 22: Judgment of written usage of MCAE hasta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>81.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only seven individuals had a score of 6 (the highest possible), indicating the highest positive attitudes toward the written usage of MCAE hasta. As for the rest of study participants, almost 53% of individuals displayed a relatively negative attitude toward written usage of MCAE hasta, whereas about 35% considered the sentences as relatively grammatical and possibly characteristic of native speakers of Spanish. It is important to also note that 9 study participants (12.5%) took a neutral position when judging written usage of MCAE hasta.

Table 23: Judgment of written usage of non-MCAE hasta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

59 The index variable of “judgment of written usage of MCAE hasta” was created by taking into consideration sentences 2, 9, and 12 of Written Task #1. For each of these sentences, participants had to answer two questions. Each of these two questions had two possible answers that were coded using numbers (0) and (1). Thus, this index variable represents a total number of six answers per participant, leading to scores of 0 and 6 as the minimum and maximum scores, respectively.
In regards to judgment of written usage of non-MCAE *hasta*, data reported in Table 23 above indicate that the same number of participants (about 17%) had the lowest score possible. Nevertheless, 18 individuals had a score of 4 (the highest possible), indicating that participants displayed more high positive attitudes toward written usage of non-MCAE *hasta* than they did toward MCAE *hasta*. Furthermore, the number of participants who took a neutral position when judging written usage of non-MCAE *hasta* more than doubled in comparison to the number of participants who displayed the same neutral attitudes toward written usage of MCAE *hasta*.

Table 24: Comprehension of written usage of MCAE *hasta*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24 above shows that, when considering participants’ comprehension of written usage of MCAE *hasta*, a considerable number of individuals (75%) displayed some degree of comprehension of *hasta* as a preposition marking the inception of

---

60 The index variable of “judgment of written usage of non-MCAE *hasta*** was created by taking into consideration sentences 11 and 14 of Written Task # 1. Therefore, this index variable represents a total number of four answers per participant, leading to scores of 0 and 4 as the minimum and maximum, respectively.
affirmative verbal situations (cf. positive values). Furthermore, over one fifth of students understood MCAE *hasta* appropriately in all cases. In contrast, less than one fourth of research participants understood the use of *hasta* in affirmative verbal situations terminative (cf. negative values).

As for participants’ comprehension of written usage of non-MCAE *hasta*, values reported in Table 25 below indicate that about 80% of individuals understood *hasta* to mark inception of negated verbal situations. Contrary to what we expected, however, several individuals displayed negative scores. In other words, they understood *hasta* to mark the end point of the given negated verbal situations.

Table 25: Comprehension of written usage of non-MCAE *hasta*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Frequency</th>
<th>Frequency Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As explained earlier in section 4.2, positive codes were given to participants’ answers to Written Task # 1, question (c) if these answers indicated that participants had understood *hasta* (MCAE and non-MCAE) to mark inception of a given verbal situation.
In regards to the way in which students used *hasta* when they expressed themselves in writing, Table 26 above shows results that are similar to the observed values for the variable of comprehension of written usage of MCAE *hasta*.\(^{62}\) When expressing themselves in writing, over 70% of study participants employed MCAE *hasta* to some extent, as indicated by the positive scores. About 22% of these individuals employed MCAE *hasta* throughout all of Written Task # 2 (hence, displaying the possible highest score of 5). Only 10% of study participants employed *hasta* exclusively as it is used in non-MCAE Spanish dialects (note the possible lowest score of -5).

So far in this chapter, we have discussed the concepts represented by the variables used in the statistical analyses, and we have explained the way in which the data were coded and aggregated according to reliability analysis. In addition, we have reported frequencies of the observed values for the key index variables that were based on data

\(^{62}\) Future research is warranted in order to see if the index variable of written comprehension actually measures the same underlying construct that is also measured by the variable of written production, or if both index variables are really functions of a third, yet to be determined variable.
gathered by means of the linguistic tasks and the background questionnaire. The next section presents an account of the analytical statistics, detailing the tests performed during the quantitative analysis.

4.5 Analytical statistics

After finalizing the data coding and establishing the variables that would be analyzed, it was necessary to determine the best approach to data analysis. Several statistical testing methods were considered based on the existing data sample, based on the number of dependent and independent variables, and based on the research questions posed at the beginning of this study. After examining the possibilities, we decided to proceed with a series of multiple linear regression analyses for the dataset. Such analysis is common when researchers think that a given variable may depend, simultaneously, on several other variables. Multiple regression models were run on each of the five dependent variables (i.e., oral production, judgment of oral usage of *hasta*, judgment of written usage of *hasta*, comprehension of written usage of *hasta*, and written production of *hasta*) in simultaneous relation to the seven independent variables that were taken into consideration (i.e., pedagogy practice, class level, language modality, age, gender, length of time during which study participants had been studying Spanish, and Spanish dialectal exposure). It is important to note here that, of the several multiple regression models presented in this section, some models do not include all of the independent variables that were initially conceived to be analyzed as possible predictors. The researcher chose to report only the models that were the most efficient in predicting the dependent variables in question. In other words, the only models reported below are those with the highest R-square values and those with the most independent variables as significant predictors.
In addition to the multiple linear regression models, the analysis included Paired-Samples $t$ tests that were run on student responses to Oral Task # 2, Written Task # 1, questions (a) and (b), as well as Paired-Samples $t$ tests on student responses to Written Task # 1, question (c). Said tasks were used to measure judgment of oral usage, judgment of written usage, and comprehension of written usage of *hasta*, respectively. Given the fact that these tasks included sentences containing both MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta*, the Paired-Samples $t$ tests were useful in comparing participants’ judgment and comprehension of these two variants of the variable in question. While multiple linear regression models would be able to tell us if (and in what ways) any of the independent variables affected participants’ judgments and comprehension of *hasta*, the Paired-Samples $t$ tests would reveal any potential differences (or lack thereof) between participants’ judgments and comprehension of MCAE *hasta* and their judgments and comprehension of non-MCAE *hasta*. The Paired-Samples $t$ tests are presented first followed by the multiple linear regression analyses.

### 4.5.1 Paired-Samples $t$ tests

The first Paired-Samples $t$ test was run on Oral Task # 2. For this task, as discussed in chapter 3, study participants had to listen to six texts that were read to them by 3 native speakers of Spanish who had been previously recorded. Text # 1 and Text # 6 employed MCAE *hasta*, Text # 3 employed non-MCAE *hasta*, and Text # 4 had no use of *hasta*, but used the expression *a las* (‘at’) to mark inception of a verbal situation. Texts # 2 and # 5 also had no use of *hasta*. Said texts were exactly the same and served as

---

63 For both Oral Task # 2 and Written Task # 1, the index variables used for the Paired-Samples $t$ tests included particular sentences that were grouped by kind (i.e., MCAE *hasta* sentences together and non-MCAE *hasta* sentences together).
control texts for the experiment. As also discussed in chapter 3, the purpose of employing MCAE hasta twice in this test (Text # 1 and Text # 6) was to be able to create three separate text pairs in such a way that a different person read each text pair and, within each text pair, the same person read both texts. Furthermore, in both Texts # 1 and # 6, where hasta was used in the affirmative inceptive way, the lexical aspect of the verbs that accompanied hasta could display unambiguous instantaneous temporal features and, therefore, all cases of hasta in these texts could reflect inceptive properties.\textsuperscript{64}

Besides examining how participants’ judgments of oral usage of hasta were affected by the independent variables that were conceived as possible predictors, the purpose of Oral Task # 2 was also to contrast participants’ judgments of several ways of actually marking inception in Spanish in similar verbal situations (i.e., via usage of MCAE hasta, via inceptive usage of non-MCAE hasta, and via the usage of the expression a las). More specifically, the researcher was interested in contrasting in separate text pairs (a) participants’ judgments of MCAE hasta with their judgments of inception with the expression a las (Text # 1 vs. Text # 4), and (b) participants’ judgments of MCAE hasta with their judgments of non-MCAE hasta on (Text # 3 vs. Text # 6). Paired-Samples $t$ tests were chosen for this purpose.

In statistics, a Paired-Samples $t$ test compares the means of two normally distributed variables, computes the difference between the two variables for each case, and tests to see if the average difference is significantly different from zero. In relation to Oral Task # 2, before performing the Paired-Samples $t$ tests, it was necessary to first

\textsuperscript{64} We realize that, even though hasta could reflect inceptive properties in these verbal situations, with the accomplishment verbs, inception was not the only possible aspect that hasta could mark. Therefore, on some level, Texts # 1 and # 6 were not strictly equivalent.
compute the variables that were going to be compared. For each of the six texts, the scores pertaining to the individual questions\textsuperscript{65} were summed up for each participant in the study, thus creating a single score per text per participant.

The summed scores for Text # 1 represent participants’ judgments of oral usage of inception with MCAE \textit{hasta} in just Text # 1; the summed scores for Text # 2 and Text # 5, respectively, represent participants’ judgments of oral language in general, given the fact that these texts were used as controls and were not related to ways of marking inception in a verbal situation. The summed scores for Text # 3 represent participants’ judgments of oral usage of inception with non-MCAE \textit{hasta}; the summed scores for Text # 4 represent participants’ judgments of oral usage of inception with \textit{a las}. Finally, the summed scores for Text # 6 represent participants’ judgments of oral usage of inception with MCAE \textit{hasta} in just Text # 6. In reporting the results of the Paired-Samples \textit{t} tests, the above-mentioned variable names are not used to refer to the summed up scores for each of the six texts. In order to be able to fit the variable labels in the output tables, we refer to said scores below by the names of the texts to which they relate, i.e., Text # 1, Text # 2, Text # 3, Text # 4, Text # 5, and Text # 6.

After calculating the variables needed to compare different components of Oral Task # 2, Paired-Samples \textit{t} tests were run to check for any significant differences between index variables Text # 1 and Text # 4, Text # 2 and Text # 5, and Text # 3 and Text # 6, respectively. Results from these analyses are presented below in Tables 27-29.

\textsuperscript{65} For each of the texts presented in Oral Task # 2, study participants had to answer the same four questions.
Table 27: Paired-Samples $t$ test: Text # 1 vs. Text # 4

**Paired Samples Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>Text 1</td>
<td>15.03</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Text 4</td>
<td>13.83</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2.717</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Paired Samples Correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Sig.: p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>Text 1 &amp; Text 4</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-.093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Paired Samples Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed): p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>Std. Error Mean</td>
<td>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>Text 1 - Text 4</td>
<td>1.194</td>
<td>3.343</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28: Paired-Samples $t$ test: Text # 3 vs. Text # 6

**Paired Samples Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>Text 3</td>
<td>14.42</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Text 6</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2.938</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Paired Samples Correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Sig.: p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>Text 3 &amp; Text 6</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paired Samples Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair 1</th>
<th>Text 3 - Text 6</th>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed): p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean=15.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N=72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation=1.956</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Error Mean=.231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference=-2.095 - .321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean=14.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N=72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation=2.196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Error Mean=.259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference=-2.716 - .008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29: Paired-samples t test: Text # 2 vs. Text # 5

Paired Samples Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair 1</th>
<th>Text 2</th>
<th>N=72</th>
<th>Std. Deviation=1.956</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean=.231</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Text 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.196</td>
<td>.259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paired Samples Correlations

| Pair 1 | Text 2 & Text 5 | N=72 | Correlation=.492 | Sig.: p< .000 |

Paired Samples Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair 1</th>
<th>Text 2 - Text 5</th>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed): p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean=1.167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N=72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation=2.103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Error Mean=.248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference=.672 - 1.661</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean=1.167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N=72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation=2.103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Error Mean=.248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference=.672 - 1.661</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean=1.167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N=72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation=2.103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Error Mean=.248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference=.672 - 1.661</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results from Table 27 above show that, when comparing Text # 1 (inception with MCAE hasta) and Text # 4 (inception with a las), the mean value for Text # 1 (=15.03) is 1.194 points higher that the mean value for Text # 4 (=13.83). This difference is statistically significant according to the Sig. (2-tailed) p value, which is less than .003. In
other words, participants’ judgments of someone marking inception in spoken Spanish with MCAE *hasta* (in just Text # 1) differ significantly from participants’ judgments of that same person marking inception in spoken Spanish with *a las* (in just Text # 4). Furthermore, judging from a higher mean value for Text # 1, we can deduce that participants favored inception marked with MCAE *hasta* more than they did inception marked with *a las*.

In terms of comparing participants’ judgments of oral usage of inception with non-MCAE *hasta* (index from Text # 3) to participants’ judgments of oral usage of inception with MCAE *hasta* (index from Text # 6), results from Table 28 indicate that the two samples have different means. The mean value for Text # 3 (=14.42) is 1.208 points lower than the mean value for Text # 6 (=15.63). This difference is significant according to the Sig. (2-tailed) \( p \) value, which is less than .008. In other words, participants’ judgments of a person marking inception in spoken Spanish with non-MCAE *hasta* (as in Text # 3) differ significantly from participants’ judgments of the same person marking inception in spoken Spanish with MCAE *hasta* (in just Text # 6). Moreover, participants judged oral usage of inception with MCAE *hasta* more favorably than they judged oral usage of inception with non-MCAE *hasta*, given that the mean value for Text # 6 is higher than the mean value for Text # 3.

As for judgments of the control texts (Text # 2 and Text # 5), results from Table 29 show that study participants did not judge the spoken Spanish in said texts in the same way. Text # 2, with a mean value of 15.44, yielded higher scores than Text # 5, whose mean value was 14.28. The difference in means (=1.167) is statistically significant given the Sig. (2-tailed) \( p \) value, which is less than .001. Serving as controls for the
experiment, Text # 2 and Text # 5 were exactly the same and had no usage of *hasta* or any other forms of marking inception of a verbal situation. Furthermore, they were both recorded by the same person. Thus, theoretically, there should not be any difference in the ways in which study participants judged the spoken Spanish in these texts. More importantly, if the two control texts were not judged equally, the validity of participants’ judgments of the other four texts becomes questionable. Therefore, in order for any valid conclusions to be drawn from the Paired-Samples $t$ tests on Text # 1 vs. Text # 4 and Text # 3 vs. Text # 6, we need to look further into the difference in participant judgments of the two control texts.

As we may recall, for Oral Task # 2, study participants had to listen to six separate recordings and, after listening to each text, they had to express their judgments of each recording by answering a series of multiple-choice questions. The questions were the same for each text. It is possible that, due to the length of the task itself, as well as its repetitive nature, the respondents may have become progressively fatigued as the task wore on. If so, a fatigue effect alone could explain the drop off in the means of Texts # 4 and # 5 compared to those of the earlier texts (1 and 2).\(^{66}\) Moreover, the difference between student judgments of Text # 1 and Text # 4, reported in Table 27, might owe its very statistical significance to this fatigue effect. It was important, therefore, to adjust all index scores equally in order to account for this potentiality.

To make said adjustment, the researcher first calculated the following score differences: (a) Text # 5 – Text # 2 (to represent the fatigue differential), (b) Text # 4 –

\(^{66}\) Unlike with the other text pairs, as reported on Table 28, the means of Text # 6 actually increased compared to those of Text # 3. Therefore, a fatigue effect, if present, may have masked an even larger relative difference between the mean scores for these texts than Table 28 has already indicated.
Text # 1, and (c) Text # 6 – Text # 3. Next, the researcher subtracted out the fatigue differential from each text pair differential as a mathematical correction for any potential fatigue effects. Thus, the researcher calculated (b) – (a), labeling the adjusted index variable as “Mod 4-1” ("mod" stands for "modified"), and (c) – (a), labeling the adjusted index variable as “Mod 6-3.”

After adjusting for any potential fatigue effects, the comparison analyses were repeated in order to check if significant differences still remained between Text # 1 and Text # 4 and between Text # 6 and Text # 3. The researcher chose to use one-sample *t* tests to analyze the above-mentioned differences. A one-sample *t* test applied to two tests separately is equivalent to a Paired-Samples *t* test. Results from the one-sample *t* tests are presented below in Tables 30 and 31.

Table 30: One-sample *t* test: Text # 1 vs. Text # 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One-Sample Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod 4-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One-Sample Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test Value = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod 4-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 31: One-sample $t$ test: Text # 6 vs. Text # 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One-Sample Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mod 6-3</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>4.695</td>
<td>.553</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One-Sample Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mod 6-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results from Table 30 above reveal that, after taking into consideration any potential fatigue effects, the adjusted scores for Text # 1 still remain slightly higher than the adjusted values for Text # 4 (cf. value of Mean Difference, which is (-.028)). This average difference, however, is no longer statistically significant according to the Sig. (2-tailed) $p$ value, which is less than .954. Therefore, the statistical significance of the results of the paired $t$ test (Text # 1 vs. Text # 4) reported in Table 27 may be seen as a mere artifact of student fatigue during data collection. In other words, with scores adjusted / corrected for potential fatigue effects, students did not judge oral usage of MCAE hasta significantly differently than they judged oral usage of a las to mark inception.

As for participants’ judgments of oral usage of inception with non-MCAE hasta (Text # 3 only) vs. participants’ judgments of oral usage of inception with MCAE hasta in just Text # 6, results from Table 31 indicate that the adjusted scores for Text # 6 are much larger than the adjusted values for Text # 3 (cf. value of Mean Difference = 2.375).
This difference in scores, even greater than the difference found in the raw, uncorrected scores for Text # 3 and Text # 6, is statistically highly significant according to the Sig. (2-tailed) $p$ value, which is less than .001. In other words, after taking into account and adjusting for any potential fatigue effects on participants’ answers for Oral Task # 2, we found that participants’ judgments of marking inception in spoken Spanish with MCAE \textit{hasta} (in just Text # 6) still differed significantly from their judgments of marking inception in spoken Spanish with non-MCAE \textit{hasta}. Moreover, the significance level of this difference actually went up for the corrected scores.

The next comparative analysis that we performed focused on Written Task # 1, questions (a) and (b). This part of Written Task # 1 was designed to measure how study participants judged written usage of \textit{hasta} as a marker of inception in affirmative and negated verbal situations. Of all of the sentences that study participants had to judge, five sentences employed MCAE \textit{hasta} and five others used non-MCAE \textit{hasta}.

Earlier in this chapter, we reported the creation of two index variables associated with Written Task # 1, questions (a) and (b), namely “judgment of written usage of MCAE \textit{hasta}” and “judgment of written usage of non-MCAE \textit{hasta}.” The first index variable included aggregated student responses to sentences 2, 9, and 12, whereas the second one included aggregated student responses to sentences 11 and 14. The sentences initially chosen for each index were those whose responses demonstrated the highest internal consistencies, as explained in Section 4.3. The index variables were created by summing up the codes assigned to each student’s response on each sentence to be included in the index, thus, creating a single score per student for the task. It was important that an equal number of items be summed up to yield the single score
representing the index variable for each student, in order for the researcher to later be able to accurately compare the means of the two index variables. Given that data from only two sentences of Written Task #1 were used to create the index variable called judgment of written usage of non-MCAE hasta (sentences 11 and 14), to have comparable data sets, for the purpose of this Paired-Samples $t$ test only, we decided to use only two of the three MCAE sentences initially chosen through reliability analysis to create the MCAE index (sentences 2, 9, and 12). Therefore, we needed to do further reliability analysis to see which two of sentences 2, 9, and 12 from Written Task #1 (questions (a) and (b)) had the best internal consistency.

As mentioned in section 4.3, the Chronbach’s alpha value for Written Task #1, questions A and B, sentences 2, 9, and 12 was .699. Given the fact that only two sentences could be taken into consideration for the index variable, various combinations of sentences 2, 9, and 12 were tried in order to find the highest alpha value. We found that sentences 9 and 12 (questions (a) and (b)) yielded the highest Chronbach’s alpha value (.7) of all the combinations we tested. Thus, those two sentences were used to recompute the variable of judgment of written usage of MCAE hasta, which, in turn, was used for the Paired-Samples $t$ test on Written Task #1, question (a) and (b).

Following the reliability analysis, the individual scores for questions (a) and (b) on sentences 9 and 12 of Written Task #1 were summed up to yield the variable of judgment of written usage of MCAE hasta. In addition, we summed the individual scores for sentences 11 and 14, questions (a) and (b), of the same task to compute the variable of judgment of written usage of non-MCAE hasta. After the variables were calculated, a Paired-Samples $t$ test was run to check for any significant differences between the average
scores of the two variables taken into consideration.

Results from this analysis, as presented below in Table 32, indicate that the mean value for judgment of written usage of MCAE *hasta* (=1.76) is .361 points lower than the mean value for judgment of written usage of non-MCAE *hasta* (= 2.13).

Table 32: Paired-Samples *t* test for Written Task # 1, questions (a) & (b)

**Paired Samples Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 JudgmentOfWrittenUsage OfMcaeHasta</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.419</td>
<td>.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JudgmentOfWrittenUsage OfnonMcaeHasta</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.394</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Paired Samples Correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Sig.: p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 JudgmentOfWrittenUsage OfMcaeHasta &amp; JudgmentOfWrittenUsage OfnonMcaeHasta</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Paired Samples Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed): p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Error Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 Judgment Of Written Usage Of McaeHasta &amp; Judgment Of Written Usage Of nonMcae Hasta</td>
<td>-.361</td>
<td>1.841</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>-.794</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In other words, participants’ judgments of inception marked in written Spanish with MCAE *hasta* differed from their judgments of inception marked in written Spanish with non-MCAE *hasta*. More specifically, participants judged written usage of non-MCAE *hasta* more favorably than they judged written usage of MCAE *hasta*, given that the mean value for judgment of written usage of non-MCAE *hasta* was the higher of the two. This difference, however, is not statistically significant judging from the Sig. (2-tailed) *p* value, which is only less than .100.

The last comparative analysis that we performed focused on Written Task # 1, question (c). Said part of Written Task # 1 was designed to measure research participants’ comprehension of written usage of *hasta*. Earlier in section 4.3 we reported the creation of two index variables associated with Written Task # 1, question (c), namely “comprehension of written usage of MCAE *hasta*” and “comprehension of written usage of non-MCAE *hasta*.” Said index variables included 5 sentences each and, therefore, the data sets were comparable (unlike the case of Written Task # 1, questions (a) and (b), where we had to use only some of the sentences initially chosen through reliability analysis.)

In order to run a Paired-Samples *t* test, we summed the individual scores per student for question (c) on sentences 2, 6, 9, 12, and 15 of Written Task # 1 to yield the variable of comprehension of written usage of MCAE *hasta*. In addition, the individual scores for question (c) on sentences 1, 4, 7, 11, and 14 of the same task were summed up to compute the variable of comprehension of written usage of non-MCAE *hasta*. Following these calculations, a Paired-Samples *t* test was run to check for any significant differences between the average scores of the two variables taken into consideration.
Results from such analysis, as reported below in Table 33, indicate that the mean value for comprehension of written usage of MCAE *hasta* (= 1.79) is .653 points lower than the mean value for comprehension of written usage of non-MCAE *hasta* (= 2.44).

Table 33: Paired-Samples $t$ test for Written Task # 1, question (c)

**Paired Samples Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ComprehensionOfWrittenUsageOfMcaeHasta</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2.960</td>
<td>.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ComprehensionOfWrittenUsageOfnonMcaeHasta</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.184</td>
<td>.375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Paired Samples Correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Sig.: p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ComprehensionOfWrittenUsageOfMcaeHasta &amp; ComprehensionOfWrittenUsageOfnonMcaeHasta</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Paired Samples Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed): p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>Std. Error Mean</td>
<td>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ComprehensionOfWrittenUsageOfMcaeHasta &amp; ComprehensionOfWrittenUsageOfnonMcaeHasta</td>
<td>-.653</td>
<td>2.063</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>-.1138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In other words, research participants’ comprehension of inception marked in written Spanish with MCAE hasta differed from their comprehension of inception marked in written Spanish with non-MCAE hasta. Furthermore, study participants understood written usage of non-MCAE hasta more appropriately than they understood written usage of MCAE hasta, given that the mean value for comprehension of written usage of non-MCAE hasta is the higher of the two. More importantly, this difference is statistically significant judging from the Sig. (2-tailed) p value, which is less than .009.

Following the comparative analyses, which used one–sample and Paired-Samples t tests, the researcher proceeded with the multiple linear regression analyses. Such analyses examine the simultaneous effect of several independent variables on study participants’ oral production, as well as their judgments, comprehension, and written production of hasta, as detailed in section 4.5.2.

4.5.2 Regression analyses

When performing a multiple linear regression analysis, it is important to keep in mind that two components of the output are usually of interest: (1) the model summary table and (2) the table of coefficients. When looking at a model summary table, one important measure to be taken into consideration is the R Square, also known as the coefficient of determination. R Square is an overall measure of the strength of the regression model itself. It is an indication of the proportion of variance in the dependent variable that can be explained by the independent variables.

The table of coefficients, on the other hand, refers to the individual independent variables (i.e., the predictors) that have been included in the regression model. It is always important to examine this table, even in cases when the overall model results are
not statistically significant. The first measure presented in the table of coefficients is the B coefficient. This measure reflects the amount of change that is observed in the dependent variable for every one unit of change in the independent variable, holding all other variables in the model constant. Related to this measure is the Standard Error of the B coefficient, representing the standard deviation of the coefficient across cases comprising the data set that is being analyzed.

The B coefficients are unstandardized in the sense that the scale of variables included in the regression is not uniform. In order to see which one of the variables is more influential within the regression model, that is, in order to compare the relative strengths of the various predictors within the model, B coefficients have to be converted to the same scale (i.e., standardized). This is where the Beta coefficient comes into play. Being a standardized coefficient, the Beta value indicates the amount of change that is observed in the dependent variable for every standard deviation unit of change in the independent variable. Thus, with other variables held constant, Beta reveals the effect of one variable upon another without regard to how differently the variables may be scaled.

The last two measures presented in the table of coefficients are the $t$ value and its significance (Sig. $t$: $p<$). The $t$ test assesses the significance of the individual B coefficients. Sig. $t$ is an indication of how likely it is that the individual independent variables actually have a real effect on (i.e., predict) the dependent variable under analysis. A Sig. $t$ value of $p<.05$ indicates that there is no more than a 5% probability that the mathematical relationship(s) observed between or among the variables measured could be due to chance. In other words, with $p < .05$, we can feel over 95% confident that the observed effect of the independent variable(s) on the dependent variable under
analysis is actually legitimate. In quantitative sociolinguistic research, when \( p < .05 \) in a regression, the associated independent variable is taken to be a statistically significant predictor for the dependent variable in question. It is important to point out that, for the regression models presented in this section, only certain measures are reported and commented. More specifically, we focus exclusively on the R Square values, the values of the B coefficient, and the significance of the \( t \) values.

The first regression model that was run had oral production as the dependent variable. Initially, all seven independent variables were included in the equation, in order to be examined as possible predictors of participants’ production of affirmative or negated verbs to mark inception in verbal situations when said individuals expressed themselves orally. Said model, however, yielded a very low R Square value and none of the independent variables appeared to be a significant predictor for oral production. After various tests, the regression model that proved to be the most efficient was the one reported in Table 34 below.

Table 34: Regression on oral production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.382(a)</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>3.345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Judging from an R Square value of .146, we can say that, taken together, the variables of Spanish dialectal exposure, language modality, and length of time during which students had been studying Spanish accounted for almost 15% of the overall variation in participants’ oral production of affirmative or negated verbs. Even though the overall regression model is not very strong, the $p$ values for language modality and Spanish dialectal exposure, .029 and .046, respectively, indicate that said variables were statistically significant in predicting oral production. Furthermore, B coefficient values of 1.076 for language modality and .371 for Spanish dialectal exposure show that these 2 variables had a positive linear relationship with the dependent variable. In other words, when the values of language modality and Spanish dialectal exposure increased, the values for oral production increased as well. Given the fact that the B coefficient for Spanish dialectal exposure is smaller than the B coefficient for language modality, we can say that the latter variable displayed a stronger influence on the dependent variable in question. The last independent variable in this model was the length of time during which participants had been studying Spanish. Said variable, though not highly significant as a predictor, had a negative impact on the dependent variable.
The next regression model that was run analyzed data that were collected from Oral Task # 2, where study participants had to listen to six texts and express their judgments of the speakers who read each text. Given the matched guise design of this task, what students actually judged were different ways to mark inception in spoken Spanish. As discussed in section 4.5.1, in a comparison of Text # 1 and Text # 4, after correction for possible fatigue effects, our Paired-Samples $t$ test showed no significant differences between participants’ judgments of oral usage of inception with MCAE hasta (in just Text # 1) and their judgments of oral usage of inception with a las. In our comparison of Text # 6 and Text # 3, however, the Paired-Samples $t$ test indicated that there were significant differences between participants’ judgments of oral usage of inception with MCAE hasta (in just Text # 6) and their judgments of oral usage of inception with non-MCAE hasta (in just Text # 3). Based on the fact that only student judgments of these two texts were found to be significantly different, the different regression analyses presented below for Oral Task # 2 focused only on participants’ judgments of oral usage of inception with MCAE hasta (in just Text # 6) and participants’ judgments of oral usage of inception with non-MCAE hasta (in just Text # 3) as dependent variables. These regression analyses examined how the independent variables affected, respectively, participants’ judgments of oral usage of inception with MCAE hasta (in just Text # 6) and their judgments of oral usage of inception with non-MCAE hasta (in just Text # 3). Additionally, we regressed the independent variables on the difference between these judgments as well.\footnote{As discussed earlier in section 4.5.1, the index variable labeled “Mod6-3” represented the difference between Text # 6 and Text # 3 after we adjusted participants’ scores to account for the potential fatigue factor.}
In analyzing factors that predicted participants’ judgments of oral usage of inception with MCAE *hasta*, the regression model presented in Table 35 below yielded promising results. Inclusion of all seven independent variables in the regression analysis yielded the strongest model, in this case with an R Square value of .280. In other words, 28% of the variance in participants’ judgments of oral usage of inception with MCAE *hasta* (Text # 6 only) can be predicted from variation in the independent variables taken together, that is, language modality, gender, age, Spanish dialectal exposure, pedagogy practice, class level, and length of time during which participants had been studying Spanish.

Table 35: Regression on judgment of oral usage: inception with MCAE *hasta* (Text # 6 only)

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.529(a)</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>2.655</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.: p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>11.370</td>
<td>2.835</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language modality</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class level</td>
<td>3.156</td>
<td>.954</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>3.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy practice</td>
<td>1.287</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>3.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.758</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>-.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpanishDialectal Exposure</td>
<td>-.274</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>-.204</td>
<td>-1.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LengthOfTime StudyingSpanish</td>
<td>-1.183</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>-.523</td>
<td>-3.670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: “judgment of oral usage: inception with MCAE *hasta* (Text # 6 only)”

Note that the last three of the above-mentioned independent variables are
significant in predicting the dependent variable under analysis. More specifically, we observe the following $p$ values: .003 for pedagogy practice, .002 for class level, and .001 for length of time during which participants had been studying Spanish. Of these three significant predictors, class level and pedagogy practice had a positive impact on the dependent variable. In addition, class level appears to be the factor that most influenced variation in the dependent variable, given its B coefficient of 3.156, which is the highest absolute value of the B coefficients for the model in question. As for the length of time during which participants had been studying Spanish, the negative value of the B coefficient indicates that this predictor had a negative impact on the dependent variable. In other words, the more time participants studied Spanish, the less positive their judgments of oral usage of inception with MCAE hasta were. Age and Spanish dialectal exposure, too, yielded a negative impact, whereas gender and language modality had a positive, though statistically insignificant, impact on the dependent variable in question.

As for participants’ judgments of oral usage of inception with non-MCAE hasta (Text # 3 only), the regression model that was run yielded a very low R Square value ($=.111$), as reported below in Table 36. Said value is an indication that only 11% of the variance in participants’ judgments of oral usage of inception with non-MCAE hasta can be predicted from variation in the independent variables taken together.

Table 36: Regression on judgment of oral usage: inception with non-MCAE hasta (Text # 3 only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.333(a)</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>2.892</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Furthermore, the majority of the independent variables yielded \( p \) values which were very far from the desired .05 maximum. Considerably high \( p \) values mean that it is not very likely that the individual independent variables actually had a predictive effect on judgment of oral usage of inception with non-MCAE hasta. The only independent variable that yielded an acceptable level of significance was length of time during which participants had been studying Spanish. The \( p \) value for said variable is .043. As a result, we can say that this independent variable can be considered a significant predictor for study participants’ judgments of oral usage of inception with non-MCAE hasta, even though the overall regression model is not very strong. Furthermore, it is important to note that the variable representing the length of time during which participants had been studying Spanish had a negative impact (cf. B coefficient value of -.726) on participants’ judgments of oral usage of inception with non-MCAE hasta. In other words, the more time participants studied Spanish, the less positive their judgments of oral usage of inception with non-MCAE hasta were.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>Sig.: ( p &lt; )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.730</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language modality</td>
<td>-.189</td>
<td>-.430</td>
<td>.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class level</td>
<td>1.872</td>
<td>1.801</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedagogy practice</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.861</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SpanishDialectal Exposure</td>
<td>-.155</td>
<td>-.920</td>
<td>.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LengthOfTime StudyingSpanish</td>
<td>-.726</td>
<td>-2.067</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: ‘judgment of oral usage: inception with non-MCAE hasta (Text # 3 only)
After separately analyzing the factors that affected participants’ judgments of oral usage of inception with MCAE *hasta*, as well as those that affected participants’ judgments of oral usage of inception with non-MCAE *hasta*, the researcher proceeded to test how the independent variables affected participants’ judgments of oral usage of inception with MCAE *hasta* in relation to their judgments of oral usage of inception with non-MCAE *hasta*. As mentioned in footnote 67, an index variable representing the respective difference between aggregated student judgments of Text # 6 and Text # 3, corrected for fatigue effects (Mod6-3), was used as the dependent variable for the multiple linear regression model in question. Said regression is reported in Table 37 below.

Table 37: Regression on judgment differential for oral uses of inception with MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unstandardized Coefficients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language modality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpanishDialectal Exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LengthOfTime StudyingSpanish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: “judgment differential for oral uses of inception with MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta*”
As in the case of the regression model for student judgment of oral usage of inception with non-MCAE *hasta*, the overall fit of the model for the judgment differential for oral uses of inception with MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta* was very poor. With an R Square value of only .155, only about 16% of the variance in the dependent variable under analysis can be predicted from variation in the independent variables taken together. It is important to point out that, of all the independent variables taken into consideration, only pedagogy practice and length of time during which participants had been studying Spanish were significant in predicting variation in the judgment differential for oral uses of inception with MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta*. More specifically, the observed $p$ values are .012 for pedagogy practice and .054 for length of time during which participants had been studying Spanish. Furthermore, a positive B coefficient value for pedagogy practice ($=1.783$) indicates that this variable had a positive linear relationship with the dependent variable in question. In other words, from classrooms where students received explicit instruction about *hasta* and modeling of non-MCAE *hasta* to classrooms where MCAE *hasta* was modeled but not explained, the difference between judgments of oral usage of inception with MCAE *hasta* and judgments of oral usage of inception with non-MCAE *hasta* increased. From this increase, we can deduce that, in classrooms where students are exposed to involuntary modeling of MCAE *hasta*, study participants’ judgments of oral usage of inception with MCAE *hasta* are more positive than their judgments of oral usage of inception with non-MCAE *hasta*.

Unlike pedagogy practice, the length of time during which participants had been studying Spanish had a negative impact (cf. B coefficient, which is -1.061) on the difference between judgments of oral usage of inception with MCAE *hasta* and
judgments of oral usage of inception with non-MCAE hasta. In other words, the more participants studied Spanish, the less difference there was between the ways in which they judged oral usage of inception with MCAE hasta and oral usage of inception with non-MCAE hasta.

The next model that was run tested variation in judgments of written usage of MCAE hasta in simultaneous relation to the independent variables included in this study. It is important to recall that the index variable of judgment of written usage of MCAE hasta was based on sentences 2, 9, and 12 of Written Task #1 (questions (a) and (b)). The results from the regression analysis are presented in Table 38 below:

Table 38: Regression on judgment of written usage of MCAE hasta (sentences 2, 9, and 12 only)

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.520(a)</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>1.681</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.: p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>5.605</td>
<td>1.795</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish Dialectal Exposure</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LengthOfTime StudyingSpanish</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language modality</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class level</td>
<td>-1.924</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>-.493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedagogy practice</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>-.174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: judgment of written usage of MCAE hasta
This model, like the regression model on judgment of oral usage of MCAE *hasta*, showed some strength in predicting variation in the dependent variable under consideration, generating an R Square value of .270. In other words, 27% of the variance in judgments of written usage of MCAE *hasta* is attributable to variation in values of the independent variables.

In terms of individual predictors, the regression model returned *p* values of less than .002 and .010 for class level and Spanish dialectal exposure, respectively. These *p* values denote a statistically significant relationship between each of these two predictors and the way in which study participants judged written usage of MCAE *hasta*. Of all the independent variables included in the model (regardless of their significance as predictors), class level had the strongest influence on the dependent variable, given the fact that it yielded the highest B coefficient absolute value. Note, however, that class level, along with age, had negative impacts on how participants judged written usage of MCAE *hasta*.

As for participants’ judgments of written usage of non-MCAE *hasta*, the regression model that was run yielded an even lower R Square value (=.082), as reported below in Table 39.

Table 39: Regression on judgment of written usage of non-MCAE *hasta*  
(sentences 11 and 14 only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.286(a)</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>1.429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 39 - continued

In the case of participants’ judgments of written usage of non-MCAE *hasta*, only 8% of the variance in non-MCAE *hasta* can be predicted from variation in the independent variables taken together. Furthermore, none of the independent variables yielded *p* values that were low enough to make them significant predictors of the dependent variable under analysis. As a result, participants’ judgments of written usage of non-MCAE *hasta* cannot be explained by variance in class level, pedagogy practice, language modality, Spanish dialectal exposure, age, gender, or length of time during which participants had been studying Spanish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. : p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.283</td>
<td>1.526</td>
<td>1.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language modality</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class level</td>
<td>-.720</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>-.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedagogy practice</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>-.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>-.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish Dialectal Exposure</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>-.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length Of Time Studying Spanish</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: judgment of written usage of non-MCAE *hasta*

After analyzing the factors that affected participants’ judgments of written usage of MCAE *hasta* and participants’ judgments of written usage of non-MCAE *hasta*, the researcher proceeded to test how the independent variables affected participants’ judgments of written usage of MCAE *hasta* in relation to their judgments of written usage of non-MCAE *hasta*. An index variable representing the respective difference between aggregated student judgments of written usage of each type of *hasta*, corrected for fatigue...
effects, was used as the dependent index variable for the multiple linear regression model in question. It is important to note that the variable representing the time during which students had been studying Spanish was not included in the regression model reported in Table 40 below. Excluding this variable from the equation yielded a more efficient model with more independent variables as significant predictors of the judgment differential for written uses of MCAE and non-MCAE hasta.

Table 40: Regression on the judgment differential for written uses of MCAE and non-MCAE hasta

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.399(a)</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>2.141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.: p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.406</td>
<td>2.272</td>
<td>.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class level</td>
<td>-1.358</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td>-.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedagogy practice</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>-.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SpanishDialectal Exposure</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language modality</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>-.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent variable: judgment differential for written uses of MCAE and non-MCAE hasta

Judging from an R Square value of .159, we can say that, taken together, the variables of class level, pedagogy practice, Spanish dialectal exposure, language modality, age, and gender account for almost 16% of the overall variation in participants’

---

68 This index variable was calculated by subtracting the scores for participants’ judgments of written usage of non-MCAE hasta from the scores for participants’ judgments of written usage of MCAE hasta. Said index variable was labeled “judgment differential for written uses of MCAE and non-MCAE hasta.”
judgment differential for written uses of MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta*. Even though the overall regression model is not very strong, the *p* values for class level and Spanish dialectal exposure, .028 and .010, respectively, indicate that said variables were statistically significant in predicting the dependent variable under analysis. Furthermore, a positive B coefficient value for Spanish dialectal exposure (= .325) indicates that this variable had a positive linear relationship with the judgment differential for written uses of MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta*. In other words, the more relative exposure participants had to MCAE Spanish dialects, the more difference there was between the ways that research participants respectively judged written usage of MCAE *hasta* and written usage of non-MCAE *hasta*.

Unlike Spanish dialectal exposure, class level had a negative impact (cf. B coefficient of -1.358) on the difference between judgments of written usage of MCAE *hasta* and judgments of written usage of non-MCAE *hasta*. In other words, as class level increased, there was less difference between the ways that participants judged written usage of MCAE *hasta* and written usage of non-MCAE *hasta*. Moreover, class level was the factor that most influenced variation in the dependent variable, given that its B coefficient had the highest absolute value of all the B coefficients in the model.

The next regression model that was run related to data that were gathered from question (c) of Written Task # 1. Said part of Written Task # 1 was designed to measure participants’ comprehension of written usage of *hasta*. As we did with the judgment variables, for the comprehension variables, first we present the regression on MCAE *hasta*, followed by the regression on non-MCAE *hasta*. Finally, we present the regression on the difference between participants’ comprehension of written MCAE *hasta*
and their comprehension of written non-MCAE *hasta*. In Table 41 below, we can see the statistical measurements for the regression model performed on comprehension of written usage of MCAE *hasta*.

Table 41: Regression on comprehension of written usage of MCAE *hasta*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: comprehension of written usage of MCAE *hasta*

Judging from the low value for the R Square (= .126), it is evident that the dependent variable in question cannot be well explained by the overall group of independent variables. The variable of gender, however, was a significant predictor in the model yielding a *p* value of less than .008. Gender also had the strongest influence on the dependent variable in the model presented in Table 41, and said influence was
negative. In other words, as values of the gender variable increased,\textsuperscript{69} comprehension of written usage of MCAE \textit{hasta} decreased.

The regression model on the comprehension of written usage of non-MCAE \textit{hasta}, too, yielded a very low R Square value, as indicated in Table 42 below. Note that the variable of time during which students had been studying Spanish was not included in the equation, given that such exclusion yielded a slightly more efficient model.

Table 42: Regression on comprehension of written usage of non-MCAE \textit{hasta}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.335(a)</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>3.165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An R Square value of only .112 indicates that just about 11\% of the variance in participants’ comprehension of written usage of non-MCAE \textit{hasta} can be explained from variation in the above-reported independent variables taken together. In terms of

\textsuperscript{69} As mentioned in section 4.2.1, the code assigned to female participants was (1) and the code assigned to male participants was (2). Therefore, higher scores trend toward male participants on the continuum and lower scores trend toward female participants.
independent variables that could act as possible predictors, again only gender had a significant effect, and with $p < .065$, its effect was borderline at best. Just like in the regression model relating to comprehension of written usage of MCAE hasta, gender had the strongest influence on the dependent variable in the model presented in Table 41, given that its B coefficient had the highest absolute value of the B coefficients in the model. Moreover, the effect that gender had on participants’ comprehension of written usage of non-MCAE hasta was also negative.

After separately analyzing the factors that respectively affected participants’ comprehension of written usage of MCAE hasta and their comprehension of written usage of non-MCAE hasta, the researcher proceeded to test how the independent variables affected participants’ comprehension of written usage of MCAE hasta in relation to their comprehension of written usage of non-MCAE hasta. The respective difference between aggregated student responses on Written Task # 1 question (c), corrected for fatigue effects, was used as the dependent index variable$^{70}$ for the regression model in question. It is important to note that age and time during which students had been studying Spanish have not been included in the regression model reported in Table 43 below. Excluding these variables from the equation yielded a more efficient model with more independent variables as significant predictors for the comprehension differential for written uses of MCAE and non-MCAE hasta.

---

$^{70}$ This index variable was calculated by subtracting scores for participants’ comprehension of written usage of non-MCAE hasta from their scores for comprehension of written usage of MCAE hasta. Said index variable was labeled “comprehension differential for written uses of MCAE and non-MCAE hasta.”
Table 43: Regression on comprehension differential for written uses of MCAE and non-MCAE hasta

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.471(a)</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>1.888</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The regression model on the comprehension differential for written uses of MCAE and non-MCAE hasta yielded an R Square value of .222. The variables of class level, pedagogy practice, Spanish dialectal exposure, language modality, and gender, taken together, account for about 22% of the overall variation in the dependent variable under analysis. The p values for class level and Spanish dialectal exposure, .007 and .010, respectively, indicate that said variables were statistically significant in predicting variation in the difference between participants’ comprehension of written usage of MCAE hasta and their comprehension of written usage of non-MCAE hasta. In addition, class level was the factor that most influenced variation in the dependent variable, given that its B coefficient had the highest absolute value of the B coefficients in the model. Furthermore, class level had a negative impact on the dependent variable. In other words, from participants who were enrolled in lower level Spanish classes to those who were...
enrolled in higher level Spanish classes, there was a decrease in the difference between how well research participants comprehended written usage of MCAE hasta and how well they comprehended written usage of non-MCAE hasta.

Unlike class level, the variable of Spanish dialectal exposure had a positive linear relationship (cf. B coefficient, which is .287) with the dependent variable in the regression model reported in Table 43 above. Therefore, as participants’ relative exposure to MCAE Spanish dialects increased so did the difference between their comprehension of written usage of MCAE hasta and their comprehension of written usage of non-MCAE hasta.

The last variable to be tested through regression analysis was written production of hasta. The regression model that was performed on this variable is reported in Table 44 below.

Table 44: Regression on written production of hasta

| Model Summary |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| .304(a) | .092 | .024 | 3.374 |

| Coefficients |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. : p< |
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | 4.577 | 2.730 | 1.676 | .098 |
| | SpanishDialectal Exposure | .166 | .193 | .106 | .861 | .393 |
| | Language modality | .173 | .487 | .042 | .356 | .723 |
| | Class level | -2.130 | .914 | -.296 | -2.329 | .023 |
| | Pedagogy practice | .327 | .501 | .079 | .652 | .517 |
| | Gender | -.515 | .931 | -.070 | -.553 | .582 |

Dependent Variable: written production of hasta
From the model summary, reported in Table 44 above, we observe that only 9.2% of the variance in the dependent variable can be accounted for by simultaneous variation in Spanish dialectal exposure, language modality, class level, pedagogy practice, and the gender of study participants. Despite the lack of overall strength of the regression model, it is important to note that class level was a statistically significant predictor of written production of \textit{hasta} \((p< .023)\). The negative B coefficient for class level indicates that as class level increased, students produced progressively less MCAE hasta in their writing.

As mentioned above, the purpose of this chapter has been to present quantitative data gathered during the sociolinguistic interviews as well as report results from the statistical analysis of these data. In this chapter we have specified the numerous variables included in this study and we have explained what these variables represent. In addition, we have detailed the data coding procedures as well as the creation of larger index variables. This chapter has also presented variable tables and detailed accounts of the various statistical tests that were performed in order to analyze the data. The implications of the statistical analyses reported in this chapter are discussed in detail in the next chapter, which concludes the dissertation.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

5.0 Introduction

The research questions that were presented in chapter 1 of this dissertation inquired about the potential effects that a chosen group of independent variables could have on the understandings, judgments, and uses of contextual meanings in Spanish as a second language. The pragmatic target was the preposition hasta (‘until’) as understood, judged, and used orally and in writing by students of Spanish at a Midwestern university who had varying exposure to and linguistic knowledge of the Spanish dialects of Mexico, Central America, and Ecuador where hasta can mark inception of an affirmative verbal situation. This chapter presents conclusions that are derived from the statistical analyses described in chapter 4. Section 5.1 reviews each one of the research questions and their respective hypotheses to determine if they were supported by the results from our statistical analyses. Section 5.2 follows up with discussions of potential reasons why certain hypotheses were not supported and summarizes the conclusions to the research questions in more general terms. Section 5.3 discusses potential implications of the present investigation for the field of linguistics and for language-related research.

5.1 Research questions informed by statistical analyses

As previously discussed, the current investigation has tried to answer the following general research questions:
(1) Will pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta* be affected by explicit instruction about *hasta* or by exposure to its modeling? If so, how?

(2) Will pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta* be affected by students’ class level? If so, how?

(3) Will pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta* be affected by the difference in the nature of social ties that may exist among members of classroom networks with emphases on different modes of expression in classroom practices? If so, how?

(4) Will pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta* be affected by the nature of network pressures that students face, outside of university Spanish classes, as members of social networks that may involve exposure to MCAE vs. non-MCAE Spanish dialects? If so, how?

(5) Will pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta* be affected by research participants’ ages? If so, how?

(6) Will pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta* be affected by research participants’ genders? If so, how?

(7) Will pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta* be affected by the length of time during which research participants had been studying Spanish? If so, how?

For each of these research questions, we formulated a respective hypothesis regarding our expectations in terms of the effects that the selected independent variables would have on participants’ pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta*. The hypotheses in question, originally given in chapter 1, are summarized in Table 45...
Table 45: Summary of hypotheses

| H 1 | The Spanish dialects that the teachers modeled in class and explanations about MCAE *hasta* usage will both influence the students’ ways of speaking in Spanish, in particular, how the students understand, judge, and use *hasta*. Modeling of MCAE *hasta* will have a greater effect on students’ ways of speaking than will direct instruction about usage of *hasta* to mark inception with and without negation. |
| H 2 | A greater L2 proficiency that may characterize students enrolled in intermediate level university Spanish classes, as opposed to students in entry level university Spanish classes, will result in differences in the development of students’ L2 pragmatics. Study participants who are members of classroom social networks in intermediate level Spanish courses will understand, judge, and use *hasta* in pragmatically more appropriate ways than their counterparts in entry level Spanish courses. |
| H 3 | From classroom networks with primarily written modes of expression to classroom networks with primarily oral modes of expression, there will be differences in how students understand, judge, and use *hasta*. Students in classroom networks with primarily oral modes of expression will understand, judge, and use *hasta* in pragmatically more appropriate ways than students in classroom networks with primarily written modes of expression. |
| H 4 | The network ties that students share as members of social networks outside of university Spanish classes where MCAE and non-MCAE uses of *hasta* are variable will affect how these students understand, judge, and use *hasta*. |
| H 5 | Research participants’ ages will not affect their understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta*. |
| H 6 | Participants’ genders will have an effect on how they understand, judge, and use *hasta*. Male participants will display pragmatically more appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of MCAE *hasta* than female study participants. |
| H 7 | A greater L2 proficiency that may characterize students who have been studying Spanish for a longer time, as opposed to students who have been studying Spanish for a shorter period of time, will result in differences in the development of students’ L2 pragmatics. Study participants who have been studying Spanish the longest will understand, judge, and use *hasta* in pragmatically more appropriate ways than participants who have been studying Spanish for shorter periods of time. |

Pedagogy practice, class level, language modality, Spanish dialectal exposure, age, gender, and length of time during which study participants had been studying Spanish were the seven independent variables that were examined in the analyses as possible predictors of students’ understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta*. The dependent variables of understanding, judgment, and use were conceived as several different variables, based on the linguistic tasks that participants had to complete. These variables were oral production, judgment of oral usage, judgment of written usage,
comprehension of written usage, and written production. Furthermore, additional dependent variables were calculated based on the differentials between MCAE and non-MCAE scores for the judgment and comprehension variables. Each of the regression models, presented in chapter 4, tested the effect of several independent variables on one dependent variable. Given that the focus of each research question is on a specific independent variable, the discussion below, regarding the hypotheses and testing results, follows the order in which research questions were presented at the beginning of this dissertation. In our discussion we review the effects of each of the independent variables across all of the regression models reported in chapter 4. Particular attention is paid to independent variables found to have significant effects on participants’ pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta*.

Our first research question related to pedagogy practice. This variable yielded a positive linear relationship with judgment of oral usage of MCAE *hasta* (cf. Table 35), judgment of written usage of both MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta* (cf. Tables 38 and 39, respectively), as well as with written production of *hasta* (cf. Table 44). The correlation was positive also in both the model for judgment differentials for oral uses (cf. Table 37) and the model for comprehension differentials for written uses of MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta* (cf. Table 43). The observed positive correlation was statistically significant in the case of judgment of oral usage of MCAE *hasta* and in judgment differentials for oral uses of MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta*. In other words, study participants who were exposed to involuntary modeling of MCAE *hasta* displayed more positive attitudes toward its oral

---

71 Despite fascinating results obtained from the Paired-Samples and One-Sample *t* tests comparing judgments and comprehension of MCAE vs. non-MCAE *hasta* (cf. Section 4.5.1), no further discussion of these tests is explicitly given in this chapter.
usage than their counterparts who only received explicit instruction about *hasta* usage. More importantly, the correlation observed between pedagogy practice and judgment differentials for oral uses of MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta* indicates that, overall, in classes where study participants received involuntary modeling of MCAE *hasta*, participants’ judgments of oral usage of MCAE *hasta* were more positive than their judgments of oral usage of non-MCAE *hasta*.

In the case of participants’ judgments of oral usage of non-MCAE *hasta* (cf. Table 36), judgment differentials for written uses of MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta* (cf. Table 40), and comprehension of written usage of both MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta* (cf. Tables 41 and 42, respectively), pedagogy practice had a negative impact. As for oral production of affirmative or negated verbs that accompany *hasta* when marking inception of a verbal situation, pedagogy practice did not contribute to the best-fit regression model, and was therefore left out of the reported regression on oral production (cf. Table 34).

Given that the only effects that proved to be statistically significant were the effects of pedagogy practice on participants’ judgments of oral usage, we conclude that our first hypothesis found minimal support in the quantitative analyses performed. Both modeling of MCAE *hasta* and instruction about *hasta* significantly influenced students’ judgments of oral usage of MCAE *hasta*. Modeling had a greater effect than direct instruction did. Our quantitative analyses did not support our initial expectation regarding pedagogy practice as a significant predictor for participants’ judgments of written usage, comprehension of written usage, or written production of *hasta*.

The second research question that this dissertation has tried to answer related to class level. This variable was a significant predictor for participants’ judgments of both
oral (cf. Table 35) and written (cf. Table 38) usage of MCAE *hasta*. Class level, however, affected these variables in opposite ways. Study participants who were enrolled in higher level classes displayed more positive attitudes toward oral usage of MCAE *hasta*, but less positive attitudes toward its written usage. This negative impact yielded statistical significance even in our regression on the judgment differentials for written uses of MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta* (cf. Table 40). Said differentials decreased from entry level Spanish courses to intermediate level Spanish courses. Class level yielded similar opposite effects for non-MCAE *hasta* as well. More specifically, the correlation was negative in the model on judgment of written usage (cf. Table 39), but positive in the model on judgment of oral usage (cf. Table 36) and in the model on judgment differentials for oral uses (cf. Table 37).

A negative correlation was observed also when looking at the overall variation in comprehension of written usage of *hasta*. While class level did not show a significant effect on participants’ comprehension of written usage of MCAE *hasta* (cf. Table 41) or of non-MCAE *hasta* (cf. Table 42) when examined separately, a significant influence was observed in our regression on the comprehension differentials for written uses of MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta* (cf. Table 43). Said differentials decreased from entry level Spanish courses to intermediate level Spanish courses. Class level proved to be a significant predictor as well for written production of *hasta* (cf. Table 44). The inverse relationship between these two variables indicates that study participants who were enrolled in entry level Spanish courses produced *hasta* in the affirmative inceptive way more often than did their counterparts in intermediate level Spanish courses. As for oral production of affirmative or negated verbs that accompany *hasta* when marking inception
of a verbal situation, just like pedagogy practice, class level did not contribute to the best-fit regression model, and was therefore left out of the reported regression on oral production (cf. Table 34).

Overall, our hypothesis regarding the effect of class level on students’ pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of hasta found split support in the quantitative analysis, in the sense that class level had multiple statistically significant effects on students’ L2 pragmatics but not always in the direction we predicted. As predicted, students did indeed judge oral use of MCAE hasta more positively as class level increased. Contrary to what we hypothesized, however, the greater L2 proficiency that, theoretically, characterized students enrolled in higher level Spanish courses, as opposed to students in lower level Spanish courses, had a negative effect on some of their understandings, judgments, and uses of MCAE hasta. More specifically, when compared to their counterparts who were enrolled in higher level Spanish courses, students who were enrolled in entry level Spanish courses judged written usage of MCAE hasta more positively and in a more positive way than they judged written usage of non-MCAE hasta, displayed a higher degree of comprehension of written usage of MCAE hasta than written usage of non-MCAE hasta, and produced hasta with affirmative verbal situations to mark inception more often.

The third research question posed by this dissertation related to language modality in classroom practices. We expected student members of classroom networks with primarily oral modes of expression to understand, judge, and use hasta in pragmatically more appropriate ways than student members of classroom networks with primarily written or a combination of both oral and written modes of expression.
Unlike the case for pedagogy practice and class level, language modality contributed to the best fit regression model on oral production with a statistically significant and positive effect (cf. Table 34). In other words, students in classroom networks with primarily oral modes of expression produced more affirmative verbs alongside *hasta* to mark inception than did students in classroom networks with primarily written modes of expression.

Oral production was the only dependent variable that was affected by language modality in a statistically significant way (cf. Table 34). The effect was positive, as predicted. Contrary to what we expected, language modality was not a significant predictor for judgments of oral or written usage (cf. Tables 35-40), comprehension of written usage (cf. Tables 41-43), written production (cf. Table 44) of *hasta*, or any of the differentials. It is important to point out, however, that, whatever small and insignificant effect was observed was an overall positive one for judgments of oral usage of MCAE *hasta* (cf. Table 35), judgment differentials for oral usage (cf. Table 37), judgments of written usage of MCAE *hasta* (cf. Table 38) and non-MCAE *hasta* (cf. Table 39), judgment differentials for written usage (cf. Table 40) and written production (cf. Table 44) of *hasta*. In other words, in classroom networks where there was an emphasis on oral expression, study participants judged oral and written usage of MCAE *hasta* in a more positive way, judged written usage of non-MCAE *hasta* in a more positive way, judged MCAE *hasta* more positively than non-MCAE *hasta*, and produced MCAE *hasta* more often than did their counterparts in classroom networks where there was an emphasis on written or a combination of both written and oral modes of expression.

As for comprehension of written usage, an inverse relationship was observed
between language modality and the comprehension of written usage of both MCAE (cf. Table 41) and non-MCAE (cf. Table 42) *hasta*, but a positive effect was observed for comprehension differentials (cf. Table 43). Therefore, from classroom networks with primarily written modes of expression to classroom networks with primarily oral modes of expression, students’ understanding of written usage of both MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta* decreased. The fact that the values for comprehension differentials for written uses of MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta* increased indicates that from classroom networks with primarily written modes of expression to classroom networks with primarily oral modes of expression, students’ understanding of written usage of MCAE *hasta* decreased less than their understanding of written usage of non-MCAE *hasta*.

Given that the only effect that proved to be statistically significant was the effect of language modality on participants’ oral production of affirmative or negated verbs alongside *hasta* to mark inception, we can say that, for our third hypothesis, the quantitative analyses provided minimal support. These results reveal an interesting pattern that we discuss further in Section 5.2.

Study participants’ Spanish dialectal exposure was another variable of interest to this study. This investigation has examined whether pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta* would be affected by the nature of network pressures that students faced, outside of university Spanish classes, as members of social networks that potentially involved exposure to MCAE and non-MCAE Spanish dialects. Spanish dialectal exposure yielded a positive linear relationship with the dependent variables of oral production (cf. Table 34), judgment of written usage of MCAE *hasta* (cf. Table 38), judgment differentials for written usage of MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta* (cf.
Table 40), and comprehension differentials for written usage of MCAE and non-MCAE hasta (cf. Table 43). More importantly, exposure’s effects on said dependent variables were statistically significant.

In the case of oral production, study participants who had greater overall relative exposures to MCAE Spanish dialects (as a result of greater relative integration into MCAE social networks outside the classroom) produced a greater number of affirmative verbs alongside hasta to mark inception. These research participants also displayed more positive attitudes toward written usage of MCAE hasta and greater differentials between judgments of written usage of MCAE and non-MCAE hasta than did their counterparts who had a greater overall relative exposure to non-MCAE Spanish dialects.

A similar effect was observed also when looking at the overall variation in comprehension of written usage of hasta. While Spanish dialectal exposure did not have a significant effect on participants’ comprehension of written usage of MCAE (cf. Table 41) and non-MCAE hasta (cf. Table 42) examined separately, a significant and positive influence was observed when examining changes in the comprehension differentials for written uses of MCAE and non-MCAE hasta. These differentials increased as students’ overall relative exposure to MCAE Spanish dialects increased.

As for judgments of oral usage (cf. Tables 35-37) and written production (cf. Table 44) of hasta, Spanish dialectal exposure did not yield a statistically significant effect. Nevertheless, Spanish dialectal exposure affected these two variables in opposite ways. Judgments of oral usage of both MCAE and non-MCAE hasta were less positive among research participants who had a higher overall relative exposure to MCAE Spanish dialects, but these same participants produced somewhat more MCAE hasta than
did those who had a greater overall relative exposure to non-MCAE Spanish dialects.

To recap, our fourth hypothesis found considerable support in the quantitative analyses that we performed. Spanish dialectal exposure was a significant predictor for oral production, judgment of written usage of MCAE hasta, judgment differentials for written uses of MCAE and non-MCAE hasta, and comprehension differentials for written uses of MCAE and non-MCAE hasta. Therefore, we conclude that network ties that students shared as members of social networks that involved exposure to MCAE and non-MCAE Spanish dialects outside of university Spanish classes affected in several ways the degree to which these students understood, judged, and used hasta. More specifically, given that all of the significant effects were positive, we conclude that network ties that students shared as members of social networks where MCAE hasta usage was relatively common led student members to understand, judge, and use MCAE hasta in more pragmatically appropriate ways than students who were members of social networks where MCAE usage was relatively less common.

Our fifth research question related to the variable of age. Initially, for this variable, we assumed the null hypothesis, given that we did not expect age to have any effect on participants’ pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of hasta. Our early statistical analyses revealed that age did not contribute to the best fit regression models for oral production, comprehension differentials for written uses of MCAE and non-MCAE hasta, and written production of hasta (cf. Tables 34, 43, and 44, respectively). In fact, the inclusion of age dropped the R Square values for these models considerably, to a degree that precluded any useful explanation or prediction of the dependent variable. Moreover, including age in the respective regression models on oral
production, comprehension differentials for written uses of MCAE and non-MCAE 
*hasta*, and written production caused other independent variables to lose their statistical 
significance as predictors.

In the regressions on judgment of oral usage of *hasta* (cf. Tables 35 and 36), 
judgment of written usage of *hasta* (cf. Tables 38 and 39), comprehension of written 
usage of *hasta* (cf. Tables 41 and 42), and in the regressions on the differentials for 
judgments of oral usage of MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta* (cf. Table 37) and on the 
differentials for judgments of written usage of MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta* (cf. Table 
40), age contributed to the models but did not emerge in any of them as a statistically 
significant predictor. The correlations between age and the dependent variables were 
negative in all regression models except in the cases of judgment of oral usage of non-
MCAE *hasta* and comprehension of written usage of MCAE *hasta*. Study participants 
who reported older ages were inclined to judge oral and written usage of MCAE *hasta* in 
a less positive way, though they understood MCAE *hasta* in more pragmatically 
appropriate ways than informants who were reportedly younger. We have to bear in 
mind, however, that none of the above-mentioned effects was statistically significant.

Given the observed results, we conclude that the quantitative analyses supported 
our initial hypothesis regarding age and its effects on participants’ understandings, 
judgments, and uses of L2 pragmatics. As we expected, age did not have a statistically 
significant effect on how students enrolled in university Spanish classes understood, 
judged, and used *hasta*.

Another independent variable that was analyzed for this research project was 
study participants’ gender. We expected male study participants to display more
pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of MCAE *hasta* than female study participants, given that female individuals tend to use prestige language forms more often than male individuals do.

Like age, gender did not yield any significance in predicting the majority of the dependent variables. Gender did not contribute to the best fit regression model for oral production (cf. Table 34). Furthermore, the results of the quantitative analyses demonstrated that, based on our data sample, gender did not significantly affect how research participants judged oral or written uses of *hasta* (cf. Tables 35-40), and no significant effect emerged for written production of *hasta* either (cf. Table 44). The only significant gender effect that we observed related to participants’ comprehension of written usage of *hasta*.

When analyzing how gender affected participants’ comprehension of written usage of MCAE *hasta* (cf. Table 41), we discovered an inverse linear relationship between the two variables under consideration. Gender had a statistically significant effect on comprehension but said effect was negative. In other words, the degree to which female study participants understood MCAE *hasta* was higher than the degree to which male study participants understood MCAE *hasta*. A similar negative and statistically significant effect was also observed in our regression on participants’ comprehension of written usage of non-MCAE *hasta* (cf. Table 42), though the significance level was marginal. Therefore, among female study participants there was a higher degree of comprehension of written usage of both MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta*. Said inverse relationship was evident also in the comprehension differentials for written uses of MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta* (cf. Table 43). Said differentials decreased as
assigned value codes for gender increased. This effect, however, was not statistically significant.

To summarize, our hypotheses relating to the effect of participants’ gender on their pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta* found minimal support in our quantitative analyses. Gender yielded a strong statistically significant effect only on participants’ comprehension of written usage of MCAE *hasta*. Said effect, however, was the opposite of what we expected, given that it was the female study participants who displayed the highest degree of comprehension of this usage of *hasta*.

The last research question that we put forth in this dissertation inquired about the way in which students’ understandings, judgments, and uses of L2 pragmatics were affected by the length of time during which they had been studying Spanish. We expected students who had been studying Spanish for relatively longer times to have greater L2 proficiencies than those who had been studying Spanish for relatively shorter periods of time. In turn, we expected these same students to demonstrate more pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta*.

Length of time during which participants had been studying Spanish did not contribute to best-fit regression models for several of the dependent variables. Therefore, this independent variable was left out of the reported regressions on judgment differentials for written uses of MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta* (cf. Table 40), comprehension of written usage of non-MCAE *hasta* (cf. Table 42), comprehension differentials for written uses of MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta* (cf. Table 43), and written production of *hasta* (cf. Table 44). Furthermore, the independent variable in question had
no significant effect on participants’ judgments of written usage of MCAE or non-MCAE hasta (cf. Tables 38 and 39), their comprehension of written usage of MCAE hasta (cf. Table 41), or their oral production of affirmative or negated verbs that accompany hasta when marking inception (cf. Table 34). Research participants’ judgments of oral usage, on the other hand, were affected significantly.

In terms of MCAE hasta (cf. Table 35), participants’ judgments of oral usage were affected in a statistically significant way by the length of time during which they had been studying Spanish. Given that this effect was negative, the longer study participants had been studying Spanish, the less positively they judged oral usage of MCAE hasta. A similar inverse and statistically significant relationship was also observed for judgment of oral usage of non-MCAE hasta (cf. Table 36), suggesting that participants who had been studying Spanish for a shorter period of time were inclined to judge oral usage of non-MCAE hasta more positively than their counterparts who reported having studied Spanish for a longer time. This consistently negative impact was observed as well in our regression on the judgment differentials for oral uses of MCAE and non-MCAE hasta (cf. Table 37). The variable of length of time during which participants had been studying Spanish remained a significant predictor, and as the values for said variable increased, the judgment differentials decreased. Thus, the more time that participants had reportedly been studying Spanish, the less their judgments of oral usage of MCAE hasta were greater than their judgments of oral usage of non-MCAE hasta.

In summary, the quantitative analysis provided evidence against our seventh hypothesis. Based on our data sample, we observed that the variable of length of time during which participants had been studying Spanish did indeed significantly predict
variation in participants’ judgments of oral usage of hasta. Nevertheless, the effects that we observed were the opposite of what we expected since longer times studying Spanish yielded less positive judgments of oral usage of both MCAE and non-MCAE hasta among research participants.

Overall, the quantitative analyses that we performed on the data collected for this investigation provided varying degrees of support for each of the hypotheses that we formulated. Table 46 below presents a summary of our hypotheses with indications of support in each regression model of the quantitative analyses.

Table 46: Summary of quantitative support for research hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Oral Production</th>
<th>Judgment of Oral Usage</th>
<th>Judgment of Written Usage</th>
<th>Comprehension of Written Usage</th>
<th>Written Production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H1 (pedagogy practice)</td>
<td>H2 (class level)</td>
<td>H3 (language modality)</td>
<td>H4 (Spanish dialectal exposure)</td>
<td>H5 (age)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Production</td>
<td>(-) (-) (+) (+) (-) (-) (-) (-)</td>
<td>MCAE (+) (+) (-) (-) (-) (-) (+)*</td>
<td>Non-MCAE (-) (-) (-) (-) (-) (-) (+)*</td>
<td>Differentials (+) (-) (-) (-) (-) (-) (+)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment of Oral Usage</td>
<td>MCAE (-) (+)* (-) (+) (-) (-) (-) (-)</td>
<td>Non-MCAE (-) (-) (-) (-) (-) (-) (-) (-)</td>
<td>Differentials (-) (+)* (-) (+) (-) (-) (-) (-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment of Written Usage</td>
<td>MCAE (-) (-) (-) (-) (-) (-) (+)*</td>
<td>Non-MCAE (-) (-) (-) (-) (-) (-) (-) (-) (-)</td>
<td>Differentials (-) (+)* (-) (+) (-) (-) (-) (-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension of Written Usage</td>
<td>MCAE (-) (-) (-) (-) (-) (-) (+)*</td>
<td>Non-MCAE (-) (-) (-) (-) (-) (-) (-) (-) (-)</td>
<td>Differentials (-) (+)* (-) (+) (-) (-) (-) (-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Production</td>
<td>(-) (+)* (-) (-) (-) (-) (-) (-)</td>
<td>MCAE (-) (-) (-) (-) (-) (+)*</td>
<td>Non-MCAE (-) (-) (-) (-) (-) (-) (-) (-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A plus sign indicates that the hypothesis was supported, whereas a minus sign represents lack of support by the quantitative analyses. An asterisk next to a plus sign indicates that the observed effect was the opposite of what we were expecting.
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In the section that follows, besides summarizing the conclusions to the research questions in more general terms, we also discuss potential reasons as to why some aspects of the hypotheses were not supported by our analyses.

5.2 Further discussion of results and general conclusions

The present study has sought to contribute to research on the effects that social networks can have on language variation and change. In particular, this study has examined how social networks can influence the understandings, judgments, and uses of contextual meaning in Spanish as a second language, in other words, L2 pragmatics. In this section we take a closer look at the hypotheses and conclusions relating to the effects of the different kinds of social networks we examined: the classroom social networks based on pedagogy practice, class level, and language modality, respectively, as well as the social networks that, outside of university Spanish classes, exposed participants to MCAE and/or non-MCAE Spanish dialects.

In a classroom context, as suggested by the study conducted by Palfreyman (2006) (cf. chapter 1), students could possibly see their L2 instructors as potential resources for language learning. Such students might be drawn (consciously or unconsciously) to conform particularly to their language teachers’ ways of speaking. Thus, when thinking in terms of pedagogy practice (modeling vs. explicit instruction), following Palfreyman we hypothesized that students would be most drawn to appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of MCAE hasta in classroom networks where the students were exposed to modeling of MCAE hasta by their instructors.

Results from our analyses supported Palfreyman’s theory only in the case of
judgments of oral usage of MCAE *hasta* and judgment differentials for oral uses of MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta*. Presumed network pressures on students to conform to the linguistic norms propagated by their teachers had empirically insignificant linguistic influence on all other measures of MCAE *hasta*, both orally and in writing. This outcome could be due to the possibility that modeling does not affect all aspects of understanding, judging, and using L2 pragmatics simultaneously, in a uniform way, or at the same rate. Furthermore, it is also possible that longer student exposure to modeling might yield greater effects on participants’ understandings, judgments, and uses of both MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta*. At the time of data collection for our study, we limited student exposure to teacher modeling to a period of only five to seven weeks. Network pressures among student members could potentially build up and intensify over time. Consequently, future research is warranted to determine if teachers’ ways of speaking percolate better throughout classroom networks, thus affecting student understandings, judgments, and uses of L2 pragmatics to a greater degree, with prolonged student exposure to modeling.

In regards to class level, the cross-sectional study conducted by Félix-Brasdefer (2007) (cf. chapter 1) concluded that there was a significant relationship between students’ class levels and their L2 pragmatic development in Spanish. More specifically, the author surmised that it was students’ increased language proficiency at higher levels of university instruction that accounted for such development. In the case of our investigation of student understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta* in Spanish, class level indeed emerged as a considerably significant predicting factor, especially in the cases of judgments of oral and written usage of MCAE *hasta*, judgment differentials for
written uses of MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta*, written production of *hasta*, and comprehension differentials for written uses of MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta*. Unlike Félix-Brasdefer’s findings, however, results from our analyses yielded inverse linear relationships between class level and many aspects of participants’ understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta*.

To recapitulate, increased levels of instruction led students to judge written usage of MCAE *hasta* more negatively. Furthermore, class level also displayed inverse linear relationships both with judgment differentials for written uses of MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta* and with comprehension differentials for written uses of MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta*. Finally, higher class levels also led to increased production of non-MCAE *hasta* in student writing. Class level, however, had quite the opposite effect on judgment of oral usage of MCAE *hasta*.

There are several potential explanations for why class level did not affect students’ L2 pragmatics in the ways we thought it would. First of all, class level may not necessarily reflect student L2 proficiency accurately. Following Félix-Brasdefer (2007), in our investigation we did not employ any language proficiency test to measure students’ actual proficiency levels, given that, at the university under consideration, students are regularly placed in particular language courses based on their scores on a placement exam designed specifically to gauge L2 proficiency. Furthermore, it is possible that the classrooms we observed for this investigation may have been characterized by a disparity in levels of L2 proficiency even within the same class level of instruction. Finally, it is also possible that, even if class level were an accurate indicator of student L2 proficiency,
our initial assumption regarding the directionality of its effects on student understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta* could simply have been wrong.

There may indeed be a generalizably significant relationship between class level and L2 pragmatic development, just as Félix-Brasdefer’s study demonstrated. This relationship, however, may just not always be positive. As mentioned above, in our investigation, students who were enrolled in higher level classes judged written usage of MCAE *hasta* less positively and used MCAE *hasta* in writing less often than their counterparts who were enrolled in lower level classes. Furthermore, these same students displayed smaller comprehension differentials and smaller judgment differentials for written uses of MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta*. These results may very well be due to the possibility that students with lower L2 proficiencies, such as those enrolled in a beginner’s level Spanish class, may be more impressionable than students who possess higher levels of L2 proficiency.

As Savignon has pointed out (1983, p. 37), sociolinguistic competence is an important component of an individual’s communicative competence. Specifically, sociolinguistic competence is what aids that individual in making a judgment about the appropriateness of the language he or she uses in a given social context. According to Sauvignon (p. 46), as an individual’s grammatical competence increases, so does his or her sociolinguistic competence, and, in second language contexts, individuals whose levels of L2 proficiency are high tend to also have high levels of sociolinguistic competence.

In the case of our study, if higher class levels did in fact reflect higher levels of L2 proficiency, and if research participants enrolled in higher level university Spanish classes
did have correspondingly higher degrees of sociolinguistic competence, then, prior to data collection, such students could well have already formed their judgments about the “appropriate” ways to mark inception in Spanish using hasta. Such judgments would be consistent with the finding that these same students (a) displayed less comprehension of written usage of MCAE hasta than they did for non-MCAE hasta, (b) judged written usage of MCAE hasta as inappropriate and also as less appropriate than written usage of non-MCAE hasta, and (c) produced MCAE hasta in writing less often than they produced non-MCAE hasta. On the other hand, research participants enrolled in beginner’s level Spanish classes may have had correspondingly less-developed sociolinguistic competencies and, by extension, less rigid “preferences” for MCAE or non-MCAE hasta usage.

The sociolinguistic competence argument accounts as well for the positive and significant correlation observed between class level and participants’ judgments of oral usage of MCAE hasta. Such a correlation is not altogether surprising in the context of sociolinguistic competence given that individuals tend to associate what they consider to be prestigious forms with writing more so than with oral language. Thus, study participants enrolled in higher level Spanish classes may be more “accepting” of MCAE hasta usage in spoken language than in writing.

In terms of language modality, our hypotheses were based on the study conducted by Kurata (2007) who, as discussed in chapter 1, discovered that close and collaborative interaction between learners and their network peers played a crucial role in creating L2 learning opportunities. In turn, these opportunities affected the learners’ language choices in communicating with others and, therefore, had an impact on their L2 use or
lack thereof.

In the case of our study, we thought that the different modes of expression among the classroom network members we observed would cause research participants to have different types of learning opportunities and even differing degrees of interactions with each other. We expected individuals who were part of classroom social networks where there was an emphasis on oral modes of expression to interact the most with each other in socially significant ways and, thus, face the most network pressures to conform to their peers’ linguistic behavior. As a result, given the presumed differences in interaction type and L2 learning opportunities, we expected participants who were members of classroom social networks with primarily oral modes of expression to understand, judge, and use *hasta* in pragmatically more appropriate ways than their counterparts in classroom social networks with emphases on other modes of expression (written or a combination of both oral and written).

Our quantitative analyses, however, supported Kurata’s findings only in the case of oral production, where language modality displayed a positive, and statistically significant, linear relationship. Despite the lack of support in the quantitative analysis, however, we do not exclude the possibility that individuals who are part of classroom social networks characterized by a high degree of interaction can be influenced by their peers’ linguistic behavior due to the network pressures that they tend to face. The limited
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73 As we may recall, for Oral Task # 1, students had to produce either a negated or an affirmative verb to accompany *hasta* when marking inception in a given verbal situation. This positive and significant correlation between language modality and oral production of verbs that accompany *hasta* may be spurious, as VanPatten (2012) has claimed that, in an L2 classroom, students tend to have more practice speaking with affirmative verbs than with any other part of speech. If VanPatten’s claim is correct, then our correlation may not be a reflection of (just) the effect of language modality on the dependent variable in question.
significant impact of language modality on participants’ understandings, judgments, and uses of L2 pragmatics observed in our study may be due to inaccurate assumptions that we initially made about the interaction and network pressures in each type of classroom included in our investigation (personal communication, Bill VanPatten). For example, we attributed greater density and/or multiplexity, and hence, greater network pressures, to social ties in Spanish conversation classes like SPAN 3170 than to social ties in Spanish composition classes like SPAN 3160. Had we actually measured such parameters in specific 3160 and 3170 classrooms, which we did not do, however, we might have found otherwise.

Indeed, across different sections of SPAN 3170, for instance, one may find differing degrees of interaction and collaboration among students. Furthermore, the degree in which oral modes of expression are used during these interactions may also be different from one section to another. In turn, the amount of network pressures that student members face in different sections of a SPAN 3170 course may vary considerably. The same variation could also be present in the other classroom social networks where there is an emphasis on other modes of expression. In other words, to most accurately gauge the effect(s) of language modality on participants’ understandings, judgments, and uses of hasta in classroom networks, we need concrete measurements of the actual interactions that take place among students and of the actual network pressures that these same students face as members of their classroom social network. Before our data collection, we did not take such measurements, and we were wrong in assuming that the theoretical design of the courses taken into consideration was a sufficient and accurate indication of the type of interaction and network pressures among students. Future
research is warranted to assess actual student interaction and network pressures in different types of classroom social networks in order to later determine if the effect of language modality on students’ L2 pragmatics is greater and/or more significant than the effect that our data set yielded.

Results were more promising with regard to Spanish dialectal exposure. As discussed in chapter 1, studies conducted by Raschke, Wei, and Lee (2002) and by Wiklund (2002) examined how ties in social networks outside of classroom settings affected individuals’ linguistic behavior. Based on these authors’ findings, we were expecting our research participants to be inclined to lean more towards following the linguistic norms of MCAE or non-MCAE Spanish dialects, depending on the relative nature of network pressures that they faced outside university Spanish classes. Our quantitative analysis, on some level, supported the findings of the above-mentioned studies by showing that an increasing exposure to MCAE Spanish dialects indeed led participants to produce more affirmative verbs alongside hasta to mark inception orally and also led them to judge written usage of MCAE hasta in a positive way. Moreover, an increasing exposure to MCAE Spanish dialects led to an increase in both participants’ judgment differentials and participants’ comprehension differentials for written uses of MCAE and non-MCAE hasta.\textsuperscript{74} Participants’ ties to social networks involving relative exposure to MCAE and non-MCAE hasta usage did not yield significant effects on the other variables we measured.

\textsuperscript{74} In the case of comprehension of written usage of hasta, even though we did not find any predicting effect for written uses of MCAE and non-MCAE hasta taken separately, the fact that Spanish dialectal exposure had a significant effect on the comprehension differentials for written uses of MCAE and non-MCAE hasta is a good indication of how the independent variable in question predicted participants’ comprehension of written usage of MCAE hasta in relation to non-MCAE hasta.
Given the significant results summarized above, and the insignificant results for written production of *hasta*, it is possible that Spanish dialectal exposure may simply affect judgments and production of *hasta* in nonuniform ways or even at different rates for oral and written usage. The network pressures faced by members of social networks outside university Spanish classes that involved relative exposure to MCAE and non-MCAE Spanish dialects may have sufficed in aiding participants to build some pragmatically appropriate perceptions of *hasta* usage in writing. These same pressures, however, were apparently too weak to significantly impact participants’ pragmatically appropriate ways of producing *hasta* in writing. It is puzzling, however, why Spanish dialectal exposure could not predict participants’ pragmatically appropriate perceptions of oral usage of *hasta*, despite the results for written perceptions and despite a positive correlation with oral production. Future research is warranted in this regard.

To sum up, we can say that social networks do, to some extent, influence individuals’ L2 pragmatics. The linguistic behavior of students of Spanish as a second language is affected, and potentially shaped, by membership in a particular classroom social network and in networks outside of classroom settings that expose individuals to particular Spanish dialects. More specifically, students’ attitudes towards ways of speaking are influenced by the linguistic norms propagated by their L2 instructors. On the other hand, membership in classroom social networks based on class level may affect students’ L2 pragmatics in different ways, given that class level theoretically relates not only to L2 proficiency but also to sociolinguistic competence. Relatively high levels of

---

75 As discussed above, Palfreyman’s study suggested that students tend to see their L2 instructors as potential resources for language learning and, thus, are drawn to conform particularly to their language teachers’ ways of speaking. Our data set, however, supported Palfreyman’s theory only for judgment of oral usage of MCAE *hasta* and judgment differentials for oral uses of MCAE and non-MCAE *hasta*. 
sociolinguistic competence in the L2 may lead students to form preferences for certain ways of speaking and writing, which are matters of language ideology. Consequently, despite presumably higher L2 proficiency levels, such students may appear to have relatively lower levels of understanding (based on comprehension differentials only) and use (based on written production only) of contextual meanings in the L2.

In terms of classroom social networks with an emphasis on oral modes of expression, it remains to be seen if such networks actually exert greater social pressures on network members due to closer and more collaborative interactions between learners. Membership in such networks may indeed influence actual L2 pragmatics in student ways of speaking, though it is possible that our results for oral production may have been mere artefacts of test design. Future research is warranted in this regard.

Finally, in an outside-of-classroom network setting, pressures that individuals perceive from ties that link them to networks that involve exposure to a particular Spanish dialect affect their understandings, judgments, and uses of L2 pragmatics in different ways. A split pattern emerges from the observed significance levels of these effects. In writing, only participants’ understandings and judgments of contextual meanings in Spanish are significantly predicted by these network pressures. Participants’ written production of L2 pragmatics is not affected. Orally, however, we observe

\[\text{hasta}\]

It is important to recall that class level yielded a split effect on study participants’ ideologies towards pragmatically appropriate use of hasta, in terms of directionality of relationship between class level and several dependent variables. More specifically, participants’ judgments of oral usage of MCAE hasta increased with class level in a statistically significant way. Class level, however, had a significant but inverse relationship with participants’ judgments of written usage of MCAE hasta, their judgment and comprehension differentials for written uses of MCAE and non-MCAE hasta, as well as with their written production of hasta.
opposite effects. Outside-of-classroom network pressures do not affect participants’ judgments of L2 pragmatics, but they significantly influence L2 pragmatic usage.

These opposite effects on oral and written language could be due to the possibility that participants who had more exposure to MCAE than to non-MCAE Spanish dialects may have considered MCAE *hasta* as the more correct form. If participants considered MCAE *hasta* to be more correct, they may have associated it with written language, which would account for the significant and positive effect observed in their attitudes toward MCAE *hasta* in writing but not in oral language. This scenario would correctly predict the production correlations as well if the effect on language attitudes was strong enough to have motivated a change in progress. Such a change would show up first in oral production and only later on in written production. In addition, for oral production, the positive significance observed could be partially related to participants’ penchant for production of affirmative verbs as mentioned above.

So far, in this chapter, we have reviewed each of the research questions and their respective hypotheses in order to highlight the support that our quantitative analyses provided. In addition, we have also discussed potential reasons as to why certain aspects of the hypotheses were not supported by said analyses. In the section that follows, which also concludes this dissertation, we discuss our study’s potential implications for the field of linguistics and for language-related research.

### 5.3 Implications of the study

As mentioned at the beginning of this dissertation, our goal for the present study has been to contribute to research on potential factors that influence understandings, judgments, and uses of contextual meanings in Spanish as a second language. Therefore,
before concluding this dissertation, it is important to consider some of the implications that this study has for the field of linguistics and for language-related research. In particular, our findings contribute to our understandings of the pragmatics of Spanish, Spanish sociolinguistics, and Spanish language pedagogy, as explained in more detail below.

In terms of contributions to our understandings of the pragmatics of Spanish, our study has carried out an in-depth examination of the preposition *hasta*, in particular its ability to mark inception in the absence of negative operators in the MCAE Spanish dialects. While previous studies on this dialectal use of *hasta*, such as the many investigations cited in chapter 1, have provided observationally adequate accounts of this phenomenon, the pragmatic analysis that we have presented in this dissertation has taken substantive steps towards descriptive and explanatory adequacy in explaining the aspectual development and pragmatic functions of affirmative inceptive *hasta*. In doing so, we have highlighted a crucial interaction between negation and lexical aspect in pragmatic change. Thus, our study’s first contribution to our understandings of the pragmatics of Spanish is that pragmatic change in Spanish can be built on semantic and syntactic interaction.

The second contribution of this study to our understandings of the pragmatics of Spanish pertains to Negative Polarity Items (NPI) and negation. In our study we provided evidence that the scope of negative particles like *no* is indeed a licensing context for NPIs in Spanish, and also that, in some cases, NPI properties are born due to scopal ambiguity. In addition, we have provided evidence from modern Spanish of how a lexeme can evolve toward becoming an NPI by going through a process similar to the one that, in Old
Spanish, transformed words like nada and nadie from (a) words with no negative valence into (b) negative pronouns used before negated verbs (cf. discussion of Medieval Spanish by Klee and Lynch, 2009) and finally into (c) permanent NPIs.

This investigation’s third contribution to our understandings of Spanish pragmatics concerns Aktionsart, that is, the lexical aspect of verbal situations. The evidence we have provided supports the conclusion drawn by Smith (1997) that basic-level verbal situations can shift due to the influence of information from the surrounding context, thus leading to derived-level verbal situations. In our study, we demonstrated that, in Spanish, all verb classes except achievements (i.e., activities, accomplishments, and states) are sensitive to and easily influenced by the surrounding context, in particular the ambiguities presented by the scope of negation. Furthermore, we illustrated how shifts in the lexical aspect of verbal situations can be accompanied by the aspectual marker hasta. Thus, our study’s final contributions to our understandings of Spanish pragmatics pertain to aspectual markers.

The first implication for aspectual markers is that, besides subcategorizing other lexical units, they may reflect aspectual information deriving from contextually influenced verbal situations. The second implication, given that the affirmative inceptive usage of hasta that we have analyzed is currently restricted to a specific group of Spanish dialects, is that certain aspectual markers may be dialect specific. These implications, alongside the implications stated above for pragmatic change, NPIs, and Aktionsart, make significant contributions to advancing the study of Spanish pragmatics.

With regard to Spanish sociolinguistics, our study furthers research on the roles that multiple social networks can play in individuals’ linguistic behaviors. As De Bot and
Stoessel (2002, p. 3) pointed out, social networks have long been considered by researchers to play an important role in influencing such behaviors. These authors also observed that, despite its value, the study of language change from a social network perspective has actually created a paradox for sociolinguists. While there is widespread belief that social networks are a determining factor in causing and/or shaping language change, and while there have been several qualitative studies that have provided evidence of this role, the quantitative studies that support the effect that social networks have on language change are scarce at best.

In this regard, our study offers additional quantitative evidence that social network analysis is indeed effective in analyzing and interpreting language variation and change. More importantly, our study is among the few that have looked at world language classrooms as a particular type of social network. Of all the social network studies we discussed in chapter 1, only the studies of Palfreyman (2006), Kurata (2007), and Wiklund (2002) explained students’ L2 performance by analyzing the effects that a given classroom social network had on the linguistic behavior of its student members. Even though these three authors analyzed L2 classrooms as social network units, they focused more on how students’ L2 behaviors were affected by students’ ties to social networks outside of classroom settings than on how such behaviors were affected by the ties that individuals shared as members of the classroom social networks themselves. In our study, by examining classroom social networks based on pedagogy practice, class level, and language modality (in addition to out-of-class social networks), we focused primarily on how student memberships in particular classroom social networks can affect their L2 behaviors. In that regard, this dissertation presents a novel approach to the study of world
language classrooms from a social network perspective. Based on our statistical analyses, the implication here for Spanish sociolinguistics is that such an approach is worthwhile; indeed, Spanish sociolinguistics can benefit from more research of this nature.

Our study has implications for the use of social network analysis in relation to L2 pragmatics as well. This dissertation offers important evidence pertaining to how, and to what extent, different kinds of social networks influence the understandings, judgments, and uses of contextual meanings in Spanish as a second language. While previous researchers have examined factors that contribute to students’ understandings, judgments, and uses of L2 pragmatics, they have done so using primarily a second language acquisition approach. To the best of our knowledge, no previous research has examined students’ L2 pragmatics from a social network perspective. Our study may be groundbreaking in this regard. The implication here is that network analytic approaches may provide a viable alternative or complement to second language acquisition approaches in the study of student understandings, judgments, and uses of L2 pragmatics. The analysis of L2 pragmatics from a social network perspective, as we have attempted to demonstrate in our study, can be very informative when it comes to examining language use in a certain social context. More importantly, by knowing how membership in a given classroom social network affects students’ L2 pragmatics, we can gather insights that may lead to improvements in second language pedagogy practices.

For example, our study found that membership in classroom networks with instructor modeling of MCAE *hasta* significantly affected only students’ attitudes toward oral usage of this construction. The implication here is that, since neither modeling of nor instruction about L2 pragmatic structures over the short term actually correlates with
any statistically significant increase in appropriate understanding or use of the structures, L2 pedagogy practices might benefit from at least having a way to influence student ideologies toward said structures, given that changes in language ideology often foreshadow future changes in language use.

With regard to class level, our finding of inverse linear relationships between class level and many aspects of student understandings, judgments, and uses of *hasta* also has important implications for second language pedagogy practices. One implication is that language teachers should not consider knowledge of pragmatic forms as processable only by students of upper level L2 classes. Contrary to the position espoused by researchers such as Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei (1998) and Kasper (2001), students might well benefit from being introduced to L2 pragmatics at the beginning stages of their study of a foreign language. Even though at such levels students possess only beginner’s level language proficiencies, they are still able to achieve certain degrees of understanding, judgment, and use of L2 pragmatics, especially in writing. More importantly, if students are exposed to L2 pragmatics when they have beginner’s proficiency levels, the sociolinguistic competence they develop concurrently may affect their L2 pragmatics more favorably than it does at later stages when they are more proficient in the L2 and have already formed rigid preferences toward certain language forms.

The last implications that stem from our analysis of L2 pragmatics from a classroom network perspective concern language modality and time studying Spanish.

---

77 This implication finds additional support in our findings pertaining to the length of time during which study participants had been studying Spanish. This variable also had a significant but negative effect on certain aspects of L2 pragmatics.
According to our findings, language modality seems to affect only oral production of L2 pragmatics. Oral interaction was surprisingly ineffective in causing changes in written production or even in participants’ attitudes toward or comprehension of written usage. The first, somewhat obvious implication here is that spoken language tends to change before written language does. Nevertheless, these findings are also an indication that while exposure to conversation can affect individuals’ L2 pragmatics in oral aspects, exposure to classroom networks based on written modes of expression does not affect any aspect of L2 pragmatics in writing. Curiously, a similar pattern was evident also for pedagogy practice. While language modality affected only oral production and pedagogy practice affected only participants’ ideologies toward spoken language, in both cases, oral interaction (through in-classroom conversation or through instructor modeling) was significant in affecting pragmatics only in spoken language.

As for the lack of effect of language modality on the written aspects of L2 pragmatics, at first glance the implication appears to be that current pedagogy practices in classes that emphasize written modes of expression are not efficient in affecting written aspects of L2 pragmatics. In that regard, as language teachers, we may need to focus on better ways to aid the development of the written aspects of L2 pragmatics. Upon further consideration, however, an alternate implication arises. Besides the possibility that we might need to change our in-classroom practices in order to have an effect on L2 pragmatics in writing, it is also possible that we should simply have lower expectations in this regard. Given that changes in spoken language precede changes in written language,

78 One way to do so could be to provide students with more frequent reading practice. Just like students’ oral production of L2 pragmatics improves with increased oral practice, perhaps increased practice with written texts might aid students in displaying pragmatically appropriate understandings, judgments, and uses of L2 pragmatics in writing.
we may just need to allow more time for students to understand, judge, and use written forms in the foreign language in pragmatically appropriate ways. The sociolinguistic factors that we found to be predictors of L2 pragmatics in spoken language could very well, over time, yield significant effects in written language as well. At the same time, however, we should keep in mind that, over time, not all of the effects on students’ L2 pragmatics will necessarily be positive.

For instance, according to our findings, longer periods of studying Spanish are associated with significant decreases in favorable judgments toward oral usage of all forms of *hasta*. The implication here is that language teachers should be aware of this issue and take appropriate measures to address it given that, as mentioned above, pedagogy practices are capable of changing and reshaping the negative attitudes that, over time, students may have formed toward certain pragmatic forms in the L2.

In summation, for the current investigation, social network analysis has served as an important tool in analyzing individuals’ linguistic behavior in certain social contexts, contributing to research on the effects that social networks can have on language variation and change. By investigating how social networks influence individuals’ L2 pragmatics, we have provided evidence of factors that aid L2 learners in understanding, judging, and using language in pragmatically appropriate ways. The analyses that we have presented are relevant to several areas of linguistic inquiry, namely, Spanish pragmatics, Spanish sociolinguistics, and Spanish language pedagogy. More importantly, even though our study has focused particularly on the pragmatics of L2 Spanish, our work may be of use crosslinguistically in research on discourse analysis, network analysis, and world language education. With regard to the latter, it is our hope that the findings we have
presented in this study provide some insight not only into what affects individuals’
linguistic behavior, but also into what could be better and more efficient methods of
helping L2 students understand, judge, and use a given foreign language in pragmatically
appropriate ways.
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Appendix A

Consent form
You have been invited to participate in a research project intended to study how students of Spanish as a second language acquire pragmatic forms. This project is Mikela Zhezha’s doctoral dissertation research. This study will be conducted in Spanish classrooms during Spring 2008. You were selected for invitation to participate in this study because you are currently registered in one of the Spanish classes under investigation. We have invited approximately 225 people to participate in this study. The participants will bear no cost for this research or receive any economic compensation.

Students electing to participate will be asked to schedule some time to meet for an interview with Mikela Zhezha in 815 Sprau Tower at their convenience. This visit will last approximately sixty minutes. During this interview, they will be asked to fill out a background questionnaire to provide general information relevant to the study, such as age, level of education, and amount of exposure to Mexican Spanish. Next, they will complete two oral tasks. For the first one, the participants will be read a series of sentence fragments, and they will be asked to complete each sentence by filling in the blanks with positive or negative actions as appropriate. This task will be audio recorded. For the second oral task, students will be asked to listen to six short texts that have been audio recorded. For each text then they will need to answer six multiple-choice questions based on their impression of the speaker. The participants will not be audio recorded for this task. Finally, the students will be asked to complete two written tasks. The first will be a group of fifteen short sentences that the participants will read in order to answer three questions according to a scale or options given. For the second written task, they will need to translate five short sentences from English into Spanish. The background questionnaire and the four tasks mentioned above are unique to the research and are not part of the classroom activities.

The researcher will do her best to minimize the distraction that the participants might experience because of any interruption to the class rhythm caused by this project. For this, she will only visit the classrooms once. This visit will last approximately thirty minutes and its purpose is to briefly explain the nature of this study, invite students to participate and also answer any questions that they might have at the moment. After this, all the classroom practices will continue as originally planned by the instructor teaching them. Student electing to participate will be asked to submit their signed consent forms at a later date. Also, all the tasks that are to be completed during the interview will be done outside of class. This way, the tasks will not interfere with the daily standard classroom activities. Furthermore, as mentioned above, the interviews will be done at a time that is convenient for participants in order to minimize interference with participants’ daily schedules. Nothing that will be recorded will be of any politically or socially sensitive nature. Nevertheless, to avoid any possible embarrassment that could theoretically result if recordings were ever publicly available, the recordings will be safe-guarded as explained in the paragraph below so as to maintain confidentiality.

All of the information collected from you will be confidential. All the data gathered, including all recordings, will be retained by Mikela Zhezha in a locked private cabinet, never to be released for public use and never to be released to anyone at all without your permission. The written forms will all be coded. Mikela Zhezha will keep a separate master list with the names of participants and the corresponding code numbers. Your name will not appear in Mikela Zhezha’s dissertation or in any future publications resulting from the research. Any information that is
obtained during this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your written consent.

Participants and future students of Spanish alike may benefit from this study. One way in which you may benefit personally from this activity is by learning something new about the Spanish spoken in Mexico. This might make you more aware of the different forms of Spanish and it might also spark new interests for your future studies in this language. With your help, this study may discover some of the ways in which students like you acquire differences in language use. As a result, this study may lead to better ways to teach students like you in the future.

Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your relations with your Spanish class instructor or with the university. You may decline participation by not signing a consent form. If you decide to participate, you may discontinue participation in the research at any time without prejudice or penalty. You may do so by simply informing Mikela Zhezha of your decision. Furthermore, should you chose to participate, you may refuse to answer any question at any time without any prejudice or penalty.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, you may contact either Mikela Zhezha at 387-3105 or Dr. Robert Vann at 387-3042. You may also contact the Chair of Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (387-8293) or the Vice President for Research at (387-8298) if questions or problems arise during the course of the study.

This consent document has been approved for use for one year by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) as indicated by the stamped date and signature of the board chair in the upper right corner. Do not participate in this study if the stamped date is older than one year.

Your signature below indicates that you have read the information above regarding the purpose and requirements of the study and that you have agreed to participate. You may withdraw your consent to the research at any time after signing this form, should you decide to discontinue participation in this study.

__________________________                      _____________________
Signature of Participant          Date

Consent obtained by:

__________________________                      _____________________
Signature of Investigator                                        Date
Appendix B

Oral Task # 1
I will read you a series of sentence fragments. Please tell me how to complete each sentence by filling in the blanks with positive or negative actions as appropriate.

1. .......................................hasta el viernes.
2. Hasta la próxima semana ...........................................
3. María, la hermana de Ramón, ......................................
4. .......................................hasta encontrar mi libro.
5. .......................................hasta la hora de cenar.
6. El perro blanco........................................................
7. Hasta que termine mis estudios.................................
8. .......................................hasta que llegue el verano.
9. ....................................... unos zapatos nuevos.
10. Hasta hablar con mi novio/a ........................................
11. Hasta adelgazar ........................................................
12. ....................................... después de cenar.
13. Hasta ahorrar bastante dinero.................................
14. .......................................hasta tomar un café.
15. ....................................... para mi profesor de español.
Appendix C

Oral Task # 1   - English translation
Note. This translation is provided here for the reader of this dissertation in order to facilitate the reader’s understanding of Oral Task # 1. Such translation was not made available to the students who participated in this study.

Note. Answers to Oral Task # 1 may vary. In this appendix, the preposition hasta has been translated as ‘until’, which corresponds to the default contextual meaning of hasta when used as a preposition in most dialects of Spanish. In MCAE Spanish where hasta indicates the inception of affirmative verbal situations, the meaning of the lexeme in question would most often be translated best by the English word at or by no word at all.

I will read you a series of sentence fragments. Please tell me how to complete each sentence by filling in the blanks with positive or negative actions as appropriate.

1. ………………………………………………until Friday.
2. Until next week ……………………………………..
3. María, Ramón’s sister, ………………………………
4. ………………………………………………until I find my book.
5. ………………………………………………until dinner time.
6. The white dog…………………………………………
7. Until I finish my studies……………………………
8. ………………………………………………until summer arrives.
9. ………………………………………………. new shoes.
10. Until I speak with my boyfriend / girlfriend ……………
11. Until losing weight ………………………………
12. …………………………………………… after having dinner.
13. Until saving enough money…………………………
14. ……………………………………………….until having a coffee.
15. ……………………………………………… for my Spanish professor.
Appendix D

Audio script for Oral Task # 2
Note. The uses of hasta with affirmative and negative verbal situations, and the lack thereof, have been underlined in texts 1, 3, 4 and 6. This indication serves only for the reader of this dissertation and was not given to the participants.

TEXT # 1:
Ayer hablé con Dora. Estaba muy cansada porque había salido del trabajo hasta las ocho de la noche. Tenía mucho sueño pero tenía que estudiar también. Además, quería esperar a su hermana que regresaba del trabajo hasta las once. Pobre Dora, menos mal que en la mañana se despierta hasta las nueve.

TEXT # 2:
Carlos es un joven de Madrid. El estudia ingeniería eléctrica. Tiene clases por la mañana y trabaja por la tarde. Vive en un apartamento cerca de la universidad, pero va a su casa los fines de semana. Está contento porque este año va a ser estudiante de intercambio en el Canadá, donde va a estudiar francés también.

TEXT # 3:
Hoy vi a Esteban. Tenía mucho sueño porque la noche anterior no había terminado de estudiar hasta la una. Casi se quedó dormido en la clase de química. Menos mal que no tiene un examen hasta la próxima semana. Quería ir a su casa para acostarse un rato, pero sus clases no se acaban hasta las cinco.

TEXT # 4:
Ayer hablé con Dora. Estaba muy cansada porque había salido del trabajo a las ocho de la noche. Tenía mucho sueño pero tenía que estudiar también. Además, quería esperar a su hermana que regresaba del trabajo a las once. Pobre Dora, menos mal que en la mañana se despierta a las nueve.

TEXT # 5:
Carlos es un joven de Madrid. El estudia ingeniería eléctrica. Tiene clases por la mañana y trabaja por la tarde. Vive en un apartamento cerca de la universidad, pero va a su casa los fines de semana. Está contento porque este año va a ser estudiante de intercambio en el Canadá, donde va a estudiar francés también.

TEXT # 6:
Hoy vi a Esteban. Tenía mucho sueño porque la noche anterior había terminado de estudiar hasta la una. Casi se quedó dormido en la clase de química. Menos mal que tiene un examen hasta la próxima semana. Quería ir a su casa para acostarse un rato, pero sus clases se acaban hasta las cinco.
Appendix E

Audio script for Oral Task # 2 - English translation
Note. This translation is provided here for the reader of this dissertation in order to facilitate the reader’s understanding of the audio script for Oral Task # 2. Such translation was not made available to the students who participated in this study.

Note. In this appendix, hasta has been translated as ‘until’, which is an appropriate translation for hasta in most dialects of Spanish. In texts (1) and (6) of the audio script that was played for the study participants, however, alternate translations are necessary to accurately capture in English the meaning of affirmative inceptive hasta usage, which marks inception in MCAE Spanish without the aid of a negated verb. Since in English the preposition until does not mark inception of an affirmative verbal situation, the alternate translations at and Ø have been added to texts (1) and (6), in brackets, in order to more accurately reflect in English translation the aspectual properties of affirmative inceptive hasta in MCAE Spanish.

TEXT # 1:
Yesterday I talked to Dora. She was very tired because she had left work until [= at] 8 p.m. She was very sleepy but she had to study too. She also wanted to wait for her sister who usually got back from work until [= at] 11 p.m. Poor Dora, thank goodness she gets up until [= at] nine in the morning.

TEXT # 2:
Carlos is a young man from Madrid. He studies electrical engineering. He has classes in the morning and works in the afternoon. He lives in an apartment close by the university, but he goes home on the weekends. He is happy because this year he is going to be an exchange student in Canada, where he is also going to study French.

TEXT # 3:
Today I saw Esteban. He was very sleepy because the previous night he had not finished studying until 1 a.m. He almost fell asleep in chemistry class. Thank goodness he does not have an exam until next week. He wanted to go home to lie down for a while, but his classes don’t finish until 5.

TEXT # 4:
Yesterday I talked to Dora. She was very tired because she had left work at 8 p.m. She was very sleepy but she had to study too. She also wanted to wait for her sister who usually got back from work at 11 p.m. Poor Dora, thank goodness in the morning she gets up at nine.

TEXT # 5:
Carlos is a young man from Madrid. He studies electrical engineering. He has classes in the morning and works in the afternoon. He lives in an apartment close by the university, but he goes home on the weekends. He is happy because this year he is going to be an exchange student in Canada, where he is also going to study French.

TEXT # 6:
Today I saw Esteban. He was very sleepy because the previous night he had finished studying until [= at] 1 a.m. He almost fell asleep in chemistry class. Thank goodness he has an exam until [=Ø] next week. He wanted to go home to lie down for a while, but his classes finish until [= at] 5.
Appendix F

Oral Task # 2
Listen to the short text recorded and answer the following questions based on your impression of the speakers:

1. Is this person a native speaker of Spanish?  YES  NO

2. What kind of job might this person have?
   a. dishwasher  b. plumber  c. grade school teacher
   d. accountant  e. brain surgeon

3. Rate the speaker’s Spanish in terms of correctness:
   
   | correct | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
   |

4. What is the highest grade that you think the speaker completed in school?
   
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | college | graduate | school |

5. What is this person’s economic status?
   a. lower class
   b. working class
   c. middle class
   d. upper middle class
   e. upper class

6. In what kind of place does the speaker live?
   a. urban  b. suburban  c. rural
Appendix G

Written Task # 1
Read the following sentences in Spanish. For each sentence, answer the following questions according to the scale or options given:

(a) Is it grammatical?       YES / NO
(b) Who would say it?       1       No native speaker of Spanish would say it.
                               2       Some native speakers of Spanish could say it.
                               3       Many native speakers of Spanish could say it.
                               4       Every native speaker of Spanish would say it.
(c) When does the action happen? (Approximate time frame where applicable)

1. No puedo verte hasta octubre.
   a. _____   b._____   c. _________________________
2. Hasta las diez salimos de compras.
   a. _____   b._____   c. _________________________
3. Mi hermana cumple diez años en octubre.
   a. _____   b._____   c. _________________________
4. No puedo comprar los zapatos hasta Navidad.
   a. _____   b._____   c. _________________________
5. Los niños se despertaron a las ocho de la mañana.
   a. _____   b._____   c. _________________________
6. Venderemos estos libros hasta que termine el semestre.
   a. _____   b._____   c. _________________________
7. Hasta que se acabe la película no pueden comer.
   a. _____   b._____   c. _________________________
8. La semana pasada compré dos vestidos nuevos.
   a. _____   b._____   c. _________________________
9. Iré a México hasta las vacaciones.
   a. _____   b._____   c. _________________________
10. Nuestros padres vivirán en Colombia el año que viene.
    a. _____   b._____   c. _________________________
11. Hasta que se gradue no puede encontrar un trabajo.
    a. _____   b._____   c. _________________________
12. Hasta la noche llamaré a mi novia.
13. Creo que el próximo domingo va a nevar mucho.
   a. _____  b._____  c. _________________________
14. No te puedes ir a la playa hasta que llegue el verano.
   a. _____  b._____  c. _________________________
15. Hasta ahorrar bastante dinero pensaré en el asunto.
   a. _____  b._____  c. _________________________
Appendix H

Written Task # 1  -  English translation
Note. This translation is provided here for the reader of this dissertation in order to facilitate the reader’s understanding of Written Task #1. Such translation was not made available to the students who participated in this study.

Note. In this appendix, hasta has been translated as ‘until’, which is an appropriate translation for hasta in most dialects of Spanish. In sentences (2), (6), (9), (12), and (15) of Written Task #1, however, alternate translations are necessary to accurately capture in English the meaning of affirmative inceptive hasta usage, which marks inception in MCAE Spanish without the aid of a negated verb. Since in English the preposition until does not mark inception of an affirmative verbal situation, the alternate translations at and when have been added to sentences (2), (6), (9), (12), and (15), in brackets, in order to more accurately reflect in English translation the aspectual properties of affirmative inceptive hasta in MCAE Spanish. It is important to point out that the use of the negated verb with the preposition ‘until’ in the English translation of sentences (1), (4), (7), (11), and (14) of Written Task #1 is literal, that is, it reflects the usage of hasta in non-MCAE Spanish dialects when referring to the beginning point of a verbal situation.

Read the following sentences in Spanish. For each sentence, answer the following questions according to the scale or options given:

(a) Is it grammatical? YES / NO
(b) Who would say it? 1 No native speaker of Spanish would say it. 2 Some native speakers of Spanish could say it. 3 Many native speakers of Spanish could say it. 4 Every native speaker of Spanish would say it.
(c) When does the action happen? (Approximate time frame where applicable)

1. I can’t see you until October.
   a. _____ b._____ c. _________________________
2. Until [= at] ten we will go shopping.
   a. _____ b._____ c. _________________________
3. My sister will be ten years old in October.
   a. _____ b._____ c. _________________________
4. I cannot buy the shoes until Christmas.
   a. _____ b._____ c. _________________________
5. The children woke up at 8 a.m.
   a. _____ b._____ c. _________________________
6. We will sell these books until [= at] the end of the semester.
7. Until the movie is over they cannot eat.  
   a. _____ b._____ c. _________________________

8. Last week I bought two new dresses.  
   a. _____ b._____ c. _________________________

9. I will go to México until [= at] vacation time.  
   a. _____ b._____ c. _________________________

10. Our parents will live in Colombia next year.  
    a. _____ b._____ c. _________________________

11. Until he graduates he cannot find a job.  
    a. _____ b._____ c. _________________________

12. Until [= at] night time I will call my girlfriend.  
    a. _____ b._____ c. _________________________

13. I think it is going to snow a lot next Sunday.  
    a. _____ b._____ c. _________________________

14. You cannot go to the beach until summer.  
    a. _____ b._____ c. _________________________

15. Until [= when] I have saved enough money I will think about the matter.  
    a. _____ b._____ c. _________________________
Appendix I

Written Task # 2
Translate the following sentences into Spanish using the preposition *hasta*. In order to do so, you might have to reword the sentences in English while still keeping the same meaning.

1. I only heard about your engagement after the ceremony.

2. They wake up no earlier than 11 a.m.

3. I can get out of work after 4 p.m.

4. I’ll be able to buy this book after I receive the check.

5. They will call tonight after 8 p.m.
Appendix J

Background questionnaire
1. Name ____________________________  

2. Gender: Male / Female

3. Age: _____ years

4. From the choices given in the tables below, indicate your exposure to the Spanish language by marking with **X** all the situations that apply to you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPOSURE TO SPANISH IN GENERAL</th>
<th>EXPOSURE TO MEXICAN, ECUADORIAN OR CENTRAL AMERICAN SPANISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_ Hispanic or of Hispanic descent (not including Mexican, Ecuadorian or Central American descent).</td>
<td>_ National or descendant of Mexico, Ecuador or Central America.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_ Have Hispanic relatives (not including Mexicans, Ecuadorians or Central Americans) who sometimes speak in Spanish.</td>
<td>_ Have Mexican, Ecuadorian or Central American relatives who sometimes speak in Spanish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_ Have had teachers or tutors of Spanish who were from a Spanish-speaking country other than Mexico, Ecuador or Central America.</td>
<td>_ Have had teachers or tutors of Spanish who were from Mexico, Ecuador or Central America.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_ Studied in a Spanish-speaking country (not including Mexico, Ecuador or Central America).</td>
<td>_ Studied abroad in Mexico, Ecuador or Central America.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_ Have spent significant time in a Spanish speaking country (not including Mexico, Ecuador or Central America) for non-academic purposes.</td>
<td>_ Have spent significant time in Mexico, Ecuador or Central America for non-academic purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_ Work with Hispanics (not including Mexicans, Ecuadorians or Central Americans) who sometimes speak in Spanish.</td>
<td>_ Work with Mexicans, Ecuadorians or Central Americans who sometimes speak in Spanish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_ Have current Hispanic neighbors (not including Mexicans, Ecuadorians or Central Americans) who sometimes speak in Spanish.</td>
<td>_ Have current Mexican, Ecuadorians or Central American neighbors who sometimes speak in Spanish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_ Socialize frequently with Hispanics (not including Mexicans, Ecuadorians or Central Americans) in Spanish.</td>
<td>_ Socialize frequently with Mexicans, Ecuadorians, and Central Americans in Spanish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_ Frequently listen to Spanish language radio or television broadcasts from countries other than Mexico, Ecuador and Central America.</td>
<td>_ Frequently listen to Spanish language radio or television broadcasts from Mexico, Ecuador or Central America.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_ Frequently read Spanish language newspapers from countries other than Mexico, Ecuador, and Central America.</td>
<td>_ Frequently read Spanish language newspapers from Mexico, Ecuador or Central America.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How often do you use your Spanish outside of class? Check **only one**:
6. For how long have you studied Spanish? Choose only one of the increments below:

   a. 1-2 years total  
   b. 3-4 years total  
   c. 5-6 years total  
   d. 7-8 years total  
   e. 9-10 years total  
   f. 10+ years total  

7. Please list any languages that you speak fluently besides Spanish and English:

   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
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Code key sheet
Note. The information contained in this appendix is provided here for the reader of this dissertation in order to facilitate the reader’s understanding of how the researcher coded participants’ answers on the tasks performed. This code key sheet was not made available to the students who participated in this study.

PEDAGOGY PRACTICE

(3) = Model  
(2) = Instruction  
(1) = Control

CLASS LEVEL

(1) = SPAN 1000  
(2) = SPAN 3160  
(2) = SPAN 3170

LANGUAGE MODALITY

(3) = Oral  
(1) = Written  
(2) = Oral + Written

ORAL TASK # 1

( -1 ) = negated verb  
( 0 ) = no verb, data inconclusive due to ambiguous verbal lexical aspect, or no data whatsoever  
( 1 ) = affirmative verb unambiguously displaying instantaneous temporal features

ORAL TASK # 2

Question 2

(1) = dishwasher  (2) = plumber  (3) = grade school teacher  
(4) = accountant  (5) = brain surgeon  (BLANK) = no data

Question 3

(1) = incorrect  (2)  (3)  (4)  (5) = correct  (BLANK) = no data

Question 4

(1) = (first grade – third grade)  
(2) = (fourth grade – sixth grade)  
(3) = (seventh grade – ninth grade)  
(4) = (tenth grade – twelfth grade)  
(5) = (college – graduate school)  (BLANK) = no data
Question 5

(1) = lower class                  (2) = working class          (3) = middle class
(4) = upper middle class          (5) = upper class       (BLANK) = no data

WRITTEN TASK # 1

Question A

(1) = YES (0) = NO or no data whatsoever

Question B

(1) = every native speaker of Spanish would say it
(1) = many native speakers of Spanish could say it
(0) = some native speakers of Spanish could say it
(0) = no native speakers of Spanish would say it
(0) = no data whatsoever

Question C

(-1) = action ending at given point of time
(1) = action starting at given point of time
(0) = answer not relevant, answer inconclusive, or no answer at all

WRITTEN TASK # 2

(-1) = hasta accompanied by a negated verb
(0) = no verb, data inconclusive due to ambiguous verbal lexical aspect, or no data whatsoever
(1) = hasta accompanied by an affirmative verb that unambiguously displays instantaneous temporal features

BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE

Gender:

(1) = female (2) = male

Age: number in years

Exposure to non-MCAE Spanish dialects: – (1 – 10)

Exposure to MCAE Spanish dialects: + (1 – 10)

Frequency of Spanish use outside of class:

(5) = daily
(4) = at least once a week
(3) = several times a month
(2) = several times a year
(1) = other

Length of time during which participants had been studying Spanish:

(1) = one to two years total
(2) = three to four years total
(3) = five to six years total
(4) = seven to eight years total
(5) = nine to ten years total
(6) = ten plus years total
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