

VIAJANDO POR EL MAR EN UNA LÍNEA DERECHA:
THE INFLUENCE OF ENGLISH L2 ON PUERTO RICAN SPANISH L1

Roberto E. Olmeda Rosario

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of:

Doctor of Philosophy

June 16, 2022

**Department of English
College of Humanities
University of Puerto Rico
Río Piedras**

Approved by:

Don Walicek, PhD
Reader

Robert Dupey, PhD
Reader

Yolanda Rivera, PhD
Dissertation Director

Copyright © 2022 Roberto E. Olmeda Rosario

Table of Contents

List of Tables	viii
List of Abbreviations	xv
Dedication	xvi
Acknowledgments	xvii
Abstract	xviii
Biographical Information	xx
Chapter 1: Introduction	
1.1 Justification.....	1
1.2 Language Contact and Change: A Few Definitions.....	2
1.3 Hypotheses.....	9
1.4 Research Questions.....	9
Chapter 2: Literature review on L2-L1 Cross-linguistic phenomena	
2.1 Introduction.....	11
2.2 Phonology.....	11
2.3 Syntax and Morphology.....	14
2.4 Sociolinguistic Factors.....	18
Chapter 3: Theoretical Framework	
3.1 Introduction.....	23
3.2 Examples of Cross-linguistic Phenomena.....	23
3.3 Theoretical Framework.....	27
Chapter 4: Methodology	
4.1 Participants.....	29

4.2 Data Collection.....	29
4.3 Justification for Methodology.....	31
4.4 Disadvantages of Acceptability Task.....	32
Chapter 5: Quantitative Analysis of Data	
5.1 Data Collection.....	34
5.2 Description of Groups.....	38
5.3 Acceptability Test.....	42
5.3.1 Lexical Borrowing: Verbs.....	43
5.3.2 Lexical Borrowing: Nouns.....	50
5.3.3 Lexical Borrowing: Prepositions.....	50
5.3.4 Lexical Borrowing: Adjectives.....	52
5.3.5 Preposition Stranding.....	53
5.4 Analysis of Data from Acceptability Test.....	55
5.4.1 Discussion of Table 5.14.....	67
5.4.2 Discussion of Table 5.15.....	69
5.4.3 Discussion of Table 5.16.....	69
5.4.4 Discussion of Table 5.17.....	70
5.4.5 Discussion of Table 5.18.....	71
5.4.6 Discussion of Table 5.19.....	72
5.4.7 Discussion of Table 5.20.....	73
5.4.8 Discussion of Table 5.21.....	74
5.4.9 Discussion of Table 5.22.....	75
5.4.10 Discussion of Table 5.23.....	75

5.4.11 Discussion of Table 5.24.....	76
5.4.12 Discussion of Table 5.25.....	77
5.4.13 Discussion of Table 5.26.....	78
5.4.14 Discussion of Table 5.27.....	78
5.4.15 Discussion of Table 5.28.....	79
5.4.16 Discussion of Table 5.30.....	81
5.4.17 Discussion of Table 5.31.....	82
5.4.18 Discussion of Table 5.32.....	83
5.4.19 Discussion of differences among groups A, B, and C for items without cross-linguistic influence.....	86
5.4.20 Discussion of differences among groups A, B, and C for items without cross-linguistic influence in the category of Lexical borrowing: Verbs.....	90
5.4.21 Discussion of differences among groups A, B, and C for items without cross-linguistic influence in the category of Lexical borrowing: Nouns.....	93
5.4.22 Discussion of differences among groups A, B, and C for items without cross-linguistic influence in the category of Lexical borrowing: Prepositions.....	95
5.4.23 Discussion of differences among groups A, B, and C for items without cross-linguistic influence in the category of Lexical borrowing: Adjectives.....	96
5.4.24 Discussion of differences among groups A, B, and C for	

items without cross-linguistic influence in the category	
of Lexical borrowing: Preposition stranding.....	98
5.5 Summary of quantitative data.....	99

Chapter 6: Qualitative analysis of data

6.1 Overview.....	100
6.2 Analysis of category: Lexical borrowing: Verbs.....	100
6.2.1 Discussion of Table 6.1.....	103
6.2.2 Discussion of Table 6.2.....	104
6.2.3 Discussion of Table 6.3.....	106
6.2.4 Discussion of Table 6.4.....	108
6.2.5 Discussion of Table 6.5.....	109
6.2.6 Discussion of Table 6.6.....	110
6.2.7 Discussion of Table 6.7.....	112
6.2.8 Discussion of Table 6.8.....	113
6.2.9 Discussion of Table 6.9.....	115
6.2.10 Discussion of Table 6.10.....	116
6.2.11 Discussion of Table 6.11.....	118
6.2.12 Discussion of Table 6.12.....	118
6.2.13 Discussion of Table 6.13.....	120
6.2.14 Discussion of Table 6.14.....	121
6.2.15 Discussion of Table 6.15.....	122
6.2.16 Discussion of Table 6.16.....	125
6.2.17 Discussion of Table 6.17.....	126

6.2.18 Discussion of Table 6.18.....	128
6.2.19 Discussion of Table 6.19.....	130
6.2.20 Discussion of Table 6.20.....	131
6.2.21 Discussion of Table 6.21.....	132
6.3 Analysis of category: Lexical borrowing: Nouns.....	133
6.3.1 Discussion of Table 6.22.....	134
6.3.2 Discussion of Table 6.23.....	136
6.3.3 Discussion of Table 6.24.....	137
6.4 Analysis of category: Lexical borrowing: Prepositions.....	138
6.4.1 Discussion of Table 6.25.....	140
6.4.2 Discussion of Table 6.26.....	141
6.4.3 Discussion of Table 6.27.....	142
6.4.4 Discussion of Table 6.28.....	144
6.4.5 Discussion of Table 6.29.....	146
6.4.6 Discussion of Table 6.30.....	147
6.4.7 Discussion of Table 6.31.....	149
6.4.8 Discussion of Table 6.32.....	149
6.4.9 Discussion of Table 6.33.....	150
6.5 Analysis of category: Lexical borrowing: Adjectives.....	151
6.5.1 Discussion of Table 6.34.....	152
6.5.2 Discussion of Table 6.35.....	153
6.5.3 Discussion of Table 6.36.....	154
6.6 Analysis of category: Preposition stranding.....	155

6.6.1	Discussion of Table 6.37.....	158
6.6.2	Discussion of Table 6.38.....	161
6.6.3	Discussion of Table 6.39.....	164
6.6.4	Discussion of Table 6.40.....	166
6.6.5	Discussion of Table 6.41.....	169
6.6.6	Discussion of Table 6.42.....	170
6.6.7	Discussion of Table 6.43.....	173
6.6.8	Discussion of Table 6.44.....	177
6.6.9	Discussion of Table 6.45.....	179
6.7	Summary of Results.....	181
6.7.1	Discussion of Tables 6.46 – 6.48.....	184
Chapter 7: Conclusions		
7.1	Overview.....	187
7.2	Discussion of Results.....	187
7.3	Research Questions.....	193
7.4	Contributions of the Study.....	195
7.5	Limitations of the Study.....	197
7.6	Recommendations for Future Research.....	198
References.....		200
Appendices		
Appendix 1: Approval from Institutional Review Board (CIPSHI).....		208
Appendix 2: Assent and Consent.....		209
Appendix 3: Survey (Language Acquisition and Use).....		213

Appendix 4: Acceptability Test.....	222
Appendix 5: Instructions for participants who completed assent and consent.....	231

List of tables

Table 1.1	Thomason and Kauffman's (1988) Borrowing Scale	6
Table 5.1	Numbers of participants	35
Table 5.2	Gender of participants	35
Table 5.3	Language use.....	35
Table 5.4	Age of exposure to English (learning).....	36
Table 5.5	Age of exposure to English (use)	36
Table 5.6	Self-reported overall proficiency in English	37
Table 5.7	Self-reported overall proficiency in Spanish	37
Table 5.8	Classification of participants based on Language Acquisition and Use survey	38
Table 5.9	Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) from all participants for each of the twenty (20) items	58
Table 5.10	Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) from all participants for the fifteen (15) items that presented cross-linguistic phenomena	60
Table 5.11	Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for all items for group A.....	61
Table 5.12	Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for all items for group B	63
Table 5.13	Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for all items for group C.....	65
Table 5.14	Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable)	

	for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of <i>Lexical borrowing: Verbs</i> for group A.....	67
Table 5.15	Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of <i>Lexical borrowing: Nouns</i> for group A.....	68
Table 5.16	Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of <i>Lexical borrowing: Prepositions</i> for group A.....	69
Table 5.17	Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of <i>Lexical borrowing: Adjectives</i> for group A.....	70
Table 5.18	Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of <i>Preposition Stranding</i> for group A.....	71
Table 5.19	Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of <i>Lexical borrowing: Verbs</i> for group B.....	72
Table 5.20	Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of <i>Lexical borrowing: Nouns</i> for group B.....	73
Table 5.21	Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of <i>Lexical borrowing: Prepositions</i> for group B.....	74

Table 5.22	Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of <i>Lexical borrowing: Adjectives</i> for group B.....	74
Table 5.23	Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of <i>Preposition Stranding</i> for group B.....	75
Table 5.24	Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of <i>Lexical borrowing: Verbs</i> for group C.....	76
Table 5.25	Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of <i>Lexical borrowing: Nouns</i> for group C.....	77
Table 5.26	Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of <i>Lexical borrowing: Prepositions</i> for group C.....	77
Table 5.27	Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of <i>Lexical borrowing: Adjectives</i> for group C.....	78
Table 5.28	Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of <i>Preposition Stranding</i> for group C.....	79
Table 5.29	Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items without cross-linguistic influence (fillers)	

	for all groups	80
Table 5.30	Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items without cross-linguistic influence (fillers) for group A.....	80
Table 5.31	Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items without cross-linguistic influence (fillers) for group B.....	81
Table 5.32	Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items without cross-linguistic influence (fillers) for group C.....	82
Table 5.33	Comparison of answers for items without cross-linguistic influence (fillers) for all groups.....	83
Table 5.34	Comparison of answers for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of <i>Lexical borrowing: Verbs</i> for all groups	87
Table 5.35	Comparison of answers for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of <i>Lexical borrowing:</i> <i>Nouns</i> for all groups	92
Table 5.36	Comparison of answers for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of <i>Lexical borrowing:</i> <i>Prepositions</i> for all groups	93
Table 5.37	Comparison of answers for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of <i>Lexical borrowing:</i>	

	<i>Adjectives</i> for all groups	96
Table 5.38	Comparison of answers for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of <i>Preposition Stranding</i> for all groups	97
Table 6.1	Answers provided from item 1 by participants from group A.....	101
Table 6.2	Answers provided from item 1 by participants from group B.....	104
Table 6.3	Answers provided from item 1 by participants from group C.....	105
Table 6.4	Answers provided from item 4 by participants from group A.....	107
Table 6.5	Answers provided from item 4 by participants from group B.....	108
Table 6.6	Answers provided from item 4 by participants from group C.....	110
Table 6.7	Answers provided from item 8 by participants from group A.....	111
Table 6.8	Answers provided from item 8 by participants from group B.....	113
Table 6.9	Answers provided from item 8 by participants from group C.....	114
Table 6.10	Answers provided from item 13 by participants from group A.....	115
Table 6.11	Answers provided from item 13 by participants from group B.....	117
Table 6.12	Answers provided from item 13 by participants from group C.....	118
Table 6.13	Answers provided from item 17 by participants from group A.....	119
Table 6.14	Answers provided from item 17 by participants from group B.....	120
Table 6.15	Answers provided from item 17 by participants from group C.....	121
Table 6.16	Answers provided from item 18 by participants from group A.....	123
Table 6.17	Answers provided from item 18 by participants from group B.....	125
Table 6.18	Answers provided from item 18 by participants from group C.....	127
Table 6.19	Answers provided from item 20 by participants from group A.....	128

Table 6.20	Answers provided from item 20 by participants from group B.....	130
Table 6.21	Answers provided from item 20 by participants from group C.....	132
Table 6.22	Answers provided from item 2 by participants from group A.....	133
Table 6.23	Answers provided from item 2 by participants from group B.....	135
Table 6.24	Answers provided from item 2 by participants from group C.....	137
Table 6.25	Answers provided from item 5 by participants from group A.....	138
Table 6.26	Answers provided from item 5 by participants from group B.....	140
Table 6.27	Answers provided from item 5 by participants from group C.....	141
Table 6.28	Answers provided from item 12 by participants from group A.....	143
Table 6.29	Answers provided from item 12 by participants from group B.....	145
Table 6.30	Answers provided from item 12 by participants from group C.....	147
Table 6.31	Answers provided from item 14 by participants from group A.....	148
Table 6.32	Answers provided from item 14 by participants from group B.....	149
Table 6.33	Answers provided from item 14 by participants from group C.....	150
Table 6.34	Answers provided from item 6 by participants from group A.....	151
Table 6.35	Answers provided from item 6 by participants from group B.....	152
Table 6.36	Answers provided from item 6 by participants from group C.....	154
Table 6.37	Answers provided from item 9 by participants from group A.....	156
Table 6.38	Answers provided from item 9 by participants from group B.....	160
Table 6.39	Answers provided from item 9 by participants from group C.....	163
Table 6.40	Answers provided from item 10 by participants from group A.....	165
Table 6.41	Answers provided from item 10 by participants from group B.....	168
Table 6.42	Answers provided from item 10 by participants from group C.....	170

Table 6.43	Answers provided from item 16 by participants from group A.....	171
Table 6.44	Answers provided from item 16 by participants from group B.....	176
Table 6.45	Answers provided from item 16 by participants from group C.....	179
Table 6.46	Use of metalanguage by group A.....	182
Table 6.47	Use of metalanguage by group B.....	183
Table 6.48	Use of metalanguage by group C.....	184

List of Abbreviations

EarlExp	Early exposure to English
Fr	Frequent use of English
LateExp	Late exposure to English
LessFr	Less frequent use of English
L1	First language
L2	Second language
UHS	University of Puerto Rico Secondary School

Dedication

This work is dedicated to my children, Amelia, Roberto, and Ignacio (“*los guys*”); to my loving and ever supportive wife, Mariely; and to my parents, Yvonne and Roberto. Achieving this goal would not have been possible without you all. I hope that, by completing this long journey together, I have inspired you to strive for more and to achieve whatever we set our minds to.

Acknowledgements

The completion of this dissertation would not have been possible without the support, advice, and patience of my dissertation director, Dr. Yolanda Rivera. Thank you for believing in me, for your encouraging words, and for being an anchor when I thought I was adrift.

I must express my deepest gratitude to the other two members of my dissertation committee, Dr. Robert Dupey and Dr. Don Walicek. Your insightful, thorough, and rigorous recommendations and comments allowed me to examine my work from new and exciting perspectives, and inspired me to become a better researcher. Thank you for challenging me and for your commitment to get the best of out me. I am truly honored to have had two people that I respect and admire so much be part of my committee.

I am also indebted to my colleagues at UHS for their support, encouragement, and collaboration. Thank you, Dr. Mary Applegate, for your tireless efforts to help me recruit participants for this study, and Dr. James Seale, for your keen linguistic awareness and for always being on the lookout for cross-linguistic constructions I could adapt and include in my acceptability test.

Lastly, I am grateful to my family. Thank you for your unwavering support, for staying by me, for nurturing me, and for being an infinite source of love, laughter, and peace.

Abstract

This research project sought to explore the influence of English L2 on Spanish L1 in an environment where the L1 (Spanish) is the dominant language. Participants were recruited through voluntary response sampling at the University of Puerto Rico Secondary School (UHS). They completed a language survey on Google Forms that collected general information about their use and acquisition of English and Spanish and yielded data about the participants' age of exposure to Spanish and English, the frequency, and domains where they use them, and their self-reported proficiency level in each language. Based on the information obtained from the language survey, participants were subdivided into three groups:

Group A (18 participants): Early exposure to English, frequent use, rated themselves 4-5

Group B (10 participants): Late exposure, less frequent use, rated themselves 3-5

Group C (8 participants): Early exposure, less frequent use, rated themselves 3-4

After answering the language survey, participants completed an acceptability test on Google Forms that included fifteen items in Spanish that included cross-linguistic influence from English and five fillers without cross-linguistic influence from English. They were prompted to indicate whether a sentence was acceptable or not in Spanish and to rewrite the sentences that they had classified as unacceptable so that they were acceptable. The quantitative analysis consisted of tallying their acceptable and unacceptable answers in percentages to facilitate comparison among groups and test the hypotheses that guided this study.

Their answers on the acceptability test were analyzed considering MacWhinney's Competition Model (2002) and Paradis' Activation Threshold Hypothesis (1993, 2007). The qualitative analysis of the data consisted of examining the participants' explanations in the acceptability when they classified an item as unacceptable. This analysis provided an insight into

their metalinguistic skills and an overview of their tendencies to adhere to standard or prescriptive grammatical structures. After analyzing the data from the acceptability test from both a quantitative and a qualitative perspective, the results partially support the hypothesis that early exposure to and frequent use of English lead to higher percentages of acceptability in items with crosslinguistic influence. While no group consistently obtained the highest number of acceptable or unacceptable answers in all items with crosslinguistic influence, group C (EarlExpLessFr) showed a tendency to behave the way group B was expected to behave (i.e., higher number of unacceptable than acceptable answers).

Among the most significant contributions of this study are that it represents one of the few research undertakings that addresses the effect that the L2 has on the L1 in a context where L1 is the dominant language. It also discusses the role of communicative competence when judging items with crosslinguistic influence by suggesting that participants focused more on function and meaning than grammar and structure. Furthermore, its findings imply that metalinguistic awareness in the L1 is enhanced by early exposure to the L2 and that the nature of bidirectional influence can be beneficial regardless of the participants' level of bilingualism and competence in the L2.

Keywords: *language contact, cross-linguistic influence, attrition, bilingualism, simultaneous bilingualism, sequential bilingualism, age of exposure, frequency of use, entrenchment, metalinguistic awareness*

Biographical Information

Roberto E. Olmeda Rosario was born in Bayamón and raised in Vega Alta, Puerto Rico. He completed a bachelor's degree in Teaching of English to Spanish Speakers (TESS) and a master's degree in Translation, both from the University in Puerto Rico, Río Piedras Campus (UPRRP). He is currently a PhD candidate in Linguistics at the UPRRP.

At the professional level, he has taught ninth-grade English at the University of Puerto Rico Secondary School (UHS) for the past fourteen years and works as a cooperating teacher and student teacher supervisor at the College of Education at UPRRP. He has taught undergraduate courses at the University of Puerto Rico, Río Piedras Campus, and at the Universidad del Sagrado Corazón in Santurce.

His research interests include language variation, language contact, cross-linguistic influence, sociolinguistics, and bilingualism. He has presented his work at several conferences and symposia such as Caribe Plurilingüe Symposium, Islands in Between Conference, and PRATESOL Northern Chapter Conference.

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Justification

This dissertation explores the phenomenon of second language (L2) English influence on first language (L1) Spanish. Although relatively scarce, research in this area has explored L2 influence on L1 syntax, morphology, phonology, perception, and lexicon (Aveledo & Athanasopoulos, 2016; Azaz & Frank, 2017; Bylund & Jarvis, 2011; Chunpeng & Hee-Don, 2017; Fabiano-Smith & Goldstein, 2010; Flege et al., 2003; Harada, 2003; Hohenstein et al., 2006; Kupisch et al., 2018; Major, 2010; Meir et al., 2017; Montrul, 2005; Muñoz-Basols & Salazar, 2016; Parker, 2016; Pavlenko, 2000; Schmid, 2016; Stoechr et al., 2017). Additionally, the role of hypercorrection from a sociolinguistic standpoint in L2-L1 cross linguistic influence has also been explored (Eckman et al., 2013). The main shortcoming of the research on cross-linguistic influence of the L2 on the L1 is that it focuses entirely on environments in which the L1 is a minority language and thus usually or often vulnerable to influence and attrition. There is a marked tendency towards studying and describing the influence of the L2 on the L1 in environments where the L2 is the dominant language.

Most research on cross-linguistic influence, as will be discussed in the literature review in Chapter 3, focuses on migrants whose L1 has come under the influence of the dominant language in the host country. Such studies examine restructuring in the L1's phonology, semantics, and grammar as a result of the language user's exposure to and more frequent use of the L2. Interestingly, while research such as van Els' (1986) taxonomy¹ for first language attrition does contemplate the possibility of L1 loss in an L1-dominant environment, research studies on L1

¹ Van Els' taxonomy (1986) describes the different environments in which an L1 or an L2 may become lost or undergo attrition: L1 loss in L1 environment, L1 loss in L2 environment, L2 loss in L1 environment, and L2 loss in L2 environment.

attrition in this context are all but nonexistent. A possible explanation for such scarcity may stem from a generalized belief that it is unlikely for a dominant language (or L1) to undergo restructuring or attrition because of influence from a minority language (or L2). However, the present study suggests that studying the attrition of L1 Spanish that has occurred as a result of influence from L2 English in an environment where L1 Spanish is the dominant language can provide a clearer picture on how attrition unfolds in this seldom studied contact situation.

The motivation for this investigation stems from observations I have made while working as an English teacher at the University of Puerto Rico Secondary School (henceforth UHS) in San Juan, Puerto Rico for the past 14 years. UHS is a laboratory school whose student population is bilingual for the most part, albeit with various degrees of proficiency in the L1 (Spanish) and L2 (English).² These observations derive from the students' frequent use of English in domains outside of the English classroom (e.g., hallways, cafeteria, library, co-curricular activities, social media) and the apparent restructuring of Spanish L1 structures that have been influenced by the phonology, lexicon, and syntax of their L2 (English). Some examples of these observations are presented in Chapter 3 (Theoretical Framework). The terminology associated with language contact along with some instances of this phenomenon and the potential factors that assist in explaining it will be discussed in the following sections.

1.2 Language Contact and Change: A Few Definitions

Before discussing the L2-L1 cross-linguistic phenomena to be studied, it is imperative to present a brief overview of the nomenclature associated with the study of language contact.

Language contact inevitably results in bilingualism (Appel & Muysken, 1987) and often leads to cross-linguistic influence and transfer of structures from the L1 to the L2 and vice versa. The

² While a small percentage of UHS students list English as their L1, Spanish is the dominant L1 among the student population.

field of second language acquisition has closely studied the phenomenon of interference or influence of the first language (L1) on the second (L2). Lado's (1957, as cited by Saville-Troike, 2012) Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH) suggest that when a structure or sound is similar in both the L1 and the L2, positive transfer will take place. That is, similar structures or sounds will, in theory, be learned and mastered without major difficulties. On the other hand, when a structure or sound is markedly different in the L2, a case of negative transfer or interference may occur. This assumption is akin to Thomason's (2001b) claim that positive transfer is more likely to occur between languages that are typologically similar due to the unmarked nature of the structures that are borrowed. However, once language users learn the source language well, both marked and unmarked features can be borrowed easily (p. 76). Despite this, some borrowed structures may still be classified as instances of negative transfer, as is the case with some of the phenomena from Puerto Rican Spanish that will be discussed in Chapter 3.

The differences between L1 language borrowing and attrition must be clearly established before proceeding. According to Poplack and Meechan (1995, as cited by Thomason, 2001b), borrowing is the "adaptation of lexical material to the morphological and syntactic (and usually, phonological) rules of the recipient language" (p. 134). Thomason (2011b) defines it as a process whereby "fluent speakers of the receiving language adopt features from the source language" (p. 1), while Schmid and Kopke (2009) add that it "involves the use of L2 elements which are typically morphologically and phonologically integrated into the L1 system" (p. 209). While definitions of this phenomenon abound in the literature on language contact, the common denominator in definitions of borrowing is that it results in the adoption, addition, or integration of elements from the source language into the receiving language. That is, the receiving language's lexical and structural inventories are enriched as a result of borrowing.

The same cannot be argued when said lexical and structural features are incorporated into the receiving language to the detriment of preexisting structures in the L1, a process known as attrition. Schmid and Kopke (2009) define attrition as:

a change in the native language system of the bilingual who is acquiring and using a second language (L2). This change may lead to a variety of phenomena within the L1 system, among which are interferences from the L2 on all levels (phonetics, lexicon, morphosyntax, pragmatics), a simplification or impoverishment of the L1, or insecurity on the part of the speaker (p. 3).

As mentioned above, the most salient difference between borrowing and attrition is that the former is often considered an expansion of the L1 system while the latter represents shrinkage or impoverishment. In this research project, I argue that extended contact between English (L2) and Spanish (L1) in Puerto Rico has led to the gradual borrowing of L2 lexical and structural features into the L1. These structures have been adopted by bilingual speakers who are fluent in the L2 in a process of shift that has resulted in the attrition of L1 semantics, syntax, and phonology.

It is important to point out some of the insights found in Thomason's (2001b) and Winford's (2003) erudite work on language contact and contact-induced change. In her typology of language contact, Thomason (2001b) mentions some of the social and linguistic factors that shape and reflect language change. Among the social factors are intensity of contact, presence versus absence of imperfect learning, and language users' attitudes. Of particular importance to this study is her discussion of intensity of contact and speaker's attitudes. While Thomason acknowledges that intensity of contact is hard to define, she states that "the duration of the contact period is important" (p. 66) when studying language change phenomena. According to

Winford (2013), intensity of contact “relate[s] to matters such as the demographics of the groups in contact, their socio-political relationships, their patterns of interaction.” I argue that, in the context where this study takes place (a secondary school in the metropolitan area in Puerto Rico), the pervasive nature of English, a co-official language with Spanish, in daily interactions, social media, advertisements, and popular culture all contribute to the intensity of contact.

Contact between Puerto Rican Spanish and American English can be traced back to the late nineteenth century at the onset of Puerto Rico’s incorporation as a colony of the United States of America, and the constant attempts that have been made since then to establish English as either the official language or a co-official language alongside Spanish. Both of these factors have led English to be taught in Puerto Rico’s education system. Although this centenary contact with English has not resulted in widespread balanced Spanish-English bilingualism on the Puerto Rican archipelago (Pousada, 2000), it has nevertheless shaped an environment in which features from English, the source language, have gradually made their way into Puerto Rican Spanish, the receiving language and the L1 of most residents of the Commonwealth. Such changes, according to Thomason (2001b), can only be introduced and initiated by Spanish-English bilinguals who speak English fluently and have control of the source language’s structure (p. 68). In other words, Spanish monolinguals, and passive bilinguals³ are, in theory, unable to be the initiators of language change and language variation in this context.⁴

Another variable of language change discussed by Thomason (2001b) and Winford (2003, 2013) is that of language users’ attitudes towards language contact. Deemed a “wild card”

³ Chin and Wigglesworth (2007) define passive bilinguals as bilinguals who are gradually losing competence in one language, usually because of disuse. They can read and understand second language input but have problems speaking or writing.

⁴ Language variation refers to the different ways that a particular language is used in different regions, groups, and social contexts. Such differences may be linguistically insignificant but socially significant (Chambers, 2002).

by Thomason (2001b, p. 61), speaker attitudes are said to be unpredictable and to frequently violate predictions about contact-induced change. While this claim about unpredictability may be compelling, Winford (2003) posits that the motivations that promote the adoption of L2 features in the L1 include “social and economic advantages that follow from such borrowing, among them social advancement, employment, educational opportunities, etc.” (p. 39). Thus, although the type of change that may occur cannot be predicted, the causes behind contact-induced change could be explained from a sociolinguistic perspective, among other approaches. For instance, Bucholtz and Hall (2008) suggest that research on crosslinguistic influence should not merely focus on the linguistic items that are being either borrowed or adapted from English, but at their social meaning-making and indexical value. In other words, users of Puerto Rican Spanish are not simply borrowing or hispanicizing English lexical items, but are constructing identity and membership in the process.

Thomason and Kaufman’s (1988) borrowing scale (as cited by Winford, 2003) may also shed some light upon the variables that may facilitate and trigger cross-linguistic phenomena. The scale, which includes five stages that range from “casual contact” to “very strong cultural pressure,” is an attempt to predict the circumstances under which language change may occur.

Table 1.1: Thomason and Kauffman’s (1988) Borrowing Scale

Stage	Features
1 Casual Contact	Lexical borrowing only
2 Slightly more intense contact	Slight structural borrowing; conjunctions and adverbial particles

3 More intense contact	Slightly more structural borrowing; adpositions, derivational suffixes
4 Strong cultural pressure	Moderate structural borrowing (major structural features that cause relatively little typological change)
5 Very strong cultural pressure	Heavy structural borrowing (major structural features that cause significant typological disruption)

This scale posits that language typology plays a crucial role in contact-induced change. That is, languages that are typologically distant will only exhibit cross-linguistic influence and borrowing under very strong cultural pressure, while languages that are typologically similar may do so even when contact is casual. In the context of Puerto Rico, cultural pressure is characterized by the ever pervasive and influential manifestation of U.S. culture via social media, consumer products, and popular culture, among other factors. It can thus be surmised that many Puerto Rican consumers of music, video games, memes, social media posts, and movies in English are likely to use English when they engage in conversations and discussions that concern U.S. culture. The present study will argue that some speech communities in Puerto Rico in the twenty-first century, mostly in the metropolitan area, are an example of stage 3 in the borrowing scale in which "more intense contact" along with "more bilinguals, attitudes and other social factors" (Thomason, 2001b, p. 70) have favored borrowing and cross-linguistic influence.

Several of the mechanisms behind contact-induced language change are discussed in detail by Thomason (2001b). She describes seven mechanisms in total: code-switching, code

alternation, passive familiarity, ‘negotiation,’ second-language acquisition strategies, bilingual first-language acquisition, and change by deliberate decision. Thomason differentiates between code-switching and code alternation by defining the former as “the use of material from two (or more) languages by a *single speaker in the same conversation*” (p. 132, emphasis added); and the latter as “the use of two (or more) languages by the same speaker” but in a situation in which each code is used by the bilingual speaker in “completely different . . . environments” (p. 136). Because Spanish monolingualism is by far more common in Puerto Rico than bilingualism (U.S. Census, 2016), it can be posited that, since code-switching demands that both interlocutor and receiver have knowledge of both codes, code alternation is the norm among bilingual speakers in Puerto Rico who choose Spanish for monolingual interlocutors and English for bilingual or English-dominant speakers.

The frequency with which code alternation occurs will depend on the number of monolingual vis-à-vis bilingual or English dominant people that the bilingual speaker interacts with on a daily basis. Winford (2003) presents a brief typology of contact settings among which he includes “the demographics of the groups involved, including numerical ratios, power and prestige relationships” and “the frequency and type of social interaction among the groups” (p. 90). Using this typology as a point of departure, it can be argued that if an English-dominant bilingual is in constant contact with other English-dominant speakers, the more frequently used code will be English, with Spanish being used exclusively with monolingual speakers and in institutional spaces where Spanish is dominant language such as schools, churches, and courtrooms, among others. If this hypothetical English-dominant language user were to have more interactions in English and fewer in Spanish, then, as anecdotal experience suggests, L2 English may end up becoming the source language of structural change with L1 Spanish

undergoing lexical and structural attrition. A discussion of interference phenomena in Puerto Rico is presented in Chapter 3.

1.3 Hypotheses

Keeping in mind the context of Puerto Rico, two hypotheses have been formulated based on the discussion included in the sections above:

1. Early (simultaneous) Spanish-English bilinguals who use English more frequently, and in more domains than Spanish, are the initiators of English L2 influence on L1 Spanish and are prone to judge instances of cross-linguistic influence as acceptable.
2. Early exposure to English and frequent use of L2 English in most domains might lead to restructuring of L1 Spanish lexicon and syntax.

Simultaneous bilinguals who have been exposed to two or more languages since early childhood and who use English more than Spanish are more likely to exhibit English-Spanish cross-linguistic phenomena in their output.⁵ This is due to their early exposure to English and the frequency with which they use it. As a result, they are prone to classify syntactic and lexical calques from English as acceptable in Spanish.

1.4 Research Questions

This work will respond to the following research questions concerning the causes and nature of the influence of English on Puerto Rican Spanish:

1. Is L2 influence on the L1 among Spanish-English bilinguals in Puerto Rico caused by early exposure to the L2 and/or by a particular affinity or preference for the L2 later in life?
2. Are the changes in the L1 systematic and thus representative of attrition due to influence from the L2? Or, instead, are these changes merely the product of borrowing?

⁵ Simultaneous bilinguals are bilinguals who have been exposed to two or more languages since early childhood and end up acquiring two or more native languages (Saville-Troike, 2012).

3. Do L1 users of Spanish resort to English L2 structures because they consider that they are acceptable in Spanish or is it perhaps that the Spanish equivalents are not readily available in their linguistic inventory in their L1 and thus they resort to a literal translation?

The three research questions posited in this study address important issues concerning language contact and cross-linguistic phenomena, and the responses to them that are presented in Chapter 7 (Section 7.3) will be based on data-driven explanations.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

Research on cross-linguistic or bidirectional influence and L1 attrition is relatively scarce. It was not until the late twentieth century that the first formal studies in this area were published (Schmid, 2016). The phenomenon of L1 attrition as the result of L2 influence remains considerably understudied, as is acknowledged by several researchers (Chunpeng & Hee-Don, 2017; Cook, 2003; Hohenstein et al., 2006; Pavlenko, 2000; Schmid, 2016) in the subfield of language acquisition. Recent efforts to explore L1 attrition in bilingual environments have looked closely at the influence of the L2 on the phonology, morphology, syntax, and lexicon of the L1.

2.2 Phonology

In a valuable contribution to the study of cross-linguistic L2-L1 influence, Pavlenko (2000) proposes five transfer phenomena: borrowing transfer, convergence, shift, restructuring, and attrition (p. 179). Relevant to the present study is the author's identification of several extralinguistic factors that appear to be important in the analysis of L2 influence on L1 phonology: age at which L2 acquisition began; degree of L2 fluency, in particular in casual speech; the amount of past and present intensive exposure to the speech of native L2 speakers; language prestige, whereby values may shift toward the more prestigious L2; cultural identification, whereby one's values shift toward the language one identifies with; and phonetic mimicry ability (p. 182). These extralinguistic variables must be taken into consideration at the time of conducting the present study, particularly in view of the fact that age of exposure and frequency of use seem to play a significant role in the linguistic choices of Spanish-English bilinguals in Puerto Rico.

Flege et al. (2003) also discuss important variables in the acquisition of L2 phonology, such as quantity and quality of input, as well as age of arrival (AoA) in the L2 environment. Flege's Speech Learning Model (SLM), a hypothesis that posits that "the phonic elements making up the L1 and L2 phonetic sub-systems of a bilingual exist in a 'common phonological space,' and so will necessarily influence one another" (p. 469), is also invoked to explain the instances of interaction that will occur in the two phonological inventories of bilinguals. The specific aim of Flege's study, which focuses on native speakers of Italian learning English, is to test the hypothesis that the vowels that bilinguals produce in the L2 may differ from vowels produced by monolingual native speakers of the L2. Their study concludes that AoA and length of exposure to the L2 are determining factors in the "native-like" production of certain vowels. That is, the earlier the subject had arrived in the L2 environment, the more likely they were to produce vowels deemed "native-like" by L2 monolingual listeners. Although AoA as a variable is immaterial to the present study, Flege et al.'s SLM hypothesis and their observations regarding quality and quantity of input offer compelling insights that can inform the formulation of hypotheses about L1 attrition under the influence of the L2. For instance, SLM suggests that failure to establish an "L2 speech sound despite audible differences between it and the closest L1 speech sound" (p. 469) could result in a "merged" category that "subsumes the phonetic properties of the perceptually linked L1 and L2 speech sounds" (p. 469).

Flege's research on phonological cross-linguistic influence can be applied to the contact situation between English and Spanish in Puerto Rico. Although English and Spanish belong to different language families, Germanic and Romance respectively, their phonetic inventories share similar vowel and consonant sounds. For instance, voiceless stops /t/, /p/, and /k/ produce similar sounds in both languages in certain environments when they are not aspirated. The same

is true for voiced stops /b/, /d/, and /g/, sibilants /s/ and /ch/, clear /l/, nasals /m/ and /n/, and fricative /f/. On the other hand, while English and Spanish have markedly different vowel systems and inventories, the pronunciation of some English monophthongs and tense vowels is close to the pronunciation of pure vowels in Spanish. For example, the vowel sound in *heat*, represented as /i:/, is similar to Spanish /i/ in *giro* just as English *met*, represented as /ε/, is similar to Spanish /e/ in *el*. Despite this partial phonetic overlap, the vowel systems of English and Spanish exhibit salient differences in terms of length (English differentiates between tense and lax) and number (Spanish has five vowel sounds whereas General American English has ten phonemic vowels). While it is possible that phonetic overlap may occasionally be noticeable in the surface representations of English and Spanish bilinguals, the systematic use of a phoneme or allophone that is exclusive to the L2 in the L1 is a manifestation of the influence of the L2 on the L1.

The first example of the latter tendency to be mentioned is the inclusion of English aspirated /t/, represented as [t^h], in Spanish utterances. The aspirated allophone of the voiceless stop /t/, which occurs in syllable-initial environments, is absent in Spanish in all environments. Yet, it is not uncommon to hear Spanish-English bilinguals in Puerto Rico reproducing English aspiration of /t/ in Spanish at the onset syllables in which a prevocalic /t/ appears. As a result, the word *tiempo* would be pronounced as [t^hiempo] and *esto* as [est^ho]. Whether this phonemic choice responds to an idiosyncratic deviation from Spanish phonology or to the direct influence of L2 English cannot be ascertained from mere casual observation.

A second example concerns the use of English approximant /ɹ/ in Spanish. The possible surface representations that a user of Puerto Rican Spanish may produce when pronouncing /r/ are represented by the archiphoneme /R/. Among the possible allophones are the trill /r/ that

occurs intervocalically (V__V) and word-initially (#___), the flap that is produced intervocalically in words such as *para* and *cara*, and the lateralization of /r/ that takes place in coda position in words such as *comer*, *soprote*, and *puerto*. Moreover, anecdotal experience indicates that an additional sound has been added to the list of these allophonic possibilities in Spanish: approximant /ɹ/. In English, approximant /ɹ/ occurs at the syllable onset in words such as *ride* and *parameter*, in intervocalic position in words such as *chorus* and *plural*, and in coda position in words such as *far* and *torment*. Curiously, this sound, which is not part of the consonant inventory of Spanish, has become pervasive in particular environments in the phonology of Puerto Rico Spanish. For instance, /ɹ/ can be heard in postvocalic and coda position in words such as *arte*, *pedir*, and *cortar* but not in prevocalic and onset position in words such as *roca*, *caro*, and *trato*. It is necessary to mention that /ɹ/ does not occur in the same environments in English and Spanish. That is, while it is produced in postvocalic position in both languages, /ɹ/ never appears word-initially, in syllable onset, or in intervocalic position in Spanish.

2.3 Syntax and Morphology

Vivian Cook, Emeritus Professor of Applied Linguistics at Newcastle University in the United Kingdom, is the editor of *Effects of the Second Language on the First* (2003), a book which is devoted entirely to the effects of the second language on the first. In the first chapter, Cook describes multicompetence, a concept that suggests that bilinguals possess two languages that coexist in one mind and merge into a “language super-system” (p. 1) instead of the two isolated systems that linguists and others commonly described. From this perspective, the bidirectional influence between languages becomes much clearer, as it posits that a bilingual’s languages are not necessarily independent or separate and instead interact and influence one

another. Although it is typically accepted that influence will most likely occur from the L1 to the L2, the state-of-the-art research cited here attests to the possibility of influence occurring in the opposite direction. In addition, Cook vehemently critiques Selinker's notion of interlanguage on the grounds that it measures an L2 learner's performance based on a native-speaker's competence and performance in the target language. Interestingly, Cook argues that the L1 may be enhanced by the L2, a view that is not commonly supported in the field of second language acquisition and which is not the focus of his book.

Hohenstein et al. (2006) present an overview of research on language interference of the L1 on the L2 and the L2 on the L1. They discuss previous studies that provide evidence for MacWhinney's (1987, 2001) Competition Model, which claims that "learners rely (especially initially) on transfer of knowledge through a set of cues from L1 to help them function in L2" (p. 249), and the theory of Structural Ambiguity, which holds that "in simultaneous bilinguals, the direction of transfer for any given structure should be from the language that is least ambiguous to that which is more ambiguous in input for that structure" (p. 250). The aim of their study is to compare early vs. late learners of English (all are Spanish L1) and analyze the motion event descriptions for both lexical word choice and grammatical constructions. In the same vein as other studies of L2 influence on the L1 (Pavlenko, 2002; Avelado and Athanasopoulos, 2016; Meir et al., 2017), their investigation emphasizes age of exposure to the L2 (early versus late bilinguals) as an important variable when assessing the influence of the L2 on the L1. They conclude that, lexically, bilinguals used more manner verbs in English and path verbs⁶ in Spanish, and that, when these results were further examined for influences of age of L2

⁶ Typologically, Spanish encodes path (i.e., the direction the movement follows) in the verbs (e.g., *entrar*, *salir*, *subir*) whereas English encodes manner (i.e. the specific way in which the motion happens) in the verbs (e.g. run, walk, crawl).

acquisition, an L2 to L1 effect was found. Furthermore, and consonant with what the present study explores, the authors invoke sociolinguistic factors to explain the varying degrees of cross-linguistic influence in their data. For instance, the paper mentions that “language dominance of the culture – in addition to that of the individual – may play a role in cross-language transfer” and cites Gutiérrez and Silva-Corvalán’s (1993) work, which suggests that “Spanish L1 is becoming simplified as a result of contact with English in the American context” (p. 259). While the dominant culture on the island is that of Puerto Ricans and the dominant language is Puerto Rican Spanish, the influence of U.S. popular culture and its majority language, English, is quite salient and evident.

It is fundamental to note that cross-linguistic influence and attrition does not necessarily result in language loss. Anderson (2004) defines and establishes the differences between language loss and language attrition. Her focus is to describe Spanish-speaking children’s performance in the L1 as they begin to acquire English as their second language (L2). In harmony with other studies on L2-L1 influence, Anderson observes that when languages are in contact and the L2 becomes the dominant language, it is the lexicon that is most vulnerable to attrition. In addition to discussing some of the factors and environments that may cause L1 attrition or loss, the author describes a few techniques that may be employed to assess what has been lost or subject to attrition in the subject’s L1. Anderson emphasizes that such assessment models must not rely only on a comparison of performance with an ideal Spanish norm but should instead be “based on an intimate knowledge of a child’s linguistic community, be it one family or a large group of families and individuals” (p. 206).

In another study, Wei (2014) discusses the extent to which language attrition may affect the lexicon, syntax, and morphology to varying degrees. She discusses van Els taxonomy (1986)

of language attrition, which is an attempt to describe the different environments in which an L1 or L2 may be lost or subject to attrition (L1 loss in L1 environment, L1 in L2 environment, L2 in L1 environment, and L2 in L2 environment). Furthermore, the author emphasizes that production (i.e., speaking and writing) is more vulnerable to attrition than reception/comprehension (i.e., reading and listening). In her paper, which cites examples of Chinese ESL learners, she argues that the lexicon is more vulnerable to attrition than morphology and syntax.

On the other hand, Stoehr et al. (2017) argue that immersion in an L2 environment may result in the deterioration of L1 abilities. Invoking Flege et al.'s Speech Learning Model (SLM), the authors suggest that an adult's L1 "phonetic spaces" are flexible and therefore vulnerable to change and attrition because of cross-linguistic influence from the L2. An interesting issue that the paper addresses is that the common practice of using monolinguals as points of reference when assessing attrition in bilinguals is problematic, as it assumes the Chomskyan view of the ideal speaker-hearer. A useful observation that the authors make is that, when exploring the effects of the L2 on the L1, bilingual subjects must be compared with other bilingual subjects under the same circumstances in order to obtain reliable results. That is, variables that concern length and age of exposure, quality and quantity of input, among others, must be taken into account when describing phenomena that pertain to cross-linguistic influence and L1 attrition.

Meir et al. (2017) investigate cross-linguistic influence of L1 on L2 and L2 on L1 in bilingual Russian-Hebrew children. The context of their study involves children who were born and raised in Israel and acquired L1-Russian as a heritage language and Hebrew as a majority language during their childhood. Like most of the papers included in this literature review, the authors begin by acknowledging that cross-linguistic influence among bilinguals is bidirectional, the L1 influences the L2 and the L2 influences the L1. In addition to instances of bidirectional

influence, the study addresses the role that L2 age of onset (AoO) plays in cross-linguistic influence. It hypothesizes that earlier AoO is associated with better performance in L2. The study presents consistent evidence for bidirectional and cross-linguistic influence and concludes that bilingual children show significantly lower performance on aspect marking and case inflections. Concerning AoO, the authors observed that children with late AoO (after 48 months) have significantly more errors than children in the bilingual groups with earlier AoO (before 24 months and 24-48 months). This paper is particularly relevant to the present study. Not only does it conclude that the bidirectionality of influence is operative, but it also considers AoO as a determining variable when assessing cross-linguistic phenomena.

2.4 Sociolinguistic Factors

Eckman et al. (2013) investigate whether hypercorrection influences the acquisition of L2 phonemic contrasts. The authors define hypercorrection in light of Labov's (1972) sociolinguistic studies as "[t]he rendition of a form by a speaker of a less prestigious variety in an attempt to have it match a more prestigious pattern, but which in the process overshoots the mark and thereby results in an 'incorrect' form, is thus an instance of hypercorrection" (p. 258). The authors propose that hypercorrection constitutes a near-final, if not the final, stage of acquisition in certain well-defined cases and identify the kinds of interlanguage (IL) changes that characterize a learner's progress in the acquisition of novel phonemic contrasts. The study concludes that "the production of hypercorrection errors may be the final stage in the acquisition of a TL phonemic contrast, and that the occurrence of such errors is based on the strength of the connection between the TL contrast being acquired and the learner's NL phonology" (p. 279). Because the present study considers the influence of English L2 on Puerto Rican Spanish L1, the

role that language prestige may have in the interplay between English and Spanish in our linguistic environment will be taken into consideration.

Blommaert (2012) addresses the need to redefine the concept of English as a fixed and geographically-determined concept. He claims that the need for this reconceptualization responds to globalization and the multilingual nature of the environments in which English is used around the world. Resultantly, sociolinguistic studies in the ethnographic tradition do not treat language as the focal object but rather emphasize and examine the actual specific resources that people use in communication. The author thus claims that “[s]tatic, absolute, decontextualized and a-temporal images of “language” will not work, for what may appear as English in certain parts of the world could, after ethnographic inspection, in actual fact prove to be a form of another language that *looks like* English (p. 6, emphasis in the original).

In section 3.1, Blommaert makes reference to the phenomenon of “styling” (as discussed by Rampton, 1994) which refers to how “(young) people appropriate and deploy linguistic resources consciously in highly marked forms of identity-work” (p. 7). He proceeds to cite several neo-Hymesian works, ethnographic in nature, that address “styling” and the interactional contexts in which it takes place. These studies have concluded that people use bits of language without knowing it in the structural sense in order to weave a particular identity, construct agency, and create social meaning. In the context of Puerto Rico, an island where Spanish is the dominant language, English “styling” is arguably invoked with this purpose regardless of the language user’s proficiency in L2 English.

Bucholtz and Hall (2008) propose research methods that promote the coalescence of different fields of scientific inquiry in linguistics such as anthropology, sociolinguistics, and linguistic anthropology. After overviewing seminal works by Hymes, Gumperz, and Labov (pp.

402-403), the authors present several examples of research approaches and avenues that are headed in the direction of the “new coalitions” that they propose.

Among these innovative methods are variation studies that consider written texts, a medium that had previously been the domain of critical discourse, as important data sources for the study of linguistic representation. When studied as “situated activity systems,” these sources serve to explore the extent to which language is employed to coordinate “social action” and is endowed with “cultural and political meaning” (p. 406). Furthermore, the authors discuss that, while lexicon had once been unfashionable in variationist research due to its low systematicity, there is a marked and emerging tendency towards giving renewed attention to these linguistic forms. They cite studies by Eckert (2000), Blommaert (1999), and Woolard (1998) as examples of this trend. The notions of style and stylization (See Blommaert, 2012, above) as well as phenomena such as language contact, code-switching, and multilingualism can be better described and nuanced when lexicon is studied as a factor in variationist research.

Eckert (2012) presents an overview of the origins of the study of variation within sociolinguistics and divides the treatment of social meaning in sociolinguistic variation into three waves. The first wave is preceded by Labov’s (1963) Martha’s Vineyard ethnographic study in which he concluded that the pronunciation of the diphthong /ay/ was being employed by the local fishing community to mark themselves as Vineyarders and resist the mainland-controlled tourist industry.

Within Eckert’s tripartite progression of the study of variation, the first wave begins with Labov’s (1966) study titled *Social Stratification of English in New York City*. Labov’s research introduced “a new quantitative empiricism into linguistics” (p. 88) which would be later replicated in similar sociolinguistic studies in North America and Great Britain. Labov’s notion

of the vernacular (i.e. a speaker's first acquired and hence more systematic and automatic linguistic production) was central to these first studies in variation. What characterized the first wave was a perspective on meaning that was based in a socioeconomic hierarchy in which certain variables (or variants) were "taken to mark socioeconomic status" (p. 90). As a result, while the methods employed in this first wave did yield several advantages such as coverage and replicability, they depended on the use of predetermined social categories and did not entail "knowledge of the speakers themselves and their communities" (p. 90).

The second wave, contrary to the centrality of the vernacular and self-monitoring that characterized the first one, sought to explore the role of social agency as the catalyst for variation. Milroy (1980, as cited by Eckert, 2012) attempted to reverse this view by exploring the positive forces in the vernacular usage of Belfast's working class and correlated individual's network types with their use of vernacular variables (p. 91). In the same light, Rickford's (1986, , as cited by Eckert, 2012) work on a sugar plantation in Guyana emphasized that "although the vernacular may be stigmatized on a global level, its association with local values and practices gives it value on the local level" (p. 91). Eckert's (2000, , as cited by Eckert, 2012) ethnographic study on the linguistic variability between Detroit's jocks and burnouts revealed that patterns of variation, and thus of agency, are not set in childhood but continue to develop with social identity. Her findings suggest that the data yielded by studies in the second wave do not index categories, but characteristics within each group. In spite of the innovations within this second wave, particularly on its treatment of agency and its reliance on ethnographic studies, it still focused on "static categories of speakers and equated identity with category affiliation" (p. 93).

The third wave views the meaning of variation as an essential feature of language and as the way through which speakers "place themselves in the social landscape through stylistic

practice” (p. 94). This variability is thus not seen as an accidental event, but rather as an ongoing and continuous process of assigning diverse meanings to linguistic features. As an example, Eckert cites two studies by Zhang (2005, 2008) that examine the indexical appropriation of individual Mandarin variables by the wealthy elite in Beijing (yuppies). These variables are employed by speakers to index their status as cosmopolites and distance themselves from state managers who are therefore constructed as local and less sophisticated. Other studies cited by Eckert (e.g. Kiesling, 1998; Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; and Johnstone, 2009) seem to align with third-wave views on style, indexicality and enregisterment in that speakers employ certain linguistic variables to distinguish themselves from the rest. As such, the main contribution that third-wave studies contributed to linguistic variation was that of placing speakers “not as passive and stable carriers of dialect, but as stylistic agents. Tailoring linguistic styles in ongoing and lifelong projects of self-construction and differentiation” (pp. 97-98).

From the literature cited here, it is evident that there is a marked tendency towards studying and describing the influence of the L2 on the L1 in environments where the L2 is the dominant language. The present study thus suggests that analyzing the attrition of L1 Spanish that has occurred as a result of influence from L2 English in an environment in which L1 Spanish is the dominant language can provide insights that contribute to knowledge about the ways in which the L1 is restructured under the influence of the L2.

Chapter 3: Theoretical Framework

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents an overview of the cross-linguistic phenomena that was explored in this study followed by the theoretical framework employed when interpreting the data. The results that were obtained, along with the analysis to be conducted based on the theories introduced in this chapter, will serve to test the hypotheses, and answer the research questions that were introduced in Chapter 1.

3.2 Examples of Cross-linguistic Phenomena

From observations that I have made during more than a decade of teaching English as a second language at UHS, it is clear that Spanish-English bilinguals employ L1 vocabulary that is either altered or significantly influenced by the L2. The following examples of spoken language have been gathered in my classrooms and other parts of the school. These are not anomalies; instead, each has emerged with relative frequency in casual conversations that I have overheard or participated in directly:

- a. *Realicé que no era cierto.*
- b. *Aceptaron mi papel para la conferencia.*
- c. *Coge una silla.*
- d. *He atendido varias actividades de servicio comunitario.*
- e. *¿Puedo mirar por mi lonchera?*

Examples *a* and *b* are similar in that they both illustrate instances of negative transfer in the form of false cognates. In Spanish, the verb *realizar* means to “efectuar, llevar a cabo algo o ejecutar una acción” (to carry out something or perform an action). In the context in which it is employed above, the verb *realizar* is used to mean “to be fully aware of.” The verbs *realizar* and

realize, while similar in form, have different meanings in English and Spanish with no semantic overlap whatsoever. Spanish has no single-word verb that conveys the same idea that the verb *to realize* expresses in English. Instead, Spanish speakers must resort to the circumlocution *darse cuenta de* to express the same idea. Whether the speaker ignores this semantic dissimilarity or opts to use *realizar* instead of *darse cuenta de* for the sake of succinctness and economy, or as the result of an uncoerced stylistic choice is not clear. The former aligns with the argument for L1 attrition posited here.

Example *b* is similar to *a* in the sense that *paper* and *papel* are false cognates in this particular context but share identical meanings in others. What the speaker intended to communicate in this utterance is that their *artículo*, *ensayo*, or *monografía* (three concepts that converge in the noun *paper* in English) has been accepted by the conference organizers. This utterance would probably not be understood or deemed nonsensical by a monolingual speaker of Spanish with little to no knowledge of English. In the same vein as example *a* above, I posit that the use of *papel* may respond to an attrited L1 lexical inventory as a result of cross-linguistic influence.

Example *c* represents a different case. *Grab a chair* or *grab a seat* is an imperative idiomatic expression used colloquially in English to tell someone to find a space, a chair in most cases, to settle or sit down. In Spanish, the equivalent phrase is *tomar asiento* (*sentarse*) in which *tomar* means to take or grab in a figurative sense, seeing as the addressee is not being asked to literally “take or seize by or as if by a sudden motion or grasp” (Merriam Webster, n.d.). The speaker of *c* is reinterpreting the meaning of *grab* quite literally in Spanish and thus translates English *grab* as *coger* instead of *tomar*. It would be interesting to explore whether this usage represents an isolated phenomenon or a systematic usage of *coger* for the figurative use of the

verb *to grab* across other idiomatic expressions such as “grab life by the horns,” “grab a bite to eat,” and “grab (someone’s) attention.”

Example *d* is quite peculiar in the sense that, as opposed to example *a*, it is evident that the speaker knows that English *assist* and Spanish *asistir* are false cognates in this context. Consequently, and in order to avoid what is a common substitution for L1 speakers of Spanish learning L2 English, they keep from what would be the correct usage of *asistir*, which is to “*estar o hallarse presente*” (Real Academia Española, n.d.). What is unusual about this example is that the speaker, whose native language is Spanish, either ignores that Spanish *atender* is incorrectly used in this example or believes that they must be cautious when using *atender* and *asistir* in Spanish because, if *assist* is incorrect in English in this context, then this may also be the case for Spanish.

Three conclusions may be drawn from this example. The first is that the speaker’s metalinguistic awareness, or their ability to manipulate and reflect upon language structures based on the context it is being used, is quite evident from their decision to transfer knowledge of semantic false cognates in the L2 into their L1. That is, the speaker uses knowledge about the meaning of *asistir/assist* to conclude that because *assist* is inadequate in English to refer to one’s physical presence in a particular place or space, then it may be true that *asistir* could be equally inadequate in the L1 and thus resorts to *atender*. The second is that it is plausible to argue that the speaker has resorted to hypercorrection as a result of this metalinguistic process. In other words, the L2 verb *to attend* is employed in the L1 as *atender* because the speaker is concerned that *asistir* may be incorrect in the L1 just as it is in the L2. As a result, the speaker overextends the use of L2 *attend* to L1 *atender*. The third is that, be it the product of metalinguistic awareness, hypercorrection, or other sociolinguistic factors, the use of *atender* in example b may

be caused by the influence of L2 English on L1 Spanish. Even then, it is possible that this language user simply overheard others use *atender* in a context that calls for *asistir* and incorporated it into their L1.

The last example (*e*) was uttered on one occasion by a tenth-grader who, upon inquiring in English if they could look for their lunchbox in my classroom, quickly switched to Spanish and formulated the same question in that language. The result was a literal (i.e., word by word) translation of the phrasal verb *look for* as *mirar por*. Although similar to example *a* in that an English verb has been translated literally to Spanish while disregarding semantic differences, sentence *e* is different because it resorts to a phrase (*mirar por*) in a context in which a single word (*buscar*) would have sufficed. While one could argue that the speaker in *a* aimed for succinctness and economy, such an argument cannot be maintained for the speaker in *e*. A few questions emerge from this example: Does the speaker in *e* resort to the circumlocution *mirar por* because they believe that it is correct in Spanish? Or is it perhaps that *buscar* is not readily available in their linguistic inventory in Spanish and thus they hastily resort to a literal translation (i.e., *mirar por*)? Moreover, a thorough analysis of these phenomena must also explore whether these instances of L2 influence on the L1 are systematic and thus representative of the speaker's Spanish competence or only represent isolated performance variables.

The acceptability test included in this study, which will be detailed in Chapters 4 and 5, includes several examples of syntactic cross-linguistic influence. For instance, the following items, which were adapted from utterances that were written by students from UHS, include instances of stranded prepositions in Spanish. This phenomenon, which is quite common in English, is rarely seen or heard in Spanish and is likely to be considered ungrammatical.

- a. Los colonizadores traían enfermedades que los nativos todavía no habían sido *expuestos* *a*.
- b. El muchacho ya no sabía quién *confiar en*.
- c. Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que lograron *apoderarse de*.

Interestingly, the constructions in *a* and *c* were more widely accepted compared to *b*. An analysis of the results, as well as possible explanations for this phenomenon, is presented in Chapter 5.

3.3 Theoretical Framework

MacWhinney's Competition Model (2002) seeks to “quantify the ways in which distributional properties of the input control language learning and processing” and predicts that linguistic stimuli (cues) that are highest in reliability and availability, and thus more frequently processed, are the ones that control comprehension and production of a language. MacWhinney's theory posits that Spanish and English bilingual learners will have two or more competing structures whenever they are required to either comprehend or produce an utterance in either one of their languages. It can further be theorized that if a speaker uses English L2 more frequently and in most domains, then the structures from the L2 will be more readily available for retrieval and thus prevail in favor of a more native-like structure in the L1. The result of these competing structures is that the L2 will emerge as the dominant language when producing (writing and speaking) structures in the L1. According to Langacker (2016) and Bybee (2013), frequency of use yield entrenchment, a phenomenon whereby more frequently used structures become fixed in the language user's linguistic inventory and are thus retrieved with less effort.

Paradis' (1993, 2007) Activation Threshold Hypothesis (as cited by Köpke, 2002) also states that structures from the language that is used less frequently (or less recently) will result in a higher activation threshold and thus be more difficult to retrieve. In other words, structures

with high activation threshold levels require more neural impulses to be retrieved. The opposite is true for the language that is used more frequently (i.e., its structures will be more readily available to the speaker due to lower activation levels and less neural impulses to be activated). The more a structure is used, the lower the activation levels become (Mehotcheva, 2010). According to this theory, Spanish and English bilingual learners will have two or more competing structures whenever they are required to either comprehend or produce an utterance in either one of their languages.

The models proposed by MacWhinney and Paradis, which were chosen because they have been effectively employed in studies about bilingualism and cross-linguistic influence (Chin & Wigglesworth, 2007; Köpke, 2002 and 2004; Köpke & Genevskaja-Hanke, 2018; Mehotcheva, 2010; Muñoz-Basols & Salazar, 2016) will be invoked to explain and comment on the causes for the cross-linguistic phenomena discussed above. The acceptability test was constructed in a way that facilitated the analysis of the data and the consideration of ideas important to both of these two theories.

Chapter 4: Methodology

4.1 Participants

Participants for this study were recruited through voluntary response sampling at UHS where the principal investigator teaches ninth-grade English. Responses from a total of 36 students from grades seventh through twelfth, whose ages range from twelve to eighteen years old, make up the sample. In the investigator's experience, the student population at UHS includes a high percentage of individuals who are bilingual in English and Spanish, albeit with different degrees of proficiency in either or both languages. The vast majority of students are bilingual, be it balanced, dominant or passive, and use both English and Spanish to varying degrees on a daily basis.⁷

Because all participants are minors, their parent or guardian was asked to read and sign a consent form in which the student's participation was described in detail along with possible risks and benefits. Once the parent or guardian had read and signed the consent form, participants were asked to read the document as well and provide their consent for participation in the investigation (see Appendix 2).

4.2 Data Collection

Data was gathered from two documents on Google Forms. First, participants completed a questionnaire (see Appendix 3) that collected general information about their use and acquisition of English and Spanish. The answers obtained from the questionnaire yielded data about the participants' age of exposure to Spanish and English, the frequency with which both languages

⁷ Balanced bilinguals are fully competent in two languages. They are thought to have perfect control of both languages in all settings. There are only tiny traces of transfer from the first language in the second language. Dominant bilinguals are dominant in one language. Their less dominant language is often referred to as the subordinate language (Chin & Wigglesworth, 2007).

are used, and the domains in which they use them. In addition, it allowed for self-reporting of proficiency level in each language and the documentation of attitudes towards Spanish and English. The survey also determined if there were significant differences among participants from different groups:

1. Speakers who acquired the second language late in life (late bilingualism)
2. Speakers who acquired the second language early in life (early bilingualism)
4. Speakers who use English in most domains
5. Speakers who use Spanish in most domains
6. Speakers with high proficiency in English (self-reported)
7. Speakers with high proficiency in Spanish (self-reported)

The second source of data was a test on Google Forms (see Appendix 4) that was used to gather data from a directed study of sentence acceptability. Participants answered indicating whether a sentence was acceptable or not in Spanish. In addition to assessing the acceptability of each sentence, participants were asked to rewrite the sentences that they had classified as unacceptable so that they were acceptable. The instructions for the acceptability test, which were provided in both English and Spanish, read as follows:

Instructions in English: Read each sentence carefully and decide whether it is an acceptable sentence in Spanish. If you consider that the sentence is unacceptable, briefly explain why and rewrite it accordingly.

Instrucciones en español: Lea cuidadosamente cada oración y decida si es aceptable en el idioma español. Si su respuesta es que la oración es inaceptable, explique brevemente por qué y proceda a reescribirla de acuerdo a su explicación.

The acceptability test contained a total of 20 questions of which 5 were fillers (i.e., sentences that adhered to prescriptive rules of Spanish syntax and semantics). The other 15 items presented negative transfer phenomena from English to Spanish that ranged from false cognates to syntactic constructions. The 5 fillers were written by the investigator, while the 15 instances of negative transfer were adapted from written assignments that students at UHS had submitted for a history class.

The participants' answers in the acceptability test were evaluated using both statistical (see Chapter 5) and qualitative (see Chapter 6) analyses. These analyses were used to determine whether there were significant differences among the participants from the groups that were mentioned above and to test the hypotheses that have been posited in this study.

4.3 Justification for Methodology

An acceptability test was chosen as the main instrument to collect data for several reasons. First, since there is no method to measure the processes that take place in the participant's mind as they read, interpret, and judge the grammaticality of a sentence, an acceptability test allowed me to make inferences about the participants' linguistic competence (Oosterhof, 2008) and about the cognitive systems that yield a particular response (Schütze and Sprouse, 2014). Second, this research method provides an opportunity to judge the grammaticality of utterances that would neither appear in previously collected language corpora nor emerge naturally in spontaneous language use (Schütze and Sprouse, 2014). Furthermore, since the sentences were taken from authentic written samples by students at UHS, this method facilitated the consideration of constructions that were potentially highly relevant to understanding language use among the participants. In this manner, the study distances itself from so-called "armchair linguistics."

Third, collecting evidence concerning the intuitions from participants with varying degrees of proficiency, frequency of use, and age of exposure allowed the researcher to explore “the internal consistence in a system of judgements” (Oosterhof, 2008). Variability in the participants’ language background paired with their intuitions in the acceptability test provided the opportunity to test hypotheses and posit possible answers to this study’s research questions. Moreover, these methods can be used for more than one purpose. In her review of literature of L1 attrition and cross-linguistic influence, Pavlenko (2000) cites several research studies (Cook, 1999; Seliger and Vago, 1991; Altenberg, 1991) in which judgment tasks were employed as a means of exploring the participants’ “inability to make appropriate grammaticality judgments” as well as their “acceptance of syntactically deviant sentences.”

Fourth, a forced-choice task (i.e., judging a sentence as acceptable or unacceptable), in which there were no ambiguous response options, may be “less vulnerable to response style variability than tasks with flexible free response options that are open to differences of interpretation” (Langsford et al., 2018).

Fifth, but no less important, the acceptability test provided participants with the opportunity to rewrite sentences that they had classified as unacceptable. This task, which has been attested in the literature for cross-linguistic influence (Schmid and Kopke, 2004), allowed the researcher to carry out a more nuanced analysis of their L1 proficiency and linguistic intuitions than would have been possible otherwise.

4.4 Disadvantages of Acceptability Task

A possible disadvantage of relying on judgment data is that the aforementioned methods require participants to invoke their metalinguistic skills to make conscious decisions about language use. As a result, an acceptability task may be deemed as artificial vis-a-vis spontaneous

elicitation tasks. However, as Schütze and Sprouse (2014) assert, acceptability judgments “have led to the construction of grammatical theories that make falsifiable predictions about cross-linguistic variation, language acquisition, and even language processing” (p. 3).

A second disadvantage is that, precisely because this is a forced-choice task, an acceptability test provides fewer opportunities for the assessment of linguistic variability among participants and may not be representative of natural language in daily life.

Chapter 5: Quantitative Analysis of Data

5.1 Data Collection

The data for this investigation was collected at the Secondary School of the University of Puerto Rico (UHS) by means of purposive sampling. Students at UHS present a unique opportunity to explore cross-linguistic influence phenomena. Most UHS students are bilingual in English and Spanish, ranging from balanced to passive, and use or are exposed to both English and Spanish to varying degrees on a daily basis. Moreover, general public opinion is that the school has higher degrees of bilingualism than most other public schools in the San Juan area.

The investigator recruited participants both in person and through the school's Facebook page. After reading or listening to a brief description of the research study, potential volunteers received an email with the consent and assent forms (see Appendix 2) to be signed by them and their parent or guardian. The students who sent both completed forms received more specific instructions via email (see Appendix 5) on how to complete the Language Acquisition and Use Survey (see Appendix 3) and the Acceptability Test (see Appendix 4). While the study aimed to collect a sample of at least fifty students, thirty-six out of fifty potential participants completed the required documents (i.e., assent/consent, Language Acquisition and Use Survey and Acceptability Test) to be included in the sample.

From the data obtained through the Language Acquisition and Use Survey, the student sample was divided into three subgroups:

Group A (18 participants): Early exposure to English, frequent use, rated their proficiency in English between 4 and 5

Group B (10 participants): Late exposure, less frequent use, rated their proficiency in English between 3 and 5

Group C (8 participants): Early exposure, less frequent use, rated themselves rated their proficiency in English between 3 and 4

Table 5.1: Number of participants

Number of participants	36
------------------------	----

Table 5.2: Gender of participants

Gender	N=36	Percentage (%)
Male	9	25
Female	24	67
Non-binary	1	3
Prefer not to answer	2	5

Table 5.3: Language use

Most used language on a daily basis	N=36	Percentage (%)
Spanish	16	44
English	2	5
Both	18	50

Prefer not to answer	0	0
----------------------	---	---

Table 5.4: Age of exposure to English (learning)

Time when they began learning English	N=36	Percentage (%)
It was spoken at home since I was born	5	14
In preschool or kindergarten	19	53
In elementary school (K-6)	10	28
In high school (7-9)	0	0
Prefer not to answer	2	5

Table 5.5: Age of exposure to English (use)

Time when they began using English	N=36	Percentage (%)
It was spoken at home since I was born	3	8
In preschool or kindergarten	13	36

In elementary school (K-6)	14	39
In high school (7-9)	6	17
Prefer not to answer	0	0

Table 5.6: Self-reported overall proficiency in English (1-5 scale in which 1 is very low and 5 is very high)

Rating	Percentage % (N=36)
1 (very low)	0 (0)
2	2.8 (1)
3	19.4 (7)
4	44.4 (16)
5 (very high)	33.3 (12)

Table 5.7: Self-reported overall proficiency in Spanish (1-5 scale in which 1 is very low and 5 is very high)

Rating	Percentage % (N=36)
1 (very low)	0 (0)
2	5.6 (2)
3	2.8 (1)
4	50 (18)
5 (very high)	41.6 (15)

Table 5.8: Classification of participants based on Language Acquisition and Use survey

Criteria	N=36	Percentage (%)
Early exposure to English, frequent use, rated I 4-5 in English proficiency	18	50
Early exposure, less frequent useIthemselves 3-4 in English proficiency	8	22
Late exposure, less freqI, rated themselves 3 or lower in English proficiency	10	28

5.2 Description of Groups

Group A: Early exposure, frequent use, self-reported proficiency of 4-5 (EarlExpFr)

Based on the responses collected in the survey, all participants from this group meet at least two of the following three criteria:

- a. They were exposed to English from an early age (since birth or in preschool/kindergarten)
 - Since birth: 5
 - Pre-K: 13
- b. They use either English or both English and Spanish on a daily basis.
 - English: 2

- Spanish: 4
 - Both: 12
- c. They rated their overall proficiency in English between 4 and 5.
- Rating of 4: 7
 - Rating of 5: 11

Nine out eighteen participants from this group gave themselves a higher rating in English than in Spanish. Of the remaining nine participants, eight rated their English and Spanish the same, and one rated their Spanish higher than their English.

Participants in this group were exposed to English at an early age, either since birth or in early childhood. Most of them use both languages on a daily basis (16 of 18) while a few (2 of 18) reported using English more than Spanish. Furthermore, using a 1-5 scale, in which 5 is very high and 1 is very low, all rated their English proficiency between 4 and 5.

It was hypothesized that the answers provided by this group would allow me to consider the variables of age of exposure and frequency of use to better understand participants' classification of cross-linguistic items as acceptable or unacceptable. Because of their early exposure to and frequent use of English, this group was hypothesized to have classified a higher percentage of cross-linguistic items as acceptable than groups B (LateExpLessFr) and C (EarlExpLessFr).

Group B: Late exposure, less frequent use, self-reported proficiency of 3-5 (LateExpLessFr)

Based on the responses collected in the survey, all participants from this group meet at least two of the following three criteria:

- a. They were exposed to English later.
 - Began learning in elementary school: 10

- Began using English in elementary school: 5
 - Began learning English in high school: 0
 - Began using English in high school: 5
- b. They use Spanish more than English on a daily basis.
- Spanish: 6
 - English: 0
 - Both: 4
- c. They rated their overall proficiency in English between 2 and 5.
- Rating of 2: 1
 - Rating of 3: 3
 - Rating of 4: 5
 - Rating of 5: 1

Eight out ten participants from this group gave themselves a higher rating in Spanish than in English. The remaining two participants rated their Spanish and English the same (i.e., 4 and 4 and 5 and 5).

Participants in this group were exposed to English later in life (in elementary school or later). Most use Spanish more than English on a daily basis (6) while four (4) reported to use both. No participants in this group use English more than Spanish. Additionally, using a 1-5 scale in which 5 is very high and 1 is very low, most of them (5) rated their English proficiency as a 4 while four rated themselves between 2 and 3.

Due to their later exposure and less frequent use of English, this group was hypothesized to have classified a lower percentage of cross-linguistic items as acceptable than groups A

(EarlExpFr) and C (EarlExpLessFr). Likewise, they were expected to classify most, if not all, of the five fillers as acceptable.

Group C: Early exposure, less frequent use, self-reported proficiency of 3-4 (EarlExpLessFr)

Based on the responses collected in the language use survey, all participants from this group meet at least two of the following three criteria:

- a. They were exposed to English from an early age (preschool/kindergarten)
 - Pre-K: 8
- b. They use Spanish more than English on a daily basis.
 - Spanish: 6
 - English: 0
 - Both: 2
- c. They rated their overall proficiency in English between 3 and 4.
 - Rating of 3: 4
 - Rating of 4: 4

Seven out eight participants from this group gave themselves a higher rating in Spanish than in English. The remaining participant rated their Spanish and English evenly (i.e., 3 and 3).

Participants in this group were exposed to English early in life (in preschool). Most of them use Spanish more than English on a daily basis (6) while two (2) reported using both. No participants in this group use English more than Spanish. Moreover, using a 1-5 scale in which 5 is very high and 1 is very low, all of them rated their proficiency in English between 3 and 4.

It was hypothesized that the answers provided by this group would shed light on the influence that the variables of exposure and frequency exert when classifying cross-linguistic items as acceptable or unacceptable. Due to their early exposure but less frequent use of English,

it was expected that these participants would rate fewer cross-linguistic items as acceptable than group A (EarlExpFr) but more than group B (LateExpLessFr).

5.3 Acceptability Test

All participants answered an acceptability test on Google Forms. Their task was to read twenty (20) sentences in Spanish and determine whether they were acceptable or not. Each sentence was followed by a short answer question that asked participants to explain why they had classified a sentence as unacceptable and to rewrite it accordingly.

The test included fifteen (15) items that presented structures that were lexically, syntactically, or morphologically influenced by English. All of these items were adapted from actual sentences that had been written by students at the University of Puerto Rico Secondary School (UHS). The remaining five (5) items, written by the principal investigator, were fillers that aligned with Spanish prescriptive grammar rules (items 3, 7, 11, 15, and 19). The expectation was that these five (5) items be classified as acceptable by most participants regardless of their group.

The fifteen (15) items that presented cross-linguistic influence are described in detail below and subdivided under the following categories:

- a. Lexical borrowing: Verbs
- b. Lexical borrowing: Prepositions
- c. Lexical borrowing: Adjectives
- d. Lexical borrowing: Nouns
- e. Preposition stranding

5.3.1 Lexical Borrowing: Verbs

Item 1: **Los gobiernos giran a las guerras para resolver conflictos.**

Expected answer: Most participants from group B (LateExpLessFr) are expected to classify this item as unacceptable. Higher numbers of acceptability are expected from groups A (EarlExpFr) and C (EarlExpLessFr).

Explanation of cross-linguistic influence: This sentence includes the phrase *giran a* as a direct translation of the English phrasal verb *turn to*. While there is partial semantic overlap between English and Spanish when it comes to the use of the verb *turn* in the sense of *girar* or *voltear* (e.g. *The world keeps turning around* / *El mundo sigue girando* and *The man turned his head around* / *El hombre volteó su cabeza*), this sentence calls for the use of the Spanish verb *recurrir*. Participants who classified this sentence as unacceptable were expected to explain that *girar a* is a direct translation of English *turn to* and that, while the sentence is understandable from a communicative standpoint, grammatical norms demand a rewritten version of this sentence would be *Los gobiernos recurren a las guerras para resolver conflictos*. Other possibilities may require a semantic shift in the verb that could slightly alter the meaning of the sentence (e.g., *Los gobiernos van a la guerra para resolver conflictos*, *Los gobiernos declaran guerras para resolver conflictos*) or both a semantic and syntactic shift (e.g., *Los gobiernos resuelven conflictos por medio de guerras*, *Las guerras son una manera que tiene el gobierno para resolver conflictos*).

Item 4: **Lo que mi jefe decía, iba.**

Expected answer: Most participants from group B (LateExpLessFr) are expected to classify this item as unacceptable. Higher numbers of acceptability are expected from groups A (EarlExpFr) and C (EarlExpLessFr).

Explanation of cross-linguistic influence: This sentence is a direct translation of the English idiom *what (someone) says goes*, which is used to express that “everyone else has to do what a person tells them to do” (*Merriam-Webster Dictionary*, n.d.). In this case, the speaker intends to say that everyone did what their boss told them to do. In Spanish, however, the equivalent of the English verb *goes*, the intransitive verb *ir*, is never used to express compliance, submission, or subordination. The sentence includes the simple past of *ir*, *iba*, as a literal translation of the past tense of *go*, *went* (i.e., *What my boss said went*). As is very well known among translators and bilingual speakers with a high level of fluency in more than one language, idioms must not be translated literally from the source language to the target language as it may result in unidiomatic or even nonsensical utterances. It is preferable to identify equivalent idioms or phrases that convey a similar meaning in the target language. Participants who classified this sentence as unacceptable were expected to explain that, while this sentence is grammatically well formed, it is not an idiomatic construction in Spanish. A possible rewritten version of this sentence is *Lo que mi jefe decía era lo que se hacía*. They could also opt for a syntactic shift along the lines of *Todos hacían lo que el jefe decía*.

Item 8: Nuestra amistad es fundada en la confianza.

Expected answer: Most participants from group B (LateExpLessFr) are expected to classify this item as unacceptable. Higher numbers of acceptability are expected from groups A (EarlExpFr) and C (EarlExpLessFr).

Explanation of cross-linguistic influence: A possible translation for this utterance is *Our friendship is founded on trust* in which the linking verb *to be* serves to connect the subject *our friendship* with its predicate adjective *founded*, a verb that means “to start or establish something” and is to be differentiated from the past tense of *to find* (found). Spanish, however,

has a more nuanced way of expressing the relationship between the subject and its quality or state of being by employing either *ser* or *estar* in different contexts. Temporality is one of the grammatical criteria that is invoked to decide between one verb or the other. For instance, if a quality or state of being is permanent or invariable, then Spanish calls for the use of *ser* (e.g., *Juan es inteligente* or *Luisa es mi hermana*). On the other hand, when a quality or state of being is transitory and could potentially change in the future, then the verb *estar* is required (e.g., *Miguel está enfermo* or *Isabel está hambrienta*).

Another trait that differentiates *ser* from *estar* concerns their semantic features from an aspectual standpoint (Luján, 1981). While the verb *ser* is imperfective, *estar* is always perfective (Holtheuer, 2011). Imperfective verbs express states that are stable and long lasting and are therefore considered unbound verbs. Perfective verbs, on the other hand, are transitory and have a limited duration in time (e.g., are bounded in time and space). The imperfective nature of *ser* manifests itself in constructions with predicative adjectives (subject + copula + adjective) and predicate nominatives (subject + copula + noun) that are not bound to change through time (e.g., *Juan es inteligente* and *Verónica es enfermera*). On the other hand, *estar* is perfective and hence employed in copular constructions that are bound to change at some point in time (e.g., *Carla está en su casa* and *El horno está caliente*).

Typologically, the linking (copular) verb system in English does not take into account aspect when deciding between one verb or another and, as a result, the verb *to be* would be used in both perfective and imperfective constructions like the ones cited above (e.g., *Luisa is my sister* for a permanent state of being and *Miguel is sick* for an impermanent one).

Since friendships are not necessarily permanent and their status could potentially change in the future, the construction in item 8 calls for the verb *estar* instead of *ser*. As for the use of

the adjective *fundada*, it may be the result of a direct translation of *founded*, which is best expressed in Spanish with the adjectives *basada* or *fundamentada*. Participants who classified this sentence as unacceptable were expected to notice the use of the verb *ser* in a temporal or impermanent construction and thus change it to *estar*. The verb *fundar*, which in Spanish means “*establecer o crear*” (Diccionario de la Real Academia Española, n.d.), should be changed to *basada* or *fundamentada*. While there is semantic overlap between English *founded* and Spanish *fundada* in this sense, this sentence is not referring to the establishment or creation of something, but rather to the foundation that something (our friendship) is based upon.

Item 13: Cuando llega el tiempo de hacer una decisión, Luis no sabe cómo.

Expected answer: Most participants from group B (LateExpLessFr) are expected to classify this item as unacceptable. Higher numbers of acceptability are expected from groups A (EarlExpFr) and C (EarlExpLessFr).

Explanation of cross-linguistic influence: As it is mentioned in Chapter 1, borrowing may be defined as the “adaptation of lexical material to the morphological and syntactic (and usually, phonological) rules of the recipient language” (Poplack and Meechan, 1995, p. 134) or as a process whereby “fluent speakers of the receiving language adopt features from the source language” (Thomason, 2001b, p. 1). It is evident that the speaker in this sentence has borrowed or transferred the meaning of the English phrase *to make a decision* to Spanish.

In English, decisions are *made*, not *taken*. While using *take* instead of *make* would not hinder the communicative intention of this phrase (i.e., They will *take* the decision soon), the more idiomatic and common construction is made with the latter (i.e., They will *make* the decision soon). Conversely, Spanish conveys the same action with the verb *tomar* and not *hacer* (i.e., *tomar una decisión*). The construction in this item is a literal translation of the English

phrase *make a decision* which represents a comprehensible yet unidiomatic construction in Spanish. Moreover, a preferable construction in Spanish would include the noun *momento* instead of *tiempo*, since the latter may be interpreted as a direct translation of *time* (e.g., when the time comes). Participants who classified this sentence as unacceptable were expected to select the more idiomatic verb *tomar* and to rewrite the sentence as follows: *Cuando llega el momento de tomar una decisión, Luis no sabe cómo.*

Item 17: Todos respetaban al presidente porque era quien aguantaba más poder en la compañía.

Expected answer: Most participants from group B (LateExpLessFr) are expected to classify this item as unacceptable. Higher numbers of acceptability are expected from groups A (EarlExpFr) and C (EarlExpLessFr).

Explanation of cross-linguistic influence: In English, it is quite common to see the noun *power* accompanied by the transitive verb *to hold* (e.g., *He held a lot of power in the company*) to refer to a situation in which someone has great influence (or power) over others. While there is semantic overlap between English and Spanish when it comes to the verb *to hold* in the sense of *agarrar*, *aguantar* and *tener*, the construction in this item would be classified as unidiomatic by a native speaker of Spanish. The phrase *aguantar poder* is likely a literal translation of *to hold power* in which the verb *to hold* has been translated in the sense of *aguantar* or *agarrar* instead of *tener*. Participants who classified this item as unacceptable were expected to notice the difference in the semantics of *aguantar* and *tener* in Spanish and thus rewrite this sentence as follows: *Todos respetaban al presidente porque era quien tenía más poder en la compañía.* Other possibilities may include the verbs *poseer* or *ostentar*.

Item 18: **Dejé de ir a su casa porque realicé que no le gustaban las visitas.**

Expected answer: Most participants from group B (LateExpLessFr) are expected to classify this item as unacceptable. Higher numbers of acceptability are expected from groups A (EarlExpFr) and C (EarlExpLessFr).

Explanation of cross-linguistic influence: Two of the most frequent uses for the transitive verb *to realize* are to refer to something that has been accomplished or achieved (e.g., She realized all of her goals) and to convey that someone has understood or become aware of something (e.g., He realized that his friends had betrayed him). In this item, the verb *to realize* is used in the second sense described above. That is, the elided first person singular subject *I* has understood or become aware of the fact that someone dislikes visits and has therefore decided to stop visiting them. Although Spanish and English share the meaning of *to realize* in the sense of accomplishing or achieving something, the second meaning of understanding or becoming aware of something is expressed with a different verb construction in Spanish (i.e., the phrase *darse cuenta de*). The resemblance between the surface structures of the verbs *realize* and *realizar* suffices provide a possible explanation for this case of cross-linguistic influence in which the verbs have a similar form but different meanings. Participants who classified this item as unacceptable were expected to notice the lack of correspondence in the semantics of English *realize* and Spanish *realizar* in this specific context. The equivalent phrase that they were expected to use in their rewritten version was *darse cuenta de* (e.g., *Dejé de ir a su casa porque me di cuenta de que no le gustaban las visitas*).

Item 20: El criminal fue tirado en prisión de inmediato.

Expected answer: Most participants from group B (LateExpLessFr) are expected to classify this item as unacceptable. Higher numbers of acceptability are expected from groups A (EarlExpFr) and C (EarlExpLessFr).

Explanation of cross-linguistic influence: In English, people are often thrown into prison or tossed in jail. These two usages reflect the way in which English codifies this action by emphasizing the manner in which it occurs. Notice that both *throw* and *toss* tacitly suggest a rather violent action in which the prisoner is depicted as an object that is thrown or tossed. This usage may very well be cultural, as it reflects that this society values and celebrates the fact that a wrongdoer or transgressor who has violated the law has been punished and subjected to imprisonment. On the other hand, while the use of *tirar en prisión* and *tirado en prisión* are not the most common constructions in Spanish, a Google search for these specific phrases using quotation marks yields between 5,030 (for *tirar en prisión*) and 61,700 (for *tirado en prisión*) results. It seems that the participial construction with *tirado* is used more frequently than the verb form *tirar* in this specific context. In view of this, and although it is not the most idiomatic construction in Spanish, it is possible that several participants would consider this item as acceptable. Those who classified it as unacceptable were expected to change the English - influenced participial *tirado* for *enviado*, *ingresado* or *puesto* (e.g., *El criminal fue enviado a prisión de inmediato*, *El criminal fue ingresado a prisión*, or *El criminal fue puesto en prisión de inmediato*).

5.3.2 Lexical borrowing: Nouns

Item 2: **Dos personas con vistas distintas pueden causar un conflicto.**

Expected answer: Most participants from group B (LateExpLessFr) are expected to classify this item as unacceptable. Higher numbers of acceptability are expected from groups A (EarlExpFr) and C (EarlExpLessFr).

Explanation of cross-linguistic influence: This sentence includes the plural noun in Spanish *vistas* as a direct translation of English plural noun *views*. There is partial semantic overlap between English *view* and Spanish *vista* when the word is used to refer to a scene that is visible from the observer's standpoint (e.g., *A room with an ocean view* / *Una habitación con vista al mar*) and when it is used in the phrase *in view of* / *en vista de*. Participants who classified this sentence as unacceptable were expected to explain that the Spanish word *vista* by itself does not suffice to convey the meaning that *view* has in English. A possible rewritten version of this sentence could be *Dos personas con puntos de vista distintos pueden causar un conflicto*. Furthermore, participants may very well decide to use a different noun (e.g., *Dos personas con opiniones distintas pueden causar un conflicto*).

5.3.3 Lexical borrowing: Prepositions

Item 5: **El teniente está en cargo del ejército.**

Expected answer: Most participants from group B (LateExpLessFr) are expected to classify this item as unacceptable. Higher numbers of acceptability are expected from groups A (EarlExpFr) and C (EarlExpLessFr).

Explanation of cross-linguistic influence: The prepositional phrase *en cargo de* is a direct translation of the English phrase *in charge of*. While there is semantic overlap in English and Spanish between the prepositions *in* and *en* when they are used for spatial or locative purposes

(*They are in Argentina / Ellos están en Argentina*), there are several instances, such as this sentence, in which a different preposition from *en* is needed when translating *in* from English.

The most widely accepted and used preposition in this case would be *a* instead of *en*. Participants who classified this sentence as unacceptable were expected to identify the use of *en cargo de* as unidiomatic in Spanish and thus opt for the more commonly used phrase *a cargo de* (i.e., *El teniente está a cargo del ejército*). Another possibility is to switch the main verb to *ser* instead of *estar* and change the prepositional phrase for a predicate adjective (*El teniente era responsable del ejército*).

Item 12: Juan es amigable, pero en la otra mano, su hermano Alberto es muy grosero.

Expected answer: Most participants from group B (LateExpLessFr) are expected to classify this item as unacceptable. Higher numbers of acceptability are expected from groups A (EarlExpFr) and C (EarlExpLessFr).

Explanation of cross-linguistic influence: The phrase *on the other hand* is used metaphorically to present two contrasting ideas or points of view. While it is usually preceded by the phrase *on the one hand*, it is common to see it used in isolation as in item 12. However, this idiomatic expression and conceptual metaphor (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980) finds its equivalent in Spanish in a construction that has nothing to do with hands. Spanish resorts to the noun *lado* to contrast two opposing ideas or concepts (i.e., *por un lado* for *on the one hand* and *por otro lado* for *on the other hand*). The construction in this item is a literal translation of the aforementioned English phrase and results in a phrase which may be considered unidiomatic by most native speakers of Puerto Rican Spanish. Participants who classified this sentence as unacceptable were expected to opt for a more idiomatic phrase in Spanish such as *por otro lado o lo contrario*. An alternative version of this item would be *Juan es amigable, pero por otro lado, su hermano*

Alberto es muy grosero or Juan es amigable, pero por el contrario, su hermano Alberto es muy grosero.

Item 14: **Luis empezó a depender demasiado en sus amigos.**

Expected answer: Most participants from group B (LateExpLessFr) are expected to classify this item as unacceptable. Higher numbers of acceptability are expected from groups A (EarlExpFr) and C (EarlExpLessFr).

Explanation of cross-linguistic influence: The phrasal verb *to depend on* is used when a person places their trust or confidence on someone or something. When it is used in that sense, the verb *depend* is always accompanied by the preposition *on*. Since the verb *depend* is intransitive in Spanish, it is always accompanied by a preposition as well, but instead of *en* it is the preposition *de*. Because the closest equivalent to the preposition *in* is Spanish *en*, a literal translation such as the one seen in item 14 is possible for a non-native speaker of Spanish whose first language is English. Participants who classified this sentence as unacceptable were expected to identify the literal translation of the preposition *in* and resort to *depend* *de*, which is the correct structure of this construction in Spanish. 52odía52nA possible reiteration of item 14 would be *Luis empezó a depender demasiado de sus amigos.*

5.3.4 Lexical borrowing: Adjectives

Item 6: **Los exploradores viajan por el mar en una línea derecha.**

Expected answer: Most participants from group B (LateExpLessFr) are expected to classify this item as unacceptable. Higher numbers of acceptability are expected from groups A (EarlExpFr) and C (EarlExpLessFr).

Explanation of cross-linguistic influence: This utterance, which inspired the title for this dissertation, includes two prepositional phrases that function as adverbial phrases. The first one,

por el mar, establishes where the explorers are travelling, and the second one, *en una línea derecha*, identifies the direction in which they are navigating. While the communicative intention of this utterance may be understood, the use of the adjective *derecha* to modify the noun *línea* yields an unidiomatic construction in Spanish in this context. The English equivalent of this phrase would require the use of the adjective *straight* (i.e., in a straight line), which translates as *derecho* in Spanish in some contexts. For instance, the sentence *The painting on the wall was not straight* calls for the use of the adjective *derecho* (e.g., *El cuadro en la pared no estaba derecho*). For the sake of idiomaticity, however, the context in which *straight* is used in this utterance requires the adjective *recta* instead of *derecha*. Participants who classified this sentence as unacceptable were expected to replace one adjective with the other and produce *Los exploradores viajan por el mar en una línea recta*.

5.3.5 Preposition Stranding

Item 9: Los colonizadores traían enfermedades que los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos a.

Expected answer: Most participants from group B (LateExpLessFr) are expected to classify this item as unacceptable. Higher numbers of acceptability are expected from groups A (EarlExpFr) and C (EarlExpLessFr).

Explanation of cross-linguistic influence: Preposition stranding is a common phenomenon in English. Although prescriptive grammar has established that it is preferable to avoid ending a sentence with a preposition, such a construction is quite common and may even be considered natural in questions and in spoken English (Ross & Murray, 1985). For instance, although a construction such as *From where did the student come?* is possible in English, a question in which the preposition appears at the end sounds more natural and idiomatic (i.e., *Where did the*

student come from?). The same is true for positive statements such as the one included in this item. A possible translation for this sentence would be: *The colonizers brought diseases that the natives had not yet been exposed to* in which the preposition *to* appears at the end and is thus “stranded” because its object (the pronoun *which*) appears before it. Spanish, however, is a language that does not allow preposition stranding. A construction such as the one in this item is not only unidiomatic but ungrammatical as well. Participants who classified this sentence as unacceptable were expected to identify the stranded preposition and to place the preposition before the object (e.g., *Los colonizadores traían enfermedades a las cuales los nativos nunca habían sido expuestos*).

Item 10: El muchacho ya no sabía quién confiar en.

Expected answer: Most participants from group B (LateExpLessFr) are expected to classify this item as unacceptable. Higher numbers of acceptability are expected from groups A (EarlExpFr) and C (EarlExpLessFr).

Explanation of cross-linguistic influence: This item presents a similar case to the previous one (item 9). The preposition *en* has been stranded and it appears after its object, the pronoun *quién*, and at the end of the sentence. Such a construction is not only unidiomatic but ungrammatical as well. As has already been established, preposition stranding is not allowed in Spanish. The resulting construction in Spanish is likely a literal translation of the phrasal verb *to trust in*. A construction in English in which this phrasal verb, and thus the preposition *in*, appears at the end is both common and acceptable (e.g., *The boy did not know who to trust in*). Participants who classified this sentence as unacceptable were expected to identify the stranded preposition and to place the preposition before the object (e.g., *El muchacho ya no sabía en quién confiar*).

Item 16: Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que lograron apoderarse de.

Expected answer: Most participants from group B (LateExpLessFr) are expected to classify this item as unacceptable. Higher numbers of acceptability are expected from groups A (EarlExpFr) and C (EarlExpLessFr).

Explanation of cross-linguistic influence: This sentence presents a case similar to that of items 9 and 10. The preposition *de* has been stranded, and it appears after its object, the noun phrase *los territorios*, and at the end of the sentence. Such a construction is not only unidiomatic but ungrammatical as well. As it has already been established, preposition stranding is not allowed in Spanish. The resulting construction in Spanish is likely a literal translation of the phrasal verbs *take over* or *take control of*. Due to the presence of the Spanish preposition *de*, the latter seems like a more plausible option. A construction in English in which either one of these phrasal verbs appears at the end of the sentence is both common and acceptable (e.g., *They removed the attackers from the territories that they had taken over* or *They removed the attackers from the territories that they had taken control of*). Participants who classified this item as unacceptable were expected to identify the stranded preposition and rewrite the sentence with a more idiomatic construction in Spanish (e.g., *Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que se habían apoderado* or *Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios de los cuales se habían apoderado*).

5.4 Analysis of Data from Acceptability Test

The results from the acceptability test were analyzed along the following lines:

- a. The percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) from all participants for each of the twenty (20) items

This analysis provides an overview of the responses by all participants in each of the items in the acceptability test.

- b. The percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for the fifteen (15) items that presented cross-linguistic phenomena

The fifteen items that presented cross-linguistic influence were analyzed separately to allow for the testing of the hypotheses that guide this study. Table 5.10 presents the percentage of acceptable and unacceptable responses for those items.

- c. The percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for all items for group A (EarlExpFr)

After dividing the groups based on the participants' responses in the Language Survey, all the answers in the acceptability test for group A (EarlExpFr) were tallied and included in table 5.11.

- d. The percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for all items for group B (LateExpLessFr)

After dividing the groups based on the participants' responses in the Language Survey, all the answers in the acceptability test for group B (LateExpLessFr) were tallied and included in table 5.12.

- e. The percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for all items for group C (EarlExpLessFr).

After dividing the groups based on the participants' responses in the Language Survey, all the answers in the acceptability test for group C (EarlExpLessFr) were tallied and included in table 5.13.

- f. The percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items with cross-linguistic influence for group A (EarlExpFr)

The data in tables 5.14 – 5.18 corresponds specifically to the answers provided by group A for items with cross-linguistic influence. This analysis put to the test the two central hypotheses that guide this study:

1. Early (simultaneous) Spanish-English bilinguals who use English more frequently, and in more domains than Spanish, are the initiators of English L2 influence on L1 Spanish and are prone to judge instances of cross-linguistic influence as acceptable.
 2. Early exposure to English and frequent use of L2 English in most domains might lead to restructuring of L1 Spanish lexicon and syntax.
- g. The percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items with cross-linguistic influence for group B (LateExpLessFr)

The data in tables 5.19 – 5.23 corresponds specifically to the answers provided by group B for items with cross-linguistic influence. When compared to the results obtained from groups A and C in the Acceptability Test, the data in tables 5.19 – 5.23 facilitates testing the two hypotheses that guide this study.

- h. The percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items with cross-linguistic influence for group C (early exposure and less frequent use)

The data presented in tables 5.24 – 5.28 corresponds specifically to the answers provided by group C for items with cross-linguistic influence. When compared with the results obtained from groups A and B, the data facilitates testing the two hypotheses that guide this study.

- i. The percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items without cross-linguistic influence (fillers) for group A (early exposure and frequent use)

The data in table 5.30 corresponds specifically to the answers provided by group A for items without cross-linguistic influence (fillers).

- j. The percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items without cross-linguistic influence (fillers) for group B (early exposure and frequent use)

The data in table 5.31 corresponds specifically to the answers provided by group B for items without cross-linguistic influence (fillers).

- k. The percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items without cross-linguistic influence (fillers) for group C (early exposure and less frequent use)

The data in table 5.32 corresponds specifically to the answers provided by group C for items without cross-linguistic influence (fillers).

The tables that are presented below are organized along the following lines:

The first column shows the item in the acceptability test, the second and third columns present the percentage of participants who classified each item as acceptable or unacceptable, respectively. The fourth column includes the percentage of participants who did not provide an answer for an item. The first number in each column identifies the percentage and the second number in parentheses shows the participants who answered acceptable and unacceptable (or did not provide an answer) out of the total number of participants.

Table 5.9: Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) from all participants for each of the twenty (20) items (N=36)

Item	Percentage acceptable (N=36)	Percentage unacceptable (N=36)	Percentage did not answer (N=36)
1: Los gobiernos giran a las guerras para resolver conflictos.	19.4 (7)	80.6 (29)	0 (0)

2: Dos personas con vistas distintas pueden causar un conflicto.	38.9 (14)	61.1 (22)	0 (0)
3: El nuevo presidente fue electo en noviembre.	77.8 (28)	22.2 (8)	0 (0)
4: Lo que mi jefe decía, iba.	58.3 (21)	41.7 (15)	0 (0)
5: El teniente está en cargo del ejército.	19.4 (7)	80.6 (29)	0 (0)
6: Los exploradores viajan por el mar en una línea derecha.	63.9 (23)	36.1 (13)	0 (0)
7: Uno de los pasajeros olvidó sus pertenencias en el avión.	97.2 (35)	2.8 (1)	0 (0)
8: Nuestra amistad es fundada en la confianza.	50 (18)	50 (18)	0 (0)
9: Los colonizadores traían enfermedades que los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos a.	25 (9)	72.2 (26)	2.8 (1)
10: El muchacho ya no sabía quién confiar en.	2.8 (1)	88.9 (32)	8.3 (3)
11: Muchos artistas no se acostumbran a la fama y la fortuna.	5.6 (2)	94.4 (34)	0 (0)
12: Juan es amigable, pero en la otra mano, su hermano Alberto es muy grosero.	38.9 (14)	58.3 (21)	2.8 (1)
13: Cuando llega el tiempo de hacer una decisión, Luis no sabe cómo.	61.1 (22)	38.9 (14)	0 (0)
14: Luis empezó a depender demasiado en sus amigos.	63.9 (23)	36.1 (13)	0 (0)
15: La pandemia les ha cambiado la vida a muchos puertorriqueños.	50 (18)	47.2 (17)	2.8 (1)

16: Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que lograron apoderarse de.	22.2 (8)	72.2 (26)	5.6 (2)
17: Todos respetaban al presidente porque era quien aguantaba más poder en la compañía.	47.2 (17)	50 (18)	2.8 (1)
18: Dejé de ir a su casa porque realicé que no le gustaban las visitas.	22.2 (8)	77.8 (28)	0 (0)
19: Fui a buscarte a tu casa pero no había nadie cuando llegué.	80.6 (29)	19.4 (7)	0 (0)
20: El criminal fue tirado en prisión de inmediato.	36.1 (13)	63.9 (23)	0 (0)

Table 5.10: Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) from all participants for the fifteen (15) items that presented cross-linguistic phenomena. (N=36)

Item	Percentage acceptable (N=36)	Percentage unacceptable (N=36)	Percentage did not answer (N=36)
1: Los gobiernos giran a las guerras para resolver conflictos.	19.4 (7)	80.6 (29)	0 (0)
2: Dos personas con vistas distintas pueden causar un conflicto.	38.9 (14)	61.1 (22)	0 (0)
4: Lo que mi jefe decía, iba.	58.3 (21)	41.7 (15)	0 (0)
5: El teniente está en cargo del ejército.	19.4 (7)	80.6 (29)	0 (0)
6: Los exploradores viajan por el mar en una línea derecha.	63.9 (23)	36.1 (13)	0 (0)
8: Nuestra amistad es fundada en la confianza.	50 (18)	50 (18)	0 (0)

9: Los colonizadores traían enfermedades que los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos a.	25 (9)	72.2 (26)	2.8 (1)
10: El muchacho ya no sabía quién confiar en.	2.8 (1)	88.9 (32)	8.3 (3)
12: Juan es amigable, pero en la otra mano, su hermano Alberto es muy grosero.	38.9 (14)	58.3 (21)	2.8 (1)
13: Cuando llega el tiempo de hacer una decisión, Luis no sabe cómo.	61.1 (22)	38.9 (14)	0 (0)
14: Luis empezó a depender demasiado en sus amigos.	63.9 (23)	36.1 (13)	0 (0)
16: Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que lograron apoderarse de.	22.2 (8)	72.2 (26)	5.6 (2)
17: Todos respetaban al presidente porque era quien aguantaba más poder en la compañía.	47.2 (17)	50 (18)	2.8 (1)
18: Dejé de ir a su casa porque realicé que no le gustaban las visitas.	22.2 (8)	77.8 (28)	0 (0)
20: El criminal fue tirado en prisión de inmediato.	36.1 (13)	63.9 (23)	0 (0)

Table 5.11: Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for all items for group A (early exposure and frequent use) (N=36)

Item	Percentage acceptable (N=18)	Percentage unacceptable (N=18)	Percentage did not answer (N=18)
1: Los gobiernos giran a las guerras para resolver conflictos.	22 (4)	78 (14)	0 (0)

2: Dos personas con vistas distintas pueden causar un conflicto.	44 (8)	56 (10)	0 (0)
3: El nuevo presidente fue electo en noviembre.	78 (14)	22 (4)	0 (0)
4: Lo que mi jefe decía, iba.	72 (13)	28 (5)	0 (0)
5: El teniente está en cargo del ejército.	17 (3)	83 (15)	0 (0)
6: Los exploradores viajan por el mar en una línea derecha.	72 (13)	28 (5)	0 (0)
7: Uno de los pasajeros olvidó sus pertenencias en el avión.	100 (18)	0 (0)	0 (0)
8: Nuestra amistad es fundada en la confianza.	56 (10)	44 (8)	0 (0)
9: Los colonizadores traían enfermedades que los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos a.	27 (5)	67 (12)	6 (1)
10: El muchacho ya no sabía quién confiar en.	0 (0)	94 (17)	6 (1)
11: Muchos artistas no se acostumbran a la fama y la fortuna.	89 (16)	11 (2)	0 (0)
12: Juan es amigable, pero en la otra mano, su hermano Alberto es muy grosero.	27 (5)	67 (12)	6 (1)
13: Cuando llega el tiempo de hacer una decisión, Luis no sabe cómo.	50 (9)	50 (9)	0 (0)
14: Luis empezó a depender demasiado en sus amigos.	61 (11)	39 (7)	0 (0)
15: La pandemia les ha cambiado la vida a muchos puertorriqueños.	56 (10)	44 (8)	0 (0)

16: Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que lograron apoderarse de.	28 (5)	72 (13)	0 (0)
17: Todos respetaban al presidente porque era quien aguantaba más poder en la compañía.	50 (9)	50 (9)	0 (0)
18: Dejé de ir a su casa porque realicé que no le gustaban las visitas.	17 (3)	83 (15)	0 (0)
19: Fui a buscarte a tu casa pero no había nadie cuando llegué.	78 (14)	22 (4)	0 (0)
20: El criminal fue tirado en prisión de inmediato.	33 (6)	67 (12)	0 (0)

Table 5.12: Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for all items for group B (late exposure and less frequent use) (N=10)

Item	Percentage acceptable (N=10)	Percentage unacceptable (N=10)	Percentage did not answer (N=10)
1: Los gobiernos giran a las guerras para resolver conflictos.	30 (3)	70 (7)	0 (0)
2: Dos personas con vistas distintas pueden causar un conflicto.	40 (4)	60 (6)	0 (0)
3: El nuevo presidente fue electo en noviembre.	90 (9)	10 (1)	0 (0)
4: Lo que mi jefe decía, iba.	30 (3)	70 (7)	0 (0)
5: El teniente está en cargo del ejército.	30 (3)	70 (7)	0 (0)
6: Los exploradores viajan por el mar en una línea derecha.	40 (4)	60 (6)	0 (0)

7: Uno de los pasajeros olvidó sus pertenencias en el avión.	100 (10)	0 (0)	0 (0)
8: Nuestra amistad es fundada en la confianza.	60 (6)	40 (4)	0 (0)
9: Los colonizadores traían enfermedades que los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos a.	10 (1)	90 (9)	0 (0)
10: El muchacho ya no sabía quién confiar en.	10 (1)	90 (9)	0 (0)
11: Muchos artistas no se acostumbran a la fama y la fortuna.	100 (10)	0 (0)	0 (0)
12: Juan es amigable, pero en la otra mano, su hermano Alberto es muy grosero.	50 (5)	50 (5)	0 (0)
13: Cuando llega el tiempo de hacer una decisión, Luis no sabe cómo.	70 (7)	30 (3)	0 (0)
14: Luis empezó a depender demasiado en sus amigos.	80 (8)	20 (2)	0 (0)
15: La pandemia les ha cambiado la vida a muchos puertorriqueños.	60 (6)	30 (3)	10 (1)
16: Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que lograron apoderarse de.	10 (1)	80 (8)	10 (1)
17: Todos respetaban al presidente porque era quien aguantaba más poder en la compañía.	50 (5)	50 (5)	0 (0)
18: Dejé de ir a su casa porque realicé que no le gustaban las visitas.	30 (3)	70 (7)	0 (0)
19: Fui a buscarte a tu casa pero no había nadie cuando	80 (8)	20 (2)	0 (0)

llegué.			
20: El criminal fue tirado en prisión de inmediato.	40 (4)	60 (6)	0 (0)

Table 5.13: Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for all items for group C (early exposure and less frequent use) (N=8)

Item	Percentage acceptable (N=8)	Percentage unacceptable (N=8)	Percentage did not answer (N=8)
1: Los gobiernos giran a las guerras para resolver conflictos.	0 (0)	100 (8)	0 (0)
2: Dos personas con vistas distintas pueden causar un conflicto.	25 (2)	75 (6)	0 (0)
3: El nuevo presidente fue electo en noviembre.	63 (5)	37 (3)	0 (0)
4: Lo que mi jefe decía, iba.	63 (5)	37 (3)	0 (0)
5: El teniente está en cargo del ejército.	13 (1)	87 (7)	0 (0)
6: Los exploradores viajan por el mar en una línea derecha.	75 (6)	25 (2)	0 (0)
7: Uno de los pasajeros olvidó sus pertenencias en el avión.	87 (7)	13 (1)	0 (0)
8: Nuestra amistad es fundada en la confianza.	25 (2)	75 (6)	0 (0)
9: Los colonizadores traían enfermedades que los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos a.	37 (3)	63 (5)	0 (0)
10: El muchacho ya no sabía quién confiar en.	0 (0)	100 (8)	0 (0)

11: Muchos artistas no se acostumbran a la fama y la fortuna.	100 (8)	0 (0)	0 (0)
12: Juan es amigable, pero en la otra mano, su hermano Alberto es muy grosero.	50 (4)	50 (4)	0 (0)
13: Cuando llega el tiempo de hacer una decisión, Luis no sabe cómo.	75 (6)	25 (2)	0 (0)
14: Luis empezó a depender demasiado en sus amigos.	50 (4)	50 (4)	0 (0)
15: La pandemia les ha cambiado la vida a muchos puertorriqueños.	25 (2)	75 (6)	0 (0)
16: Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que lograron apoderarse de.	25 (2)	75 (6)	0 (0)
17: Todos respetaban al presidente porque era quien aguantaba más poder en la compañía.	37 (3)	63 (5)	0 (0)
18: Dejé de ir a su casa porque realicé que no le gustaban las visitas.	25 (2)	75 (6)	0 (0)
19: Fui a buscarte a tu casa pero no había nadie cuando llegué.	87 (7)	13 (1)	0 (0)
20: El criminal fue tirado en prisión de inmediato.	37 (3)	63 (5)	0 (0)

Table 5.14: Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of *Lexical borrowing: Verbs* for group A (early exposure and frequent use) (N=18)

Item (Lexical Borrowing: Verbs)	Percentage acceptable (N=18)	Percentage unacceptable (N=18)	Percentage did not answer (N=18)
1: Los gobiernos giran a las guerras para resolver conflictos.	22 (4)	78 (14)	0 (0)
4: Lo que mi jefe decía, iba.	72 (13)	28 (5)	0 (0)
8: Nuestra amistad es fundada en la confianza.	56 (10)	44 (8)	0 (0)
13: Cuando llega el tiempo de hacer una decisión, Luis no sabe cómo.	50 (9)	50 (9)	0 (0)
17: Todos respetaban al presidente porque era quien aguantaba más poder en la compañía.	50 (9)	50 (9)	0 (0)
18: Dejé de ir a su casa porque realicé que no le gustaban las visitas.	17 (3)	83 (15)	0 (0)
20: El criminal fue tirado en prisión de inmediato.	33 (6)	67 (12)	0 (0)

5.4.1 Discussion of Table 5.14

Participants from group A had a higher percentage of acceptable items in two out of seven items in this category (items 4 and 8) and had lower percentages of acceptability in three out of seven items (items 1, 18, and 20). The remaining two items (13 and 17) received an even number of acceptable and unacceptable responses. Item 4 includes the use of the verb *iba* instead of the more acceptable construction in Spanish *se hacía*. It is possible that most participants in

this group classified this item as acceptable for one of the following reasons: (1) the meaning of only one word (the verb *iba*) is transferred from English as opposed to an entire phrase or syntactic structure; (2) the construction may be unfamiliar to them, and they classified the item as acceptable to avoid explaining its unacceptability and rewriting the item; (3) the structure is familiar to them in English and it has become entrenched (Langacker, 2016 and Bybee, 2014) in their lexical inventory and thus wins the competition with the Spanish *se hacía* construction.

Item 8 includes the phrase *es fundada* as a direct translation of *is founded*. Among the possible reasons why most participants in this group rated this item as acceptable are: (1) while they may know the Spanish verbs *ser* and *estar*, they are unaware of the nuances behind the use of one versus the other (see explanation in section 5.3.1 above); (2) the English structure has become entrenched (Langacker, 2016 and Bybee, 2014) in their inventory and thus is preferred over the Spanish *está basada* construction.

The saliency or markedness of the transferred structures in items 1, 18, and 20 may have led most participants in group A to classify these items as unacceptable. An in-depth discussion of the participants' explanations and rewritten versions of the items in this category is included in Chapter 6.

Table 5.15: Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of *Lexical borrowing: Nouns* for group A (early exposure and frequent use) (N=18)

Item (Lexical Borrowing: Nouns)	Percentage acceptable (N=18)	Percentage unacceptable (N=18)	Percentage did not answer (N=18)
2: Dos personas con vistas distintas pueden causar un conflicto.	44 (8)	56 (10)	0 (0)

5.4.2 Discussion of Table 5.15

Most participants in group A, ten out of eighteen or 56%, classified this item as unacceptable while the remaining eight classified it as acceptable. Because the difference between the number of acceptable versus unacceptable answers is negligible, a detailed discussion of the participants' explanations and rewritten versions of the item in this category is provided in Chapter 6.

Table 5.16: Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of *Lexical borrowing: Prepositions* for group A (early exposure and frequent use) (N=18)

Item (Lexical borrowing: prepositions)	Percentage acceptable (N=18)	Percentage unacceptable (N=18)	Percentage did not answer (N=18)
5: El teniente está en cargo del ejército.	17 (3)	83 (15)	0 (0)
12: Juan es amigable, pero en la otra mano, su hermano Alberto es muy grosero.	27 (5)	67 (12)	6 (1)
14: Luis empezó a depender demasiado en sus amigos.	61 (11)	39 (7)	0 (0)

5.4.3 Discussion of Table 5.16

Most participants classified items 5 and 12 as unacceptable. Item 12 includes an entire phrase or idiom in Spanish (i.e., *en la otra mano*) that does not have the same adversative function it does in English. This helps explain the reason why twelve out of eighteen participants (67%) classified it as unacceptable. Items 5 and 14, however, both contain an unidiomatic use of the preposition *en* in different contexts. Curiously, there is a marked difference between the

number of acceptable answers for item 5 (3) and item 14 (11). A more nuanced discussion of the participants' explanations and rewritten versions of these two items can be found in Chapter 6.

Table 5.17: Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of *Lexical borrowing: Adjectives* for group A (early exposure and frequent use) (N=18)

Item (Lexical borrowing: adjectives)	Percentage acceptable (N=18)	Percentage unacceptable (N=18)	Percentage did not answer (N=18)
6: Los exploradores viajan por el mar en una línea derecha.	72 (13)	28 (5)	0 (0)

5.4.4 Discussion of Table 5.17

Most participants (thirteen out of eighteen or 72%) classified this item as acceptable. It is possible that this result is due to one of the following reasons: (1) the prepositional phrase *en una línea derecha* has become entrenched (Langacker, 2016 and Bybee, 2014) in their lexical inventory and thus wins the competition with the Spanish *en una línea recta*; (2) upon seeing that this item is included in this study's title, participants may have been misled to believe that this item is grammatically acceptable in Spanish. A more detailed discussion of the participants' explanations and rewritten versions of this item can be found in Chapter 6.

Table 5.18: Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of *Preposition Stranding* for group A (early exposure and frequent use)

Item (Preposition stranding)	Percentage acceptable (N=18)	Percentage unacceptable (N=18)	Percentage did not answer (N=18)
9: Los colonizadores traían enfermedades que los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos a.	27 (5)	67 (12)	6 (1)
10: El muchacho ya no sabía quién confiar en.	0 (0)	94 (17)	6 (1)
16: Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que lograron apoderarse de.	27 (5)	72 (13)	0 (0)

5.4.5 Discussion of Table 5.18

While most participants classified all three items with stranded prepositions as unacceptable, several judged them as acceptable. Out of all the phenomena included in this study, preposition stranding is the only one that does not occur in Spanish. The participants' rewritten versions of these items, along with their explanations on the Acceptability Test, will shed some light on the metalinguistic processes that are involved when they are decoding and interpreting constructions such as the ones in this category.

Table 5.19: Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items with cross-linguistic influence in the (N=10) category of *Lexical borrowing: Verbs* for group B (late exposure and less frequent use)

Item (Lexical borrowing: Verbs)	Percentage acceptable (N=10)	Percentage unacceptable (N=10)	Percentage did not answer (N=10)
1: Los gobiernos giran a las guerras para resolver conflictos.	30 (3)	70 (7)	0 (0)
4: Lo que mi jefe decía, iba.	30 (3)	70 (7)	0 (0)
8: Nuestra amistad es fundada en la confianza.	60 (6)	40 (4)	0 (0)
13: Cuando llega el tiempo de hacer una decisión, Luis no sabe cómo.	70 (7)	30 (3)	0 (0)
17: Todos respetaban al presidente porque era quien aguantaba más poder en la compañía.	50 (5)	50 (5)	0 (0)
18: Dejé de ir a su casa porque realicé que no le gustaban las visitas.	30 (3)	70 (7)	0 (0)
20: El criminal fue tirado en prisión de inmediato.	40 (4)	60 (6)	0 (0)

5.4.6 Discussion of Table 5.19

As expected for this group, there were higher percentages of unacceptability in more than half of the items in this category (four out of seven), with items 1, 4, and 18 receiving a 70% unacceptability rating from participants in group B. Item 17 received an even number of acceptable and unacceptable responses (5). The remaining two items (8 and 13) were classified as acceptable by most participants (60% and 70%, respectively). Although the participants in this

group were expected to classify items 8 and 13 as unacceptable, they may have judged them as acceptable for one of the following reasons: (1) they are unaware of the more acceptable constructions in Spanish (i.e., *está basada* and *tomar una decision*); (2) as a result of their less frequent use of two or more languages in most domains of their daily lives, their metalinguistic skills may not be as acute and/or developed as participants in groups A and C. A more detailed comparison among the responses provided by all groups in this category is presented below in Table 5.34.

Table 5.20: Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of *Lexical borrowing: Nouns* for group B (late exposure and less frequent use) (N=10)

Item	Percentage acceptable (N=10)	Percentage unacceptable (N=10)	Percentage did not answer (N=10)
2: Dos personas con vistas distintas pueden causar un conflicto.	40 (4)	60 (6)	0 (0)

5.4.7 Discussion of Table 5.20

While most participants in group B (six out of ten) classified this item as unacceptable, a significant number (four out of ten) judged it as acceptable. A more detailed discussion of the participants' explanations and rewritten versions of this item can be found in Chapter 6.

Table 5.21: Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of *Lexical borrowing: Prepositions* for group B (late exposure and less frequent use) (N=10)

Item	Percentage acceptable (N=10)	Percentage unacceptable (N=10)	Percentage did not answer (N=10)
5: El teniente está en cargo del ejército.	30 (3)	70 (7)	0 (0)
12: Juan es amigable, pero en la otra mano, su hermano Alberto es muy grosero.	50 (5)	50 (5)	0 (0)
14: Luis empezó a depender demasiado en sus amigos.	80 (8)	20 (2)	0 (0)

5.4.8 Discussion of Table 5.21

Surprisingly, the acceptability percentages for group B in this category are higher than those for group A (EarlExpFr), with item 14 receiving an 80% of acceptability. Curiously, item 5 includes the same preposition as item 14 (i.e., *en*), but received a much lower percentage of acceptability (30% and 80%, respectively).

Table 5.22: Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of *Lexical borrowing: Adjectives* for group B (late exposure and less frequent use) (N=10)

Item	Percentage acceptable (N=10)	Percentage unacceptable (N=10)	Percentage did not answer (N=10)
6: Los exploradores viajan por el mar en una línea derecha.	40 (4)	60 (6)	0 (0)

5.4.9 Discussion of Table 5.22

Although most participants (six out of ten) judged this item as unacceptable, the difference in percentage is negligible. Just as it has been posited for group A (EarlExpFr), it is possible that participants may have been misled to believe that this item is grammatically acceptable in Spanish after seeing this construction included in the study's title. An analysis of the participants' rewritten version appears in Chapter 6.

Table 5.23: Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of *Preposition stranding* for group B (late exposure and less frequent use) (N=10)

Item	Percentage acceptable (N=10)	Percentage unacceptable (N=10)	Percentage did not answer (N=10)
9: Los colonizadores traían enfermedades que los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos a.	10 (1)	90 (9)	0 (0)
10: El muchacho ya no sabía quién confiar en.	10 (1)	90 (9)	0 (0)
16: Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que lograron apoderarse de.	10 (1)	80 (8)	10 (1)

5.4.10 Discussion of Table 5.23

As expected, an overwhelming majority of participants in this group judge preposition stranding, an inexistent phenomenon in Spanish, to be unacceptable. This may be the result of their later exposure to and less frequent use of English, a language where preposition stranding is common. A more detailed comparison among the responses provided by all groups in this category is presented in Table 5.38 below.

Table 5.24: Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of *Lexical borrowing: Verbs* for group C (early exposure and less frequent use) (N=8)

Item (Lexical borrowing: Verbs)	Percentage acceptable (N=8)	Percentage unacceptable (N=8)	Percentage did not answer (N=8)
1: Los gobiernos giran a las guerras para resolver conflictos.	0 (0)	100 (8)	0 (0)
4: Lo que mi jefe decía, iba.	63 (5)	37 (3)	0 (0)
8: Nuestra amistad es fundada en la confianza.	25 (2)	75 (6)	0 (0)
13: Cuando llega el tiempo de hacer una decisión, Luis no sabe cómo.	75 (6)	25 (2)	0 (0)
17: Todos respetaban al presidente porque era quien aguantaba más poder en la compañía.	37 (3)	63 (5)	0 (0)
18: Dejé de ir a su casa porque realicé que no le gustaban las visitas.	25 (2)	75 (6)	0 (0)
20: El criminal fue tirado en prisión de inmediato.	37 (3)	63 (5)	0 (0)

5.4.11 Discussion of Table 5.24

Two of the seven items in this category received a higher percentage of acceptability (items 4 and 13) while five were classified as unacceptable by most (items 8, 17, 18, and 20) or all (item 1) participants in this group. While a more nuanced analysis of the participants' explanations in the acceptability test is provided in Chapter 6, the results in this category suggest that: (1) participants in group C exhibit more highly developed metalinguistic skills in Spanish

because of their more balanced exposure (when compared to the other two groups) to both languages in most domains; (2) due to their less frequent use of English, the Spanish structures have become more entrenched in their linguistic inventory and are the ones that most deem as acceptable.

Table 5.25: Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of *Lexical borrowing: Nouns* for group C (early exposure and less frequent use) (N=8)

Item (Lexical borrowing: Nouns)	Percentage acceptable (N=8)	Percentage unacceptable (N=8)	Percentage did not answer (N=8)
2: Dos personas con vistas distintas pueden causar un conflicto.	25 (2)	75 (6)	0 (0)

5.4.12 Discussion of Table 5.25

In line with the results obtained by groups A and B in this category, most participants in group C judged this item as unacceptable.

Table 5.26: Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of *Lexical borrowing: Prepositions* for group C (early exposure and less frequent use) (N=8)

Item (Lexical borrowing: Prepositions)	Percentage acceptable (N=8)	Percentage unacceptable (N=8)	Percentage did not answer (N=8)
5: El teniente está en cargo del ejército.	13 (1)	87 (7)	0 (0)
12: Juan es amigable, pero en la otra mano, su hermano Alberto es muy grosero.	50 (4)	50 (4)	0 (0)

14: Luis empezó a depender demasiado en sus amigos.	50 (4)	50 (4)	0 (0)
---	--------	--------	-------

5.4.13 Discussion of Table 5.26

Table 5.26 seems to align with the pattern that has been established by groups A and B in this category: they rate the cross-linguistic use of Spanish preposition *en* depending on the context where it is found. While all three sentences include *en*, only items 12 and 14 received a significant number of acceptable responses (four each or 50%). Item 5, on the other hand, was classified as acceptable by just one participant. It is possible that item 5, with its unidiomatic use of *en cargo del*, leads participants to judge it as unacceptable because they interpret the combination of *en* + *cargo* as a misspelled version of the noun *encargo*. It is also possible that the cross-linguistic constructions in 12 and 14 have become entrenched and transferred to the participants' L1.

Table 5.27: Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of *Lexical borrowing: Adjectives* for group C (early exposure and less frequent use) (N=8)

Item (Lexical borrowing: Adjectives)	Percentage acceptable (N=8)	Percentage unacceptable (N=8)	Percentage did not answer (N=8)
6: Los exploradores viajan por el mar en una línea derecha.	75 (6)	25 (2)	0 (0)

5.4.14 Discussion of Table 5.27

There is a clear tendency towards judging item 6 as acceptable as all three groups present higher acceptability percentages. Again, it is possible that they perceive the title of this study as

authoritative and prescriptively well-constructed and thus feel inclined to classify this item as acceptable without giving it a second thought.

Table 5.28: Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of *Preposition stranding* for group C (early exposure and less frequent use) (N=8)

Item (Preposition stranding)	Percentage acceptable (N=8)	Percentage unacceptable (N=8)	Percentage did not answer (N=8)
9: Los colonizadores traían enfermedades que los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos a.	37 (3)	63 (5)	0 (0)
10: El muchacho ya no sabía quién confiar en.	0 (0)	100 (8)	0 (0)
16: Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que lograron apoderarse de.	25 (2)	75 (6)	0 (0)

5.4.15 Discussion of Table 5.28

Most participants in this study, regardless of their age of exposure, frequency of use or proficiency in English and Spanish, demonstrate a clear tendency towards classifying stranded prepositions as unacceptable. Interestingly, group C is the only group in which the totality of participants has rated more than one item as unacceptable (i.e., item 1 in Table 5.24 and item 10 in Table 5.28). A more nuanced analysis of their answers in this and all other categories is included in Chapter 6.

Table 5.29: Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items without cross-linguistic influence (fillers) for all groups (N=36)

Item	Percentage acceptable (N=36)	Percentage unacceptable (N=36)	Percentage did not answer (N=36)
3: El nuevo presidente fue electo en noviembre.	77.8 (28)	22.2 (8)	0 (0)
7: Uno de los pasajeros olvidó sus pertenencias en el avión.	97.2 (35)	2.8 (1)	0 (0)
11: Muchos artistas no se acostumbran a la fama y la fortuna.	94.4 (34)	5.6 (2)	0 (0)
15: La pandemia les ha cambiado la vida a muchos puertorriqueños.	50 (18)	47.2 (17)	2.8 (1)
19: Fui a buscarte a tu casa pero no había nadie cuando llegué.	80.6 (29)	19.4 (7)	0 (0)

Table 5.30: Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items without cross-linguistic influence (fillers) for group A (early exposure and frequent use) (N=18)

Item	Percentage acceptable (N=18)	Percentage unacceptable (N=18)	Percentage did not answer (N=18)
3: El nuevo presidente fue electo en noviembre.	78 (14)	22 (4)	0 (0)
7: Uno de los pasajeros olvidó sus pertenencias en el avión.	100 (18)	0 (0)	0 (0)
11: Muchos artistas no se acostumbran a la fama y la fortuna.	89 (16)	11 (2)	0 (0)
15: La pandemia les ha cambiado la vida a muchos	56 (10)	44 (8)	0 (0)

puertorriqueños.			
19: Fui a buscarte a tu casa pero no había nadie cuando llegué.	78 (14)	22 (4)	0 (0)

5.4.16 Discussion of Table 5.30

All items without cross-linguistic influence obtained higher percentages of acceptability for group A. One item (7) was classified as acceptable by all participants in this group. The item that obtained fewer acceptability answers (item 15) includes an indirect object pronoun (*les*) that participants may have classified as unacceptable after concluding that the agreement is to be made with the direct object *la vida* instead of with the indirect object *los puertorriqueños*. The remaining items (3, 15, and 19) were classified as acceptable by most participants in group A.

Table 5.31: Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items without cross-linguistic influence (fillers) for group B (late exposure and less frequent use) (N=10)

Item	Percentage acceptable (N=10)	Percentage unacceptable (N=10)	Percentage did not answer (N=10)
3: El nuevo presidente fue electo en noviembre.	90 (9)	10 (1)	0 (0)
7: Uno de los pasajeros olvidó sus pertenencias en el avión.	100 (10)	0 (0)	0 (0)
11: Muchos artistas no se acostumbran a la fama y la fortuna.	100 (10)	0 (0)	0 (0)
15: La pandemia les ha cambiado la vida a muchos puertorriqueños.	60 (6)	30 (3)	10 (1)
19: Fui a buscarte a tu casa pero no había nadie cuando llegué.	80 (8)	20 (2)	0 (0)

5.4.17 Discussion of Table 5.31

All items without cross-linguistic influence obtained higher percentages of acceptability for group B. Two items (7 and 11) were classified as acceptable by all participants in this group. The item that obtained fewer acceptability answers (item 15) includes an indirect object pronoun (*les*) that participants may have classified as unacceptable after concluding that the agreement is to be made with the direct object *la vida* instead of with the indirect object *los puertorriqueños*.

The remaining items (3 and 19) were classified as acceptable by most participants in group B. A more nuanced analysis of their explanations for this and all other items without cross-linguistic influence is included in Chapter 6.

Table 5.32: Percentage of responses (acceptable or unacceptable) for items without cross-linguistic influence (fillers) for group C (early exposure and less frequent use) (N=8)

Item	Percentage acceptable (N=8)	Percentage unacceptable (N=8)	Percentage did not answer (N=8)
3: El nuevo presidente fue electo en noviembre.	63 (5)	37 (3)	0 (0)
7: Uno de los pasajeros olvidó sus pertenencias en el avión.	87 (7)	13 (1)	0 (0)
11: Muchos artistas no se acostumbran a la fama y la fortuna.	100 (8)	0 (0)	0 (0)
15: La pandemia les ha cambiado la vida a muchos puertorriqueños.	25 (2)	75 (6)	0 (0)
19: Fui a buscarte a tu casa pero no había nadie cuando llegué.	87 (7)	13 (1)	0 (0)

5.4.18 Discussion of Table 5.32

The results from group C are slightly different from groups A and B. For instance, item 15 was classified as unacceptable by most participants (six out of eight, or 75%). As it has been explained before, this item includes an indirect object pronoun (*les*) that participants may have classified as unacceptable due to confusion with pronoun and object agreement in Spanish. Item 11 was classified as acceptable by all participants in group C. The remaining items (3, 7, and 19) were classified as acceptable by most participants in this group.

Table 5.33: Comparison of answers for items without cross-linguistic influence (fillers) for all groups

3: El nuevo presidente fue electo en noviembre.	Acceptable	Unacceptable	Did not answer
Group A: Early exposure and frequent use (N=18)	78 (14)	22 (4)	0 (0)
Group B: Late exposure and less frequent use (N=10)	90 (9)	10 (1)	0 (0)
Group C: Early exposure and less frequent use (N=8)	63 (5)	37 (3)	0 (0)

7: Uno de los pasajeros olvidó sus pertenencias en el avión.	Acceptable	Unacceptable	Did not answer
Group A: Early exposure and frequent use (N=18)	100 (18)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Group B: Late exposure and less frequent use (N=10)	100 (10)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Group C: Early exposure and less frequent use (N=8)	87 (7)	13 (1)	0 (0)

11: Muchos artistas no se acostumbran a la fama y la fortuna.	Acceptable	Unacceptable	Did not answer
Group A: Early exposure and frequent use (N=18)	89 (16)	11 (2)	0 (0)
Group B: Late exposure and less frequent use (N=10)	100 (10)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Group C: Early exposure and less frequent use (N=8)	100 (8)	0 (0)	0 (0)

15: La pandemia les ha cambiado la vida a muchos puertorriqueños.	Acceptable	Unacceptable	Did not answer
Group A: Early exposure and frequent use (N=18)	56 (10)	44 (8)	0 (0)
Group B: Late exposure and less frequent use (N=10)	60 (6)	30 (3)	10 (1)
Group C: Early exposure and less frequent use (N=8)	25 (2)	75 (6)	0 (0)

19: Fui a buscarte a tu casa pero no había nadie cuando llegué.	Acceptable	Unacceptable	Did not answer
Group A: Early exposure and frequent use (N=18)	78 (14)	22 (4)	0 (0)
Group B: Late exposure and less frequent use (N=10)	80 (8)	20 (2)	0 (0)
Group C: Early exposure and less frequent use (N=8)	87 (7)	13 (1)	0 (0)

5.4.19 Discussion of differences among groups A, B, and C for items without cross-linguistic influence

Item 3 was classified as acceptable by most participants in all three groups. Group C (EarlExpLessFr) exhibited the highest percentage of unacceptability (37%) when compared to groups A (22%) and B (10%).

Item 7 presented less variability than other items without cross-linguistic influence. The totality of participants from groups A (EarlExpFr) and B (LateExpLessFr) classified this item as acceptable while most participants in group C (87%) did the same.

Item 11 was also judged as acceptable by most participants in all groups. The totality of participants from groups B (LateExpLessFr) and C (EarlExpLessFr) classified this item as acceptable while most participants in group A (EarlExpFr) (89%) did the same.

Item 15 presented the most variability out of the items without cross-linguistic influence. While most participants from groups A and B classified this item as acceptable (56% and 60%, respectively), most participants from group C (75%) classified it as unacceptable. Item 19 exhibits similar percentages for all three groups, with most participants classifying this item as acceptable (78% for A, 80% for B, and 87% for C). A more detailed analysis of the participants' explanations for this item is included in Chapter 6.

Table 5.34: Comparison of answers for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of

Lexical borrowing: Verbs for all groups

1: Los gobiernos giran a las guerras para resolver conflictos.	Acceptable	Unacceptable	Did not answer
Group A: Early exposure and frequent use (N=18)	22 (4)	78 (14)	0 (0)
Group B: Late exposure and less frequent use (N=10)	30 (3)	70 (7)	0 (0)
Group C: Early exposure and less frequent use (N=8)	0 (0)	100 (8)	0 (0)

4: Lo que mi jefe decía, iba.	Acceptable	Unacceptable	Did not answer
Group A: Early exposure and frequent use (N=18)	72 (13)	28 (5)	0 (0)
Group B: Late exposure and less frequent use (N=10)	30 (3)	70 (7)	0 (0)
Group C: Early exposure and less frequent use (N=8)	63 (5)	37 (3)	0 (0)

8: Nuestra amistad es fundada en la confianza.	Acceptable	Unacceptable	Did not answer
Group A: Early exposure and frequent use (N=18)	56 (10)	44 (8)	0 (0)
Group B: Late exposure and less frequent use (N=10)	60 (6)	40 (4)	0 (0)
Group C: Early exposure and less frequent use (N=8)	25 (2)	75 (6)	0 (0)

13: Cuando llega el tiempo de hacer una decisión, Luis no sabe cómo.	Acceptable	Unacceptable	Did not answer
Group A: Early exposure and frequent use (N=18)	50 (9)	50 (9)	0 (0)
Group B: Late exposure and less frequent use (N=10)	70 (7)	30 (3)	0 (0)
Group C: Early exposure and less frequent use (N=8)	75 (6)	25 (2)	0 (0)

17: Todos respetaban al presidente porque era quien aguantaba más poder en la compañía.	Acceptable	Unacceptable	Did not answer
Group A: Early exposure and frequent use (N=18)	50 (9)	50 (9)	0 (0)
Group B: Late exposure and less frequent use (N=10)	50 (5)	50 (5)	0 (0)
Group C: Early exposure and less frequent use (N=8)	37 (3)	63 (5)	0 (0)

18: Dejé de ir a su casa porque realicé que no le gustaban las visitas.	Acceptable	Unacceptable	Did not answer
Group A: Early exposure and frequent use (N=18)	17 (3)	83 (15)	0 (0)
Group B: Late exposure and less frequent use (N=10)	30 (3)	70 (7)	0 (0)
Group C: Early exposure and less frequent use (N=8)	25 (2)	75 (6)	0 (0)

20: El criminal fue tirado en prisión de inmediato.	Acceptable	Unacceptable	Did not answer
Group A: Early exposure and frequent use (N=18)	33 (6)	67 (12)	0 (0)
Group B: Late exposure and less frequent use (N=10)	40 (4)	60 (6)	0 (0)
Group C: Early exposure and less frequent use (N=8)	37 (3)	63 (5)	0 (0)

5.4.20 Discussion of differences among groups A, B, and C for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of *Lexical borrowing: Verbs*

Item 1 (Los gobiernos giran a las guerras para resolver conflictos.) was classified as unacceptable by most participants in all groups (78% for group A and 70% for group B), with the totality of group C (EarlExpLessFr) judging this item as unacceptable. It seems clear that the phrase *girar a* is considered unidiomatic by most participants in this study. The participants' explanations for this item will be analyzed in Chapter 6.

Item 4 (Lo que mi jefe decía, iba.) was classified as acceptable by most participants in group A (EarlExpFr) (72%), as it was hypothesized, and by the majority of participants from group C (EarlExpLessFr) (63%). On the other hand, most participants from group B (LateExpLessFr) classified this item as acceptable. The results in this item align with the hypotheses that guide this study (i.e., (1) Early (simultaneous) Spanish-English bilinguals who use English more

frequently, and in more domains than Spanish, are the initiators of English L2 influence on L1 Spanish and are prone to judge instances of cross-linguistic influence as acceptable;

(2) Early exposure to English and frequent use of L2 English in most domains might lead to restructuring of L1 Spanish lexicon and syntax.)

Item 8 (Nuestra amistad es fundada en la confianza.) was classified as acceptable by most participants from groups A (EarlExpFr) and B (LateExpLessFr) (56% and 60%, respectively). Surprisingly, and contrary to what was hypothesized, group B had a higher percentage of acceptability than the other two groups, with most participants from group C (EarlExpLessFr) (75%) classifying this item as unacceptable.

Item 13 (Cuando llega el tiempo de hacer una decisión, Luis no sabe cómo.) is one of the few items that disproves the hypotheses that guide this study. Contrary to what was hypothesized, a smaller percentage of participants from group A (EarlExpFr) classified this item as acceptable (50%) than groups B (LateExpLessFr) (70%) and C (EarlExpLessFr) (75%). The participants' explanations for this item will be discussed in Chapter 6 to provide a more nuanced analysis of the results that were obtained.

Item 17 (Todos respetaban al presidente porque era quien aguantaba más poder en la compañía.) was evenly rated as acceptable and unacceptable by 50% of participants in both group A (EarlExpFr) and group B (LateExpLessFr). Group C (EarlExpLessFr) was the outlier for this item, with 37% classifying it as acceptable and 63% as unacceptable. Once more, a greater number than expected from participants in Group B (LateExpLessFr) classified an item with cross-linguistic influence as acceptable.

Item 18 (Dejé de ir a su casa porque realicé que no le gustaban las visitas.) presents the most unforeseen set of data from the items in this category. Most participants from group A

(EarlExpFr), the group that was expected to provide higher percentages of acceptability in items with cross-linguistic influence, classified this item as unacceptable (83%). Although most members from groups B (LateExpLessFr) and C (EarlExpLessFr) classified this item as unacceptable, their percentages (70% and 75%, respectively) were lower than those provided by group A.

Item 20 (El criminal fue tirado en prisión de inmediato.) presents a similar case to the previous item (18), with most participants from group A (EarlExpFr) classifying this item as unacceptable (67%). While the difference between group A and the other two groups in this item is not as significant as the one seen in item 18, the percentage of unacceptability for group B (LateExpLessFr) (60%) is lower than expected. The participants' explanations for this item will be discussed in Chapter 6 to provide a more nuanced analysis of the results.

Table 5.35: Comparison of answers for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of *Lexical borrowing: Nouns* for all groups

2: Dos personas con vistas distintas pueden causar un conflicto.	Acceptable	Unacceptable	Did not answer
Group A: Early exposure and frequent use (N=18)	44 (8)	56 (10)	0 (0)
Group B: Late exposure and less frequent use (N=10)	40 (4)	60 (6)	0 (0)
Group C: Early exposure and less frequent use (N=8)	25 (2)	75 (6)	0 (0)

5.4.21 Discussion of differences among groups A, B, and C for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of *Lexical borrowing: Nouns*

The results obtained in this item (**Dos personas con vistas distintas pueden causar un conflicto.**) align with the hypotheses that guide this study. Although only by a slight margin, group A (EarlExpFr) had a higher percentage of acceptability (44%) than groups B (LateExpLessFr) (40%) and C (EarlExpLessFr) (25%). Even then, the percentage for group B (LateExpLessFr) exceeds the number that was expected for this group since they were hypothesized to have higher percentages of unacceptability than the other two groups in items with cross-linguistic influence.

Table 5.36: Comparison of answers for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of *Lexical borrowing: Prepositions* for all groups

5: El teniente está en cargo del ejército.	Acceptable	Unacceptable	Did not answer
Group A: Early exposure and frequent use (N=18)	17 (3)	83 (15)	0 (0)
Group B: Late exposure and less frequent use (N=10)	30 (3)	70 (7)	0 (0)
Group C: Early exposure and less frequent use (N=8)	13 (1)	87 (7)	0 (0)

12: Juan es amigable, pero en la otra mano, su hermano Alberto es muy grosero.	Acceptable	Unacceptable	Did not answer
Group A: Early exposure and frequent use (N=18)	27 (5)	67 (12)	6 (1)
Group B: Late exposure and less frequent use (N=10)	50 (5)	50 (5)	0 (0)
Group C: Early exposure and less frequent use (N=8)	50 (4)	50 (4)	0 (0)

14: Luis empezó a depender demasiado en sus amigos.	Acceptable	Unacceptable	Did not answer
Group A: Early exposure and frequent use (N=18)	61 (11)	39 (7)	0 (0)
Group B: Late exposure and less frequent use (N=10)	80 (8)	20 (2)	0 (0)
Group C: Early exposure and less frequent use (N=8)	50 (4)	50 (4)	0 (0)

5.4.22 Discussion of differences among groups A, B, and C for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of *Lexical borrowing: Prepositions*

This category presented some variability in the results and seems to disprove the hypotheses for the most part.

Item 5 (El teniente está en cargo del ejército.) obtained a higher percentage of acceptability from group B (LateExpLessFr) (30%) than from groups A (EarlExpFr) (17%) and C (EarlExpLessFr) (13%).

Item 14 (Luis empezó a depender demasiado en sus amigos.) presents a similar scenario, with group B (LateExpLessFr) obtaining a higher percentage of acceptability (80%) than groups A (EarlExpFr) (61%) and C (EarlExpLessFr) (50%).

It is important to note that items 5 and 14 present a case in which only the preposition *en* has been directly translated from English. The unacceptability of these items hinges on changing *en* for *a* in item 5 (i.e., *El teniente está a cargo del ejército*) and *en* for *de* in item 14 (i.e., *Luis empezó a depender demasiado de sus amigos*).

Item 12 (Juan es amigable, pero en la otra mano, su hermano Alberto es muy grosero.), on the other hand, includes an idiomatic expression that has been directly translated from English (i.e., *on the other hand*), and not just the single preposition *en* as in items 5 and 14. The results show groups B (LateExpLessFr) and C (EarlExpLessFr) with a 50% rate of acceptability and unacceptability and group A (EarlExpFr) with the lowest percentage of acceptability out of the three groups at 27%.

While the results in the category of *Lexical borrowing: Prepositions* appear to disprove the hypotheses, they support the premise that early exposure and/or frequent use of English and

Spanish promote keener metalinguistic skills and allow participants from groups A and C to judge items with cross-linguistic influence as unacceptable.

Table 5.37: Comparison of answers for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of *Lexical borrowing: Adjectives* for all groups

6: Los exploradores viajan por el mar en una línea derecha.	Acceptable: percentage (number of participants)	Unacceptable: percentage (number of participants)	Did not answer: percentage (number of participants)
Group A: Early exposure and frequent use (N=18)	72 (13)	28 (5)	0 (0)
Group B: Late exposure and less frequent use (N=10)	40 (4)	60 (6)	0 (0)
Group C: Early exposure and less frequent use (N=8)	75 (6)	25 (2)	0 (0)

5.4.23 Discussion of differences among groups A, B, and C for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of *Lexical borrowing: Adjectives*

This item is one of the few that clearly aligns with the hypotheses that guide this investigation, but still presents a certain degree of variation. As hypothesized, group A (EarlExpFr) has a higher percentage of acceptability (72%) than group B (LateExpLessFr) (40%), but that percentage is still slightly lower than the percentage of acceptability for group C (EarlExpLessFr) (75%).

While this study invokes factors such as early exposure to and frequent use of English to account for the high percentage of acceptability for these groups, it is also possible that they

respond to other factors. For instance, because this item appears in the title of the study, it could be surmised that participants from all three groups, but more specifically A and C, judged this construction as correct.

Table 5.38: Comparison of answers for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of *Preposition stranding* for all groups

9: Los colonizadores traían enfermedades que los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos a.	Acceptable: percentage (number of participants)	Unacceptable: percentage (number of participants)	Did not answer: percentage (number of participants)
Group A: Early exposure and frequent use (N=18)	27 (5)	67 (12)	6 (1)
Group B: Late exposure and less frequent use (N=10)	10 (1)	90 (9)	0 (0)
Group C: Early exposure and less frequent use (N=8)	37 (3)	63 (5)	0 (0)

10: El muchacho ya no sabía quién confiar en.	Acceptable	Unacceptable	Did not answer
Group A: Early exposure and frequent use (N=18)	0 (0)	94 (17)	6 (1)
Group B: Late	10 (1)	90 (9)	0 (0)

exposure and less frequent use (N=10)			
Group C: Early exposure and less frequent use (N=8)	0 (0)	100 (8)	0 (0)

16: Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que lograron apoderarse de.	Acceptable	Unacceptable	Did not answer
Group A: Early exposure and frequent use (N=18)	28 (5)	72 (13)	0 (0)
Group B: Late exposure and less frequent use (N=10)	10 (1)	80 (8)	10 (1)
Group C: Early exposure and less frequent use (N=8)	25 (2)	75 (6)	0 (0)

5.4.24 Discussion of differences among groups A, B, and C for items with cross-linguistic influence in the category of *Preposition stranding*

The overwhelming number of unacceptable answers in all three items in this category was expected for two reasons: (1) they align with the hypothesis that group A (EarlExpFr) would have a higher percentage of acceptability (28%) than groups B (LateExpLessFr) (10%) and C (EarlExpLessFr) (25%), and (2) they include a construction (preposition stranding) that is non-existent in Spanish.

It is evident that, regardless of the age of exposure or frequency of use, most participants classified the stranded prepositions in items 9 (*Los colonizadores traían enfermedades que los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos a.*), 10 (*El muchacho ya no sabía quién confiar en.*), and 16 (*Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que lograron apoderarse de.*) as unacceptable.

Interestingly, and contrary to what would be expected when compared to the other cross linguistic phenomena included in this study, 10% of participants from group B (LateExpLessFr) classified all three items in this category as acceptable while 23% and 37% of participants from group C (EarlExpLessFr) classified items 9 and 16 as acceptable.

5.5 Summary of quantitative data

Group C (EarlExpLessFr) obtained the highest percentage of unacceptable answers in all categories (46%) as well as the lowest percentage of acceptability in most items (60%). These are the numbers and tendencies that were expected from group B (LateExpLessFr).

Contrary to what was proposed in the hypotheses that guide this study, group A (EarlExpFr) did not obtain the highest percentages of acceptability in items with cross-linguistic influence. These participants did, however, produce a lower percentage of unacceptability, albeit in an unexpected tie with group B at 27%. The implications of the numbers reported in this chapter will be presented in Chapter 7 (Conclusions).

Chapter 6: Qualitative Analysis of Data

6.1 Overview

This chapter provides a more nuanced examination of the participants' answers in the acceptability test. The participants' explanations for classifying an item as unacceptable offer insights concerning their metalinguistic skills and an overview of their tendencies to adhere to standard or prescriptive grammatical structures.

The analysis will focus on the items with cross-linguistic influence for which participants provided an explanation and a rewritten (or acceptable) version. Items will be analyzed by category and subdivided by groups to allow for comparison. In order to make reference to specific explanations, each answer was identified by group (A, B or C), item number, and the order in which the participant's answer appears in the results (e.g., A.1.9 refers to the ninth answer in the results for group A for item 1 in the acceptability test). The answers included here are reproduced *verbatim*; the investigator has neither altered nor edited them in any way.

6.2 Analysis of Category: *Lexical borrowing: Verbs*

The items examined here comprise direct translations from English of isolated verbs or verb phrases. Each table includes only the participants' unacceptable answers. The discussion that follows each table addresses the participants' answers and explanations in the acceptability test and evaluates the nature of such explanations to provide a more nuanced view of the participants' metalinguistic awareness.

Item 1: **Los gobiernos giran a las guerras para resolver conflictos.**

Table 6.1: Answers provided for item 1 by participants from group A (EarlExpFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
A.1.1	<i>El uso de la palabra giran es incorrecto. Reescrita: Los gobiernos tienden a utilizar las guerras para resolver conflictos.</i>
A.1.2	<i>En mi opinión una mejor traducción sería "tornar a las guerras". Los gobiernos tornan a las guerras para resolver conflictos.</i>
A.1.3	<i>Los gobiernos van a las guerras para resolver conflictos.</i>
A.1.4	<i>Está haciendo una traducción directa de inglés a español y aunque en inglés es aceptable escribir/decir "Governments turn to wars to resolve conflicts" en español se debería escribir/decir "Los gobiernos recurren/acuden a las guerras para resolver conflictos".</i>
A.1.5	<i>La oración debería de decir, "Los gobiernos recurren a las guerras para resolver conflictos."</i>
A.1.6	<i>El contexto en el que se está usando el verbo "giran" está incorrecto. Se está usando "giran" con la definición de "turn" (To resort to something), la cual no se le aplica al verbo "giran" en español. La oración puede cambiarse a "Los gobiernos utilizan las guerras para resolver conflictos."</i>

A.1.7	<i>La oración suena extraña ya que suena como si los gobiernos tienes que dar vueltas para las guerras. Oración re escrita: Los gobiernos recurren a las guerras para resolver conflictos.</i>
A.1.8	<i>Porque significa "turn" en inglés y sería aceptable en inglés. Sin embargo no hace sentido en español. Reescribir la oración: Los gobiernos usan las guerras para resolver conflictos.</i>
A.1.9	<i>No hace mucho sentido la palabra "giran". Los gobiernos utilizan las guerras para resolver conflictos.</i>
A.1.10	<i>"Giran" es una palabra usado figuradamente en inglés, no tiene el mismo impacto en español. "Los gobiernos deciden utilizar guerras para resolver conflictos."</i>
A.1.11	<i>No se porque exactamente, pero decir que "giran" suena mal. Tal vez se escucharía mejor si dijera algo como: "Las guerras son la primera opción del gobierno para resolver conflictos."</i>
A.1.12	<i>Esto suena como una traducción de: The governments turn to wars to solve conflicts. Parece que la palabra 'turn' fue traducida sin contexto, pues la palabra 'gira' realmente no se usa de la misma manera en español. En este caso, 'turn' se refiere más bien a 'recurrir'. La oración entonces sería : Los gobiernos recurren a las guerras para resolver conflictos.</i>
A.1.13	<i>Los gobiernos utilizan las guerras para resolver conflictos.</i>

A.1.14	<i>Porque la palabra giran no se utiliza en ese contexto. Yo lo escribiría como: Los gobiernos acuden a las guerras para resolver conflictos.</i>
--------	---

6.2.1 Discussion of Table 6.1

It is evident that most participants (fourteen out of eighteen, or 78%) from group A (EarlExpFr) rejected the use of *girar* in a context that according to prescriptive norms calls for the verbs *recurrir* or *utilizar*. Their answers demonstrate awareness of the direct translation of the English verb *turn* to Spanish *girar*. Among the constructions that they provided are *tienden a* (A.1.1), *tornan a* (A.1.2), *van a* (A.1.3), *acuden a* (A.1.14), *recurren a* (A.1.4, A.1.5, A.1.7, A.1.12), *utilizan* or *usan* (A.1.6, A.1.8, A.1.9, A.1.10, and A.1.13), and *son la primera opción* (A.1.11).

Some of their explanations overtly state that the construction is “strange” (A.1.7), ill-sounding (A.1.11), and nonsensical (A.1.9). The most common explanation (six out of eighteen participants) is that the construction in item 1 is a direct translation from English, with A.1.12 providing a translation in English to prove their point. None of the answers and rewritten versions for item 1 seem to deviate from standard or prescriptive Spanish.

Table 6.2: Answers provided for item 1 by participants from group B (LateExpLessFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
B.1.1	<i>porque no tiene sentido usa mal la palabra "turn", la oracion deberia ser "Los gobiernos tornan a las guerras para resolver conflictos"</i>
B.“.2	<i>Es una traducción mal hecha de "turn to". Los gobiernos resultan a las guerras para resolver conflictos.</i>
B.1.3	<i>El verbo de girar según mi conocimiento no se usa en esta situación, ya que se refiere más a girar pero de ademán físico o de direcció. Yo lo escribiría de la siguiente manera: "Los gobiernos recurren a las guerras para resolver conflictos".</i>
B.1.4	<i>Los gobiernos hacen guerras para resolver conflictos.</i>
B.1.5	<i>Los gobiernos giran hacia las guerras para resolver conflictos.</i>
B.1.6	<i>La palabra gira no hace mucho sentido en esta oracion ya que no es un verbo que se utilizaria en este contexto. "Los gobiernos recurren a las guerras para resolver conflictos."</i>
B.1.7	<i>La palabra giran no se debe de utilizar en esta oración. Los gobiernos recurren a las guerras para resolver conflictos.</i>

6.2.2 Discussion of Table 6.2

Seven out of ten participants (70%) from group B (LateExpLessFr) classified this item as unacceptable. Although the responses and explanations from group B for item 1 are similar to

those provided by group A (EarlExpFr), there are two answers that do not adhere to standard or prescriptive Spanish conventions. For instance, B.1.1 opts for the verb *tornar* instead of *recurrir*, a choice that may respond to the morphological similarity between English *turn to* and Spanish *tornar*. While their selection is not entirely ungrammatical, the construction with *tornar* is not as frequent and productive as *recurrir*. B.1.2 rewrote the sentence with the verb *resultar* (i.e., *Los gobiernos resultan a las guerras para resolver conflictos.*). This version of the sentence is grammatically sound but semantically unclear and results in a construction whose meaning is obscured and rendered almost nonsensical. Interestingly, the participants from group B use Spanish more frequently than English and were exposed to a monolingual Spanish environment in early childhood. Although one item does not suffice to arrive at any conclusions at this moment, the results in this item suggest that group A might exhibit higher levels of metalinguistic awareness in Spanish semantics.

Table 6.3: Answers provided for item 1 by participants from group C (EarlExpLessFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
C.1.1	<i>Los gobiernos acuden a las guerras para resolver conflictos.</i>
C.1.2	<i>Giran puede verse como una mala traduccion de "turn". Los gobiernos optan por las guerras para resolver conflictos.</i>
C.1.3	<i>Esta oración es inaseptable en el idioma español ya que el verbo giran está mal utilizado. La oración se podría escribir de la siguiente manera: Los gobiernos van a las guerras para resolver conflictos.</i>
C.1.4	<i>La palabra giran significa moverse, pero no se utiliza en este contexto. La oración correcta sería Los gobiernos se inclinan</i>

	<i>a las guerras para resolver conflictos. O Los gobiernos utilizan las guerras para resolver conflictos.</i>
C.1.5	<i>la palabra giran puede tener muchos usos, en ingles es "turn to wars" entonces serviría pero en este caso yo diría los gobiernos utilizan las guerras para resolver conflitos</i>
C.1.6	<i>Es inaceptable porque, aunque se entiende, se pudiese mal interpretar. Los gobiernos dependen de guerras "para resolver conflictos.</i>
C.1.7	<i>"Los gobiernos giran a las guerras..." es una traducción literal del inglés a español. Oración reescrita: Los gobiernos recurren a las guerras para resolver conflictos.</i>
C.1.8	<i>La oración viene directamente del termino "turn to", que no significa lo mismo en español. La oración se puede cambiar a "Los gobiernos acuden a las guerras para resolver conflictos."</i>

6.2.3 Discussion of Table 6.3

All eight participants (100%) from group C (EarlExpLessFr) classified this item as unacceptable. Group C presents the most varied array of options for the *giran a* construction. C.1.1 and C.1.8 prefer a construction with *acuden*, C.1.4 and C.1.5 opted for *utilizan*. The remaining set of participants provided different possibilities for *giran a*: C.1.2 used *optan por*, C.1.3 went for *van a*, C.1.6 preferred *dependen de*, and C.1.7 wrote *recurren a*. The semantic variety for this group is remarkable, as they collectively provide several options without altering the intended meaning of the sentence. The only construction in which the meaning undergoes a

semantic change is C.1.6, which does not convey the meaning of *resorting* or *going to war* but rather *depending* on it. Nonetheless, the semantic shift is not as noticeable as the one seen in some constructions from group B (e.g., B.1.2).

Their explanations in this item ranged from a direct translation (B.1.2, B.1.7, and B.1.8) or influence from English (B.1.5) to a violation of Spanish grammar conventions (B.1.3).

Item 4: Lo que mi jefe decía, iba.

Table 6.4: Answers provided for item 4 by participants from group A (EarlExpFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
A.4.1	<i>La oración esta en el orden incorrecto y no sigue las reglas del uso de la coma. No sé como se rescribiría la oración, pero presumo que sería "Lo que mi jefe iba a decir", no entiendo el significado original.</i>
A.4.2	<i>Tiene sintaxis y conjugación del verbo erróneo. "Lo que mi jefe iba a decir".</i>
A.4.3	<i>No hace mucho sentido. Lo que mi jefe decia, lo implementaba.</i>
A.4.4	<i>Es un dicho en inglés, y ya que está traducido en español, no tiene el mismo efecto. Debe ser algo como: "Todo debe ser como mi jefe dice."</i>
A.4.5	<i>Lo que mi jefe diga, va. - Para que se escuche mejor tenemos que cambiarlo al presente.</i>

6.2.4 Discussion of Table 6.4

Most participants in group A (EarlExpFr) classified this item as acceptable (thirteen out of eighteen, or 72%). The answers included in this table respond to the five participants (28%) who deemed this construction unacceptable in Spanish. Curiously, two of the five participants (A.4.1 and A.4.2) did not understand the intended meaning and thought that *iba* functions as an auxiliary verb in which the main verb *decir* is missing. Although difficult to ascertain with the available data, it is possible that several participants from this group labelled this item as acceptable due to their not understanding it and/or not knowing how to rewrite it or explain its unacceptability. Answers A.4.3 and A.4.4 understood the intended meaning and provided a more acceptable version in Spanish (*Lo que mi jefe decia, lo implementaba* and *Todo debe ser como mi jefe dice*, respectively). A.4.5, on the other hand, chose to change the tense from simple past to simple present (i.e., from *iba* to *va*) without altering the verb itself. The participant mentioned that this was necessary to make this sentence sound better.

Two participants (A.4.1 and A.4.2) wrote that the syntax or word order in this item was incorrect and one (A.4.4) stated that the construction sounds like a direct translation from English.

Table 6.5: Answers provided for item 4 by participants from group B (LateExpLessFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
B.4.1	<i>El orden en que está escrito está mal. Mi jefe dijo que iba.</i>
B.4.2	<i>Honestamente no logré captar la idea que la oración es intentado dar o decir. Sin embargo, se sabe que es inaceptable en el español ya que no tiene sentido. La única manera de</i>

	<i>escribir la oración de manera correcta que se me ocurrió fue "Lo que mi jefe iba a decir".</i>
B.4.3	<i>Lo que dice mi jefe, va.</i>
B.4.4	<i>Lo que decía mi jefe, iba.</i>
B.4.5	<i>La oracion esta redactada de manera incorrecta ya que no se conjugaron las palabras. "Lo que mi jefe iba a decir"</i>
B.4.6	<i>Iba lo que mi jefe decía.</i>
B.4.7	<i>La palabra decía está incorreta. Lo que mi jefe dice, iba.</i>

6.2.5 Discussion of Table 6.5

Seven out of ten participants (70%) from group B (LateExpLessFr) classified this item as unacceptable. Most of the participants from this group who classified this item as unacceptable did not understand the meaning that it intends to convey. This is made evident by the fact that most of them either merely altered the order of elements in the sentence (B.4.4 and B.4.6), changed the verb tense (B.4.3 and B.4.7), mistook *iba* as an intransitive action verb meaning *to go somewhere* (B.4.1), or interpreted *iba* as an auxiliary verb for the main verb *decir* (B.4.2 and B.4.5).

It can be surmised that group B's inability to interpret the meaning of this construction responds to their late exposure and less frequent use of English. From the results obtained from group A (EarlExpFr) for this item, it seems that exposure and/or frequent use seem to enhance metalinguistic awareness and enable speakers to identify direct translations and cross-linguistic phenomena.

Regarding the reasons that this group opted to classify this item as unacceptable, the participants mentioned syntax (B.4.1) and a lack of understanding of the overall message of the sentence (B.4.2).

Table 6.6: Answers provided for item 4 for participants from group C (EarlExpLessFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
C.4.1	<i>La oración es inaceptable ya que no se entiende el mensaje que esta queriendo llevar la persona que escribió está oración . Podría escribirse de la siguiente manera: Lo que mi jefe me dijo que añadiera, era lo correcto.</i>
C.4.2	<i>El verbo iba se utiliza más para la acción de irse. La oración correcta sería Lo que mi jefe dice, va.</i>
C.4.3	<i>La oración es inaceptable debido a que iba es de ir. Oración reescrita: Lo que mi jefe decía, era.</i>

6.2.6 Discussion of Table 6.6

Three out of eight participants (37%) from group C (EarlExpLessFr) classified this item as unacceptable. Most of the participants from group C who classified item 4 as unacceptable struggled to understand the meaning that it intends to convey or did not interpret it as an instance of cross-linguistic influence. C.4.1 (*Lo que mi jefe me dijo que añadiera, era lo correcto.*) adds a relative clause (*que añadiera*) that does not appear in the acceptability test. The participant also rewrote *iba* as *era lo correcto*. While this answer suggests that the participant has grasped the intended message (i.e., that the boss is the authority whose every demand is met), the changes that they made represent a semantic shift from the original message. Answers C.4.2 and C.4.3

indicate that these participants are not aware of the auxiliary use of the verb *ir* in Spanish and suggest a different verb instead (e.g., *era* in C.4.3). Moreover, C.4.2 does not recognize that *iba* (past) and *va* (present) are both conjugations of the Spanish verb *ir* and thus suggest *va* as an alternative verb.

Contrary to what was hypothesized, group A is the only group that interpreted the meaning of item 4 correctly and provided rewritten versions that are both acceptable and grammatically sound in Spanish.

Item 8: ***Nuestra amistad es fundada en la confianza.***

Table 6.7: Answers provided for item 8 by participants from group A (EarlExpFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
A.8.1	<i>La palabra fundada no es la mejor para esta oracion. Reescrita: Nuestra amistad es basada en la confianza.</i>
A.8.2	<i>Creo que una mejor traducción sería "estar" en vez de "ser". Nuestra amistad está fundada en la confianza.</i>
A.8.3	<i>El verbo "es" debería estar en pasado. "Nuestra amistad está fundada en la confianza".</i>
A.8.4	<i>Debería de decir "Nuestra amistad está fundada en la confianza."</i>
A.8.5	<i>La oración es inaceptable, ya que la palabra correcta es basada. Oración reescrita: Nuestra amistad está basada en la confianza.</i>

A.8.6	<i>El verbo "es" está en la conjugación incorrecta y creo que la palabra "fundada" también. Reescribir la oración: Nuestra amistad está fundamentada en la confianza.</i>
A.8.7	<i>De verdad que no sé porque, pero no se escucha bien. Sería: "La confianza es la fundación de nuestra amistad."</i>
A.8.8	<i>Nuestra amistad esta basada en la confianza. - Decir que esta fundada suena a como si estuviese creada por la confianza y a eso no es a lo que se refiere en la oración.</i>

6.2.7 Discussion of Table 6.7

Eight out of ten (44%) participants from group A classified this item as unacceptable. Three of the participants who classified this item as unacceptable (A.8.2, A.8.3, and A.8.4) changed the linking verb *ser* for *estar* but accepted the adjective *fundada*. Curiously, A.8.3 thought that the present tense of *estar* (*está*) is the past tense of the verb *es* and produced a construction with *fundada* in Spanish (i.e., *Nuestra amistad está fundada en la confianza*). A.8.1 did change the adjective *fundada* for *basada* but did not substitute *ser* for *estar* (i.e., *Nuestra amistad es basada en la confianza*).

The remaining participants (A.8.5, A.8.6, A.8.7, and A.8.8) opted for more prescriptive rewritten versions for item 8. A.8.5 and A.8.8 reformulated this sentence with the phrase *está basada* while A.8.6 used *está fundamentada*. A.8.7 opted for a more creative construction in which the subject of the sentence is no longer the noun phrase *Nuestra amistad* but rather *La confianza*. Interestingly, because the participant changed the adjective *fundamentada* for the

noun phrase *la fundación*, this new construction requires the use of the verb *ser* instead of *estar* (i.e., *La confianza es la fundación de nuestra amistad*.).

Table 6.8: Answers provided for item 8 by participants from group B (LateExpLessFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
B.8.1	<i>Es una mala traducción de "founded on", no creo que la palabra fundada exista en español. Nuestra amistad está basada en la confianza.</i>
B.8.2	<i>La oracion es inaceptable en el español porque a pesar de que esta dando el mensaje correcto, fundada no es la palabra que se debe usar. La oración escrita correctamenet sería: "N"estra amistad se basa en la confianza", que significa lo mismo pero ahora hace más sentido.</i>
B.8.3	<i>Nuestra amistad fue fundada en la confianza.</i>
B.8.4	<i>La palabra es no debería de estar utilizada en esta oración. Nuestra amistad está fundada en la confianza.</i>

6.2.8 Discussion of Table 6.8

Four out of ten participants (40%) in this group classified this item as unacceptable. B.8.1 and B.8.2 identified *fundada* as the main issue in this sentence, with B.8.1 claiming that *fundada* does not exist in Spanish. Although neither B.8.1 nor B.8.2 mentioned the auxiliary verb *es* in their explanation, both changed it for more idiomatic constructions. B.8.1 used the verb *estar* while B.8.2 decided to use a pronominal form of *se*. B.8.3 substituted present tense *es* for past

tense *fue* but did not change the adjective *fundada*. Similarly, B.8.4 wrote *está* instead of *es* but kept the adjective *fundada*.

One participant (B.8.1) cited a direct translation from the English construction *founded on* and another (B.8.2) alluded to the semantics of *fundada* as the wrong word to be used in this context.

Table 6.9: Answers provided for item 8 by participants from group C (EarlExpLessFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
C.8.1	<i>Nuestra amistad se encuentra basada en la confianza.</i>
C.8.2	<i>Es una oracion correcta, con excepcion de un detalle. Nuestra amistad esta fundada en la confianza.</i>
C.8.3	<i>La palabra "fundada" esta mal utilizada ya que fundada significa que se originó. Pienso que una manera de escribirlo correctamente sería: Nuestra amistad esta basada en la confianza.</i>
C.8.4	<i>El verbo es debe ir en pasado La oración sería Nuestra amistas está funfada en la confianza.</i>
C.8.5	<i>Simplemente no suena correcto. Nuestra amistad se formó atraves de la confianza.</i>
C.8.6	<i>La palabra "fundada" sería una traducción directa de "funded". En español, se diría "Nuestra amistad es basada en la confianza."</i>

6.2.9 Discussion of Table 6.9

Six out of eight participants (75%) classified this item as unacceptable. C.8.1, C.8.3, and C.8.6 changed *fundada* for *basada*, but C.8.6 kept the verb *es* instead of opting for a construction with *estar*. C.8.1 decided to change *es* for a construction with the pronominal *se* (i.e., *se encuentra basada*) and C.8.4, like A.8.3 above, wrote *está* as the past tense of *es*.

C.8.2 and C.8.4 changed *ser* for *estar* but did not change the adjective *fundada*. C.8.5 produced a more creative construction and changed the main verb *es* for the verb phrase *se formó* and added the adverbial phrase *a través* (i.e., *Nuestra amistad se formó a través (sic) de la confianza.*).

Participants from group C had different ways of explaining the acceptability of this item, with only one of them C.8.6 mentioning a direct translation of the English verb *funded* (the participant probably intended to write *founded*).

Item 13: ***Cuando llega el tiempo de hacer una decisión, Luis no sabe cómo.***

Table 6.10: Answers provided for item 13 by participants from group A (EarlExpFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
A.13.1	<i>Cuando llega el momento de tomar una decisión, Luis no sabe cómo.</i>
A.13.2	<i>La oracion esta escrita en el orden incorrecto. Reescrita: Cuando llega el momento, Luis no sabe como hacer una decision.</i>
A.13.3	<i>En el español se toman decisiones, no se hacen. Cuando llega el tiempo de tomar una decisión, Luis no sabe cómo.</i>

A.13.4	<i>Debería ser "Cuando llega el tiempo de tomar una decisión, Luis no sabe qué hacer".</i>
A.13.5	<i>No sé como explicarlo pero no suena bien. Reescribir la oración: Cuando llega el tiempo de tomar una decisión, Luis no sabe cómo.</i>
A.13.6	<i>La separación de la oración se sienta mal. "Luis no sabrá cómo hacer una decisión cuando llega el tiempo."</i>
A.13.7	<i>No sé porque, pero se escucha mal. "A la hora de decidir, Luis no sabe que hacer."</i>
A.13.8	<i>Aquí el problema es que, debido a la posición del 'cómo', no se define qué es lo que Luis no sabe hacer. Puedo inducir que se refiere a decisiones, pero para aclarar esto, la oración puede ser: Cuando llega el tiempo, Luis no sabe cómo hacer una decisión.</i>
A.13.9	<i>Cuando llega el tiempo de hacer una decisión, Luis no sabe que hacer. - Es inaceptable porque ya hacia al final de la oración no hace sentido.</i>

6.2.10 Discussion of Table 6.10

Nine out of eighteen participants (50%) in this group classified this item as unacceptable. A.13.1 provided the only answer that closely adheres to prescriptive Spanish grammar. They changed the phrase *hacer una decisión* for *tomar una decisión* and the noun *tiempo* for *momento*. The rest of the answers and explanations are quite varied. A.13.3, A.13.4 and A.13.5 changed

hacer for *tomar* but kept the noun *tiempo*. A.13.3, however, explicitly explained that decisions in Spanish are taken (*tomar*), not made (*hacer*). A.13.2, on the other hand, changed *tiempo* for *momento* but kept the verb *hacer*.

The rest of the participants had different explanations for this item. A.13.6 changed the main verb from *llega* to *sabr * (future of *saber*). Their construction, *Luis no sabr  c mo hacer una decisi n cuando llega el tiempo*, called for the use of the subjunctive *llegue* in the subordinate clause *cuando llegue el tiempo*.

A.13.7 opted for a construction that is slightly different from the semantics of the original sentence but is grammatical and acceptable in Spanish (i.e., *A la hora de decidir, Luis no sabe que (sic) hacer*). A.13.8 changed the order of elements in the sentence but kept both *hacer* and *tiempo*. Lastly, A.13.9 claimed that the ending of the sentence is nonsensical but made no changes to the direct translation of *hacer una decisi n* and *tiempo*.

The varied answers and explanations for item 13 suggest that most participants from group A did not quite catch the cross-linguistic phenomena in this sentence. Only one participant (A.13.1) produced a version of the sentence that provides a prescriptive construction. As seen in the discussion above, several participants focused more on syntax than on the verb *hacer* or the noun *tiempo*.

Table 6.11: Answers provided for item 13 by participants from group B (LateExpLessFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
B.13.1	<i>Cuando llega el tiempo de hacer una decisi�n, Luis no sabe c�mo hacerla.</i>
B.13.3	<i>Pienso que hay que reemplazar "hacer" por "tomar". -Cuando llega el tiempo de tomar una decisi�n, Luis no sabe c�mo.-</i>

6.2.11 Discussion of Table 6.11

Three out of ten participants (30%) classified this item as unacceptable. Only one participant (B.13.3) changed *hacer* por *tomar*. B.13.2 kept both *hacer* and *tiempo* but changed the order of elements without providing any further explanation. B.13.2 added the bound morpheme *-la* to make the direct object of the transitive verb *hacer* clearer but did not provide an explanation either.

Table 6.12: Answers provided for item 13 by participants from group C (EarlExpLessFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
C.13.1	<i>Verbalizado no está mal, escrito sí. Cuando viene a tomar una decisión, a Luis se le dificulta.</i>
C.13.2	<i>En esta oración, se usa la palabra hacer como si fuera "make". Se puede cambiar a "Cuando llega el tiempo de tomar una decisión, Luis no sabe como".</i>

6.2.12 Discussion of Table 6.12

Two out of eight participants (25%) classified this item as unacceptable. C.13.1 explained that the construction in item 13 may be acceptable if it is uttered in conversation (*verbalizado*) but would be unacceptable if it is expressed in written form. Their rewritten version changed *hacer* for *tomar* and *Luis no sabe cómo* for *a Luis se le dificulta*. Curiously, their new version avoids the phrase *llega el tiempo* entirely and opts for a construction that is less formal in Spanish (i.e., *Cuando viene a tomar*).

While C.13.2 adequately recognized the direct translation of *make a decision* in Spanish and changed it to *tomar una decisión*, they maintained the use of *tiempo* instead of *momento*. It is

important to point out that this group presented the highest percentage of acceptable answers (75%) in this item out of the three groups.

Item 17: *Todos respetaban al presidente porque era quien aguantaba más poder en la compañía.*

Table 6.13: Answers provided for item 17 by participants from group A (EarlExpFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
A.17.1	<i>En vez de decir "aguantaba" debería ser "tenía". "Todos respetaban al presidente porque era quien tenía más poder en la compañía".</i>
A.17.2	<i>Debería de decir: "Todos respetaban al presidente porque era quien tenía más poder en la compañía."</i>
A.17.3	<i>Aguantaba no está utilizada correctamente. Oración reescrita: Todos respetaban al presidente porque tenía más poder que todo el mundo en la compañía.</i>
A.17.4	<i>Sería: "Todos respetaban al presidente porque era quien más poder tenía en la compañía."</i>
A.17.5	<i>aguantaba no se utiliza en este contexto. Todos respetaban al presidente porque era quien tenía más poder en la compañía.</i>
A.17.6	<i>Porque aguantaba no se utiliza en este contexto. "Todos respetaban al presidente porque era quien tenía más poder en la compañía."</i>
A.17.7	<i>Todos respetaban al presidente porque era quien tenía más poder en la compañía. Puse que fue inaceptable porque la</i>

	<i>palabra "aguantaba" no se escucha mal pero "tenia" se escucha mejor.</i>
--	---

6.2.13 Discussion of Table 6.13

Nine out of eighteen participants (50%) classified this item as unacceptable. Interestingly, all the participants who provided rewritten versions for item 17 recognized the direct translation of the English verb *held* in this context and changed it from *aguantaba* to *tenía*. Three of them (A.17.3, A.17.5, and A.17.6) specified that *aguantaba* is inadequate in this context but do not refer to a direct translation from English *held*. Interestingly, A.17.7 mentioned that while *aguantaba* did not strike them as unidiomatic, the verb *tenía* “sounds better.”

Table 6.14: Answers provided for item 17 by participants from group B (LateExpLessFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
B.17.1	<i>la palabra aguantaba esta mal segun el contexto de la oracion, "Todos respetaban al presidente porque era quien tenia mas poder en la compañía"</i>
B.17.2	<i>'Aguantaba' se utiliza para aguantar físicamente, en contrario a "hold" en ingles. Todos respetaban al presidente porque era quien tenía mas poder en la compañía.</i>
B.17.3	<i>Esta oración es inaceptable en el español ya que el verbo aguantar no es el que debe usarse aunque de un mensaje similiar al que se quiere dar. La manera correcta de escribir esta oración es "Todos respetaban al presidente porque era quien tenía más poder en la compañía."</i>

B.17.4	<i>Todos respetaban al presidente porque era quien tenia más poder en la compañía.</i>
B.17.5	<i>El "aguantaba" no se utiliza para referirse a alguien que tiene algo. "Todos respetaban al presidente porque era quien tenia más poder en la compañía."</i>

6.2.14 Discussion of Table 6.14

Five out of ten participants (50%) from this group classified this item as unacceptable. In a similar scenario to what was observed for group A (EarlExpFr), the participants in this group who classified this item as unacceptable changed the verb *aguantaba* for *tenía*. One of them (B.17.2) pointed out the direct translation of the English verb *hold* in this context, and two others (B.17.1 and B.17.3) mentioned that the context does not call for the verb *aguantaba*. The remaining participant (B.17.5) referred to the semantics of *aguantaba* and explained that, in Spanish, this verb is never used to express that someone is in possession of something. Like group A, the participants from group B who marked this item as unacceptable successfully identified the unidiomatic use of the verb *aguantaba* in this context.

Table 6.15: Answers provided for item 17 by participants from group C (EarlExpLessFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
C.17.1	<i>Todos respetaban al presidente porque era quien más poder tenía dentro de la compañía.</i>
C.17.2	<i>"Aguantaba" es una traduccion literal de hold. Todos respetaban al presidente porque era quien tenia mas poder en la compania.</i>

C.17.3	<i>Inaceptable ya que en este caso no se dice aguantaban si no que tenía. Podría escribirse esta oración de la siguiente manera: Todos respetaban al presidente porque era quien tenía más poder en la compañía.</i>
C.17.4	<i>El "wording" esta incorrecto. Todos respetaban al presidente porque era quien mas poder tenía en la compañía.</i>
C.17.5	<i>La palabra aguantaba se refiere a sostener o tolerar, mientras tanto, en la oración se refiere a tener. Oración reescrita: Todos respetaban al presidente porque era quien tenía más poder en la compañía.</i>

6.2.15 Discussion of Table 6.15

Five out of eight participants (63%) in this group classified this item as unacceptable. Consonant with the results that have been obtained for this item for groups A (EarlExpFr) and B (LateExpLessFr), participants from group C preferred the verb *tenía* over *aguantaba*. One of the explanations (C.17.2) explicitly identified *aguantaba* as a direct translation of *held*. C.17.5 specified the reason why *aguantaba* is unacceptable in this context by listing some of the semantic associations that this verb has in Spanish (e.g., *sostener* or *tolerar*). The remaining answers (C.17.1, C.17.3, and C.17.4) changed *aguantaba* to *tenía* without providing any explicit justification or rationale.

Item 18: *Dejé de ir a su casa porque realicé que no le gustaban las visitas.*

Table 6.16: Answers provided for item 18 by participants from group A (EarlExpFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
A.18.1	<i>Una mala traducción, "me di cuenta" sería mejor que "realicé". Dejé de ir a su casa porque me di cuenta que no le gustaban las visitas.</i>
A.18.2	<i>Dejé de ir a su casa porque me di cuenta que no le gustaban las visitas.</i>
A.18.3	<i>realicé no es una palabra en español, se debe usar una forma de "darse cuenta". "Dejé de ir a su casa porque me di cuenta que no le gustaban las visitas".</i>
A.18.4	<i>"Realized" no se traduce como "realicé". " Dejé de ir a su casa porque me di cuenta que no le gustaban las visitas".</i>
A.18.5	<i>Debería de decir: "Dejé de ir a su casa porque me di cuenta que no le gustaban las visitas."</i>
A.18.6	<i>Realicé y realize no son la misma palabra y no comparten significado entre los dos idiomas. En el español, realicé se usa como un verbo que significa crear o hacer, mientras que realize es darse cuenta de algo. La oración debe decir "Dejé de ir a su casa porque me di cuenta que no le gustaban las visitas".</i>
A.18.7	<i>Realicé significa hacer. Oración re-escrita: Deje de ir a su casa porque me di cuenta que no le gustaban las visitas.</i>

A.18.8	<i>La palabra "realicé" no se usa de esa manera. Reescribir la oración: Dejé de ir a sus casa porque me di cuenta que le gustaban las visitas.</i>
A.18.9	<i>La palabra "realice" no esta en el diccionario, mala traduccion del ingles al espanol. Deje de ir a su casa porque me di cuenta de que no le gustaban las visitas.</i>
A.18.10	<i>"Realicé" no significa lo mismo en ingles y español. "Deje de ir a su casa porque me di cuenta que no le gustaban las visitas."</i>
A.18.11	<i>La palabra realicé (de realizar) es diferente a la palabra en inglés 'realize' (de darse cuenta). Ya que en esta oración la palabra realicé se está usando como 'realize', la oración correcta debe ser: Dejé de ir a su casa porque me di cuenta de que no le gustaban las visitas.</i>
A.18.12	<i>Realice esta usado incorrectamente, esa palabra es para referirse a completar algo. Dejé de ir a su casa porque me di cuenta que no le gustaban las visitas.</i>
A.18.13	<i>No le gustaba que lo visitaran, así que deje de hacerlo.</i>
A.18.14	<i>Dejé de ir a su casa porque me di cuenta que no le gustaban las visitas. - Lo que está en incorrecto es la palabra "realice" que es un verbo.</i>

6.2.16 Discussion of Table 6.16

Fifteen out of eighteen participants (83%) from group A (EarlExpFr) classified this item as unacceptable. While all fifteen participants identified the verb *realicé* as the element that needed to be changed in this sentence, their reasons for doing so differed from one another. A.18.1 called *realicé* a “bad translation” of the English verb *realized*, A.18.8 wrote that *realicé* cannot be used that way in Spanish, A.18.10 pointed out that the verbs *realicé* and *realize* do not mean the same in English and Spanish, and A.18.11 acknowledged that Spanish *realicé* has a different meaning from the English verb *realized* in this context.

Although other explanations also recognized the inappropriate use of *realicé* in this context, some expressed the belief that the verb *realizar* does not exist at all in Spanish (A.18.3 and A.18.9). Another participant (A.18.6) claimed that there is no semantic overlap between *realize* and *realizar* in both languages, an assertion that is not accurate when we use this verb to mean *to achieve or complete (something)*.. Some explanations did not mention why they changed *realized* for *me di cuenta de* (A.18.2, A.18.5, and A.18.13) while others pointed out that *realicé* was used incorrectly but did not provide a detailed rationale for their choice (A.18.4, A.18.7, A.18.8, and A.18.14).

Table 6.17: Answers provided for item 18 by participants from group B (LateExpLessFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
B.18.1	<i>La palabra "realice" esta fuera de contexto en esta oración. Dejé de ir a su casa porque me di cuenta que no le gustaban las visitas.</i>
B.18.2	<i>"realice" viene de la palabra "Realize" pero ese no es el significado que se le da a esa palabra a la hora de traducirlo</i>

	<i>al español y con el contexto de la oracion, esa no es la traduccion adecuada. "Deje de ir a su casa porque me di cuenta que no le gustaban las visitas"</i>
B.18.3	<i>Es una traducción mal hecha de "realized". Deje de ir a su casa porque me di cuenta que no le gustaban las visitas.</i>
B.18.4	<i>La oración es inaceptable por que la palabra "realicé" no es la traducción correcta de la palabra "realize" en inglés que significa darse cuenta, mientras que realicé signifca haber hecho algo. La oración escrita correctamente sería: "Deje de ir a su casa porque me di ceunta que no le gustaban las visitas"</i>
B.18.5	<i>Deje de ir a su casa porque me di cuenta que no le gustaban las visitas.</i>
B.18.6	<i>Realice esta incorrecto y no hace sentido en la oracion. Deje de ir a su casa porque me di cuenta que no le gustaban las visitas.</i>
B.18.7	<i>La palabra realicé no debería de estar utilizada en esta oración. Deje de ir a su casa porque me di cuenta que no le gustaban las visitas.</i>

6.2.17 Discussion of Table 6.17

Seven out of ten participants (70%) from group B (LateExpLessFr) classified this item as unacceptable. All seven participants changed *realicé* for *me di cuenta*. Four answers cited

context as the main reason why *realicé* is unacceptable (B.18.1, B.18.2, B.18.6, and B.18.7), with B.18.6 mentioning that its use “makes no sense” in the sentence. B.18.3 and B.18.4 mentioned that Spanish *realicé* is a mistranslation of English *realize*, with B.18.4 specifying the difference in the semantics between both languages. B.18.5 did not provide any explanation for their change.

Table 6.18: Answers provided for item 18 by participants from group C (EarlExpLessFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version“
C.18.1	<i>Dejé de ir a su casa porque me percaté de que no le gustaban las visitas.</i>
C.18.2	<i>No se usa "realice" con la definicion o contexto adecuado. Deje de ir a su casa porque me di cuenta que no le gustaban las visitas.</i>
C.18.3	<i>en inglés sería I realized pero no se traduce así de literal, es más como dejé de ir a su casa porque me di cuenta que no le gustaban las visitas</i>
C.18.4	<i>Utilizaron la palabra "realicé" como si fuera "realized". Dejé de ir a su casa porque me dí cuenta de que no le gustaban las visitas.</i>
C.18.5	<i>La palabra "realicé" en esta oración es una traducción literal del inglés "realized". Oración reescrita: Dejé de ir a su casa porque me di cuenta que no le gustaban las visitas.</i>

C.18.6	<i>"Realicé" y "realized" no tienen el mismo significado. Por eso, la oración debería ser "Dejé de ir a su casa porque me di cuenta de que no le gustaban las visitas".</i>
--------	---

6.2.18 Discussion of Table 6.18

Six out of eight participants (75%) from group C (EarlExpLessFr) classified this item as unacceptable. All six participants changed the verb *realicé* for a different verb in Spanish, with five opting for the phrase *me di cuenta de* as a substitute. One of the participants (C.18.1) was the only from the three groups who used the verb *percatar* (i.e., *me percaté de*). However, they did not provide an explanation for this change.

Explanations for this group were similar to groups A (EarlExpFr) and B (LateExpLessFr). C.18.2 mentioned context as the cause for the incorrect use of *realicé*, C.18.3, C.18.4, and C.18.5 cited a literal translation of *realize* as the issue, and C.18.6 referred to the difference in meaning between *realize* and *realicé*.

Item 20: *El criminal fue tirado en prisión de inmediato.*

Table 6.19: Answers provided for item 20 by participants from group A (EarlExpFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
A.20.1	<i>El criminal fue encarcelado de inmediato.</i>
A.20.2	<i>Una traducción literal de un concepto que sería expresado mejor son una frase similar. El criminal fue llevado a la prisión de inmediato.</i>

A.20.3	<i>Está traduciendo incorrectamente "The criminal was thrown in jail immediately". Debería ser "El criminal fue encarcelado inmediatamente".</i>
A.20.4	<i>El "tirado en" es un traducción directa de "thrown in".</i>
A.20.5	<i>Decir tirado en prisión es un disparate que viene de "thrown in prison". La oración debe decir "El criminal fue encarcelado de inmediato."</i>
A.20.6	<i>Mala traducción del inglés al español, no hace sentido. El criminal fue puesto en prisión de inmediato.</i>
A.20.7	<i>Se diría: "El criminal lo metieron preso de inmediato."</i>
A.20.8	<i>Esta oración suena como si fue traducida palabra por palabra del inglés: The criminal was thrown into jail immediately. No obstante, en español sería mejor: El criminal fue encarcelado de inmediato.</i>
A.20.9	<i>El criminal fue encarcelado lo mas rápido posible.</i>
A.20.10	<i>Porque tirado no se utiliza en este contexto. "El criminal fue puesto en prisión de inmediato."</i>
A.20.11	<i>El criminal fue puesto en prisión de inmediato. - "Fue tirado en prisión" suena muy literal como si lo hubieran tirado del cielo a prisión.</i>

6.2.19 Discussion of Table 6.19

Twelve out of eighteen participants (67%) from group A (EarlExpFr) classified this item as unacceptable. Five of them (A.20.1, A.20.3, A.20.5, A.20.8, and A.20.9) preferred the participial *encarcelado* instead of *tirado*, a change that required eliminating the prepositional phrase *en prisión* to avoid redundancy. Three participants (A.20.6, A.20.10, and A.20.11) used the phrase *puesto en*, one (A.20.2) wrote *llevado a*, and another (A.20.7) chose the more colloquial phrase *lo metieron preso* but did not add the accusative preposition *a* in the noun phrase *el criminal* (e.g., *Al criminal lo metieron preso*).

In their explanations, five participants (A.20.2, A.20.3, A.20.4, A.20.6, and A.20.8) cited a direct translation to be the problem with *tirado en*, one (A.20.5) pointed out “nonsense” to be the cause for their change, and one (A.20.10) mentioned that *tirado en* is used incorrectly in this context. Three participants (A.20.1, A.20.7, and A.20.9) did not provide an explanation for their change.

Table 6.20: Answers provided for item 20 by participants from group B (LateExpLessFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
B.20.1	<i>la palabra "tirado" en la oracion esta fuera de contexto, viene de "thrown". "El criminal fue arrojado en prision de inmediato"</i>
B.20.2	<i>'Tirado' es utilizado para describir a la acción física de coger/tener algo en las manos y tirarlo. Debe ser una traducción directa de "thrown into" que no es literal. El criminal fue llevado a prisión de inmediato.</i>
B.20.3	<i>El criminal fue puesto en prisión de inmediato.</i>

B.20.4	<i>El criminal, de inmediato, fue tirado en prisión.</i>
B.20.5	<i>El en esta incorrecto. El criminal fue tirado a prisión de inmediato.</i>
B.20.6	<i>La palabra tirado no se utiliza en este contexto. El criminal fue puesto en prisión de inmediato.</i>

6.2.20 Discussion of Table 6.20

Six out of ten participants (60%) from group B (LateExpLessFr) classified this item as unacceptable. Four of these participants (B.20.1, B.20.2, B.20.3, and B.20.6) identified *tirado* as the element that needed to be changed and wrote *arrojado* (B.20.1), *llevado* (B.20.2), and *puesto en* (B.20.3, B.20.6) in their new versions. The other two answers seemed to have ignored *tirado* and focused on other elements. For instance, B.20.4 merely changed the order of elements and moved the adverbial phrase *de inmediato* to the middle of the sentence (i.e., *El criminal, de inmediato, fue tirado en prisión.*) and B.20.5 identified the preposition *en* as the issue and changed the sentence to *El criminal fue tirado a prisión de inmediato.*

Out of the four participants who identified *tirado en* as unacceptable, B.20.1 and B.20.6 cited context as the cause, and B.20.2 referred to a direct translation of *thrown into*. The remaining participant (B.20.3) did not provide an explanation for their change.

Table 6.21: Answers provided for item 20 by participants from group C (EarlExpLessFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
C.20.1	<i>El criminal fue encarcelado en prisión de inmediato.</i>
C.20.2	<i>Tirado no es apropiado para esta oracion, pues la definicion no corresponde. El criminal fue internado en prision de inmediato.</i>
C.20.3	<i>El verbo "tirado" no es el correcto. El criminal fue llevado a la prisión de inmediato.</i>
C.20.4	<i>La palabra tirado se refiere a lanzar, lo cual no hace sentido en la oración. Oración reescrita: El criminal fue ingresado a prisión de inmediato.</i>
C.20.5	<i>El uso de la palabra "tirado" no es igual al de "thrown" en inglés. Se podría cambiar a "El criminal fue metido en prisión de inmediato."</i>

6.2.21 Discussion of Table 6.21

Five out of eight participants (63%) classified from group C (EarlExpLessFr) this item as unacceptable. Their rewritten versions present the most lexical variety when compared to the other two groups. One sentence was reformulated with *encarcelado* but kept the phrase *en prisión* (C.20.1), another used *internado* (C.20.2), *llevado a* (C.20.3), *ingresado a* (C.20.4), and *metido en* (C.20.5).

Two participants (C.20.2 and C.20.3) mentioned that *tirado en* is not appropriate in this context but did not explain why, C.20.4 stated that the participial *tirado* makes no sense in the

sentence due to its meaning in Spanish, and C.20.5 alluded to a direct translation from the English phrase *thrown in*. The remaining participant (C.20.1) did not provide an explanation for their rewritten version.

6.3 Analysis of category: *Lexical borrowing: Nouns*

The items examined here comprise instances of cross-linguistic influence in the grammatical category of nouns. Each table includes only the participants' unacceptable answers. The discussion that follows each table addresses the participants' answers and explanations in the acceptability test and evaluates the nature of such explanations to provide a more nuanced view of the participants' metalinguistic awareness.

Item 2: ***Dos personas con vistas distintas pueden causar un conflicto.***

Table 6.22: Answers provided for item 2 by participants from group A (EarlExpFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
A.2.1	<i>La palabra vistas se ve inadecuada en esta oracion. Reescrita: Dos personas con opiniones diferentes pueden causar un conflicto.</i>
A.2.2	<i>En este caso una mejor traducción sería "puntos de vista", no "vistas". Dos personas con puntos de vista distintas pueden causar un conflicto.</i>
A.2.3	<i>Dos personas con perspectivas distintas pueden causar un conflicto. acceptable</i>
A.2.4	<i>Está haciendo una traducción directa de inglés a español y aunque en inglés es aceptable escribir/decir "Two people with different views may cause conflict" en español se debería</i>

	<i>escribir/decir "Dos personas con puntos de vista diferentes pueden causar conflicto".</i>
A.2.5	<i>Vistas es mejor utilizada para la vista de un paraíso, etc. Oración re escrita: Dos personas con visiones diferentes pueden causar un conflicto.</i>
A.2.6	<i>La palabra "vistas" se puede usar en inglés pero no en español. Reescribir la oración: Dos personas con puntos de vista distintos pueden causar un conflicto.</i>
A.2.7	<i>De verdad no sé porque pero creo que se diría: "Dos personas con puntos de vista diferentes pueden tener un problema."</i>
A.2.8	<i>En la oración, vista se refiere a perspectiva. Creo que sería mejor utilizar las palabras 'perspectiva' o 'punto de vista' para evitar confusión con la palabra 'vista' del sentido visual. Dos personas con puntos de vista distintos pueden causar un conflicto.</i>
A.2.9	<i>Dos personas con opiniones diferentes pueden causar un conflicto.</i>
A.2.10	<i>Porque vistas es de ver. "Dos personas con puntos de vistas distintas pueden causar un conflicto.</i>

6.3.1 Discussion of Table 6.22

Ten out of eighteen participants (56%) from group A (EarlExpFr) classified this item as unacceptable. All ten participants changed the noun *vistas* for a more idiomatic word or phrase in

Spanish. Six participants (A.2.2, A.2.4, A.2.6, A.2.7, A.2.8, and A.2.10) wrote *puntos de vista*, while two (A.2.1 and A.2.9) opted for the noun *opiniones*. The remaining two answers include *perspectivas* (A.2.3) and *visiones* (A.2.5) as possible alternatives to *vistas*.

Three participants (A.2.2, A.2.4, and A.2.6) commented that *vistas* is a mistranslation of the English noun *views* and four (A.2.1, A.2.5, A.2.8, and A.2.10) justified their change by concluding that the meaning of *vistas* is inadequate and does not align with the context of this sentence. Three participants (A.2.3, A.2.7, and A.2.9) did not provide an explanation, with A.2.7 explicitly writing that they did not know why they were changing *vistas* for *puntos de vista*. One participant classified the item as acceptable but provided the following explanation in the acceptability test: *La oración es una traducción directa de "different views", debería decir "Dos personas con opiniones distintas pueden causar un conflicto."*

Table 6.23: Answers provided for item 2 by participants from group B (LateExpLessFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
B.2.1	<i>La palabra vistas no es la mejor representación de lo que quiere decir la oración. Dos personas con opiniones distintas pueden causar un conflicto.</i>
B.2.2	<i>views en esta oración sería perspectivas, "Dos personas con perspectivas distintas pueden causar un conflicto"</i>
B.2.3	<i>La palabra 'vista' usualmente se refiere a la vista ocular. Dos personas con visiones distintas pueden causar un conflicto.</i>
B.2.4	<i>Según lo que puedo deducir esta oración usa la palabra "views" en inglés. Sin embargo, solo escribir vistas en su traducción al español es incorrecto ya que en inglés se esta</i>

	<i>refiriendo a los puntos de vista de las personas. Yo lo escribiría de la siguiente manera "Dos personas con puntos de vistas distintos pueden causar un conflicto".</i>
B.2.5	<i>La palabra distinta no hace sentido en esa oración. La oración correcta sería: Dos personas con vistas diferentes pueden causar conflictos.</i>
B.2.6	<i>Pienso que hay que reemplazar "distintas" con "diferentes" e invertir esto con "vistas", mas añadir puntos con vista. -Dos personas con diferentes puntos de vista pueden causar un conflicto.-</i>

6.3.2 Discussion of Table 6.23

Six out of ten participants (60%) from group B (LateExpLessFr) classified this item as unacceptable. While most participants in this group targeted the noun *vistas* in their rewritten versions, one of them (B.2.5) decided to change the adjective *distintas* for *diferentes* because the former does not make sense in this sentence. Curiously, they neither changed nor commented about the noun *vistas* in their answer. Two participants (B.2.4 and B.2.5) changed *vistas* for *puntos de vista*; the remaining three participants wrote *opiniones* (B.2.1), *perspectivas* (B.2.2), and *visiones* (B.2.3).

Only one participant (B.2.4) wrote that *vistas* is a direct translation of English *views*; the rest (B.2.1, B.2.2, B.2.3, and B.2.5) commented that *vistas* is not the best word to be used in this context.

Table 6.24: Answers provided for item 2 by participants from group C (EarlExpLessFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
C.2.1	<i>Dos personas, con vistas distintas, pueden causar un conflicto.</i>
C.2.2	<i>Vistas distintas es una traduccion literal de "different views". Dos personas con perspectivas distintas pueden causar un conflicto.</i>
C.2.3	<i>La sintaxis de esta oración es incorrecta y no permite que se entienda en su totalidad. Se podría decir de la siguiente manera: El ver dos personas distintas puede causar un conflicto.</i>
C.2.4	<i>Aunque se entiende, yo lo escribiría diferente. Dos personas con formas de pensar diferentes pueden causar un conflicto.</i>
C.2.5	<i>La palabra "vistas" más bien se refiere a la apariencia o el aspecto exterior de una cosa y no concuerda con lo que se dice en la oración. Oración reescrita: Dos pe“sonas con persp”ctivas diferentes pueden causar un conflicto.</i>
C.2.6	<i>Vistas distintas significaría "different views" en inglés, pero en español tendría que ser dos personas con perspectivas distintas pueden causar un conflicto.</i>

6.3.3 Discussion of Table 6.24

Six out of eight participants (75%) from group C (EarlExpLessFr) classified this item as unacceptable. Although most participants focused on changing *vistas* in their rewritten versions,

two saw this sentence from another point of view. For instance, C.2.1 separated the prepositional phrase *con vistas distintas* with commas (i.e., *Dos personas, con vistas distintas, pueden causar un conflicto.*). C.2.3 seems to have misunderstood the meaning of the sentence and focused on altering the syntax, a change that also altered the overall message and meaning of the sentence (i.e., *El ver dos personas distintas puede causar un conflicto.*). The answers that did focus on *vistas* changed it for *perspectivas* (C.2.2, C.2.5, and C.2.6) and *formas de pensar* (C.2.4).

Two of the participants who identified *vistas* as unacceptable (C.2.2 and C.2.6) described it as a direct translation of *views*. C.2.5 explained that the meaning of *vistas* is inadequate in this context and C.2.4 did not provide a detailed explanation for their change to *formas de pensar*.

6.4 Analysis of Category: *Lexical borrowing: Prepositions*

The items examined here comprise instances of cross-linguistic influence in the grammatical category of prepositions. Each table includes only the participants' unacceptable answers. The discussion that follows each table addresses the participants' answers and explanations in the acceptability test and evaluates the nature of such explanations to provide a more nuanced view of the participants' metalinguistic awareness.

Item 5: *El teniente está en cargo del ejército.*

Table 6.25: Answers provided for item 5 by participants from group A (EarlExpFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
A.5.1	<i>El teniente está a cargo del ejército.</i>
A.5.2	<i>No se dice en cargo, sino que a cargo. Reescrita: El teniente esta a cargo del ejercito.</i>
A.5.3	<i>No es un horror gramatical, pero en español se dice "a cargo", no "en cargo". El teniente está a cargo del ejército.</i>

A.5.4	<i>El teniente está a cargo del ejército.</i>
A.5.5	<i>En vez de escribir/decir "El teniente está en cargo del ejército" debería ser "El teniente está a cargo del ejército".</i>
A.5.6	<i>La oración debería ser "El teniente está a cargo del ejército."</i>
A.5.7	<i>Esta oración está escrita como una traducción directa de "The lieutenant is in charge of the army", por lo cual "in charge" se escribió como "en cargo". Esto está incorrecto ya que en el español "in charge" se escribe "a cargo". La oración debe decir "El teniente está a cargo del ejército".</i>
A.5.8	<i>Se puede decir "in" en inglés pero en esta ocasión no se puede usar en español. Reescribir la oración: El teniente está a cargo del ejército.</i>
A.5.9	<i>Mal uso de la preposicion "en". El teniente esta a cargo del ejercito.</i>
A.5.10	<i>"En" se cambia por "a": "El teniente esta a 'ca'go del ejército."</i>
A.5.11	<i>La preposición correcta y más exacta en esta oracion es 'a' en vez de 'en'. El teniente está a cargo del ejército.</i>
A.5.12	<i>No se dice en cargo, es a cargo. El teniente esta acargo del ejercito</i>
A.5.13	<i>El teniente esra a cargo del ejército</i>
A.5"14	<i>Porque es "a" ya que el teniente no esta encima de cargo. "El teniente está a cargo del ejército."</i>

A.5.15	<i>El teniente esta a cargo del ejercito. -</i>
--------	---

6.4.1 Discussion of Table 6.25

Fifteen out of eighteen participants (83%) from group A (EarlExpFr) classified this item as unacceptable. Interestingly but not surprisingly, all fifteen participants changed the preposition *en* for *a* (i.e., *en cargo* for *a cargo*). Although it could be written off as a typo, one participant (A.5.12) affixed the preposition *a* to the noun *cargo* (i.e., *acargo*).

Two participants (A.5.7 and A.5.8) justified their answer by citing a direct translation of English *in* to Spanish *en*. Most of the remaining participants did not provide a detailed explanation for their change and limited themselves to writing *a* instead of *en*. One participant, however, (A.5.14) wrote about the function of *en* in Spanish and how its use would imply that the lieutenant is literally on (*encima de*) *cargo*.

Table 6.26: Answers provided for item 5 by participants from group B (LateExpLessFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
B.5.1	<i>La palabra "en" debe ser sustituida por "a". El teniente está a cargo del ejército.</i>
B.5.2	<i>En cargo es una mala traducción de "in charge". El teniente esta a cargo del ejército.</i>
B.5.3	<i>La oración es inaceptable en español ya que es una traducción literal del inglés "in charge". Sin embargo, a mi entender la manera correcta de escribir la oración es "'El teniente esta a cargo del ejercito", no usando el "en" que se muestra inicialmente.</i>

B.5.4	<i>El "en" en la oracion esta usado incorrectamente. "El teniente está a cargo del ejército."</i>
B.5.5	<i>El teniente está a cargo del ejército.</i>
B.5.6	<i>Pienso que hay que reemplazar "en" por "a". -El teniente está a cargo del ejército.-</i>
B.5.7	<i>No se debería de decir en cargo. El teniente está a cargo del ejército.</i>

6.4.2 Discussion of Table 6.26

Seven out of ten participants (70%) from group B (LateExpLessFr) classified this item as unacceptable. All seven participants changed the preposition *en* for *a* in their rewritten versions of this sentence.

Participants B.2.2 and B.2.3 cited a direct translation from English to Spanish as the reason why they substituted *en* for *a*. The rest of the participants did not cite the specific reasons why they chose *a* over *en* in their rewritten version of this sentence.

Table 6.27: Answers provided for item 5 by participants from group C (EarlExpLessFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
C.5.1	<i>El teniente está a cargo del ejército.</i>
C.5.2	<i>La oracion tiene un uso inadecuado de preposicion. El teniente esta a cargo del ejercito.</i>
C.5.3	<i>La preposición que se utiliza está incorrecta. La oración correcta sería El teninete está a cargo del ejército.</i>
C.5.4	<i>Esta a cargo del ejército, en no se ve bien ahí</i>

C.5.5	<i>Es "a" envés de "en". El teniente está a cargo del ejército.</i>
C.5.6	<i>La palabra "en" se utiliza para indicar lugar, posición de algo, tiempo, ect, pero no se usa para decir que esa cosa es responsabilidad de tal persona. Oración reescrita: El teniente está a cargo del ejército.</i>
C.5.7	<i>En esta oración, "en cargo" viene de "in charge", pero en español se debería escribir "El teniente esta a cargo del ejército".</i>

6.4.3 Discussion of Table 6.27

Seven out of eight participants (87%) from group C (EarlExpLessFr) classified this item as unacceptable. Consonant with the results obtained for groups A and B, the totality of participants who classified this item as unacceptable in group C changed the preposition *en* for *a*.

One of the participants (C.5.7) noticed that *en cargo* is a direct translation of *in charge*. Interestingly, two participants (C.5.2 and C.5.3) used grammatical terms to explain their change from *en* to *a* and cited an incorrect use of the preposition. Another participant (C.5.6) listed some of the correct uses for *en* in Spanish, noting that it is never used to express that something is someone's responsibility. The rest of the participants did not cite the specific reasons why they chose *a* over *en* in their rewritten version of this sentence.

Item 12: *Juan es amigable, pero en la otra mano, su hermano Alberto es muy grosero.*

Table 6.28: Answers provided for item 12 by participants from group A (EarlExpFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
A.12.1	<i>Juan es amigable, pero su hermano Alberto es muy grosero.</i>
A.12.2	<i>"En la otra mano" no suena como una frase correcta. Reescrita: Juan es amigable, pero por otro lado, su hermano Alberto es muy grosero.</i>
A.12.3	<i>Una traducción literal que sería expresado mejor con una frase similar. Juan es amigable, pero por otra parte, su hermano Alberto es muy grosero.</i>
A.12.4	<i>pero en la otra mano no funciona gramaticamente en español como "on the other hand" funciona en inglés. La describiría simplemente como "Juan es amigable, pero su hermano Alberto es muy grosero".</i>
A.12.5	<i>Debería ser "Juan es amigable, pero por otra parte, su hermano Alberto es muy grosero", ya que "on the other hand" no se traduce exactamente al español.</i>
A.12.6	<i>"On the other hand," (traducción directa: en otra mano) es una expresión en inglés. En vez de "en otra mano," puede ser "por otro lado."</i>
A.12.7	<i>En la otra mano es una traducción directa de "On the other hand", y está incorrecta. Además, en la oración se usa pero y "en la otra mano", lo cual significaría lo mismo y se haría</i>

	<i>redundante repetir. Es español se dice "por el otro lado", así que la oración debe decir "Juan es amigable, por el otro lado, su hermano Alberto es muy grosero".</i>
A.12.8	<i>"En la otra mano" es una traducción de una expresión que se usa en el inglés. Juan es amigable, pero por otra parte, su hermano Alberto es muy grosero.</i>
A.12.9	<i>No hace mucho sentido. Juan es amigable, por el otro lado, su hermano Alberto es muy grosero.</i>
A.12.10	<i>Esta traducida literalmente. Sería: "A diferencia de su hermano Alberto, Juan es amigable."</i>
A.12.11	<i>"On the other hand" es un conector lógico que se tradujo palabra por palabra al español. No obstante, ese conector realmente no se usa en español. Además, faltan comas entre la aposición (que puede ser 'su hermano', o 'Alberto'). Por lo tanto, la oración puede ser: Juan es amigable, pero, por otra parte, su hermano, Alberto, es muy grosero.</i>
A.12.12	<i>Juan es amigable pero su hermano Alberto es un grosero.</i>

6.4.4 Discussion of Table 6.28

Twelve out of eighteen participants (67%) from group A (EarlExpFr) classified this item as unacceptable. All of them identified the phrase *on the other hand* as unacceptable and provided different options to improve this sentence. Three participants (A.12.1, A.12.4, and A.12.12) decided to eliminate the phrase *en la otra mano* and kept the conjunction *pero* (i.e.,

Juan es amigable, pero su hermano Alberto es un grosero.). Most of the remaining participants kept *pero* and changed the phrase *en la otra mano* for a more idiomatic expression in Spanish. Four participants wrote *por otra parte* (A.12.3, A.12.5, A.12.8, and A.12.11) and four others chose *por otro lado* (A.12.2, A.12.6, A.12.7, and A.12.9). The remaining participant (A.12.10) opted for a more creative yet still acceptable construction (i.e., *A diferencia de su hermano Alberto, Juan es amigable*).

Eight participants recognized *en la otra mano* as a direct and unidiomatic translation of *on the other hand* (A.12.3, A.12.4, A.12.5, A.12.6, A.12.7, A.12.8, A.12.10, and A.12.11). Two other answers mentioned that the phrase *en la otra mano* was incorrect or made no sense (A.12.2 and A.12.9) and the remaining two participants provided no explanation for their change (A.12.1 and A.12.12).

One participant did not classify the item as acceptable or unacceptable but wrote the following: *Esta mejor dicho si usamos la frase por el otro lado. Seria... Juan es amigable, por el otro lado, su hermano Alberto es muy grosero* (It would sound better if we used the phrase *por el otro lado*. It would be... *Juan es amigable, por el otro lado, su hermano Alberto es muy grosero*).

Table 6.29: Answers provided for item 12 by participants from group B (LateExpLessFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
B.12.1	<i>La frase "pero en la otra mano" no es la correcta. Juan es amigable, pero por otra parte, su hermano Alberto es muy grosero.</i>
B.12.2	<i>usa la frase "at the other hand" de manera literal cuando en español no se refiere literalmente a la mano, "Juan es amigable, por otro lado, su hermano Alberto es muy grosero"</i>

B.12.3	<i>La frase 'en la otra mano' nunca se usa en español. Se podría sustituir así: Juan es amigable, pero por otro lado, su hermano Alberto es muy grosero.</i>
B.12.4	<i>La oración es inaceptable en el español ya que hay una traducción errónea del conector lógico "on the other hand" en inglés. La oración escrita correctamente sería: "Juan es amigable, pero, por otro lado, su hermano Alberto es muy grosero"</i>
B.12.5	<i>La frase en la otra mano no debería de estar utilizada en esta oración. Juan es amigable, mientras que su hermano Alberto es muy grosero.</i>

6.4.5 Discussion of Table 6.29

Five out of ten participants (50%) from group B (LateExpLessFr) classified this item as unacceptable. All five participants identified the phrase *en la otra mano* as unacceptable and provided their own version of it. Three rewrote *en la otra mano* as *por otro lado* (B.12.2, B.12.3, and B.12.4) and one (B.12.1) wrote *por otra parte*. The remaining participant (B.12.5) chose the phrase *mientras que* as a substitute for *en la otra mano*.

Two participants (B.12.2 and B.12.4) mentioned a direct translation of *on the other hand* as the reason why the sentence is unacceptable, and two others (B.12.1 and B.12.5) wrote that the phrase *en la otra mano* is not correct in Spanish. The remaining participant (B.12.3) wrote that the phrase *en la otra mano* should never be used in Spanish.

Table 6.30: Answers provided for item 12 by participants from group C (EarlExpLessFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
C.12.1	<i>Juan es amigable, pero su hermano, Alberto, es muy grosero.</i>
C.12.2	<i>La frase "pero en la otra mano" es un "direct translation", eso no se escribe así en español. Juan es amigable, por lo contrario, su hermano Alberto es muy grosero.</i>
C.12.3	<i>La frase "pero en la otra mano" es una traducción literal del inglés "on the other hand". Oración reescrita: Juan es amigable, por otro lado, su hermano Alberto es muy grosero.</i>
C.12.4	<i>El decir "en la otra mano" es del inglés, y no tiene el mismo significado en español. Se puede cambiar a "Juan es amigable, pero por otro lado, su hermano Alberto es muy grosero".</i>

6.4.6 Discussion of Table 6.30

Four out of eight participants (50%) from group C (EarlExpLessFr) classified this item as unacceptable. All four participants identified the phrase *on the other hand* as unacceptable and provided different options to improve this sentence. One participant (C.12.1) decided to eliminate the phrase *en la otra mano* and kept the conjunction *pero* (i.e., *Juan es amigable, pero su hermano, Alberto, es muy grosero.*). Two participants (C.12.3 and C.12.4) rewrote *en la otra mano* as *por otro lado* and one (C.12.2) opted for *por lo contrario*, a somewhat unidiomatic construction.

Three of the four participants (C.12.2, C.12.3, and C.12.4) identified *en la otra mano* as a direct translation of *on the other hand* and explained that it is unacceptable in Spanish. The participant offering the remaining answer (C.12.1) did not provide an explanation for their rewritten version.

Item 14: ***Luis empezó a depender demasiado en sus amigos.***

Table 6.31: Answers provided for item 14 by participants from group A (EarlExpFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
A.14.1	<i>Luis empezó a depender demasiado de sus amigos.</i>
A.14.2	<i>Debería ser "Luis empezó a depender demasiado de sus amigos".</i>
A.14.3	<i>Debería de ser: "Luis empezó a depender demasiado de sus amigos."</i>
A.14.4	<i>En esta oración, "en sus amigos" es una traducción directa de "on his friends", lo cual se cambiara a "de sus amigos" en español. La oración debe decir "Luis empezó a depender demasiado de sus amigos".</i>
A.14.5	<i>La palabra correcta es comenzó. Oración reescrita: Luis comenzó a depender demasiado en sus amigos.</i>
A.14.6	<i>La palabra "en" en esta oración no está correcta. Reescribir la oración: Luis empezó a depender demasiado de sus amigos.</i>
A.14.7	<i>Sería "de" en vez de "en". "Luis empezó a depender demasiado de sus amigos."</i>

6.4.7 Discussion of Table 6.31

Seven out of eighteen participants (39%) from group A (EarlExpFr) classified this item as unacceptable. Six of the seven participants (A.14.1, A.14.2, A.14.3, A.14.4, A.14.6, and A.14.7) identified the preposition *en* as unacceptable. The remaining participant kept the preposition *en* in their rewritten version and identified the verb *empezó* as unacceptable. Their sentence included the verb *comenzó* instead (i.e., *Luis comenzó a depender demasiado en sus amigos*). Despite their rather unorthodox interpretation of this sentence, this participant did not provide a rationale for their change.

One participant (A.14.4) explained that *en sus amigos* is a direct translation of *on his friends*. The rest of the participants who changed *en* for *de* (i.e., *de sus amigos*) did not provide a specific explanation for their appreciation and limited themselves to saying that *en* should not be used in this context and that the correct construction should be made with the preposition *de*.

Table 6.32: Answers provided for item 14 by participants from group B (LateExpLessFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
B.14.1	<i>La palabra "en" no es la correcta para esta ocasión. Luis empezó a depender demasiado de sus amigos.</i>
B.14.2	<i>El "en" esta usado incorrectamente. Luis empezó a depender demasiado de sus amigos</i>

6.4.8 Discussion of Table 6.32

Two out of ten participants (20%) from group B (LateExpLessFr) classified this item as unacceptable. This number is rather low considering the linguistic profile of this group and the fact that it was hypothesized that group B would display the highest percentages of

unacceptability in items with cross-linguistic influence. Both participants who identified this item as unacceptable identified the preposition *en* as incorrect and changed it to a construction with *de* (i.e., *depender demasiado de sus amigos*). Furthermore, neither of the two participants provided a detailed explanation for the change and limited themselves to stating that the preposition *en* is incorrect in this context.

Table 6.33: Answers provided for item 14 by participants from group C (EarlExpLessFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
C.14.1	<i>Esta oración es inaceptable ya que uno "depende de" no se utiliza la frase "en sus". Se podría escribir de la siguiente manera: Luis empezó a depender demasiado de sus amigos.</i>
C.14.2	<i>En vez de la preposición en, se usaría de. Luis empezó a depender demasiado de sus amigos.</i>
C.14.3	<i>Luis comenzó a depender demasiado de sus amigos, para mí la de arriba solo suena mal</i>
C.14.4	<i>En esta oración cambiaron "depend on" por "depender en", y esta incorrecto. Luis empezó a depender demasiado de sus amigos.</i>

6.4.9 Discussion of Table 6.33

Four out of eight participants (50%) from group C (EarlExpLessFr) classified this item as unacceptable. All four identified the preposition *en* as unacceptable and changed it for a more idiomatic construction with *de* (i.e., *depender demasiado de sus amigos*).

One participant (C.14.4) identified *dependen* as a direct translation of *depend on*. Another (C.14.2) referred directly to the grammatical category of *en* and mentioned that the preposition *de* should be used instead of *en*. The other two participants wrote about the unacceptability (C.14.1) or ill-sounding nature (C.14.3) of the phrase *en sus amigos* but did not provide a detailed explanation for their choice of the preposition *de*.

6.5 Analysis of Category: *Lexical borrowing: Adjectives*

The item examined here includes a direct translation of adjectives from English. Each table includes only the participants' unacceptable answers. The discussion that follows each table addresses the participants' answers and explanations in the acceptability test and evaluates the nature of such explanations to provide a more nuanced view of the participants' metalinguistic awareness.

Item 6: *Los exploradores viajan por el mar en una línea derecha.*

Table 6.34: Answers provided for item 6 for participants from group A (EarlExpFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
A.6.1	<i>Los exploradores navegan por el mar en una línea derecha.</i>
A.6.2	<i>Los exploradores viajan por el mar en una línea recta.</i>
A.6.3	<i>En vez de escribir/decir "Los exploradores viajan por el mar en una línea derecha" debería ser "Los exploradores viajan por el mar en una línea recta".</i>
A.6.4	<i>No se puede decir "línea derecha". Reescribir la oración: Los exploradores viajan por el mar en una línea recta.</i>
A.6.5	<i>Los exploradores recorren el mar en una línea recta.</i>

6.5.1 Discussion of Table 6.34

Five out of eighteen participants (28%) from group A (EarlExpFr) classified this item as unacceptable. The original sentence in the acceptability test (i.e., *Los exploradores viajan por el mar en una línea derecha.*) includes an adjective that is a direct translation of *straight*. The context in this sentence calls for the adjective *recta*, instead. Four of the five participants (A.6.2, A.6.3, A.6.4, A.6.5) who classified this item as unacceptable provided a rewritten version of this sentence that includes the adjective *recta* instead of *derecha*. The remaining participant (A.6.1) kept the adjective *derecha* but changed the verb *viajan* for *navegan*. Although more specific to the semantic domain of this sentence, *navegan* neither changes the meaning of the sentence nor renders it unidiomatic.

Only one participant (A.6.4) provided a brief explanation for their change, but they limited themselves to writing that *derecha* cannot be used in this context. The other five participants, including the one who substituted *viajan* for *navegan*, did not provide an explanation for classifying this sentence as unacceptable and for providing a rewritten version.

Table 6.35: Answers provided for item 6 for participants from group B (LateExpLessFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
B.6.1	<i>La palabra "derecha" no explica el sentido correctamente. Los exploradores viajan por el mar en una línea recta.</i>
B.6.2	<i>usa de manera incorrecta el "right", "Los exploradores viajan por el mar en una línea recta"</i>
B.6.3	<i>Suena muy confusa, quizás una mejor versión sería: Los exploradores viajan por el mar en una línea directa.</i>

B.6.4	<i>La oración inaceptable en español ya que no usan la palabra correcta en el sintaxis para la traducción de la palabra "straight" en inglés. La oración escrita correctamente sería: "Los exploradores viajan por el mar en una línea recta".</i>
B.6.5	<i>Pienso que hay que reemplazar "derecha" por "recta". -Los exploradores viajan por el mar en una línea recta.-</i>
B.6.6	<i>La palabra derecha no se debe de utilizar en este contexto. Los exploradores viajan por el mar en una línea recta.</i>

6.5.2 Discussion of Table 6.35

Six out of ten participants (60%) from group B (LateExpLessFr) classified this item as unacceptable. All six participants identified the adjective *recta* as unacceptable and proceeded to write their own version of the sentence. Five participants (B.6.1, B.6.2, B.6.4, B.6.5, and B.6.6) changed *derecha* for *recta* and one (B.6.3) wrote *directa* as a substitute for *derecha*. Although there is some semantic overlap among *directa*, *recta*, and *derecha* and *línea derecha* would convey a similar meaning as *línea recta*, the most idiomatic option, as explained in Chapter 5, Section 5.3.4, would be *línea recta*. It is possible that the participant who wrote this answer successfully concluded that *derecha* is unacceptable in this context but either did not recall or did not have time to retrieve *recta* as the most idiomatic option.

The participants' explanations in this item were quite varied. B.6.1 mentioned that *derecha* does not communicate the meaning of this sentence correctly while B.6.2 wrote that the sentence uses the adjective *right* incorrectly. While B.6.2 makes no explicit reference to a direct translation, their answer reveals that they successfully identified the influence of English in this

sentence. B.6.3 described this sentence as confusing but did not elaborate on the reasons for their appreciation. B.6.6 stated that *derecha* should not be used in this context and B.6.5 limited their explanation to saying that *derecha* must be replaced for *recta*. B.6.4 presented what is perhaps the most interesting explanation from this group. On the one hand, they successfully identified a direct translation of *straight* to be the reason why the sentence is unacceptable. On the other hand, however, they claimed that the unacceptability of this sentence stems from incorrect syntax but did not make any changes to the order of elements in the sentence and limited themselves to changing *derecha* for *recta*.

Table 6.36: Answers provided for item 6 for participants from group C (EarlExpLessFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
C.6.1	<i>Los exploradores viajan por el mar, en línea recta.</i>
C.6.2	<i>La palabra derecha en la oración se refiere al lado derecho, no a algo que no se desvía. Oración reescrita: Los exploradores viajan por el mar en línea recta.</i>

6.5.3 Discussion of Table 6.36

Two out of eight participants (25%) from group C (EarlExpLessFr) classified this item as unacceptable. Both participants changed *derecha* for *recta* in their rewritten versions of this sentence. Moreover, participant C.6.1 added a comma before the prepositional phrase (i.e., *Los exploradores viajan por el mar, en línea recta.*) and both (C.6.1 and C.6.2) deleted the indefinite article *una* and wrote *en línea recta* instead of *en una línea recta*. This is a minor change that neither alters the meaning of the sentence nor is the target of this study.

C.6.2 explained that the adjective *derecha* is employed to refer to location (e.g., right side or left side) and not to describe an undeviating course or path as *recta* would do. C.6.1 did not provide an explanation for their rewritten version and limited themselves to replacing *derecha* with *recta*. Interestingly, one participant in this group classified this item as acceptable but added that “*recta sonaría mejor pero pienso que aún es aceptable.*” (*recta* would sound better, but I still think it is acceptable). This participant is clearly concerned with meaning and not with structure. By recognizing that *recta* would sound better but that *derecha* still conveys the same meaning, this participant shows that their grammatical competence is up to par with their communicative competence. Their answer suggests, however, that the latter has prevailed over the former. A more detailed discussion of the grammatical/communicative competence dichotomy (or structure versus meaning) and its implications for this study is presented in chapter 6 (Conclusions).

6.6 Analysis of Category: *Preposition stranding*

The items examined below contain stranded prepositions in Spanish, a construction that is considered ungrammatical. Each table includes only the participants’ unacceptable answers. The discussion that follows each table addresses the participants’ answers and explanations in the acceptability test and evaluates the nature of such explanations to provide a more nuanced view of the participants’ metalinguistic awareness.

Item 9: *Los colonizadores traían enfermedades que los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos a.*

Table 6.37: Answers provided for item 9 by participants from group A (EarlExpFr)

A.9.1	<i>Los colonizadores traían enfermedades que los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos.</i>
A.9.2	<i>La oracion esta mal estructurada. Reescrita: Los colonizadores traian enfermedades a las cuales los nativos todavia no habian sido expuestos.</i>
A.9.3	<i>En el español nunca se termina con una preposición. Los colonizadores traían enfermedades a las que nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos.</i>
A.9.4	<i>El "expuestos a," es un traducción directa de "exposed to." La oración debería decir, "Los colonizadores traían enfermedades que los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos."</i>
A.9.5	<i>Esta oración está escrita como una traducción directa de "The colonizers brought illnesses that the natives had not been exposed to", por tal razón, su estructura está escrita de la misma manera que se escribe en inglés. Cuando se escribe con su estructura correcta, la oración debe decir "Los colonizadores trajeron enfermedades a las que los nativos no estaban expuestos".</i>

A.9.6	<i>La palabra "a" no va en ese lugar. Reescribir la oración: Los colonizadores traían enfermedades a las que los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos.</i>
A.9.7	<i>La oracion es un poco dificil de leer. Los colonizadores trajeron enfermedades a los cuales los nativos no se habian expuesto.</i>
A.9.8	<i>La estructura de la oración es un poco rara. Debería ser: "Los colonizadores traían enfermedades nunca expuestos a los nativos."</i>
A.9.9	<i>Esto tampoco se escucha bien. Sería: "Los colonizadores trajeron enfermedades a las que los nativos todavía no se habían expuesto.</i>
A.9.10	<i>Esto tendría sentido si estuviera en inglés: The colonizers brought illnesses that the natives weren't exposed to yet. Es decir, el 'a' está fuera de lugar. Por lo cual, la oración puede ser: Los colonizadores traían enfermedades a las cuales los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos.</i>
A.9.11	<i>Porque una oracion no puede terminar incompleta. "Los colonizadores traían enfermedades que los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos a ellas."</i>
A.9.12	<i>Los colonizadores trajeron enfermedades las cuales los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos. - Las palabras que</i>

	<i>se utilizaron en la oración son las correctas pero el orden no lo es. NO hace mucho sentido.</i>
--	---

6.6.1 Discussion of Table 6.37

Twelve out of eighteen participants (67%) from group A (EarlExpFr) classified this item as unacceptable. As mentioned in chapter 4, preposition stranding is perhaps the most marked structure in this study because it does not occur in Spanish. As a result, it might strike participants as ungrammatical regardless of their group and linguistic background. In this case, the stranded preposition is *a* (i.e., *Los colonizadores traían enfermedades que los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos a.*).

The twelve participants from group A who classified this item as unacceptable identified the stranded preposition *a* as unacceptable. Although the standard structure in Spanish would call for the displaced preposition to be placed elsewhere in the sentence, such a construction would require adding other elements that do not appear in the original sentence (e.g., *Los colonizadores traían enfermedades a las que los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos.*). In this new construction, the preposition *a* is placed after the independent clause *Los colonizadores traían enfermedades* and is then followed by the Spanish relativo compuesto *las que* (*Diccionario panhispánico de dudas*, 2005). The relative pronoun *que* may also be substituted for *cuales* (i.e., *las cuales*). Four participants (A.9.3, A.9.5, A.9.6, and A.9.9) opted for a construction with *a las que* and three (A.9.2, A.9.7, and A.9.10) wrote *a las cuales*. It is important to point out that A.9.7 wrote *los cuales* instead of *las cuales*, a construction that does not agree with this pronoun's antecedent, the Spanish feminine noun *enfermedades*. With the available data it is impossible to determine whether the participant's version adheres to agreement rules in English (most nouns

have no grammatical gender in English) or if their misconstruction is the result of a typo. A.9.3 dropped the definite article *los* before the plural noun *nativos* (i.e., *Los colonizadores traían enfermedades a las que nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos.*). One participant (A.9.12) decided to rewrite the sentence with *las cuales* but left the preposition *a* out of their final version (i.e., *Los colonizadores trajeron enfermedades las cuales los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos.*).

A.9.1, A.9.4, A.9.8, and A.9.11 dropped the preposition *a* in their rewritten version, a construction that, although comprehensible, eliminates a rule-governed element required by the Spanish verb *exponer*. Although it could be argued that group A's frequent use of English may have influenced the structure they produced, this is unlikely since the verb *to expose* also requires the preposition *to* in a construction such as this one (e.g., *They were exposed to the disease.*). Therefore, the omission of the preposition *a* could respond to the fact that the use of *a* is not prevalent in vernacular Spanish and speakers might consider it optional.

Three participants (A.9.4, A.9.5, and A.9.10) explicitly mentioned or alluded to a direct translation from English to be the cause for the unacceptability of this item, with A.9.4 referring to a direct translation of *exposed to* and A.9.5 and A.9.10 translating the entire sentence from Spanish to English to prove their point.

Answers from A.9.2, A.9.6, and A.9.12 referred to “bad” or “wrong” syntax when explaining their answer and proceeded to rewrite the sentence accordingly, with A.9.12 dropping the preposition *a* as mentioned above. A.9.7 and A.9.9 stated that the sentence is “difficult to read” and “does not sound good,” respectively. One participant (A.9.1) avoided the stranded preposition by omitting it altogether but did not provide an explanation for their change.

It is important to note that three participants specifically mentioned that placing the preposition *a* at the end of the sentence is unacceptable in Spanish. Although they did not mention stranded prepositions directly, A.9.3 wrote that a sentence in Spanish never ends with a preposition, A.9.6 noticed that the preposition was misplaced, and A.9.11 observed that the placement of the preposition makes the sentence sound incomplete.

Table 6.38: Answers provided for item 9 by participants from group B (LateExpLessFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
B.9.1	<i>El orden de la oración está mal. Los colonizadores traían enfermedades a las que los nativos no habían sido expuestos todavía.</i>
B.9.2	<i>al final hay una "a" que no debería ir, esta ahí ya que la traducción en inglés tiene un "to", "Los colonizadores traían enfermedades a las que los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos"</i>
B.9.3	<i>La sintaxis no cuadra ya que entiendo que nunca se terminan oraciones en español con 'a'. Es una mala traducción de "had not been exposed to" y la versión correcta sería: Los colonizadores traían enfermedades a las que los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos.</i>
B.9.4	<i>En este caso la oración es inaceptable en el español ya que la preposición "a" no es necesaria y no se puede usar de la manera que se presenta. Además hay que añadir una preposición y un artículo adicional para que la oración suene</i>

	<i>mejor. La oración escrita correctamente sería "Los colonizadores traían enfermedades a las que los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos".</i>
B.9.5	<i>Los colonizadores traían enfermedades que los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos a ellas.</i>
B.9.6	<i>Los colonizadores traían enfermedades que los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos.</i>
B.9.7	<i>El "a" no debería estar en la oracion. "Los colonizadores traían enfermedades que los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos."</i>
B.9.8	<i>Los colonizadores traían enfermedades que los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos.</i>
B.9.9	<i>Una oración no debe de terminar con la palabra a y la sintaxis está incorrecta. Los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos a enfermedades que traían los colonizadores.</i>

6.6.2 Discussion of Table 6.38

Nine out of ten participants (90%) from group B (LateExpLessFr) classified this item as unacceptable. The nine participants from group B who classified this item as unacceptable identified the stranded preposition *a* as unacceptable. As explained in the discussion for group A above, placing the preposition *a* elsewhere in the sentence may require adding other elements (e.g., *las que* or *las cuales*) to achieve well-formedness in Spanish. Four participants (B.9.1, B.9.2, B.9.3, and B.9.4) rewrote this sentence by adding a relative clause introduced by *a las que*

after the independent clause *Los colonizadores traían enfermedades*. This construction effectively places the preposition *a* in a more canonical position in Spanish and avoids the stranded preposition.

Similar to several participants from group A, three members from group B (B.9.6, B.9.7, and B.9.8) identified the stranded preposition but proceeded to eliminate it altogether (i.e., *Los colonizadores traían enfermedades que los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos*). As mentioned before, the verb *exponer* must appear with the preposition *a*, even with its participial form (i.e., *expuestos a*).

Two of the participants' answers (B.9.5 and B.9.9) avoided the stranded preposition by placing it elsewhere in the sentence, but their version distances itself from the expected constructions with *a las que* or *a las cuales*. For instance, B.9.5's rewritten version adds the pronoun *ellas* after the preposition *a* (i.e., *Los colonizadores traían enfermedades que los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos a ellas*). This version successfully conveys the intended message and avoids the stranded preposition but does not sound natural in Spanish. B.9.9 opted for a different construction as well: *Los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos a enfermedades que traían los colonizadores*. In this version, the subject *los colonizadores* has been placed in a relative clause at the end of the sentence and the direct object *los nativos* appears at the beginning. While different from most versions provided by groups A and B, this sentence is both meaningful and idiomatic.

Three participants from group B (B.9.1, B.9.3, and B.9.9) pointed out that the word order or syntax in this item is wrong or incorrect. B.2.2 and B.2.3 commented on the influence of English in this sentence and cited a direct translation as a possible cause for this unidiomatic construction.

Four participants commented on the use of the preposition *a* in this sentence. B.9.2 stated that the preposition should not appear at the end and B.9.3 observed that sentences in Spanish do not end in a preposition. Interestingly, B.9.4 mentioned that the preposition is not necessary, yet included it in their rewritten version at the beginning of the relative clause (i.e., *Los colonizadores traían enfermedades a las que los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos.*). B.9.7 noted that the preposition was not necessary and proceeded to eliminate it from their final version (i.e., *Los colonizadores traían enfermedades que los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos.*).

B.9.5, B.9.6, and B.9.8 did not explain what made this sentence unacceptable nor did they provide a rationale for their rewritten version.

Table 6.39: Answers provided for item 9 by participants from group C (EarlExpLessFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
C.9.1	<i>Los colonizadores traían enfermedades a las que los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos.</i>
C.9.2	<i>Los sintagmas estan en un orden inadecuado. Los colonizadores traian enfermedades a las que los nativos no habian sido expuestos.</i>
C.9.3	<i>La preposición a no va al final de la oración. La oración sería: Los colonizadores traín enfermedaes que los nativos no habían sido expuestos.</i>
C.9.4	<i>Se entiende, pero no está escrita correctamente. Los nativos fueron expuestos a enfermedades que trajeron los colonizadores.</i>

C.9.5	<i>El orden en la oración está incorrecto, ya que en español no se diría "expuestos a" como en inglés se dice "exposed to". Se puede cambiar a "Los colonizadores traían enfermedades a las cuales los nativos no habían sido expuestos."</i>
-------	---

6.6.3 Discussion of Table 6.39

Five out of eight participants (63%) from group C (EarlExpLessFr) classified this item as unacceptable. All five focused on the stranded preposition and provided a rewritten version that avoided this construction. Four of the participants (C.9.1, C.9.2, C.9.4, and C.9.5) kept the preposition *a* and proposed different versions for this sentence. C.9.1 and C.9.2 opted for a construction with *a las que* (i.e., *Los colonizadores traían enfermedades a las que los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos.*) and C.9.5 preferred *a las cuales* (i.e., *Los colonizadores traían enfermedades a las cuales los nativos no habían sido expuestos.*). C.9.4, on the other hand, avoided the stranded preposition by changing the original order of elements in the sentence. Similar to B.9.9 above, C.9.4 decided for a passive construction in which *Los nativos* was moved to the beginning of the sentence and *los colonizadores* was placed in a relative clause describing the noun *enfermedades* (i.e., *Los nativos fueron expuestos a enfermedades que trajeron los colonizadores.*). The remaining participant (C.9.3) dropped the preposition *a* altogether (i.e., *Los colonizadores traín (sic) enfermedaes (sic) que los nativos no habían sido expuestos.*).

Two participants (C.9.2 and C.9.5) stated that syntax is the main problem in this sentence, with C.9.2 mentioning that the syntagms (*sintagmas*) are not organized properly. C.9.5 also referred to a direct translation from *exposed to* in their explanation. C.9.3 wrote specifically about the misplacement of the preposition *a* and explained that it should not appear at the end of

the sentence. C.9.4 wrote that, while the meaning is comprehensible, the sentence is not written correctly. The remaining participant (C.9.1) did not provide an explanation for their answer.

Item 10: *El muchacho ya no sabía quién confiar en.*

Table 6.40: Answers provided for item 10 by participants from group A (EarlExpFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
A.10.1	<i>El muchacho ya no sabía en quién confiar.</i>
A.10.2	<i>La oracion esta mal estructurada. Reescrita: El muchacho ya no sabia en quien confiar.</i>
A.10.3	<i>En el español no se termina con una preposición. El muchacho ya no sabía en quién confiar.</i>
A.10.4	<i>El muchacho ya no sabía en quién confiar.</i>
A.10.5	<i>En esta en la posición incorrecta, debe ser "El muchacho ya no sabía en quién confiar".</i>
A.10.6	<i>Debería ser "El muchacho ya no sabía en quién confiar".</i>
A.10.7	<i>La oración debería ser "El muchacho ya no sabía en quién confiar."</i>
A.10.8	<i>Esta oración está escrita como una traducción directa de "The young man no longer knew who to trust in" por tal razón, su estructura está escrita de la misma manera que se escribe en inglés. Debe estar escrita como, "El muchacho ya no sabía en quién confiar".</i>
A.10.9	<i>La oración esta incorrecta sintácticamente. Oración reescrita: El muchacho ya no sabía en quién confiar.</i>

A.10.10	<i>La palabra "en" está en el lugar que no es. Reescribir la oración: El muchacho ya no sabía en quién confiar.</i>
A.10.11	<i>No hace sentido. El muchacho ya no supo en quien confiar.</i>
A.10.12	<i>Esta era otra oración que suena rara. "El muchacho ya no sabía en quién confiar."</i>
A.10.13	<i>No sé porque, pero sé que esta mal escrito. "El muchacho ya no sabia en quién podia confiar."</i>
A.10.14	<i>El 'en' está fuera de lugar. Debe ser: El muchacho ya no sabía en quién confiar.</i>
A.10.15	<i>Falto el en. El muchacho ya no sabia en quien confiar.</i>
A.10.16	<i>Porque en esta al final y se supone que este después de sabía. "El muchacho ya no sabía en quién confiar."</i>
A.10.17	<i>El muchacho no sabia en quien confiar - Hace bastante sentido esta oración pero el "en" al final no va, va antes de quien.</i>

6.6.4 Discussion of Table 6.40

Seventeen out of eighteen participants (94%) from group A (EarlExpFr) classified this item as unacceptable. It is evident that most participants from this group recognized stranded prepositions as incorrect. All seventeen participants placed the stranded preposition *en* in its canonical head-first position in the prepositional phrase *en quién confiar* (i.e., *El muchacho ya no sabía en quién confiar.*).

Participants A.10.2 and A.10.9 were the only ones to specifically refer to structure or syntax in their explanation. Most participants (A.10.3, A.10.5, A.10.10, A.10.14, and A.10.16)

directly mentioned that the placement of the preposition *en* is unacceptable, with a few of them (e.g., A.10.3 and A.10.17) referring directly to prescriptive Spanish grammar not allowing a preposition to appear at the end of a sentence. Curiously, one participant (A.10.15) explained that the preposition *en* was missing, when in reality they may have intended to say that it was misplaced.

A.10.8 mentioned that this construction is a direct translation from English (e.g., *trust in*) and translated the sentence it to prove their point.

Four participants (A.10.11 and A.10.12) observed that the sentence made no sense or did not sound right but did not provide a specific explanation for their answer. A.10.13 acknowledged that they did know exactly what was wrong with the sentence, but they still knew it was wrong. The remaining participants (A.10.1, A.10.4, and A.10.6) avoided the stranded preposition in their rewritten version but provided no explanation whatsoever.

It is important to point out that there is one participant from group A who did not classify this item as acceptable or unacceptable (tabulated in the quantitative analysis as “Did not answer”). Nonetheless, they wrote the following in their explanation: *El ya no sabia en quien confiar*. Their answer, which omits the noun *muchacho* for unknown reasons, suggests that they identified the stranded preposition as unacceptable and rewrote the sentence accordingly.

Technically, then, no member of group A classified item 10 as acceptable.

Table 6.41: Answers provided for item 10 by participants by group B (LateExpLessFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
B.10.1	<i>El orden de la oración no tiene sentido. El muchacho ya no sabía en quién confiar.</i>
B.10.2	<i>En esta oracion hay un "en" al final que no deberia ir, otra ves coge el "in" que va al final de esta otraccion en ingles. "El muchacho ya no sabia en quien confiar"</i>
B.10.3	<i>También parece ser una traducción directa e incorrecta de "trust in". El muchacho ya no sabía en quien confiar.</i>
B.10.4	<i>La oración es inaceptable ya que esta escrita con la sintaxis incorrecta. La manera correcta de escribir la oración es ""El muchaho ya no sabía en quién confiar."</i>
B.10.5	<i>El muchacho ya no sabia en quien confiar.</i>
B.10.6	<i>El muchacho ya no sabía en quién confiar.</i>
B.10.7	<i>El orden de las palabras es incorrecto. "El muchacho ya no sabía en quién confiar."</i>
B.10.8	<i>Pienso que hay que poner "en" al frente de "quién". -El muchacho ya no sabía en quién confiar.-</i>
B.10.9	<i>El orden de las palabras en la oración está incorrecto. El muchacho ya no sabía en quién confiar.</i>

6.6.5 Discussion of Table 6.41

Nine out of ten participants (90%) from group B (LateExpLessFr) classified this item as unacceptable. Responding in the same vein as group A, all nine participants placed the stranded preposition *en* in its canonical head-first position in the prepositional phrase *en quién confiar* (i.e., *El muchacho ya no sabía en quién confiar.*).

The participants' explanations for this item were similar to those provided by group A. One participant (B.10.2) commented that the placement of the preposition *en* at the end of the sentence is influenced by English syntax. B.10.3 also mentioned a direct translation from English (i.e., *trust in*) but made no direct comment about the stranded preposition in Spanish. B.10.8 wrote that they thought that the preposition *en* should be placed before the pronoun *quién* but did not cite influence from English to be the cause.

Four participants (B.10.1, B.10.4, B.10.7, and B.10.9) provided explanations that were split between what they called nonsensical order and incorrect syntax. Without mentioning any conventions of language directly, these answers and the rewritten versions that accompany them, implicitly invoke prescriptive rules in Spanish.

The remaining two participants (B.10.5 and B.10.6) did not provide an explanation for their rewritten version.

The only participant from group B who classified this item as acceptable added an alternative version of this sentence: *El muchacho ya no sabía en quién confuar (sic)*. Based on their response, it is possible that this participant mistakenly clicked on “acceptable” when they intended to classify this item as “unacceptable.” Another possibility is that they did consider this construction to be acceptable, hence their answer, but they thought that their rewritten version was more idiomatic.

Table 6.42: Answers provided for item 10 by participants by group C (EarlExpLessFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
C.10.1	<i>El muchacho ya no sabía en quién confiar.</i>
C.10.2	<i>"En" no esta en una posicion logica. El muchacho ya no sabia en quien confiar.</i>
C.10.3	<i>Está oración es inaceptable ya que la monosílaba "en" está fuera de lugar ya que la oración sería escrita asi "El muchacho ya no sabía en quién confiar".</i>
C.10.4	<i>La preposición en no va al final. La oración sería: El muchacho no sabía en quién confiar.</i>
C.10.5	<i>las palabras estan mal organizadas, el muchacho ya no sabía en quién confiar</i>
C.10.6	<i>El "en" va antes de "quién". El muchacho ya no sabía en quién confiar.</i>
C.10.7	<i>La oración tiene un error de sintaxis. Oración reescrita: El muchacho ya no sabía en quién confiar.</i>
C.10.8	<i>El orden de las palabras está incorrecto. Se puede cambiar a "El muchacho ya no sabía en quien confiar".</i>

6.6.6 Discussion of Table 6.42

All eight participants (100%) from group C (EarlExpLessFr) classified this item as unacceptable. In what appears to be a unanimous appreciation by all three groups, all members

of group C avoided the stranded preposition and produced a construction in which *en* appears before the pronoun *quién* (i.e., *El muchacho ya no sabía en quién confiar.*)

The explanations provided by group C follow a similar pattern to the one already established by groups A and B. Participants C.10.5, C.10.7, and C.10.8 alluded to syntax or word order but did not cite specific rules or conventions in Spanish.

Other explanations (C.10.2, C.10.3, C.10.4, and C.10.6) directly mentioned that the preposition *en* is misplaced in the sentence, thus implicitly acknowledging the unidiomatic use of stranded prepositions in Spanish. Participant C.10.3, however, referred to *en* as a *monosílaba* instead of calling it a preposition.

The remaining participant (C.10.1) avoided the stranded preposition in their rewritten version but did not provide an explanation.

Item 16: ***Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que lograron apoderarse de.***

Table 6.43: Answers provided for item 16 by participants from group A (EarlExpFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
A.16.1	<i>Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorio que habían logrado apoderarse.</i>
A.16.2	<i>La oracion esta escrita en un orden incorrecto. Reescrita: Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que lograron apoderarse.</i>
A.16.3	<i>En el español no se terminan las oraciones con una preposición. Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios de que lograron apoderarse.</i>

A.16.4	<i>Debería de ser: "Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios de los cuales lograron apoderarse."</i>
A.16.5	<i>Esta oración está escrita como una traducción directa de "They removed the attackers from the territories they had been able to overpower" por tal razón, su estructura está escrita de la misma manera que se escribe en inglés. Debe estar escrita como, "Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios de los que lograron apoderarse".</i>
A.16.6	<i>La oración tiene varios errores. Oración reescrita: Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que se lograron apoderar.</i>
A.16.7	<i>No hace sentido, esta mal puesto la oracion. Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que habian logrado apoderar.</i>
A.16.8	<i>Finalizando la oración con la palabra "de" no suena bien. "Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que los lograron apoderar." (?)</i>
A.16.9	<i>No se puede terminar una oración con una preposición. Sería: "Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que habían logrado apoderarse."</i>
A.16.10	<i>La preposición 'de' está fuera de lugar. Creo que sería mejor: Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios de los cuales lograron apoderarse.</i>
A.16.11	<i>Luego de que se apoderaron de los territorios sacaron a los a atacantes.</i>

A.16.12	<i>Porque una oración no puede terminar incompleta. "Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que lograron apoderarse de ella."</i>
A.16.13	<i>Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios de los cuales se pudieron apoderar.- El orden de esta oracion esta mal escrito y pues es difícil de entender. Me causo un poco de dificultad reescribirla.</i>

6.6.7 Discussion of Table 6.43

Thirteen out of eighteen participants (72%) from group A (EarlExpFr) classified this item as unacceptable. This sentence presents a similar case to items 9 and 10. The preposition *de* has been stranded and it appears after its object, the noun phrase *los territorios*, and at the end of the sentence. All thirteen participants identified *de* as being misplaced in the sentence and produced constructions that avoided the stranded preposition. Nevertheless, group A's rewritten versions for item 16 present much more internal variability than the ones provided for items 9 and 10.

Four possible constructions in Spanish that avoid the stranded preposition are the following:

- a. *Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios de los que se habían apoderado.*
- b. *Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios de los que habían logrado apoderarse.*
- c. *Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios de los cuales se habían apoderado.*
- d. *Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios de los cuales habían logrado apoderarse.*

In two of these constructions (a) and (c), the reflexive pronoun *se* goes from being a bound morpheme at the end of the pronominal verb *apoderarse* to a free morpheme before the auxiliary verb *habían*. The constructions in (b) and (d), on the other hand, maintain *se* as a bound

morpheme in *apoderarse*. All the suggested constructions add the *relativo compuesto* structure *de los que* (a and b) or *de los cuales* (c and d) before the pronominal construction with *se* (i.e., *se habían apoderado*).

All the participants' reconstructed sentences avoided the stranded preposition. Due to the variability in the participants' answers, their rewritten versions will be listed below and classified according to the constructions that they produced.

- a. Construction without *relativo compuesto* and *se* as bound morpheme: Three participants maintained the construction with *apoderarse* (A.16.1, A.16.2, and A.16.9) but left out the *relativo compuesto* structure *de los que* or *de los cuales*. The resulting construction, *Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que habían logrado apoderarse*, is both idiomatic and grammatically sound.
- b. Construction with *dequeísmo*: One participant (A.16.3) added an additional preposition *de* before the relative clause (i.e., *Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios de que lograron apoderarse*.) a phenomenon that is known in Spanish as *dequeísmo*.
- c. Construction with misplaced *se* as free morpheme: One participant (A.16.6) rewrote the sentence with *se* as a free morpheme, but their construction (i.e., *Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que se lograron apoderar*.) is ungrammatical in Spanish due to the placement of *se* before the verb *lograron*.
- d. Construction without *se*: One participant (A.16.7) opted for a construction that eliminated a construction with *se*. The final product (i.e., *Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que habian logrado apoderar*.) obscures the meaning of this sentence and adds transitivity to the verb *apoderar*, a property that is not inherent to this verb when it is used in the sense of “taking control over something.”

- e. Ungrammatical and unidiomatic construction: The rewritten versions provided by A.16.8 (*Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que los lograron apoderar.*) and A.16.12 (*Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que lograron apoderarse de ella.*) show that they either misunderstood the original sentence or were unable to produce a grammatical and idiomatic sentence that avoided the stranded preposition.
- f. Construction that changes original syntax: The sentence provided by A.16.11 (i.e., *Luego de que se apoderaron de los territorios sacaron a los a atacantes.*) avoided the stranded preposition and maintained the meaning of the original sentence but changed the syntax and elements of the sentence significantly.
- g. Construction that approximates Spanish grammar conventions: Four participants (A.16.4, A.16.5, A.16.10, and A.16.13) provided rewritten versions of this item that align with Spanish grammar conventions. Their constructions maintained the morpheme *se* and incorporated the *relativo compuesto* phrase *de los que* or *de los cuales*:
 - A.16.4: *Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios de los cuales lograron apoderarse,*
 - A.16.5: *Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios de los que lograron apoderarse.*
 - A.16.10: *Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios de los cuales lograron apoderarse.*
 - A.16.13: *Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios de los cuales se pudieron apoderar.*

Regarding the explanations provided by group A, two participants (A.16.2 and A.16.13) mentioned syntax or incorrect order as the problem and one (A.16.5) cited a bad translation. Interestingly, most participants in this group (A.16.3, A.16.8, A.16.9, A.16.10, and A.16.12) specifically mentioned that ending a sentence with a preposition is unacceptable in Spanish or that the preposition had been misplaced. The rest of the participants limited themselves to saying

that sentence was incorrect (A.16.6) or did not provide an explanation for their answer (A.16.1, A.16.4, and A.16.11).

Table 6.44: Answers provided for item 16 by participants from group B (LateExpLessFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
B.16.1	<i>Se debe escribir en otro orden. Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios de que lograron apoderarse.</i>
B.16.2	<i>el "de" al final de la oracion no va ahi, esta ahi ya que se tradujo muy mecanicamente la oracion del ingles. "Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios de los cuales lograron apoderarse"</i>
B.16.3	<i>Es otra traducción literal que terminaría con "of" . Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que se lograron apoderar.</i>
B.16.4	<i>En este caso la oración es inaceptable solo por que la preposición "de" es innecesaria. Es decir, la oración correcta sería: "Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que lograron apoderarse.".</i>
B.16.5	<i>Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que lograron apoderarse.</i>
B.16.6	<i>Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que lograron apoderarse.</i>
B.16.7	<i>Pienso que no hay un orden correcto en las palabras y que varias pueden ser reemplazadas o cambiadas de orden. -</i>

	<i>Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que pudieron apoderar.-</i>
B.16.8	<i>La oración no puede terminar en de. Sacaron a los atacantes y así lograron apoderarse de los territorios.</i>

6.6.8 Discussion of Table 6.44

Eight out of ten participants (80%) from group B (LateExpLessFr) classified this item as unacceptable. All participants in this group avoided the stranded preposition in the original sentence. Since their answers are as varied as those provided by group A, their constructions will be divided based on what they wrote in the acceptability test.

- a. Construction without *relativo compuesto* and *se* as bound morpheme: Three participants maintained the construction with *apoderarse* (B.16.4, B.16.5, B.16.6) but left out the *relativo compuesto* structure *de los que* or *de los cuales*. The resulting construction, *Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que lograron apoderarse*, is both idiomatic and grammatically sound.
- b. Construction with *dequeísmo*: One participant (B.16.1) added an additional preposition *de* before the relative clause (i.e., *Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios de que lograron apoderarse*.) a phenomenon that is known in Spanish as *dequeísmo*.
- c. Construction with misplaced *se* as free morpheme: One participant (B.16.3) rewrote the sentence with *se* as a free morpheme, but their construction (i.e., *Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que se lograron apoderar*.) is ungrammatical in Spanish due to the placement of *se* before the verb *lograron*.

- d. Construction without *relativo compuesto* and without *se*: One participant (B.16.7) produced a construction that lacks the *relativo compuesto* and the morpheme *se*. The resulting construction, *Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que pudieron apoderar*, is both unidiomatic and ungrammatical.
- h. Construction that changes original syntax: The sentence provided by B.16.8 (i.e., *Sacaron a los atacantes y asi lograron apoderarse de los territorios.*) avoided the stranded preposition and maintained the meaning of the original sentence but changed the syntax and elements of the sentence significantly. The final product, however, is both idiomatic and grammatically sound.
- i. Construction that approximates Spanish grammar conventions: One participant (B.16.2) provided a rewritten version of this item that aligns with Spanish grammar conventions (i.e., *Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios de los cuales lograron apoderarse.*) since it avoided the stranded preposition, maintained the morpheme *se*, and incorporated the *relativo compuesto* phrase *de los cuales*.

Two participants (B.16.2 and B.16.3) mentioned that item 16 is a direct translation from English, with B.16.2 (and B.16.8) noting that the preposition *de* should not be placed at the end of the sentence. Curiously, B.16.4 did not refer to a misplaced preposition but instead to an “unnecessary” one.

Two participants (B.16.1 and B.16.7) commented on the incorrect order (or syntax) of this item while the remaining two (B.16.5 and V.16.6) did not provide an explanation for their rewritten version.

Table 6.45: Answers provided for item 16 by participants from group C (EarlExpLessFr)

Code (Group.Item.Answer#)	Explanation and/or rewritten version
C.16.1	<i>Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios de los que lograron apoderarse.</i>
C.16.2	<i>Hay palabras de mas. Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que lograron apoderarse.</i>
C.16.3	<i>El orden de la oración está incorrecto y "de"no va al final. La oración sería: Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que se habían logrado apoderarse.</i>
C.16.4	<i>Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que habían logrado apoderarse, decir apoderarse de es más como hablado, escrito se ve raro</i>
C.16.5	<i>Tuve que leerlo tres veces para entender. Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios de los cuales se apoderaron.</i>
C.16.6	<i>El usar frases como "apoderarse de" al final de las oraciones está incorrecto en el español. Podría ser "Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios de los que se pudieron apoderar."</i>

6.6.9 Discussion of Table 6.45

Six out of eight participants (75%) from group C (EarlExpLessFr) classified this item as unacceptable. All of them attempted to dispose of the stranded preposition in their rewritten version. As has been the norm in the category of stranded prepositions, due to the variability of

the participants' answers, their constructions will be divided based on what they wrote in the acceptability test.

- a. Construction without *relativo compuesto* and *se* as bound morpheme: Two participants (C.12.2 and C.12.4) maintained the construction with *apoderarse* but left out the *relativo compuesto* structure *de los que* or *de los cuales*.
- b. Construction with misplaced *se* as free morpheme: One participant (C.16.3) rewrote the sentence with *se* as a free morpheme, but their construction (i.e., *Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios (sic) que se habían logrado apoderarse.*) is ungrammatical in Spanish due to the placement of *se* before the auxiliary verb *habían*.
- c. Construction that approximates Spanish grammar conventions: Three participants produced versions of this item that are both idiomatic and grammatically well formed. C.16.1 wrote *Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios de los que lograron apoderarse*, C.16.5 recommended *Sacaron a los atacantes (sic) de los territorios de los cuales se apoderaron*, and C.16.6 proposed *Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios de los que se pudieron apoderar*.

The explanations provided by group C were quite varied as well. One participant (C.16.3) stated that the word order in this item was wrong, and another (C.16.6) commented that adding a phrase such as *apoderarse de* at the end of a sentence is not allowed in Spanish. C.16.2 argued that the sentence had unnecessary words (i.e., *palabras de más*) and C.16.5 admitted having difficulties with this sentence, to the point that they had to read it three times to understand it. The only participant in this study to allude to the spoken versus written language dichotomy, C.16.4 argued that the sentence sounds strange when it appears in written form but would be acceptable if it were used in spoken language. This assertion is quite interesting because it

suggests that this participant would be able to use and understand a construction with a stranded preposition in Spanish if used in spoken communication, but they would avoid it when writing.

6.7 Summary of Results

This chapter presented a detailed description of the participants' explanations in the acceptability test for items with cross-linguistic influence. While the quantitative analysis presented in Chapter 5 supports the view that early exposure to English (i.e., groups A and C) produced higher percentages of acceptability when judging the grammaticality of items with cross-linguistic influence, this chapter presented some insights into the participants' cognitive processes and metalinguistic awareness when explaining their reasons to classify an item as unacceptable. Metalinguistic awareness involves intentionally reflecting on and manipulating language (Gombert, 1990, as cited by Friesen and Bialystok, 2012) and requires that attention be actively focused on the explicit properties of language (Bialystok, 2001).

Although the acceptability test did not ask participants to provide a detailed account of the reasons why they had rewritten an item, a considerable number of participants from all groups employed metalanguage, or technical terminology to analyze or describe language (Crystal, 1997), in their explanations. A more detailed analysis of the number of participants from each group who exhibited metalinguistic awareness may shed some light on the degree to which early exposure to and/or frequent use of the L2 influences the grammatical competence of the L1. While the absence of a metalinguistic explanation in a participant's acceptability test does not suffice to claim that they lack grammatical competence or metalinguistic awareness, an analysis of the groups who showed a tendency to deploy more technical explanations provides for a more nuanced discussion of the hypotheses and research questions that guide this study.

The participants' explanations were classified as *metalinguistic* whenever they explicitly mentioned grammatical or linguistic nomenclature (e.g., word order, syntax, specific parts of speech, punctuation, direct or “bad” translations, meaning, etc.). It was to be expected that participants from group B (LateExpLessFr) presented higher percentages of metalanguage than groups A (EarlExpFr) and C (EarlExpLessFr) due to their preference for and more frequent use of Spanish. Based on the results that were discussed in this chapter, the participants' use of metalanguage was tabulated in terms of the number and percentage of explanations for unacceptability that employed technical or grammatical terms. The results are as follows:

Table 6.46: Use of metalanguage by group A (EarlExpFr)

Number of unacceptable answers (by category of cross-linguistic influence)	Number of explanations that employed metalanguage	Percentage
<i>Lexical borrowing: Verbs</i> 62 unacceptable answers	34	55%
<i>Lexical borrowing: Nouns</i> 10 unacceptable answers	6	60%
<i>Lexical borrowing: Prepositions</i> 34 unacceptable answers	19	56%
<i>Lexical borrowing: Adjectives</i> 5 unacceptable answers	1	20%
<i>Preposition stranding</i> 42 unacceptable answers	25	60%

Total

153 unacceptable answers	85	56%
--------------------------	----	-----

Table 6.47: Use of metalanguage by group B (LateExpLessFr)

Number of unacceptable answers (by category of cross-linguistic influence)	Number of explanations that employed metalanguage	Percentage
<i>Lexical borrowing: Verbs</i> 39 unacceptable answers	17	44%
<i>Lexical borrowing: Nouns</i> 6 unacceptable answers	6	100%
<i>Lexical borrowing: Prepositions</i> 14 unacceptable answers	11	79%
<i>Lexical borrowing: Adjectives</i> 6 unacceptable answers	5	83%
<i>Preposition stranding</i> 26 unacceptable answers	19	73%

Total

91 unacceptable answers	58	64%
-------------------------	----	-----

Table 6.48: Use of metalanguage by group C (EarlExpLessFr)

Number of unacceptable answers (by category of cross-linguistic influence)	Number of explanations that employed metalanguage	Percentage
<i>Lexical borrowing: Verbs</i> 36 unacceptable answers	22	61%
<i>Lexical borrowing: Nouns</i> 6 unacceptable answers	4	67%
<i>Lexical borrowing: Prepositions</i> 15 unacceptable answers	11	73%
<i>Lexical borrowing: Adjectives</i> 2 unacceptable answers	1	50%
<i>Preposition stranding</i> 19 unacceptable answers	12	63%
Totals		
78 unacceptable answers	50	64%

6.7.1 Discussion of Tables 6.46 - 6.48

The results obtained from the analysis of participants' explanations in the acceptability test were expected based on the hypotheses and research questions that guide this study, yet unforeseen in light of the quantitative data discussed in Chapter 5. On the one hand, the numbers obtained by group B (LateExpLessFr) regarding their use of metalanguage were expected

considering their more frequent use of L1 Spanish and their presumably heightened grammatical competence in their L1 when compared to groups A and C. On the other hand, the results are also unforeseen due to the fact that group B obtained high percentages of acceptability when judging the grammaticality of cross-linguistic items (see Chapter 5). These results could misleadingly suggest that group B (LateExpLessFr) would not possess the metalinguistic awareness to explain why they had classified an item as unacceptable by employing technical and grammatical nomenclature.

Group B (LateExpLessFr) demonstrated higher metalinguistic awareness by generating the highest number of metalinguistic explanations in most categories (four out of five); group C (EarlExpLessFr) obtained the highest number in the remaining category. Group A, on the other hand, obtained the lowest number of metalinguistic explanations in all five categories. These results seem to partially align with the hypotheses and theoretical framework that guide this study. It may be posited that group B's Spanish prescriptive rules and their corresponding grammatical terminology is more readily available for retrieval than group A's. These results can be interpreted in light of MacWhinney's Competition Model (2002) and Paradis' Activation Threshold Hypothesis (1993) (see Chapter 3: Theoretical Framework). That is, due to their early exposure to and frequent use of Spanish, structures in Spanish are more entrenched in the participants' internal competence and seem to be "winning the competition" against their English counterparts.

The data obtained in this chapter, however, does not directly correlate with the quantitative analysis discussed in Chapter 5. That is, considering that group C (EarlExpLessFr) obtained the highest percentages of unacceptability (46%) and the lowest percentages of acceptability (20%), it may have been expected that they may have exhibited more metalinguistic

awareness than groups A (EarlExpFr) and B (LateExpLessFr) by deploying metalanguage in most of their explanations. This seems to suggest that, while group C (EarlExpLessFr) is equipped with the grammatical competence to judge instances of cross-linguistic influence as unacceptable at a higher rate than the other two groups, this does not necessarily entail that they are proficient at employing metalanguage in their explanations.

The opposite is true for group B, whose higher tendency to classify items with cross-linguistic influence as acceptable could misleadingly suggest that their explanations for the unacceptability of items with cross-linguistic influence would lack metalinguistic nomenclature. The results that have been discussed here suggest the opposite, with group B employing metalanguage in more instances than groups A and C. This apparent contradiction could be caused by several factors. For instance, participants from group B may feel more comfortable using technical terms to talk about Spanish grammar than groups A and C due to their early exposure to and frequent use of Spanish, their L1, in most domains. That is, while we can surmise that participants from all groups have received explicit grammatical explanations in Spanish as part of the language curriculum, participants from group B feel more comfortable deploying metalanguage when describing and manipulating structures in their L1. Another possible explanation is that participants may have not understood the meaning of the item and did not feel prepared to provide a cogent explanation for an unacceptable judgment. These findings directly correlate with the research questions that guide this study by supporting the view that early exposure to and/or frequent use of L2 English may decrease metalinguistic awareness in L1 Spanish.

Chapter 7: Conclusions

7.1 Overview

This chapter summarizes the key findings of the study and discusses its research aims, questions, and hypotheses. It also addresses the value and contributions that this study makes to bilingual studies, research on cross-linguistic influence, and language teaching. Moreover, it reviews the limitations of the study and identifies opportunities for future research.

7.2 Discussion of Results

After analyzing the data from the acceptability test from both a quantitative (Chapter 5) and a qualitative (Chapter 6) perspective, the results partially support the hypothesis that early exposure to and frequent use of English lead to higher percentages of acceptability in items with cross-linguistic influence. From the fifteen items with cross-linguistic influence included in the acceptability test, group B (LateExpLessFr) obtained the highest percentage of acceptability from the three groups in eight of them (53%), followed by group A (EarlExpFr) with four (27%) and group C (EarlExpLessFr) with three (20%). This suggests that, while no group consistently obtained the highest number of acceptable or unacceptable answers in all items with cross-linguistic influence, group C shows a tendency to behave the way group B was expected to behave (i.e., a higher number of unacceptable than acceptable answers). For reference, these are the hypotheses that were introduced in Chapter 1:

1. Early (simultaneous) Spanish-English bilinguals who use English more frequently, and in more domains than Spanish (i.e., group A), are prone to judge instances of cross-linguistic influence as acceptable.
2. Early exposure to English and frequent use of L2 English in most domains might lead to restructuring of L1 Spanish lexicon and syntax.

The first hypothesis was partially proven. Group A was expected to present higher percentages of acceptability in most items, but this was not the case. Instead, it was group B (LateExpLessFr) that obtained the highest percentage of acceptability (53%) in items with cross-linguistic influence. Group A (EarlExpFr) had the second highest percentage of acceptability with 27% and group C, the lowest with 20%. The first hypothesis is then partially proven because, although group A obtained a consistent rate of acceptable answers (see Chapter 5), they did not obtain the highest number as was expected. Therefore, it seems plausible to suggest that the variables of early exposure and frequent use do have a role in acceptability judgments of this nature, but they do not suffice to explain why group B (LateExpLessFr) obtained the highest percentage of acceptability, contrary to what was expected. They also obtained the same percentage as group A (27%) in unacceptability ratings. An explanation of the possible causes for the results obtained from group B is presented below.

The second hypothesis is also partially proven. By presenting the second highest percentage of acceptability of the three groups (27%), group A (EarlExpFr) shows a tendency of restructuring L1 Spanish lexicon and syntax. Group C (EarlExpLessFr), on the other hand, was less likely to rate items with cross-linguistic influence as acceptable as suggested by their lower rates of acceptability (i.e., they obtained the lowest percentage of acceptability in six out of fifteen items). It is important to point out that this study focuses on restructuring at the perception level (reading and comprehension) rather than the production level (speaking and writing). According to Wei (2014), production (i.e., speaking and writing) is more vulnerable to attrition than reception/comprehension (i.e., reading and listening). In her study, which involves Chinese ESL learners, she argues that the lexicon is more vulnerable to attrition than morphology and syntax. Wei's findings may provide a possible explanation for group A's lower-

than-expected percentages of acceptability judgments on the test. That is, it is conceivable that group A is yet to exhibit attrition or restructuring of Spanish structures in regards to comprehension, a skill that is less vulnerable to attrition according to Wei. Its participants may, however, show restructuring or attrition in speaking and writing, two domains that are not addressed directly in this study.

Another result that necessitates a more nuanced explanation is group B's (LateExpLessFr) unforeseen high percentages of acceptability for items with cross-linguistic influence. A possible cause is that group B participants may have detected an instance of cross-linguistic influence in the item but were not equipped with the metalinguistic knowledge (metalanguage) to provide an explanation. This possibility is unlikely for two reasons: (1) items could be classified as unacceptable without the need to provide an explanation, as explanations were optional; (2) group B exhibited one of the highest percentages of metalinguistic awareness (64%) when explaining the unacceptability of an item.

A second explanation is the likelihood that participants from group B simply did not detect many of the instances of cross-linguistic influence because their grammatical competence is not up to par with the other two groups. This possibility is based merely on an assumption based on their linguistic profile. While a direct assessment of the participants' grammatical competence lies beyond the scope of this work, it can be posited that group B's focus when completing the acceptability test was on the meaning (semantics) rather than the structure of each item. This possibility requires that we establish the differences between grammatical and communicative competence. Grammatical competence refers to a speaker's knowledge of lexicon and rules concerning morphology, syntax, and phonology (Brown, 2014; Canale & Swain, 1980). In other words, a speaker exhibits grammatical competence when their linguistic

performance (i.e., comprehension and production) shows mastery of language structures and an adherence to constructions that are deemed “correct” and “well formed.” On the other hand, while communicative competence does regard control of linguistic structures as an indispensable requirement of communication, it deemphasizes linguistic forms (i.e., grammar) in favor of linguistic functions (i.e., meaning). According to Richards (2006), communicative competence entails “knowing how to maintain communication despite having limitations in one’s language knowledge (e.g., through using different kinds of communication strategies)” (p. 3). Cummins (1979) adds that a speaker’s basic interpersonal communicative skills (BICS) encompass the capacity that all human beings use to function in daily interpersonal exchanges. Group B’s high percentages of acceptability could be explained with regards to the grammatical/communicative competence dichotomy. That is, while sentences with cross-linguistic influence may have struck them as unidiomatic in Spanish, they chose to focus on the meaning and communicative function of the sentences instead of their grammatical form.

A third and more appealing possibility is that early exposure and frequent use of two (or more) languages (i.e., groups A and C) enhances and strengthens L1 metalinguistic knowledge. This finding supports Cook’s (2003) assertion that the L1 may be enhanced by the L2, particularly when it comes to conscious control of L1 structures and detection of cross-linguistic influence from the L2. Since group C (EarlExpLessFr) excelled at detecting and explaining instances of cross-linguistic influence, it may be posited that early exposure is a more definitive factor than frequency of use in the development of grammatical competence and metalinguistic awareness in the L1 and the L2. Because the participants from group C are simultaneous bilinguals who have a particular preference for Spanish in most domains (i.e., less frequent use of English), it can be posited that their grammatical competence has developed evenly in both

languages, contrary to groups A and B, both of which have members who use one of their languages more than the other (i.e., English more than Spanish for group A and Spanish more than English for group B). As simultaneous bilinguals, participants from group C are likely to possess native-like competence in both of their languages and show balanced frequency of use in both. On the other hand, since groups A and B are composed of dominant bilinguals in either one of their languages (i.e., English is the dominant language and Spanish the subordinate language for group A; the opposite is true for group B), it is more likely that their metalinguistic awareness has not equally developed in both of their languages. Group B's tendency to rate most items with cross-linguistic influence as acceptable seems to attest to this possibility.

A fourth possibility concerns sociolinguistics, sociocultural variation, and the role of language users in language change and language variation (Milroy, 2003). It can be posited that members from group B, and all participants when considering the data discussed in Chapter 5, classify items with cross-linguistic influence as acceptable because they are active partakers of synchronic variation in their L1 as a result of cross-linguistic influence from the L2. In other words, because all participants belong to the same school community (UHS), it is not unlikely that they have heard, read, or even used some of the structures included in the acceptability test as part of their interactions with other students. As a result, their acceptability judgments are not the mere product of favoring function and meaning over form and structure, or even lack of grammatical competence. Instead, they are participants in the development of synchronic variation in Puerto Rican Spanish that could potentially result in language change, be it at the level of community, region, or otherwise. These observations align with Cook's (2003, as cited by Köpke, 2004) observation: "In these complex social situations, it is hard to decide whether there is really an effect of L2 on L1 or there has simply been an evolutionary change in the L1 as

spoken by particular groups.” The data collected in this study does not suffice to ascertain that the participants who classified items with cross-linguistic influence as acceptable are cognizant of these gradual effects, changes, or variations. Their metalinguistic explanations and analyses included in Chapter 6 seem to suggest it is possible that they are aware of such changes and effects.

What is more, group B’s propensity to accept lexical and syntactic borrowings from English may very well respond to what Blommaert (2012) calls “styling” (as discussed by Rampton, 1994). “Styling” refers to the way in which “(young) people appropriate and deploy linguistic resources consciously in highly marked forms of identity-work” (p. 7). Several research undertakings, ethnographic in nature, address “styling” and have concluded that people use bits of language without knowing it in the structural sense in order to weave a particular identity, construct agency, and create social meaning. Although the language profile for participants from group B disproves the notion that they have no knowledge of English “in the structural sense,” they do report lower levels of proficiency than groups A and C in the language use survey. Arguably, the high percentages of acceptability exhibited by group B are not the result of the participants’ lack of knowledge of the L1 or the L2. Instead, a more nuanced analysis (as proposed by sociocultural linguistics, and which is currently beyond the scope of this study) could suggest that their linguistic choices respond to an attempt at establishing an identity as Puerto Rican teenagers with access to an English-speaking community who possess the competence and skill to accept and incorporate novel structures into their linguistic inventory. It is important to mention that this appreciation results from my own preconceived notions of social categorization; a more refined description of these language users and their agentive and

indexical intentions with language would emerge from a more in-depth and ethnographically-grounded interview.

7.3 Research Questions

The research questions that guided this study are presented here, followed by an answer based on the empirical data that has been gathered.

1. *Is L2 influence on the L1 among Spanish-English bilinguals in Puerto Rico caused by early exposure to and frequent use of the L2?*

The data collected in this study and the ensuing analysis that is presented in Chapters 5 and 6 do not suffice to make the claim that L2 influence on the L1 among Spanish-English bilinguals in Puerto Rico is caused by early exposure to and frequent use of the L2. Had group A (EarlExpFr) or C (EarlExp) obtained higher percentages of acceptability than group B, the answer would have been a definitive yes. The empirical data collected in this study suggests that early exposure and frequent use do affect the participants' judgment of items with cross-linguistic influence, but not the degree that had been hypothesized. Although it could be argued that group B's (LateExpLessFr) high percentages of acceptability are the result of English L2 influence on Spanish L1, their late exposure and infrequent use of English dismiss this claim.

2. *Are these changes in the L1 systematic and thus representative of a case of attrition because of influence from the L2? Or, instead, are these changes merely the product of borrowing?*

Because group B (LateExpLessFr) obtained the highest percentages of acceptability, it is unlikely that their judgments were influenced by the L2, as explained in the answer for the first research question. Based on the participants explanations in the acceptability test,

there seems to be no attrition of L1 grammatical competence but there seems to be a tendency to rate lexical borrowings as acceptable. The same is not true for syntactic calques or direct translations from the L2 as is demonstrated by the participants' overwhelming rejection of preposition stranding. Additionally, the claim that L1 structures and competence have undergone attrition is disproven to some degree by the participants' consistent reliance on metalanguage and apparent awareness of Spanish prescriptive grammar. This finding is consonant with Anderson (2004), whose study about Spanish-speaking children's performance in the L1 as they begin to acquire English as their second language (L2) posits that cross-linguistic influence does not necessarily result in language loss.

3. *Do L1 users of Spanish resort to English L2 structures because they believe that they are acceptable in Spanish or is it perhaps that the Spanish equivalents are not readily available in their linguistic inventory in their L1 due to influence from the L2?*

The results suggest that judging items with cross-linguistic influence as acceptable may be caused by both factors stated in the research question (i.e., a belief that the item is indeed acceptable in Spanish and difficulties when retrieving L1 grammatical structures). Because most participants from all three groups employed metalanguage in their explanations in the acceptability test, it can be argued that some L1 structures may not be readily available for retrieval (i.e., they have higher thresholds of activation (Paradis, 2002) in the participants' linguistic inventory), but others are. In other words, the L2 wins the competition (MacWhinney, 2002) most of the time, especially for groups A (EarlExpFr) and B (LateExpLessFr), but not always.

7.4 Contributions of the Study

While a modest one, the most important contribution of this study is that it represents one of the few research undertakings that addresses the effect that the L2 has on the L1 in a context where L1 is the dominant language. Furthermore, this study considered the variables of L2 age of exposure and frequency of use in an L1-dominant environment. These variables are crucial when discussing cross-linguistic influence phenomena. This is consonant with Stoehr et al.'s (2017) observation that, when exploring the effects of the L2 on the L1, bilingual subjects must be compared with other bilingual subjects under the same circumstances to obtain reliable results. This research project follows their recommendation by considering variables that concern age of exposure and frequency of use within the same linguistic environment. While Meir et al.'s study (2017) does hypothesize that earlier age of onset (AoO) is associated with better performance in L2 and present evidence for bidirectional and cross-linguistic influence, their focus is, as is typical in the literature for cross-linguistic research, on the influence that the L1 has on the L2.

An interesting finding of this study is the role of communicative competence when judging items with cross-linguistic influence. As discussed above, the high percentages of acceptability obtained by group B (LateExpLessFr) indicate that they placed boundaries of unacceptability on generalizable abstract grammatical structures (e.g., ending a sentence with a preposition is not acceptable), but not so much on content words with semantic meaning (e.g., verbs, nouns, adjectives).

Likewise, group C's (EarlExpLessFr) ability to successfully identify instances of cross-linguistic influence and provide well-argued metalinguistic explanations on the acceptability test suggest that metalinguistic awareness in the L1 is enhanced by early exposure to the L2. This

finding is particularly important because it provides even more evidence of the benefits of bilingualism and the significance of early exposure while cogently dismissing the misconception that the L2 will have a negative impact on the L1. This view supports Cook's (2019) multi-competence perspective on bilingualism (i.e., bilinguals possess two languages that coexist in one mind and merge into a "language super-system") and, as explained above, provides tentative proof of the benefits of the L2 on the L1. By embracing a holistic stance on bilingualism and rejecting the fractional view of bilinguals as two monolinguals whose languages do not interact, we are provided with a framework that explains bidirectional influence between languages.

As the present study demonstrates, the nature of this bidirectional influence can be beneficial regardless of the participants' level of bilingualism, a claim that is supported by group B's (LateExpLessFr) use of metalanguage (e.g., "*traducción directa del inglés*") in the acceptability test. Accepting that this bidirectionality is an inherent characteristic of language acquisition and development poses curricular implications for traditional language teaching paradigms that discreetly separate first and second language skills, syllabi, and curricula. For the L1 teacher, multi-competence challenges monolingual attitudes about language teaching that view instructors as the gatekeepers of L1 prescriptive grammar. The same holds true for second language teaching, a field in which several methods and approaches (e.g., the Audiolingual Method and the Direct Method) discourage the use of the speaker's native language as they acquire a second language. The findings of this study support the idea that the product of language teaching is not merely the achievement of communicative competence to facilitate and negotiate meaning in the L2 (e.g., Communicative Language Teaching), but also the development of multi-competence in two or more languages. As has been proposed here, early

exposure to the L2 seems to increase metalinguistic awareness in the L1 and furthers the language user's competence in both languages.

7.5 Limitations of the Study

Even though the collected data allowed for the hypotheses to be tested and the research questions to be answered, there were some limitations related to issues that if approached differently might have otherwise yielded a more nuanced and generalizable set of conclusions. First, the sample of participants should have been larger than 36 to increase the validity and reliability of the data. Because of the voluntary response sampling that was employed, fewer students than expected volunteered for the study.

A second limitation is that the number of items with cross-linguistic influence for each category was uneven. That is, there were few items in some categories (e.g., only one item for lexical borrowing of nouns) and too many for others (e.g., seven items for lexical borrowing of verbs). This oversight sets some constraints for inter-categorical analyses and comparisons.

A third shortcoming is the type of statistical analysis that was conducted. That is, the study relied too much on tendencies, percentages, and comparisons *among* groups. A more advanced statistical analysis (e.g., SPSS) would have allowed for an analysis of tendencies *within* the responses of the participants in the three groups for a more comprehensive view of the correlation among the variables that were considered for this investigation.

Also, while the language survey did inquire about quality of input by asking participants to state the sources from which they had acquired their L1 and L2, this variable was not taken into consideration in the distribution of groups and the analysis of data in the acceptability test. As stated by Stoehr et al. (2017), quality of input is a central factor when considering phenomena that pertain to studies about cross-linguistic influence and L1 attrition.

Finally, future studies must address the exogenous factors that influence language change (Milroy, 2003). That is, this study focused on the internal (structural) characteristics of language variation and not on the sociolinguistic (external) variables (e.g., attitudes, perceptions, indexical markers of identity) that trigger language change and variation.

7.6 Recommendations for Future Research

Future research on cross-linguistic influence should explore the sociolinguistic and attitudinal factors that affect a language user's linguistic competence and performance. A study of this nature would inquire about the correlation between the participants' attitudes about their languages (English and Spanish) and their tendency to judge instances of cross-linguistic influence as acceptable in an acceptability test.

Likewise, it would be of interest to the field of SLA to explore the correlation between the variables included in this study (i.e., age of exposure and frequency of use) longitudinally. An endeavour of this nature would advance our knowledge about the effects that length of exposure has on a speaker's judgment of constructions with cross-linguistic influence. Moreover, while Flege et al.'s (2003, 2006, and 2019) research has focused on investigating the influence of the L2 on a language user's production and perception of L1 phonology, a study that focuses on this phenomenon in an L1-dominant environment is yet to be carried out.

This study focused mainly on language users' perception, comprehension, and judgment of cross-linguistic constructions. It would then be interesting to investigate the correlation between the participants' performance in a judgment task (perception) and their performance in a writing or speaking task (production). The objective would be to examine which constituent of a language user's competence (perception or production) in the L1 is more significantly affected by early exposure and frequent use of the L2.

Regarding the sociolinguistic dimensions of cross-linguistic influence and the role of language users in language change, future studies must explore the extent to which language users' attitudes towards either one of the languages in contact impact their decision to accept or reject structural variation and cross-linguistic influence. Furthermore, a sociolinguistic study of this nature should compel researchers to investigate whether these variations and changes emerge unconsciously and involuntarily or are instead indexical markers that allow language users to mark and express a particular aspect of their identity (Eckert, 2012; Silverstein, 2003). Such observations would assist in understanding whether such changes are temporary and inconsequential, or if we are indeed detecting and witnessing language change in progress on the island.

In the field of language teaching, further studies that investigate the correspondence between a language user's multi-competence in two or more languages and their performance in production and comprehension tasks would inform current views about the applicability of translanguaging (Hua, Wei & Jankowicz-Pytel, 2020; MacSwan, 2017; Velasco & García, 2014; Wei, 2017.) in the SLA classroom. That is, instead of looking at cross-linguistic influence as undesirable phenomena to be eradicated by gatekeeping practices in language teaching, we need more studies that support the positive impact that cross-linguistic influence may have on a language user's metalinguistic awareness and linguistic competence.

References

- Anderson, R. (2004). First language loss in Spanish-speaking children: Patterns of loss and implication for clinical practice. In B. Goldstein, (Ed.), *Bilingual language development and disorders in Spanish-English speakers* (pp. 187-212). Brookes.
- Appel, R. & Muysken, P. (1983). *Language contact and bilingualism*. Amsterdam University Press.
- Aveledo, F. & Athanasopoulos, P. (2016). Second language influence on first language motion event encoding and categorization in Spanish-speaking children learning L2 English. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 20(4), 403–420.
- Azaz, M. & Frank, J. (2017). Bidirectional cross-linguistic influence in late bilinguals: Evidence from the container-content relation. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism*, 8(4), 411–445.
- Bialystok, E. (2001). *Bilingualism in development: Language, literacy, and cognition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2012). Sociolinguistics & English language studies. In B. Street & C. Leung (Eds.), *Handbook of English language studies*. Routledge.
- Brown, D.H. (2014). *First language acquisition: Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.). Pearson ESL.
- Bucholtz, M. and Hall, K. (2008). All of the above: New coalitions in sociocultural linguistics. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*. 12(4), 401-431.
- Bybee, J. (2013). Usage-based theory and exemplar representations of constructions. In T. Hoffmann & G. Trousdale (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of construction grammar*.

Oxford University Press.

Bylund, E. & Jarvis, S. (2011). L2 effects on L1 event conceptualization. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 14(1), 47–59.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-47.

Chambers, J.K. (2002). Studying language variation: An informal epistemology. In J.K. Chambers, P. Trudgill, & N. Schilling-Estes (Eds.), *The handbook of language variation and change*. Blackwell.

Chin, N. B. & Wigglesworth, G. (2007). *Bilingualism: An advanced resource book*. Routledge.

Chunpeng, C. & Hee-Don, A. (2017). The influence of L2 on L1 lexical competence and grammatical properties in written expressions. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 40(2), 181-191.

Cook, V. (2003). *Effects of the second language on the first*. Multilingual Matters.

Cook, V. (2019). *Evidence for multi-competence*. Vivian Cook.
<http://www.viviancook.uk/Writings/Papers/LL92.htm>

Crystal, D. (1997). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Cummins, J. (1979). Cognitive/academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimum age question and some other matters. *Working Papers on Bilingualism*, 19, 121-129.

Eckert, P. (2000). *Linguistic variation as social practice*. Blackwell.

Eckert, P. (2012). Three waves of variation study: The emergence of meaning in the study of sociolinguistic variation. *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 41, 87-100. 10.1146/annurev-

anthro-092611-145828.

- Eckman, F., Iverson, G., & Yun Song, J. (2013). The role of hypercorrection in the acquisition of L2 phonemic contrasts. *Second Language Research*, 29(3), 257–283.
- Els, T. van (1986). An overview of European research on language attrition. In B. Weltens, K. de Bot, & T. van Els (Eds.), *Language Attrition in Progress*. Foris.
- Fabiano-Smith, L. & Goldstein, B. (2010). Phonological acquisition in bilingual Spanish-English speaking children. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 53(1), 160-78.
- Flege, J., Birdsong, D., Bialystok, E., Mack. M., Sung, H., & Tsukada, K. (2006). Degree of foreign accent in English sentences produced by Korean children and adults. *Journal of Phonetics*, 34, 153-175.
- Flege, J., Schirru C., & MacKay, J. (2003). Interaction between the native and second language phonetic subsystems. *Speech Communication*, 40(4), 467–491.
- Flege, J. & Wayland, R. (2019). The role of input in native Spanish Late learners' production and perception of English phonetic segments. *Journal of Second Language Studies*. 2(1).
- Friesen, D. & Bialystok, E. (2012). Metalinguistic ability in bilingual children: The role of executive control. *Riv Psicolinguist Appl*. 12(3), 47-56.
- Grosjean, F. (2010). *Bilingual: Life and reality*. Harvard University Press.
- Harada, T. (2003). L2 influence on L1 speech in the production of VOT. *Proceedings of the 15th International Congress of Phonetic Sciences*, 1085-1088.
- Hohenstein, J., Eisenberg, A. & Naigles, L. (2006). Is he floating across or crossing afloat? Cross-influence of L1 and L2 in Spanish–English bilingual adults. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*. 9(3), 249–261.

- Holtheuer, C. (2011). The distribution of ser and estar with adjectives: A critical survey. *Revista Signos*. 244(75), 33-47. Retrieved from:
<https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=157019202004>
- Hua, Z., Wei L., & Jankowicz-Pytel, D. (2019): Translanguaging and embodied teaching and learning: lessons from a multilingual karate club in London. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, DOI: 10.1080/13670050.2019.
- Köpke, B. (2002). Activation thresholds and non-pathological first language attrition. In F. Fabro (Ed.), *Advances in the Neurolinguistics of Bilingualism: Essays in Honor of Michel Paradis*, (pp.119-142). Forum.
- Köpke, B. (2004). Neurolinguistic aspects of attrition. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 17(1), 3-30.
- Köpke, B., & Genevska-Hanke, D. (2018). First language attrition and dominance: Same or different? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 1963. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01963>
- Kupisch, T., Bayram F., & Rothman J. (2018). Terminology matters II: Early bilinguals show cross-linguistic influence but are not attriters. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism*, 7(6), 719-724.
- Labov, W. (1963). The social motivation of a sound change. *Word*, 19(3), 273-309.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago University Press.
- Langacker, R. (2016). 2. Entrenchment in cognitive grammar. In H. Schmid (Ed.), *Entrenchment and the Psychology of Language Learning: How We Reorganize and Adapt Linguistic Knowledge* (pp. 39-56). De Gruyter Mouton.
- Langsford, S., Perfors, A., Hendrickson, A. T., Kennedy, L. A., & Navarro, D. J. (2018). Quantifying sentence acceptability measures: reliability, bias, and variability. *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics*, 3(1), 1-34. <https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.396>

- MacSwan, J. (2017). A multilingual perspective on translanguaging. *American Educational Research Journal*, 54, 167-201. 10.3102/0002831216683935.
- MacWhinney, B. (1987). The competition model. In B. MacWhinney (Ed.), *Mechanisms of language acquisition* (pp. 249–308). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- MacWhinney, B. (2002). The competition model: The input, the context, and the brain. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and Second Language Instruction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Major, R. (2010). First language attrition in foreign accent perception. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 14(2), 163–183.
- Mehotcheva, T. (2010). *After the fiesta is over: foreign language attrition of Spanish in Dutch and German Erasmus students* (Doctoral dissertation). Universitat Pompeu Fabra.
- Meir, N., Walters J., & Armon-Lotem, S. (2017). Bi-directional cross-linguistic influence in bilingual Russian-Hebrew children. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism*, 7(5), 514-553.
- Merriam-Webster (n.d.). Grab. In *Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary*. Retrieved February 22, 2022, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/grab>
- Meyerhoff, M. (2006). *Introducing sociolinguistics*. Routledge.
- Milroy, J. (2003). On the role of the speaker in language change. In R. Hickey (Ed.), *Motives for Language Change*. Cambridge University Press.
- Montrul, S. (2005). Second language acquisition and first language loss in adult early bilinguals: exploring some differences and similarities. *Second Language Research*, 21(3), 199–249.
- Muñoz-Basols, J. & Salazar, D. (2016). Cross-linguistic lexical influence between English and Spanish. *Spanish in Context*, 13(1), 80–102.

- Navarro, F. (2008). La anglización del español: mucho más allá de *bypass*, *piercing*, *test*, *airbag*, *container* y *spa*. In *Actas del III Congreso el español, Lengua de traducción*. ESLEtRA
- Oosterhoof, A. (2008). *The semantics of generics in Dutch and related languages*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Paradis, M. (1993). Linguistic, psycholinguistic, and neurolinguistic aspects of "interference" in bilingual speakers: The activation threshold hypothesis. *International Journal of Psycholinguistics*, 9(2), 133–145.
- Paradis, M. (2007). L1 attrition features predicted by a neurolinguistic theory of bilingualism. In B. Köpcke, M. Schmid, M. Keijzer, & S. Dostert (Eds.), *Language attrition: Theoretical perspectives*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Parker, H. (2016). *L2 effect on bilingual Spanish/English encoding of motion events: Does manner salience transfer?* Open Access Dissertations. Retrieved from https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/open_access_dissertations/827/
- Pavlenko, A. (2000). L2 influence on L1 in late bilingualism. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 11(2). Retrieved from <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7gs944m5>
- Poplack, S. & Meechan, M. (1995). Patterns of language mixture: Nominal structure in Wolof-French and Fongbe-French bilingual discourse. In P. Muysken & L. Milroy (Eds.), *One speaker, two languages*. Cambridge University Press.
- Pousada, A. (2000). The competent bilingual in Puerto Rico. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2000(142), 103-118. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.2000.142.103>
- Real Academia Española. (n.d.). Asistir. In *Diccionario de la lengua española*. Retrieved February 22, 2022, from <https://dle.rae.es/asistir?m=form>

- Real Academia Española. (n.d.). Que. In *Diccionario panhispánico de dudas*. Retrieved March 18, 2022, from <https://www.rae.es/dpd/que>
- Richards, J.C. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today*. Cambridge University Press.
- Roldán, M. (1974). Toward a semantic characterization of “ser” and “estar.” *Hispania*, 57(1), 68–75. <https://doi.org/10.2307/339442>
- Ross Winterowd, W. & Murray, P. (1985). *English writing and skills*. Coronado Publishers.
- Saville-Troike, M. (2012). *Introducing second language acquisition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Schmid, M. (2016). First language attrition. *Language Teaching*, 49(2), 186-212.
- Schmid, M., & Köpke, B. (2004). First language attrition: the next phase. In K. B. Keijzer & M. Schmid (Eds.), *First language attrition: Interdisciplinary perspectives on methodological issues*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Schmid, M. & Köpke, B. (2009). L1 attrition and the mental lexicon. In A. Pavlenko (Ed.), *The bilingual mental lexicon: Interdisciplinary approaches*. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691262-011>
- Schmid, M., Köpke B., Keijzer M., & Weilemar L. (2004). *First language attrition: Interdisciplinary perspectives on methodological issues*. John Benjamins.
- Schütze, C.T., & Sprouse, J. (2014). Judgment data. In R. Podesva & D. Sharma (Eds.), *Research methods in linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Serratrice, L. (2013). Cross-linguistic influence in bilingual development: Determinants and mechanisms. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism*, 3(1), 3–25.
- Silverstein, M. (2003). Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language & Communication*, 23(3–4), 193–229. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0271-5309\(03\)00013-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0271-5309(03)00013-2)

- Stoehr, A., Benders, T., van Hell, J. G., & Fikkert, P. (2017). Second language attainment and first language attrition: The case of VOT in immersed Dutch–German late bilinguals. *Second Language Research*, 33(4), 483–518.
- Tarone, E. (2012). Interlanguage. In C. Chapelle (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. Wiley Blackwell.
- Thomason, S. (2001a). Contact-induced typological change. In M. Haspelmath, E. König, W. Oesterreicher, & W. Raible (Eds.), *Language typology and language universals: An international handbook*. De Gruyter.
- Thomason, S. (2001b). *Language contact: An introduction*. Georgetown University Press.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2016). Language spoken at home and ability to speak English. Retrieved from <https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?src=bkmk>
- Velasco, P. & García, O. (2014). Translanguaging and the writing of bilingual learners. *Bilingual Research Journal*. 37(1), 6-23.
- Wei, J. (2014). Selectivity of second language attrition. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(8), 1603-1608.
- Wei, L. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*. 39(1), 9–30.
- Winford, D. (2003). *An introduction to contact linguistics*. Blackwell.
- Winford, D. (2013). Social factors in contact languages. In P. Bakker & Y. Matras (Eds.), *Contact languages: A comprehensive guide*. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Year, J. (2004). Instances of the comparative fallacy. *Teachers College, Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics*, 4(1).

Appendix 1: Approval from Institutional Review Board (CIPSHI)

Universidad de
Puerto Rico

COMITÉ INSTITUCIONAL PARA LA PROTECCIÓN DE LOS SERES HUMANOS
EN LA INVESTIGACIÓN (CIPSHI)
IRB 00000944
cipshi.degi@upr.edu ~ <http://graduados.upmp.edu/cipshi>

AUTORIZACIÓN DEL PROTOCOLO

Número del protocolo: 2021-102

Título del protocolo: "Viajando por el mar en una línea derecha": The Influence of English L2 on Puerto Rican Spanish L1

Investigador: Roberto E. Olmeda Rosario

Tipo de revisión: ☒ Inicial ☐ Renovación

Evaluación: ☐ Comité en pleno
☒ Revisión expedita:
Categoría(s) expedita 45 CFR §46.110: 7

Fecha de la autorización: 11 de junio de 2021

Además, el CIPSHI:

- ☒ Concedió la **dispensa** solicitada para modificar el procedimiento estándar de toma de consentimiento informado.

Cualquier modificación posterior a esta autorización requerirá la consideración y reautorización del CIPSHI. Además, debe notificar cualquier incidente adverso o no anticipado que implique a los sujetos o participantes. Al finalizar la investigación, envíe el formulario de Notificación de Terminación de Protocolo.



Margarita Moscoso Álvarez, Ph.D.
Presidenta del CIPSHI o
representante autorizado

Decanato de
Estudios Graduados
e Investigación

18 Ave. Universidad STE 1801
San Juan PR 00925-2512

787-764-0000
Ext. 86700
Fax 787-763-6011

Página electrónica:
<http://graduados.upmp.edu>

Patrón con Igualdad de Oportunidades en el Empleo M/M/V/I

Appendix 2: Assent and Consent



UNIVERSITY OF PUERTO RICO
RIO PIEDRAS CAMPUS
COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
13 Ave Universidad Suite 1301
San Juan, PR 00931

HOJA DE CONSENTIMIENTO-ASENTIMIENTO INFORMADO

Título de la investigación

Viajando por el mar en una línea derecha: The Influence of English L2 on
Puerto Rican Spanish L1

9 de septiembre de 2021

Estimadas madres, padres y personas encargadas de la Escuela Secundaria de la UPR (UHS):

Su hijo/a ha sido invitado/a a participar en una investigación sobre la influencia del inglés en el español de Puerto Rico. La investigación es el proyecto de tesis doctoral del Prof. Roberto E. Olmeda Rosario, maestro de inglés de noveno en la Escuela Secundaria de la Universidad de Puerto Rico.

Su hijo/a podría ser seleccionado/a para participar en esta investigación porque, al ser miembro de la Escuela Secundaria de la Universidad de Puerto Rico, cumple con las características del grupo poblacional que será estudiado. Esperamos reclutar un total de 50 estudiantes.

Los y las participantes deberán ser hablantes nativos de español y haber aprendido inglés como segundo idioma. Es preferible que los y las participantes hayan vivido toda su vida en Puerto Rico y que hayan estado expuestos al inglés en el hogar o en la escuela desde una edad temprana (en o antes de los cinco años). Los y las participantes serán estudiantes de noveno a duodécimo grado en la ESUPR (UHS).

Esta investigación es importante ya que se ha documentado muy poco la influencia que tiene una segunda lengua (el inglés) sobre la primera (el español) en un ambiente donde la primera lengua es la dominante. De la misma forma, el investigador percibe algunos cambios y novedades en el uso del español entre la juventud puertorriqueña que quisiera investigar más a fondo.

Participación

Si usted autoriza que su hijo/a participe en esta investigación, este/a llenará un cuestionario que indica su género, municipio de residencia, ocupación u oficio y escolaridad de las personas adultas con quienes vive, frecuencia de uso del inglés y el español y edad a la que fueron expuestos por primera vez al inglés, SIN identificarlos por nombre ni relación. También completarán una prueba de selección múltiple y de respuesta corta. Ambos documentos serán administrados digitalmente en *Google Forms* y completarlos les tomará entre treinta minutos y una hora.

Si bien los y las participantes no deben descargar ninguna aplicación para poder contestar el cuestionario y la prueba, es posible que puedan incurrir en cargos adicionales por el consumo de datos móviles o de conexión de internet. El investigador y el/la participante acordarán una fecha para que completen los documentos. Es preferible que los y las participantes contesten el cuestionario y la prueba fuera de su horario lectivo en la Escuela Secundaria.

Riesgos

Los riesgos asociados con este estudio son mínimos. Los incidentes o eventos adversos que podrían ocurrir durante la investigación serán los que ocurren normalmente en el curso del día de un/a estudiante. Aunque la investigación no conlleva riesgos mayores, es posible que, al saberse que la investigación trata sobre las formas de hablar y de usar el inglés y el español, algunos/as estudiantes pudieran ser señalados/as por su uso del lenguaje. Los y las participantes también podrían sentir incomodidad con algunas de las preguntas en el cuestionario o cansancio mientras contestan la prueba de aceptabilidad en *Google Forms*. Los y las participantes pueden dejar de responder preguntas tanto en el cuestionario como en la prueba de aceptabilidad.

Confidencialidad

Ninguna publicación o informe hará uso de los nombres de los/las estudiantes que participen. El investigador será quien analice los resultados. Oficiales del Recinto de Río Piedras de la Universidad de Puerto Rico o de agencias federales responsables de velar por la integridad en la investigación podrían requerirle al investigador los datos crudos obtenidos en este estudio, incluyendo este documento.

La identidad de los participantes será resguardada por el investigador a través de la creación de números de identificación que no tendrán relación alguna con el nombre o número de estudiante del participante. El hecho de que cada participante completará el cuestionario y la prueba de aceptabilidad de forma individual y de que la única persona con acceso a los resultados es el

investigador principal y la directora de tesis minimiza aún más la posibilidad de poner en riesgo la identidad e integridad de los participantes.

Aun así, la información que comparta electrónicamente en el dispositivo (computadora, celular u otro) o plataforma que utilice puede ser intervenida o revisada por terceras personas. Estas personas pueden tener acceso legítimo o ilegítimo al dispositivo y a su contenido como un familiar, patrono, hackers, intrusos o piratas informáticos, etc. Además, en el dispositivo que utilice puede quedar registro de la información que acceda o envíe electrónicamente. De igual forma, si bien el nombre de los/as participantes no será divulgado al presentar los resultados, estos podrían ser identificados/as indirectamente por su género, residencia, ocupación de los miembros adultos de sus núcleos familiares e institución académica a la que asisten.

Una vez obtenidos los datos, el Prof. Olmeda será el custodio de estos. Se conservarán los consentimientos informados por un periodo de tres años en las computadoras del investigador y de la supervisora de tesis. Se utilizará la nube de *Google Drive* y se borrarán los datos una vez transcurran tres años. Los datos obtenidos del cuestionario y de la prueba de aceptabilidad serán almacenados permanentemente de manera digital (encriptados en la computadora personal del investigador) y podrían ser compartidos con otros investigadores bajo un acuerdo de confidencialidad. Los datos obtenidos serán lo único que se asociará con el cuestionario y la prueba de cada participante.

Beneficios

Participar en esta investigación no conlleva ningún beneficio directo para los participantes.

Derechos

Si han leído este documento y han decidido que su hijo/a participe, por favor entienda que la participación de él/ella es completamente voluntaria y que él/ella tiene derecho a abstenerse de participar o retirarse del estudio en cualquier momento, sin que esto tenga algún efecto en las calificaciones, en la relación maestro/estudiante, en los servicios que recibe en la escuela, ni en futuras clases que pudiese tomar el estudiante con el maestro del curso. El o la participante tendrá la opción de cambiar sus respuestas antes de someter los cuestionarios o de abstenerse de contestar alguna pregunta (prefiero no contestar). Además, es su derecho recibir una copia de este documento por lo que se les exhorta grabar o imprimir el mismo.

En caso de que decida ser parte de la investigación, la participación del/la estudiante en la investigación culminará una vez someta el cuestionario y la prueba de aceptabilidad en *Google Forms* presionando sobre el botón de *Submit*.

Si tienen alguna pregunta o desean más información acerca de esta investigación, por favor comuníquense con el Prof. Roberto E. Olmeda Rosario al 787-346-5167, o por correo electrónico a su dirección roberto.olmeda1@upr.edu. También puede comunicarse con la Dra. Yolanda Rivera Castillo, directora de tesis, al 787-764-0000 (ext. 89632), o por correo electrónico a su dirección yolanda.rivera5@upr.edu.

Si tiene preguntas sobre sus derechos como participante o una reclamación o queja relacionada con su participación en este estudio, puede comunicarse con la Oficial de Cumplimiento del Recinto de Río Piedras de la Universidad de Puerto Rico, al teléfono 764-0000, extensión 86773 o a cipshi.degi@upr.edu.

Al padre, madre o encargado/a:

Su firma en este documento significa que usted ha autorizado a su hijo/a a (____participar) (____no participar) después de haber leído y discutido con él/ella la información presentada en esta hoja de asentimiento.

Nombre en letra de molde
del padre, madre o
encargado/a

Fecha

Firma

A la/el estudiante:

Tu firma en este documento significa que has tomado la decisión de (____participar) (____no participar) después de haber leído y discutido con tu padre, madre o encargado/a la información presentada en esta hoja de asentimiento.

ANTES DE FIRMAR, asegúrate de que entiendes que:

- 1) Tu participación en esta investigación es **TOTALMENTE VOLUNTARIA**, y no afecta tu nota ni positiva ni negativamente
- 2) **TE PUEDES RETIRAR** del estudio en cualquier momento.
- 3) Contestarás un cuestionario y una prueba de selección múltiple y de respuesta corta en *Google Forms*.

Nombre en letra de molde
de la/el estudiante

Fecha

Firma

Appendix 3: Survey (Language Acquisition and Use)

Survey (Language Acquisition and Use)

This Google Forms document is intended to collect general information about your use and acquisition of English and Spanish. Please answer each question to the best of your knowledge.

* Required

1. Assigned code: *

2. Gender

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Male
☐ Female
☐ Non-binary
☐ Prefer not to answer

3. Where do you live? (write only the name of the town or city)

4. What is your parent or guardian's occupation?

5. What language do you use the most on a daily basis?

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Spanish
- ☐ English
- ☐ Both
- ☐ Prefer not to answer
- ☐ Other: _____

6. When did you begin learning English?

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ It was spoken at home since I was born.
- ☐ In preschool or kindergarten
- ☐ In elementary school (K-6)
- ☐ In high school (7-9)
- ☐ Prefer not to answer

7. When did you begin using English?

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ It was spoken at home since I was born.
- ☐ In preschool or kindergarten
- ☐ In elementary school (K-6)
- ☐ In high school (7-9)
- ☐ Prefer not to answer

8. When did you begin learning Spanish?

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ It was spoken at home since I was born.
- ☐ In preschool or kindergarten
- ☐ In elementary school (K-6)
- ☐ In high school (7-9)
- ☐ Prefer not to answer

9. When did you begin using Spanish?

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ It was spoken at home since I was born.
- ☐ In preschool or kindergarten
- ☐ In elementary school (K-6)
- ☐ In high school (7-9)
- ☐ Prefer not to answer

10. What have been your main sources for acquiring English so far? Mark the options that apply.

Check all that apply.

- ☐ Television
- ☐ Video games
- ☐ Teachers
- ☐ Other English-speakers (family, friends, neighbors)
- ☐ Books
- ☐ Videos
- ☐ Phone or tablet apps
- ☐ Other: _____

11. What have been your main sources for acquiring Spanish so far? Mark the options that apply.

Check all that apply.

- ☐ Television
- ☐ Video games
- ☐ Teachers
- ☐ Other Spanish-speakers (family, friends, neighbors)
- ☐ Books
- ☐ Videos
- ☐ Phone or tablet apps
- ☐ Other: _____

12. How often do you use English?

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Every day
- ☐ Four to five times a week
- ☐ Two to three times a week
- ☐ Once a week
- ☐ Only during my English classes at UHS
- ☐ I never use English.
- ☐ Prefer not to answer

13. For what purposes do you use English? Mark all of the options that apply.

Check all that apply.

- ☐ To write posts on social media
- ☐ To speak to friends at school
- ☐ To speak to friends outside of school
- ☐ To speak to monolingual English-speaking friends and family members
- ☐ To speak to bilingual (Spanish-English) friends and family members.
- ☐ To sing my favorite songs in English
- ☐ To speak to English-speaking people while playing video games online
- ☐ To read books in English
- ☐ Other: _____

14. For what purposes do you use Spanish? Mark all of the options that apply.

Check all that apply.

- ☐ To write posts on social media
- ☐ To speak to friends at school
- ☐ To speak to friends outside of school
- ☐ To speak to monolingual Spanish-speaking friends and family members
- ☐ To speak to bilingual (Spanish-English) friends and family members.
- ☐ To sing my favorite songs in Spanish
- ☐ To speak to Spanish-speaking people while playing video games online
- ☐ To read books in Spanish
- ☐ Other: _____

15. What are your strengths in English? Mark all of the options that apply.

Check all that apply.

- ☐ Writing
- ☐ Speaking
- ☐ Listening comprehension
- ☐ Reading comprehension
- ☐ Grammar
- ☐ Other: _____

16. What are your strengths in Spanish? Mark all of the options that apply.

Check all that apply.

- ☐ Writing
- ☐ Speaking
- ☐ Listening comprehension
- ☐ Reading comprehension
- ☐ Grammar
- ☐ Other: _____

17. In which areas do you believe that your English needs to improve? Mark all of the options that apply.

Check all that apply.

- ☐ Writing
- ☐ Speaking
- ☐ Listening comprehension
- ☐ Reading comprehension
- ☐ Grammar
- ☐ Other: _____

18. In which areas do you believe that your Spanish needs to improve? Mark all of the options that apply.

Check all that apply.

- ☐ Writing
☐ Speaking
☐ Listening comprehension
☐ Reading comprehension
☐ Grammar
☐ Other: _____

19. Are you bilingual in English and Spanish?

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ I am not entirely sure.
☐ Prefer not to answer

20. Briefly explain your answer to the previous question.

21. On a scale of 1-5 (with 1 being very low and 5 being very high), how would you describe your overall proficiency in English?

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Very low	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Very high

22. On a scale of 1-5 (with 1 being very low and 5 being very high), how would you describe your overall proficiency in Spanish?

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Very low	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Very high

23. How would you describe your relationship with English? You may mark up to two options.

Check all that apply.

- ☐ I need it to have better opportunities in life.
- ☐ I want to improve my English because I want to communicate with more people.
- ☐ I would like to improve my English, but it is not a priority for me.
- ☐ I prefer English over Spanish.
- ☐ I do not need English because I already know Spanish.
- ☐ Other: _____

24. How would you describe your relationship with Spanish? You may mark up to two options.

Check all that apply.

- ☐ I need it to have better opportunities in life.
- ☐ I want to improve my Spanish because I want to communicate with more people.
- ☐ I would like to improve my English, but it is not a priority for me.
- ☐ I prefer Spanish over English.
- ☐ I do not need Spanish because I already know English.
- ☐ Other: _____

25. Would you like to share any additional comments about your use of English and Spanish?

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms

Appendix 4: Acceptability Test

Acceptability Test

Instructions in English:

Read each sentence carefully and decide whether it is an acceptable sentence in Spanish. If you consider that the sentence is unacceptable, briefly explain why and rewrite it accordingly.

Instrucciones en español

Lea cuidadosamente cada oración y decida si es aceptable en el idioma español. Si su respuesta es que la oración es inaceptable, explique brevemente por qué y proceda a reescribirla de acuerdo a su explicación.

*** Required**

1. Assigned code: *

2. Los gobiernos giran a las guerras para resolver conflictos.

Mark only one oval.

☐ acceptable

☐ unacceptable

3. Si contestó inaceptable, explique brevemente por qué y proceda a reescribir la oración.

4. Dos personas con vistas distintas pueden causar un conflicto.

Mark only one oval.

☐ acceptable

☐ unacceptable

5. Si contestó inaceptable, explique brevemente por qué y proceda a reescribir la oración.

6. El nuevo presidente fue electo en noviembre.

Mark only one oval.

☐ aceptable

☐ inaceptable

7. Si contestó inaceptable, explique brevemente por qué y proceda a reescribir la oración.

8. Lo que mi jefe decía, iba.

Mark only one oval.

☐ aceptable

☐ inaceptable

9. Si contestó inaceptable, explique brevemente por qué y proceda a reescribir la oración.

10. El teniente está en cargo del ejército.

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ acceptable
☐ inacceptable

11. Si contestó inacceptable, explique brevemente por qué y proceda a reescribir la oración.

12. Los exploradores viajan por el mar en una línea derecha.

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ acceptable
☐ inacceptable

13. Si contestó inacceptable, explique brevemente por qué y proceda a reescribir la oración.

14. Uno de los pasajeros olvidó sus pertenencias en el avión.

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ acceptable
☐ inacceptable

15. Si contestó inaceptable, explique brevemente por qué y proceda a reescribir la oración.

16. Nuestra amistad es fundada en la confianza.

Mark only one oval.

☐ acceptable

☐ inaceptable

17. Si contestó inaceptable, explique brevemente por qué y proceda a reescribir la oración.

18. Los colonizadores traían enfermedades que los nativos todavía no habían sido expuestos a.

Mark only one oval.

☐ acceptable

☐ inaceptable

19. Si contestó inaceptable, explique brevemente por qué y proceda a reescribir la oración.

20. El muchacho ya no sabía quién confiar en.

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ acceptable
☐ inacceptable

21. Si contestó inacceptable, explique brevemente por qué y proceda a reescribir la oración.

22. Muchos artistas no se acostumbran a la fama y la fortuna.

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ acceptable
☐ inacceptable

23. Si contestó inacceptable, explique brevemente por qué y proceda a reescribir la oración.

24. Juan es amigable, pero en la otra mano, su hermano Alberto es muy grosero.

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ acceptable
☐ inacceptable

25. Si contestó inaceptable, explique brevemente por qué y proceda a reescribir la oración.

26. Cuando llega el tiempo de hacer una decisión, Luis no sabe cómo.

Mark only one oval.

☐ aceptable

☐ inaceptable

27. Si contestó inaceptable, explique brevemente por qué y proceda a reescribir la oración.

28. Luis empezó a depender demasiado en sus amigos.

Mark only one oval.

☐ aceptable

☐ inaceptable

29. Si contestó inaceptable, explique brevemente por qué y proceda a reescribir la oración.

30. La pandemia les ha cambiado la vida a muchos puertorriqueños.

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ acceptable
☐ inacceptable

31. Si contestó inacceptable, explique brevemente por qué y proceda a reescribir la oración.

32. Sacaron a los atacantes de los territorios que lograron apoderarse de.

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ acceptable
☐ inacceptable

33. Si contestó inacceptable, explique brevemente por qué y proceda a reescribir la oración.

34. Todos respetaban al presidente porque era quien aguantaba más poder en la compañía.

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ acceptable
☐ inacceptable

35. Si contestó inaceptable, explique brevemente por qué y proceda a reescribir la oración.

36. Deje de ir a su casa porque realicé que no le gustaban las visitas.

Mark only one oval.

☐ acceptable

☐ inaceptable

37. Si contestó inaceptable, explique brevemente por qué y proceda a reescribir la oración.

38. Fui a buscarte a tu casa pero no había nadie cuando llegué.

Mark only one oval.

☐ acceptable

☐ inaceptable

39. Si contestó inaceptable, explique brevemente por qué y proceda a reescribir la oración.

40. El criminal fue tirado en prisión de inmediato.

Mark only one oval.

☐ acceptable

☐ inacceptable

41. Si contestó inacceptable, explique brevemente por qué y proceda a reescribir la oración.

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms

Appendix 5: Instructions for participants who completed assent and consent

¡Hola, XXXX!

Gracias por acceder a participar en mi investigación. He compartido contigo dos documentos en Google Forms: *Survey* y *Acceptability Test*. Por favor, lee las instrucciones con detenimiento y completa ambos documentos en o antes del 31 de octubre de 2021. En la pregunta que dice *Assigned Code* debes escribir VPMXX tanto en el *Survey* como en el *Acceptability Test*.

Survey: <https://forms.gle/NPoZ72kGCDfTvVdG7>

Acceptability Test: <https://forms.gle/kki4v3s4m6574ZJy5>

Si tienes alguna pregunta, no dudes en contactarme.

Nuevamente, ¡gracias!

Cordialmente,

Roberto E. Olmeda