L2 Tense and Time Reference

ELI HINKEL
The Ohio State University

The meaning and forms of tenses are complex and often difficult for nonnative speakers to acquire. The concepts associated with time which differ among language communities can present an additional level of complexitv for learners. In a survey, 130 ESL students were asked to describe the meanings of English tenses in terms of time concepts used in ESL grammar texts. The results suggest that speakers of Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, and Arabic associate different temporal relationships with the terms *right now, present,* and *past* than do native speakers. An implication of this finding is that grammar teaching that utilizes descriptions of time accepted in English-speaking communities to explain usages and meanings of English tenses can produce a low rate of learner comprehension.

Few ESL researchers doubt that learners' L1 conceptualization of time and lexical and/or grammatical time markers have an impact on their acquisition of English tense. In all languages, time is referred to in some fashion. However, *time attributes* (i.e., perceptual, conceptual and cultural divisions of time) differ among societies. One obvious example of this is the boundary of a day. In nonsecular Muslim and Jewish cultures, days begin at sunset and not at midnight as in Western civil convention. On the other hand, the Japanese consider sunrise the beginning of a new day.

Time attributes are bound to reflect on the systems through which languages represent these divisions (Levinson, 1983). *Linguistic* references to time attributes can take many forms: Some languages, such as Chinese and Japanese refer to time lexically by employing nouns and adverbs; others, like English, also utilize *grammatical* references (i.e., verb tense). If both L1 time attributes and their linguistic references differ from those in L2, learners may find themselves in an environment where they cannot pick out the temporal attribute to which tense is a grammatical reference (Donnellan, 1991).

English *aspect* can be morphologically marked as well. For example, the verbs in both sentences *He runs* and *He is running* are

557

in the present tense. However, the present simple *runs* carries *iterative* (or *habitual) implicature,* whereas *-ing* in the second sentence imparts *progressive implicature* to the verb's present tense meaning. Aspects, which Comrie (1976), Lyons (1977), and Richards (1987) view as additional features of *time deixis* (or means of locating events in time), can present the same potential dichotomy between the time attributable and its reference.

In order to gain insight into how ESL learners acquire morphological tense, numerous studies have examined the order of morpheme acquisition (e.g., Andersen, 1977; Bailey, Madden, & Krashen, 1974; Dulay & Burt, 1974; Larsen-Freeman, 1976; Makino, 1979; Pienemann, 1985). In addition, a great deal of research has been devoted to ESL learner acquisition of tense and morpheme meaning (Andersen, 1983; Bailey, 1989a, 1989b; Hatch, 1978). Whereas some specialists on language and tense acquisition believe that learners acquire tense meanings before their morphological forms, others hold the opposite view. This paper will address the issue of whether nonnative speakers (NNSs) who have received extensive L2 training and have achieved a relatively high L2 proficiency intuitively perceive English conceptualization of time and its grammatical references to deictic (or indexical) time, that is, morphological tense, in ways similar to native speakers (NSs). Another focus of this study is NNSs' perceptions of English aspectual implicature.

ESL teachers and L2 researchers recognize that English tenses are difficult to acquire (DeCarrico, 1986; Richards, 1981; Riddle, 1986). Guiora (1983) notes that speakers of Hebrew encounter difficulty mastering the meanings and usages of several of the English past tenses which, to them, seem redundant and without an easily discernible function. He also notes that speakers of Chinese may be faced with establishing an entirely new hypothesis of how time is used and referred to. Sharwood Smith (1988) indicates that his Polish students had difficulty relating to the past progressive and its form. Richards (1981) discusses the complexity of introducing English progressive tenses and their explicit and implied meanings. Dialect variations even within English-speaking societies make for significant differences in tense usage and meanings (Leech, 1971).

Coppetiers (1987), who conducted a study of highly educated NNSs with near-native proficiency in French, found that whereas they had obviously acquired tense forms, their perceptions of tense meanings were not NS-like. Coppetiers contends that the NNSs' perceptions of tense meanings were strongly affected by tense meanings in the L1 so that the speakers of Romance languages interpreted the meanings of French tenses differently from speakers of Germanic and tenseless languages (pp. 560-561).

To date, whether speakers of the many languages without morphological tenses can fully master the English verbal system of tenses has not been determined. Richards (1973) observes that ESL learners' omissions of tense markers represent a damaging and confusing type of error. Chappel and Rodby (1983) note that ESL students' tense-related errors often detract from the overall comprehensibility of their text. They further mention that despite the fact that verb tenses occupy a prominent role in the teaching of ESL, students seem to choose verb tenses arbitrarily. In their view, tense errors may result from the learners' lack of understanding of the impact of tense on text.

BACKGROUND: PRAGMATICS OF TIME AND TENSE

The issue of the relationship between grammatical tense and time and the acquisition of tense systems is complex. Whether a connection exists between the detailed marking of time in English and its morphological tense as a grammatical category has not been established with certainty. Comrie (1985) mentions that various cultural groups "have radically different conceptualizations of time" (p. 3) and only some measure time and occurring events with exactitude. Fillmore (1975) notes that, in most languages, lexical markers, such as *today, tomorrow,* and *yesterday,* can refer to a variety of time lengths within a relevant span. These relevant spans, however, differ from one language to another. Levinson (1983) claims that in "languages without true tenses, for example Chinese or Yoruba" (p. 78), the concept of time is realized through adverbs and implicit and contextual assumptions. Southeast Asian languages require a strict discourse frame which delineates time and, therefore, the time reference.

The numerous studies of the meaning relationships in English between attribute and reference—the thing and its name—have demonstrated that they are vague (Bach, 1981) and language specific. Kripke (1991) views notions of meanings as "determined by the conventions of the language" which can be treated only in conjunction with the related linguistic phenomena of the language (p. 84). Bach (1981) advances this argument stating that, in order to be understood, the speaker and his audience must have mutual contextual beliefs. Linguistic meanings of tense also include the mutual beliefs and shared perceptions of the members of a speech community. The expression of such beliefs and perceptions may not be shared by members of other speech communities (Searle, 1979).

As Donnellan (1991) notes, if descriptions of time are used referentially, the subjects to whom these descriptions are addressed

are thus enabled to "pick out" (p. 60) the references and their attributes. However, if the reference does not fit the subjects' perceptions of the attribute, they may be unable to establish a correspondence between them.

For example, if the NS instructor states that the morpheme *-ed* marks the verb for past simple tense but the student's conceptualization of past differs from the instructor's, the student may not use this morpheme in the contexts where the instructor would. Learners' abilities to establish the referential relationships between L2 time deixis, tense, and morphological markers necessarily affects their perceptions of the meanings and functions of tense morphemes.

Recanti's (1991) availability principle assumes that linguistic meanings must be available or accessible to our "ordinary, conscious intuitions" (p. 106). Because time-span conceptualizations and their lexical references differ for NSs and NNSs, English grammatical references to time may not be readily available for pragmatic interpretation by speakers of tenseless languages. If this is the case, morphological time reference (i.e., linguistic meaning of tense) may not be accessible to these speakers' conscious intuitions. Another complication is that even developed morphological tense structures in two languages may differ greatly (Fillmore, 1975).

Levinson (1983) sees English time reference as calendrical reckoning and observes that most Amerindian languages, Japanese, and Hindi differ from it and one another in names and lengths of days and time spans. In his brief examination of how the time attribute corresponds to tense, Levinson mentions that in languages with tense, sentences are anchored to a context by morphological tense, whereas other languages utilize other linguistic and social means of contextual anchoring. If mutual contextual beliefs (Bach, 1981) and calendrical time deixis (Levinson, 1983) are necessary for picking out a time attribute and its morphological reference in English, NNSs lacking intuitions and access to knowledge associated with the English time deixis and linguistic tense may face problems in using and interpreting English time references.

Usually, instructors teach tenses by presenting rules, explaining the meanings of tenses, and by identifying the time deixis and lexical contexts in which certain tenses are called for (Eisenstein, 1987). Such presentations are usually accompanied by exercises in which the students are expected to apply the instructor's explanations. In order to do so successfully, the students have to perform a series of tasks. They need to be aware of the lexical and syntactic markers of time and their environments in the sentence, understand their meanings and implications, analyze them for time and tense

reference and aspect implicature, pick out one or more corresponding auxiliaries or morphemes, put them in the relevant form, and produce a correct verbal structure. In this study, ESL students were asked in a questionnaire to reverse this process and describe the meanings and implications which tenses and aspects have for them through the reference terms associated with English time deixis. (The descriptions of English time deixis and the framework of temporality were adopted following Leech, 1971, and Comrie, 1985.)

METHOD

Questionnaire Design

In the questionnaire, the students were asked to describe four sentences for each of the 8 English tenses excluding future, a total of 32 sentences: 4 present (present simple, present progressive, present perfect, and present perfect progressive) and 4 past (past simple, past progressive, past perfect, and past perfect progressive). If responses for 2 sentences with the same tense and aspect differed, they were averaged independently for tense and aspect. In order to circumvent the issue of the respondents' possible confusion when performing the required task, responses to the first 2 sentences per tense were considered invalid and excluded from data analysis.

In the questionnaire, time attributes and references were listed with the immediate present first, moving back to the past perfect, which is the most deictically distant from the present moment. To assure that the tense descriptors were accessible to the NNSs, the selection of terms describing the meanings of tenses and aspectual implicatures were chosen from intermediate/advanced ESL and grammar texts: *right now* (Azar, 1989) and *at the moment of speaking* (Leech, 1971); *in the present and in the past* (Leech & Svartvik, 1975); *in the past* and *before another past event* (Azar, 1989; Leech, 1971; Leech & Svartvik, 1975); *progressive* (Azar, 1989; Leech, 1971; Leech & Svartvik, 1975); and *repetitive/habitual* (Azar, 1989; Leech& Svartvik, 1975).

The semantics of the contexts were made uniform for grammatical gender, animacy, and number. The choice of sentences in the questionnaire reflected several considerations:

1. The verbs did not carry momentary or durational meanings (Leech, 1971) (as in, respectively, *blink* or *love)* and only three verbs were used: *walk, talk,* and *visit.*

2. Explicit time markers were excluded, with the exception of *before,* to motivate the past perfect tenses (Azar, 1989; Leech, 1971).

3. Vocabulary was restricted to fewer than 100 high-frequency words.

(See the Appendix for a listing of the questionnaire sentences. These are presented in an order different from that in the actual questionnaire.)

The NNS and the NS controls were instructed to choose however many of the multiple-choice items they wished and thus describe their own perceptions of temporal references and the progressive and iterative/habitual aspects (Comrie, 1985; Leech, 1971; Richards, 1981). However, true to the multiple-choice testing tradition, almost all participants selected only one answer per multiple-choice selection. The first multiple-choice selection had a general heading, *The time of the action is,* and required the subjects to identify the English verb time reference regressively from the present to the past. The second selection had the heading *The action is* and dealt with the respondents' perceptions of aspect. The aspects addressed in the questionnaire included the progressive aspect and the iterative/habitual aspect. The perfective aspect and Ø aspect were not included and, for the purposes of this study, are termed *nonprogressive / nonhabitual.* (The selection in the questionnaire corresponding to these aspects was *none of the above.)* The multiple-choice options remained uniform for all 32 sentences.

For example, the students read the sentence *Bob is talking to his brother.* Then they saw two multiple-choice selections for tense and aspect descriptors, respectively

1. The time of the action is:
   a. right now/at the moment of speaking
   b. in the present and in the past
   c. in the past
   d. before another past event
   e. cannot decide
2. The action is:
   a. progressive
   b. repetitive/habitual
   c. none of the above
   d. cannot decide

The survey was administered at the conclusion of the Autumn Quarter, immediately following 9 weeks of instruction in daily or thrice-weekly ESL classes. There was no time limit for the subjects to respond to the questions.

Subjects

Of the 130 ESL students who participated in this study, 70 students were speakers of Chinese (CH); 17, Korean (KR); 13, Japanese (JP); 11, Vietnamese (VT); 12, Spanish (SP); and 7, Arabic (AR). Of the 21 NS included as controls, 19 were graduate students enrolled in various departments at The Ohio State University (OSU), most of whom had minimal training in linguistics. The remaining 2 were ESL instructors. The total number of participants was 151.

All NNS participants had been admitted to OSU and were taking classes at the university. Their TOEFL scores ranged from 500 to 617, with a mean of 563. Unlike the majority of NNSs, the Vietnamese and some speakers of Spanish were U.S. resident aliens or citizens and thus were not required to take the TOEFL.

The NNS subjects' ESL training ranged from 4 to 18 years with a mean of 9.6 years. All NNS students included in the study, with the exception of the Vietnamese, had been residing in the U.S. for a period of time ranging from 2.5 to 30 months, with a mean of 6.3 months. The Vietnamese students' residence in the U.S. ranged from 4 to 11 years, with an average of 5.7 years, and the duration of their formal ESL training ranged from 9 to 33 months, with a mean of 10.3 months.

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

The sizes of the NNS groups were not equalized. After the data were compiled for each sentence, they were converted to percentages. The NS values were compared to those for other groups. The temporal reference for each tense chosen by the highest number of NSs was accepted as the tense temporal reference against which all those of the NNSs were compared. (See Table 1.)

Only in the present progressive were the NNSs' perceptions of tense meanings close to those of NSs. Otherwise, NSs generally chose descriptions of temporal references substantially differently from members of all groups of trained NNSs. In fact, the differences between NSs and NNSs were statistically significant $(p < .01)$ for each row of Table 1 except the present progressive, which is not significant.[1] The NNSs' temporal reference for the present progressive *right now/at the moment of speaking* indicates

---

[1] This is based on Fisher's exact test for each row, grouping all NNSs together. A chi-square test for independence would not have been appropriate due to small cell sizes associated with percentages near 0 or 100%. Since results for 2 sentences were used and averaged in Table 1, care was taken to perform the test separately for each sentence.

<div align="center">

TABLE 1
Temporary Reference (%)
(N= 151)

</div>

	NS	CH	KR	JP	VT	SP	AR
	(*n*=21)	(*n*=70)	(*n*=17)	(*n*=13)	(*n*=11)	(*n*=12)	(*n*=7)
Right now/at the moment of speaking							
Present progressive	100	90	88	85	100	100	100
In the present and in the past							
Present simple	95	40	24	38	0	83	72
Present perfect progressive	96	49	64	62	9	75	72
In the past							
Present perfect	97	34	29	23	36	58	57
Past progressive	100	60	71	85	46	67	57
Past simple	100	81	88	0	55	58	57
Before another past event							
Past perfect progressive	95	41	35	92	27	58	86
Past perfect	98	61	70	85	27	67	71

that, for them, it is the most intuitively accessible deictic point. This finding is consistent with that of Olshtain (1979) whose case study showed that even a speaker of a language without aspect acquired the present progressive earlier than other tenses. The past simple attribute provides the second most easily available point of reference because present, past, and future are the basic tense meanings within the conceptualizations of linear temporality (Comrie, 1985). The unanimity of the Japanese, none of whom perceived it to mark the past, may be explained by the Japanese system of naming a certain number of days back from today which can be included in both the present and the past (Fillmore, 1975).

The Chinese perceived the deictic time of the present progressive and past simple most nearly approximating NS perceptions. In terms of distance from the NS values, these two tenses were followed by the past perfect and the past progressive, then the present simple, present perfect progressive, past perfect progressive, and present perfect, respectively. Interestingly, the values for Koreans followed approximately the same pattern. The Vietnamese values for the present progressive and past simple are also the highest for this group and are similarly followed by the past progressive. As has been mentioned, the Japanese are somewhat different.

With the exception of the speakers of Spanish and Arabic, the values for the other present tenses reflect the considerable difficulty most NNSs had when choosing the temporal descriptions listed within the selections. The past perfect tenses presented less difficulty, which can be partially explained by the lexical (as opposed to grammatical) reference of *before.* Levinson (1983) indicates that most tenseless languages provide for lexical and discourse sentence anchors. In this case, the adverb *before* is an explicit lexical marker congruent with the concepts of time reference intuitively available to the speakers of such languages.

Linear conceptualizations of time may not be common to all societies (von Stutterheim & Klein, 1987). Among the 6 groups of NNSs, only the speakers of Spanish and Arabic were speakers of languages with developed morphological tenses. The very fact that Spanish and Arabic have deictic time reference provides an established conceptual structure and morphological temporal reference which the speakers of these languages can draw on when exposed to L2 conceptualizations of time and morphological tense. To some degree, they share more mutual conceptualizations of time with NSs and were more successful in picking out appropriate L2 time attributes than speakers of Chinese, Korean, Japanese, and Vietnamese.

The NSs' behavior in the analysis of tense-marked temporality demonstrates that they appear to know that auxiliaries and morphemes represent deictic time reference and were, therefore, able to pick out the more appropriate time attribute (Donnellan, 1991). They appear to have access to the linguistic meanings which auxiliaries and morphemes encode in English. The NNSs, however, do not seem to have the NS-like intuitive knowledge of the linear conceptualization of time and its linguistic references.

Morphological references to deictic time are inextricably linked to tense reference. If a grammatical reference to temporality implies a deictic time, we assume that the NNS knows and intends that meaning (Recanti, 1991); that is, we assume that NNSs' choice of morphemes implies their knowledge of morphological meanings. Even if the NNSs' intuitive knowledge of deictic time attribute is NS-like but their choice of morphemes is not, their NS-like intuitive knowledge of deictic time would still appear seriously flawed.

In the second task, the study participants were requested to assign aspectual implicature (Comrie, 1976, 1985) to each temporal reference of tense. The implicature of linear temporal aspects tends to increase the distance between the NS and NNS perceptions of temporality. (See Table 2.)

TABLE 2
Aspectual Implications (%)
(N= 151)

	NS (*n*=21)	CH (*n*=70)	KR (*n*=17)	JP (*n*=13)	VT (*n*=11)	SP (*n*=12)	AR (*n*=7)
Progressive							
Present progressive	100	64	59	100	36	75	86
Present perfect progressive	95	56	65	85	0	67	71
Past progressive	99	53	71	92	27	50	71
Past perfect progressive	96	49	65	85	27	58	43
Interactive/habitual							
Present simple	97	47	59	77	18	50	85
Nonprogressive/nonhabitual							
Present perfect	97	34	29	23	36	42	43
Past simple	98	47	82	62	46	42	86
Past perfect	96	56	53	38	28	34	57

The NNSs' perceptions of aspectual implicature indicated by their choices were also analyzed against the choices made by the majority of NSs. NSs chose descriptions of aspectual implicature significantly differently *(p< .01)* from NNSs in every case, including present progressive (based on Fisher's exact test). A cell-by-cell comparison of same-tense values associated with the NNSs' perceptions of L2 aspectual implicature (see Table 2) shows an average decline of 7.8% compared to values associated with NNSs' perceptions of temporality (see Table 1). This finding is consistent with Bailey's (1989a, 1989b) account of NNS acquisition of past simple and past progressive, which notes that the progressive aspect combined with the meaning of the past presents an additional level of complexity for L2 learners. The NNSs' perceptions of the progressive aspect were generally closer to those of NSs than were their perceptions of the habitual and nonprogressive/nonhabitual.

Durative and continuative, and iterative and repetitive aspects, in some form, can be found in all Lls represented in the data with the exception of Vietnamese. NNSs whose Lls have aspect as referential implicature thus have access to the associated linguistic conceptualization. Chinese (Li & Thompson, 1981) and Spanish (Comrie, 1976, 1965) have the durative and continuative; Korean (Joo Hwang, 1987), Japanese (Inoue, 1984), and Arabic (Kaye, 1987) have both types of implicature—durative and continuative, and iterative and repetitive. However, the aspectual implicature in

these languages is different from that of English—so much so that, as the cited authors indicate, it is rather difficult to describe in terms of English. Vietnamese, however, is unique in that it does not have tenses or aspects, and its word order is the sole means of indicating grammatical relations (Nguyen, 1987).

The NNS perceptions of aspect and temporality in the present perfect are the most distant from those of NSs. Among the speakers of tenseless languages, the Koreans and the Japanese more closely approximated NS values over the range than did the Chinese, who have only durative L1 aspect. In turn, the values for the Chinese were nearer NS values than the Vietnamese. The fact that the Spanish continuative and the situational repetitive are not similar to the English progressive and iterative (Comrie, 1976, 1985) is presumably reflected in the values for the Spanish speakers.

Leech (1971) and Comrie (1976, 1985) strongly distinguish between the basic meanings of tenses and the secondary meanings of aspects. The NNSs' interpretations of L2 time deixis that are, in Donnellan's (1991) framework, restricted by their L1 conceptualization are made additionally difficult by the need to infer aspectual implicature. The fact that the distance between NNS and NS perceptions was greater in regard to aspectual implicature than with temporal reference supports the earlier observation that NNSs' intuitions regarding morphological references to deictic temporality may not be fully developed by years of L2 training.

CONCLUSION

Independent of the NNSs' perceived meanings of time spans, morphological references to time impose obvious constraints on L2 learner performance. The fact that NNSs with extensive language training and TOEFL scores above 500 consistently made temporal reference analyses and choices of time attributes significantly different from those of NSs in nearly all cases can be accounted for by four interrelated hypotheses which require further investigation.

1. NNSs' intuitive conceptualizations of time are not linear and/or deictic and, therefore, removed from those of NSs. Extensive L2 instruction may diminish this conceptual distance only to a limited extent.

2. Because English, unlike some other languages, requires morphological reference to time deixis, NNSs' intuitions associated with deictic tense may not be based on linear temporality and morphological tense as fully as those of NSs are.

3. Despite their years of language training, compared to NSs, NNSs have limited access to the means of interpreting morphological deictic time.

4. As is apparent from the data for the Vietnamese speakers, many years of exposure to L2, combined with instruction, may "have a limited impact on NNSs' perceptions of L2 deictic tense.

The marked differences which have been noted between the NS and NNS perceptions of time and its associated morphology as described in the terms accepted in L1 research and L2 methodology can also imply that tense-related instruction does not always strike a familiar chord or provide for a point of reference in NNSs' conceptualizations of time and its grammatical encoding.

IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHING

The data presented in this study are preliminary and require further investigation. For this reason, only some general suggestions and implications for teaching can be offered. The substantial differences between NS and NNS perceptions of tense meanings seem to indicate that NSs and NNSs view time spans and their divisions and measurements differently. If this is the case, the teacher cannot assume that the terminology and the conceptualizations associated with English time deixis are understood by NNS students in the same way as they are understood by NSs. Specifically and thoroughly explaining English time attributes and notions, the reference terms used to describe them, and their impact on the meanings of tenses can possibly help L2 learners associate the word labels and morphemes which refer to time divisions.

The data further show that for these L2 learners, the present progressive, past simple, and past progressive, respectively, represented the most accessible deictic time spans. It is reasonable that the teaching of English tenses should begin with these three tenses. As has been noted, Japanese speakers may have particular difficulty with the meanings and morphology associated with the past simple. Because NNSs tend to rely on lexical time markers such as *before* and *after* when interpreting the meanings of tenses and their morphological references, these may be included in the initial explanations of the English tense system to facilitate the learners' understanding of time-span relationships and tense meanings.

Because morphological tense markers impose constraints on learner performance, they may be specially addressed in conjunction with tense meanings. The speakers of Spanish seem to have difficulty distinguishing between English tense-related morphemes

and false cognates associated with the Spanish tense system and its morphology (Andersen, 1983; Comrie, 1985). The intuitions of Vietnamese speakers regarding tense morphological markers seem to be notably different from those of other groups of NNSs, presumably due to the absence of morphological deixis in their L1. For speakers of Arabic, as opposed to Chinese and Korean, English notions of temporality seem to impose somewhat reduced constraints associated with notions of temporality. However, their acquisition of the meanings and forms for the perfect tenses, such as the past perfect, past perfect progressive, and present perfect, appears to present substantial difficulty. In very general terms, the teaching of English conceptual notions of time, its divisions, and the relationships between these divisions can underlie or even precede the teaching of the tense system and its morphological references.

■

THE AUTHOR

Eli Hinkel received her PhD in linguistics from The University of Michigan in 1984 and has taught in intensive and ITA-training programs for the past 10 years. Her research interests include concept-based transfer and L2 teaching methodologies. She is employed as Coordinator of the ESL Composition Program at The Ohio State University.

REFERENCES

Andersen, R. (1977). The impoverished. state of cross-sectional morpheme acquisition/accuracy morphology. In C. Henning (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Los* Angeles *Second Language Research Forum* (pp. 308-320). Los Angeles: University of California.

Andersen, R. (1983). Transfer to somewhere. In S. Gass & L. Selinker (Eds.), *Language transfer in language learning* (pp. 177-202). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Azar, B. (1989). *Understanding and using English grammar* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bach, K. (1981). Referential/attributive. *Synthese, 49,* 219-244.

Bailey, N., Madden, C., & Krashen, S. (1974). Is there a "natural sequence" in adult second language learning? *Language Learning, 27,* 235-244.

Bailey, N. (1989a). Theoretical implications of the acquisition of the English simple past and past progressive. In *S.* Gass, C. Madden, D. Preston, & L. Selinker (Eds.), *Variation in second language acquisition: Vol. 2. Psycholinguistic issues* (pp. 109-124). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Bailey, N. (1989b). Discourse conditioned tense variation: Teacher implications. In M. Eisenstein (Ed.), *The dynamic interlanguage: Empirical studies in second language variation* (pp. 279-295). New York: Plenum Press.

Chappel, V., & Rodby, J. (1983). Verb tense and ESL composition: A discourse-level approach. In M. A. Clarke & J. Handscombe (Eds.), *On TESOL '82. Pacific perspectives on language learning and teaching* (pp. 309-320). Washington, DC: TESOL.

Comrie, B. (1976). *Aspect: An introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Comrie, B. (1985). *Tense.* Cambridge Cambridge University Press.

Coppetiers, R. (1987). Competence differences between native and non-native speakers. *Language, 63,* 544-4573.

DeCarrico, J. (1986). Tense, aspect and time in the English modality. *TESOL Quarterly, 20* (4), 665-682.

Donnellan, K. (1991). Reference and definite descriptions. In S. Davis (Ed.), *Pragmatics* (pp. 52-64). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dulay, H., & Burt, M. (1974). Natural sequences in child second language acquisition. *Language Learning, 24,* 37-53.

Eisenstein, M. (1987). Grammatical explanations in ESL: Teach the student, not the method. In M. Long & J. Richards (Eds.), *Methodology in TESOL.* New York: Newbury House.

Fillmore, C. (1975). Santa Cruz lectures on deixis. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Guiora, A. (1983). The dialectic of language acquisition. *Language Learning, 33,* 3-12.

Hatch, E. (1978). Discourse analysis and second language acquisition. In E. Hatch (Ed.), *Second language acquisition: A book of readings.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Inoue, K. (1984). Some discourse principles and lengthy sentences in Japanese. In S. Miyagawa & C. Kitagawa (Eds.), *Studies in Japanese language use.* Edmonton, Canada: Linguistic Research.

Joo Hwang, S. J. (1987). *Discourse feature of Korean narration.* Dallas, TX: The Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Kaye, A. (1987). Arabic. In B. Comrie (Ed.), *The world's major languages.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kripke, S. (1991). Speaker's reference and semantic reference. In S. Davis (Ed.), *Pragmatics* (pp. 77-96). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (1976). An explanation of the morpheme acquisition order of second language learners. *Language Learning, 26,* 125-134.

Leech, G. (1971). *Meaning and the English verb.* London: Longman.

Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1975). *A communicative grammar of English.* London: Longman.

Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Li, C., & Thompson, S. (1981). *Mandarin Chinese. A functional reference grammar.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics (Vols. 1 & 2).* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Makino, T. (1979). English morpheme acquisition order of Japanese secondary school students. *TESOL Quarterly, 13* (3), 428-449.

Nguyen, D-H. (1987). Vietnamese. In B. Comrie (Ed.), *The world's major languages.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Olshtain, E. (1979). The acquisition of the English progressive: A case study of a seven-year-old Hebrew speaker. *Working Papers in Bilingualism, 18,* 81-102.

Pienemann, M. (1985). Learnability and syllabus construction. In K. Hyltenstam & M. Pienemann (Eds.), *Modeling and assessing second language acquisition.* San Diego, CA: College-Hill Press.

Recanati, F. (1991). The pragmatics of what is said. In S. Davis (Ed.), *Pragmatics* (pp. 97-120). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Richards, J. C. (1973). Error analysis and second language strategies. In J. W. Oller & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *Focus on the learner: Pragmatic perspectives for the language teacher.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Richards, J. C. (1981). Introducing the progressive. *TESOL Quarterly, 15* (4), 391-402.

Richards, J. C. (1987). Introducing the perfect: An exercise in pedagogic grammar. In M. H. Long & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *Methodology in TESOL.* New York: Newbury House.

Riddle, E. (1986). Meaning and discourse function of the past tense in English. *TESOL Quarterly, 20* (2), 267-286.

Searle, J. (1979). Referential and attributive. *Monist, 62,* 190-208.

Sharwood Smith, M. (1988). Imperative versus progressive: An exercise in contrastive pedagogical linguistics. In W. Rutherford & M. Sharwood Smith (Eds.), *Grammar and second language teaching.* New York: Newbury House.

von Stutterheim, C., & Klein, W. (1987). A concept-oriented approach to second language studies. In C. Pfaff (Ed.), *First and second language acquisition process.* Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.

APPENDIX

SENTENCES USED IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Used for data analysis

1. Bob is talking to his brother.
2. John walks to school.
3. The student talked to his friend about the new movie.
4. The students had been talking to Bob before the meeting.
5. Peter was walking quietly.
6. Peter has walked to school.
7. John talks to his brother about his friends.
8. Bob is walking to the movies.
9. John has been talking to Bob on the phone.
10. John had been visiting Bob before leaving for school.
11. John has visited his brother at school.
12. Bob has been walking.
13. Peter visited his brother in Hawaii.
14. The student had visited Bob before going to school.
15. John had talked to Peter before lunch.
16. John was talking to Bob.

Excluded from data analysis

1. Bob is visiting his cousin.
2. John talks to Peter.
3. The student walked to school from the meeting.
4. Peter had been walking quickly before meeting Bob.
5. John was talking quietly.
6. Bob has talked to Peter.
7. The student visits his brother at school.
8. John is talking to a friend.
9. Peter has been visiting his brother in Hawaii.
10. The student had been walking home before the rain.
11. Bob has talked about his new school.
12. John walked to the meeting.
13. Peter has been talking on the phone.
14. The student had talked to Bob before going home.
15. Bob had walked to school before talking to Peter.
16. Peter was visiting Bob.