

THE VARIABLE GRAMMAR OF THE SPANISH SUBJUNCTIVE IN SECOND-
GENERATION BILINGUALS IN NEW YORK CITY

by

KEVIN BOOKHAMER

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Hispanic and Luso-Brazilian Literatures and
Languages in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,
The City University of New York

2013

© 2013

KEVIN MICHAEL BOOKHAMER

All Rights Reserved

This Manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Hispanic and Luso-Brazilian Literatures and Languages in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement in the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

RICARDO OTHEGUY

Date

Chair of Examining Committee

JOSÉ DEL VALLE

Date

Executive Officer

RICARDO OTHEGUY

JOSÉ DEL VALLE

LAURA CALLAHAN

Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Abstract

THE VARIABLE GRAMMAR OF THE SPANISH SUBJUNCTIVE IN SECOND-
GENERATION BILINGUALS IN NEW YORK CITY

by

Kevin Bookhamer

Adviser: Dr. Ricardo Otheguy

This morphosyntactic dissertation study compares the use of MOOD (indicative & subjunctive) in first- and second-generation Spanish speakers in New York City. The data for this study are from a transcription of naturalistic Spanish conversations with New Yorkers of different generations, representing the six primary Spanish-speaking groups in NYC: Puerto Rican, Dominican, Mexican, Ecuadorian, Colombian and Cuban. We analyze data from 26 born in Latin America and 26 born or raised in NYC, totaling 52 transcriptions. The reference model is the mood usage of first-generation newcomers, not a standard Spanish normative framework. The objective was to examine the use of mood by way of descriptive and inferential analytical methods in order to determine whether or not the second-generation bilinguals' mood grammar has changed, and if so, to establish exactly where and how it differs from the first-generation.

The research questions were: 1) Does the subjunctive use of second-generation NYC bilinguals differ from that of their first-generation NYC counterparts? 2) What are the syntactic and communicative contexts in which the subjunctive is used in the first and second generations? 3) What internal and external independent variables condition mood choice in both immigrant generational groups? 4) Is the second generation's use of mood such that grammatical command of mood appears developed and systematic? Or is there evidence of an incomplete or unsystematic mood grammar?

Our findings corroborate the results from other studies centered on generational U.S. subjunctive use: the second generation generates fewer subjunctives and more indicatives than the first-generation, a finding supported by statistical significance. The two generations also differ significantly concerning the internal contexts where mood manifests, but command of mood does appear intact among the majority of the second generation, thus problematizing common notions such as attrition, incomplete acquisition, and to a degree, simplification. Furthermore, analyses concerning several external variables show that the first generation appears essentially homogenous with respect to their use of mood, whereas the second-generation displays far more variability.

Finally, this dissertation contributes to the variationist-sociolinguistic knowledge of Spanish grammar in bilingual settings.

Acknowledgments

First and foremost I'd like to thank Ricardo Otheguy, the adviser for this dissertation study. I studied with Doctor Otheguy from the first semester at the Graduate Center in the fall of 2007 and he has always been extremely patient and helpful in all areas of my academic journey. This dissertation truly would not be possible without the direct guidance and generosity of Doctor Otheguy, especially with respect to the NYC corpus that I was allowed to use for this study.

Furthermore, I'd like to thank the other two members on the committee, Dr. Laura Callahan & Dr. José Del Valle, for their direction not only with this dissertation, but also throughout my academic career at the Graduate Center. These two professors challenged me intellectually with their unique areas of research, vastly contributing to my growth as a well-rounded and open-minded linguist.

Finally, I'd like to acknowledge my fellow Graduate Center Hispanic & Luso-Brazilian Languages & Literatures classmates and colleagues with whom I trudged through five plus years, from 2007 to 2012. Joss Ruggles had an especially important role in this dissertation as she provided much needed knowledge on the nature of statistical analysis and procedure. Also, I extend a very special thanks to Dr. David Quintero at SCCC who sparked my interest in the Spanish language, as well as Dr. Anthony Geist & Dr. Edgar O'Hara at the University of Washington for their years of support and encouragement. And to all the linguistic scholars and their relative investigations, past and present, this world would certainly be a dull place in the absence of your contributions concerning this amazing human phenomenon we like to call language.

Thank you.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	x
Chapter One: Introduction to the Study	1
1. The Problem	1
1.1 Latino New York	2
2. Research Questions & Hypotheses	2
3. Relevance of the Study	4
3.1 Variationist-Sociolinguistic Approach	6
Recapitulation	9
Chapter Two: Review of the Literature	11
Introduction	11
1. Key Works: The Spanish Subjunctive in the U.S.	11
1.1 Carmen Silva-Corvalán	11
1.2 Silvina Montrul	15
1.3 Andrew Lynch	16
1.4 Lourdes Torres	19
1.5 James Lantolf	22
1.6 Recapitulation of Key Works	24
2. Other Noteworthy Investigations	26
Recapitulation	29
Chapter Three: Methodology	31
Introduction	31
1. The Corpus	31

2. Collection Procedures	34
2.1 Descriptive Procedure	35
2.2 Inferential Procedure: Envelope of Variation	38
3. Analysis of Data	41
3.1 Obligatory & Optional Subjunctive Contexts	42
Recapitulation	45
Chapter Four: Findings	47
Introduction	47
1. Descriptive Findings	47
2. LAR & NYR: Separate Groups	53
3. Inferential Findings: Internal Variables	55
4. Inferential Findings: External Variables	62
4.1 Socio-Demographic Variables & Factors	62
4.2 Spanish-use Variables & Factors	65
5. Regional External Variables	66
Recapitulation	69
Chapter Five: Discussion & Conclusions	71
Introduction	71
1. Comparative Analysis of Key Works	71
1.1 Temporal Adverbial Clause	74
1.2 Volitional / Influential Noun Clause	75
1.3 Comment Clause	77
1.4 Protasis Clause	77

1.5 Apodosis Clause	79
1.6 Concessive Clause	82
1.7 Summary	83
2. Answers to Research Questions & Hypotheses	84
2.1 Different Mood Grammars	96
3. Qualitative Considerations	97
3.1 Obligatory Subjunctive Contexts: NYR 417P & NYR 311C	99
3.2 Optional Subjunctive Contexts: NYR 417P & NYR 311C	105
3.3 Fragmented and/or Simplified Mood Grammar	107
3.4 External Variables: NYR 417P & NYR 311C	110
Recapitulation	111
Appendices	115
I. Subjunctive Explained	115
II. Variables	116
III. Factors	118
Bibliography	125

List of Tables

Table 3.2a Verb Forms by Generation	35
Table 3.2b Subjunctive Tense Distribution by Generation	36
Table 3.2c Distribution of Mood for NYR Consultant 379C	36
Table 3.2d Subjunctive Tense Distribution for NYR Consultant 379C	37
Table 3.2e Distribution of Mood for Mainland NYR Consultants	37
Table 3.2f Subjunctive Tense Distribution for Mainland NYR Consultants	38
Table 4.1a Indicative and Subjunctive Verbs by Generation	47
Table 4.1b Indicative and Subjunctive Verbs by Mainland & Generation	48
Table 4.1c Indicative and Subjunctive Verbs by Caribbean & Generation	48
Table 4.1d Distribution of Subjunctive by Tense	49
Table 4.1e Distribution of All Qualifying Tokens by Category – LAR	50
Table 4.1f Distribution of All Qualifying Tokens by Category – NYR	51
Table 4.1g Distribution of Subjunctive by Category	52
Table 4.2a Obligatory Use of the Subjunctive by Generation	54
Table 4.2b Optional Use of the Subjunctive by Generation	54
Table 4.3a Distribution of Subjunctive by Syntactic & Semantic Contexts	56
Table 4.3b Hierarchy of Contexts by Percentage of Subjunctive	58
Table 4.3c Contexts by Largest Percentage-Point Difference	59
Table 4.3d Apodosis Clause in Hypothetical Conditional Sentence	61
Table 4.4a External Variable: English Skill – NYR	63
Table 4.4b External Variable: Education – NYR	64
Table 4.4c External Variable: Spanish Skill – NYR	64

Table 4.4d External Variable: Areal Origin – NYR	64
Table 4.4e External Variable: Spanish Use in General – NYR	65
Table 4.5a Regional External Variable: Spanish Skill – LAR	66
Table 4.5b Regional External Variable: Spanish Skill – LAR	66
Table 4.5c Regional External Variable: Age of Arrival – NYR	67
Table 4.5d Regional External Variable: Sex – LAR	68
Table 4.5e Regional External Variable: Sex – NYR	68
Table 5.2a Hierarchy of Contexts with 90% or More Subjunctive Use by Generation	85
Table 5.3a Mood Distribution in Obligatory Subjunctive Contexts for NYR 417P	100
Table 5.3b Mood Distribution in Obligatory Subjunctive Contexts for NYR 311C	102
Table 5.3c Mood Distribution in Optional Subjunctive Contexts for NYR 417P	105
Table 5.3d Mood Distribution in Optional Subjunctive Contexts for NYR 311C	106

Chapter 1

Introduction to the Study

This introductory chapter presents the conceptualization and grounds for the current dissertation study. We begin with the linguistic problem under investigation, followed by the research questions and hypotheses to be tested, and close with the relevance of our project.

1. The Problem

The present dissertation study deals with the Spanish grammar of second-generation bilinguals in New York City (NYC), comparing it with that of Latin American newcomers to the City. More specifically, the project compares the use of indicative mood (e.g. *él canta*) and subjunctive mood¹ (e.g. *quiero que él cante*) in Spanish-English bilinguals who were born, or raised from early childhood, in NYC, to that of their newly arrived Latin American first-generation counterparts. The reference model against which mood selection among second-generation bilinguals is compared is the usage of first-generation newcomers, not a standard Spanish normative framework. The purpose of our study is to gain an understanding of the underlying grammar of second-generation speakers based on their actual usage of mood.

Situated in the study of Spanish in the U.S. and of language contact in general², this morphosyntactic study is carried out within the variationist-sociolinguistic model pioneered by Labov (1969). The data are from the Otheguy-Zentella corpus, a widely used transcription of 140 naturalistic conversations with Spanish speaking New Yorkers of different generations and Latin American origins. Of these 140 consultants, we use a balanced total of 52 transcriptions for

¹ For a complete explanation of Spanish subjunctive morphology, see Appendix I.

² The latter includes pioneers such as Weinreich (1953) and Haugen (1972); the former more contemporary work from Silva-Corvalán (1994) on Spanish in Los Angeles, California; Otheguy & Zentella (2012) in NYC; Lynch (1999) in Miami, to name a few.

analysis, consisting of 26 consultants from two different groups: newcomers born in Latin America and bilinguals born or raised in NYC. We refer to these groups as first and second immigrant generations, respectively. The consultants represent the six primary Spanish speaking groups in NYC: Puerto Rican, Dominican, Mexican, Ecuadorian, Colombian and Cuban³.

1.1 Latino New York

New York City has a significant bilingual Spanish-English population. The most recent reports from the U.S. Census Bureau indicate that within the five boroughs that make up NYC, there are approximately 2,336,076 Latinos, who make up 28 percent of the city's entire population⁴. Moreover, in the Bronx the number of Latinos constitutes over half of the population, at 54 percent. The data shows that 59 percent of the Latino population is native to the U.S. and 41 percent is foreign born. Given these percentages, it can be concluded that Spanish-English bilingualism is a salient and widespread component of NYC Latino communities⁵.

2. Research Questions & Hypotheses

This dissertation study's objective is to discover whether second-generation bilinguals command mood usage in the same manner as do the members of the first generation. If, however, they do not, we aim to establish exactly where and how they differ. In other words, we study this grammatical feature in order to determine whether or not the second-generation bilinguals' mood grammar has changed when compared to that of the first generation. The research questions that guide the investigation are the following:

³ The nationalities are presented here according to the 2007 U.S. Census Bureau in terms of most to least inhabitants in NYC. Cubans are not specifically named in the census, but are situated in the Other Nationalities category.

⁴ This figure does not account for undocumented Latinos residing in NYC, which are estimated as being as many as 500,000.

⁵ The U.S. Census reported that 47 percent of these populations spoke a language other than English at home.

Q.a) Does the subjunctive use of second-generation NYC bilinguals differ from that of their first-generation NYC counterparts?

Q.b) What are the syntactic and communicative contexts in which the subjunctive is used in the first and second generations? Where is the subjunctive obligatory and where does it alternate with the indicative (and in certain cases, with the conditional as well)?

Q.c) What internal and external independent variables condition mood choice in both immigrant generational groups?

Q.d) Is the second generation's use of mood such that, when compared to that of their first-generation counterparts, grammatical command of mood appears developed and systematic? Or is there evidence of an incomplete or unsystematic mood grammar?

A pilot study addressing these questions was previously undertaken and the results suggested differences in mood usage according to generation. The second-generation consultants, for example, had an over-all reduction in subjunctive usage, resulting in an increased use of the indicative throughout all syntactic and semantic contexts, when compared to the first generation. Furthermore, there appeared to be differences in the distribution of mood in each generation. That is, how and where the subjunctive was used differed between the two groups. For instance, the first-generation consultants produced the subjunctive 100 percent of the time in six syntactic environments, whereas the second generation had only three environments with 100 percent subjunctive usage. Nonetheless, in general the second-generation consultants displayed far more similarities to the first generation than they did differences in their use of mood. In fact, although the second-generation consultants had a percentage-point drop in subjunctive usage compared to the first generation, they often demonstrated complex understandings of mood

choice based on pragmatically subtle differences in the intended message⁶, as well as a nearly identical use of subjunctive tenses⁷. Those findings led us to the hypotheses that the present dissertation explores:

H.1) Second-generation bilinguals command mood choice in Spanish, but the underlying grammar appears to be simplified when compared to that of the first generation⁸.

H.2) Subjunctive use decreases, while indicative use increases, in all syntactic and communicative contexts of the second generation.

H.3) Immigrant generation conditions mood choice more so than does any other variable.

Finally, in order to test these hypotheses and answer the previously stated research questions, we perform thorough quantitative (i.e., test for statistical significance) and qualitative analyses of the data, which are the subjunctive and indicative verb forms produced by first- and second-generation Spanish speakers in NYC.

3. Relevance of the Study

The Spanish spoken in the U.S. has been an area of interest in linguistic investigation for some time now, and for good reason: it offers a variety of study opportunities due to its direct contact with English and with other Spanish varieties, the absence of monolingual Spanish normative pressures, as well as its ongoing social struggles within an English dominant country.

⁶ For example, several second-generation consultants produced both the subjunctive and the indicative in optional subjunctive syntactic & semantic contexts such as possibility, e.g., *quizá viene/venga*, where the mood choice pragmatically determines the message communicated. We further examine this idea in our discussion of the findings, Chapter 5.

⁷ E.g., present *cante*, imperfect *cantara/cantase*, present-perfect *haya cantado* and pluperfect *hubiera/hubiese cantado*.

⁸ SIMPLIFICATION is an important notion in variationist-sociolinguistic studies, especially those situated in language contact settings. Silva-Corvalán uses the term "...to refer to a complex process involving the expansion of a form to a larger number of contexts (i.e., generalization) at the expense of a form undergoing simplification which is used with increasingly lower frequency" (1994:257). Throughout this dissertation we elaborate on this idea and whether it may be symptomatic of a change in the grammar of the second-generation bilinguals.

Scholars from many linguistic fields (such as phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics/pragmatics) have undertaken research in several Spanish-English bilingual cities in the U.S.⁹, and within generativist and variationist-sociolinguistic models. Indeed, generational differences in the use of the Spanish subjunctive have been included among the various linguistic features studied. These investigations, however, often consider only one Latino community¹⁰, disregarding the multitude of Spanish speaking peoples with origins in other Caribbean and Latin American countries. Another limitation of these studies is that standardized Spanish norms are frequently used as the comparative model and grammatical judgment tasks are the source for data collection. Our study takes a different approach to tackle these problems.

First, our investigation analyzes subjunctive use in NYC from all six of the Spanish-speaking groups previously mentioned (see section 1 above). We use natural conversation from a total of 52 consultants as the corpus for data collection- the largest corpus study centered on mood in NYC to date. Second, first-generation's indicative and subjunctive use serves as the comparative model for second-generation analysis. In other words, our findings are determined by actual language use, not by manufactured tests and competence tasks, which often contradict real use. Finally, this project examines the findings both quantitatively and qualitatively within a variationist-sociolinguistic model, presenting empirical conclusions on the genuine bilingual Spanish-English settings in NYC.

⁹ For example, Silva-Corvalán (1995, 1994, 1991, 1986), Gutiérrez (2003), Acevedo (2000), Salvi (1997), and Ocampo (1990) in California; Guitart (1982), García (1977) and Martínez Mira (2009, 2006) in the Southwest; Lynch (2008, 1999) in Miami; Otheguy et al. (2012, 2009, 2007, 2005, 2004, 2003, 2001, 1995, 1993), Lapidus (2005), Flores-Ferrán (2004), Torres (1998), Zentella (2012, 1997, 1990), Garcia (1995), Pousada (1982), Milán (1982) and Lantolf (1978) in NYC; Gragera (2009) in Massachusetts; Puente-Schubeck (1991) in New Mexico; Montrul (2009, 2004, 2002) in Illinois; Mikulski (2010) in the Northeast; Smith (2007) in the Southeast.

¹⁰ In NYC, for instance, the focus of subjunctive use across generations has centered primarily on the bilingual Puerto Rican community (Zentella 1997, Torres 1989, Pousada & Poplack 1982, Milán 1982, and Lantolf 1978).

3.1 Variationist-Sociolinguistic Approach

This project is situated within a variationist-sociolinguistic approach to linguistic study as it deals with speakers' linguistic behaviors within speech communities in which variable speech features exhibit several internal and external conditioning factors. Labov (1969) initiated the study of systemic linguistic variation through which variables and factors are identified in order to probabilistically determine the use of any given variant. This approach suggests that variation is governed by internal and external variables and factors, which can be statistically determined through quantitative analyses. The ultimate objective of variationist-sociolinguistic investigation is to arrive at an understanding of the grammar of the language under study, or, as Sankoff and Cedergren (1976) posit, the rules of competence of the given language. Applying these constructs to a study dealing with syntactic variation, such as the current project, however, presents a number of complications that need discussing.

Silva-Corvalán (2001) discusses the problems involved in realizing a true syntactic variationist study given the difficulties of establishing that two syntactic utterances are indeed SAYING THE SAME THING (Labov 1972). That is, in order for a syntactic study to be considered variationist, a field that began in phonological investigations where two phonological variants truly do mean the same thing, it must be shown that two variants express the same idea, i.e., that there are no semantic or pragmatic differences between the variants. According to this line of thought, labeling the current study exclusively variationist, then, would appear somewhat problematic because it would seem impossible to argue semantic/pragmatic synonymy in what is being communicated when a speaker uses subjunctive or indicative mood. In fact, the opposite is the case: the mood contrast exists, to a certain degree, in order to express differences in the communication. If, however, a grammatical function was incompletely acquired, or has eroded

over time, as Montrul (2009) suggests, the possibility of the two moods acting as variants of the same communication in particular syntactic and/or semantic contexts becomes more plausible. This idea parallels Lynch's (1999, 2008) mention of UNSYSTEMATIC use of mood, i.e., where the subjunctive-indicative dichotomy has eroded and the two moods are being used interchangeably without any noticeable semantic or pragmatic distinctions¹¹.

In the case of our investigation, because one important aspect of the study deals with comparing the second-generation's use of mood to that of the first generation, generational differences in the use of either the indicative or the subjunctive within the same syntactic context creates environments of variation. In other words, if it can be determined that second-generation consultants use the indicative in syntactic and semantic environments where the first-generation group uses only the subjunctive, variation is present because the communication is equivalent. For example, an obligatory subjunctive context for first-generation consultants is the volitional / influential noun clause¹² (e.g., *quiero que cantes*). We discovered that the indicative is used here (e.g., *quiero que cantas*), albeit infrequently, by consultants from the second generation, thus meeting the requirement of a syntactic context with variation. The message relayed appears to be the same, irrespective of the mood used in this context: 'I want you to sing'. The use of the indicative in this particular context, of course, would certainly sound strange to a first-generation consultant, as well as to many from the second generation, and would likely be judged as unacceptable, but the communication would nevertheless remain intact. In contexts where the mood is 100 percent subjunctive for both immigrant generations, analysis is still possible by way

¹¹ We are not proposing that variationist studies are only viable in bilingual situations where incompleteness is a factor. Several investigations have been undertaken in monolingual settings, using the same variationist principles. These comments pertain to our study because we are in a bilingual setting.

¹² The different syntactic and semantic contexts established for this project are presented in Chapter 3, Methodology.

of quantitative comparison, that is, which group uses form X more/less, thus there is no break in the syntactic variationist framework.

The current consensus on what constitutes a variationist-sociolinguistic investigation, however, is not so fundamentally concerned with establishing precise synonymy between variants. Otheguy and Zentella (2012) summarize the objective of variationist-sociolinguistic studies as follows:

For us, the point is that in sociolinguistics, given the discipline's research interests, forms can be treated as variants of a linguistic variable even when the variants differ in content and represent, in particular instances of use, choices by the speaker that are meaningful or rooted in the facilitation of communication. Because sociolinguistics examines the correlation between linguistic variants and contextual and social factors, it matters little where precisely in the continua between equivalence and meaningfulness or between redundancy and functionality one places the consequences of the choice between variants. What matters is that the correlation should be handled insightfully and that it should be revealing with regard to the question under study (2012:63).

We subscribe to this line of thought with our study of mood, under a variationist model, in a situation of language contact and bilingualism.

Finally, regarding our view on the theory of grammar, we conceive of our consultant's mood grammar postulated on the basis of empirical usage data, i.e., a grammar based on their actual language performance as opposed to introspective competence (for a discussion of competence, see Chomsky 1965). A grammar conceived of by way of performance consists of underlying principles that guide language use, which can be postulated by quantitative analyses. Grammar based on intuitions (i.e., relying on self-analysis and judgments) is a method we find

inadequate for the purpose of this dissertation study given the circumstances of the Spanish spoken by the second-generation bilinguals who, for the most part, have little to no formal education in Spanish. That is, the development (or perhaps under-development) of this particular grammatical feature, mood, is completely contingent on its use and function as per the communication within the family and/or community of which the second-generation speaker is a part. We are not proposing, however, that formal education is required for command of mood use in Spanish. Rather, because the second generation likely does not command reading and writing in Spanish, two skills generally necessary for competence based tasks, we center on the oral production of mood in order to describe their grammar. This reality, along with the cross-linguistic and cross-dialectal situation of our consultants, composes our investigation forum.

Recapitulation

The objective of the dissertation is to determine whether or not the NYR group commands mood selection. We achieve this by answering the research questions set forth above and testing the hypotheses developed from the findings of our pilot study (see section 2 of the present chapter for research questions and hypotheses). In its broadest context, our study contributes to the knowledge of Spanish grammar in bilingual settings within the variationist-sociolinguistic model. More specifically, we aim to show whether or not second-generation bilinguals use mood in a systematic manner, symptomatic of a stable grammar; or if mood usage appears random, suggesting an incomplete mood grammar. Also addressed in our study are the widespread concepts associated with subsequent generations known as ATTRITION,

INCOMPLETE ACQUISITION¹³ and SIMPLIFICATION in works focused on bilingualism.

The arrangement of this dissertation is as follows: in Chapter 2 we review the pertinent literature surrounding generational subjunctive mood use in the U.S.; Chapter 3 deals with the methodology developed for data collection and analysis; Chapter 4 presents the relevant findings from the 52 consultants selected for this project; finally, Chapter 5 concerns the discussion and conclusions in terms of our research problems.

¹³ Montrul defines ATTRITION as “...the loss of linguistic abilities at the individual level and across generations” and INCOMPLETE ACQUISITION “[w]hen input to one of the languages in bilingual children is not sufficiently rich and abundant during the period of language development, a language runs the risk of not reaching its full potential” (2009:241-42).

Chapter Two

Review of the Literature

Introduction

In this chapter we review the literature pertaining to our area of study. Linguistic research centered on the subjunctive use by speakers of second and subsequent immigrant generations¹⁴ in the U.S. is, of course, at the forefront of our review as it most closely relates to the current study. These are not, however, the only works considered in our research. The relevant literature on general variationist sociolinguistics has also been examined, including approaches to linguistic study, especially in language contact situations. That is, while this particular review concentrates on studies based on Spanish mood choice in the U.S., other works not of an investigative nature, but rather of a theoretical one, have also been considered in preparation for this dissertation project¹⁵.

1. Key Works: The Spanish Subjunctive in the U.S.

The scholars that have spearheaded the study of the Spanish subjunctive in the U.S. are Carmen Silva-Corvalán (1995, 1994a & 1994b) with her seminal work on Spanish spoken in Los Angeles; Silvina Montrul (2009) working with heritage speakers in Illinois; Andrew Lynch (1999) with his dissertation study on Spanish in Miami; and Lourdes Torres (1989) in NYC and James Lantolf (1978) in Rochester, New York. We review each individually.

1.1 Silva-Corvalán

Silva-Corvalán is likely the most cited and comparative model in respect to mood selection by bilinguals in the U.S. Her investigations have focused on Spanish speakers in Los Angeles, California and have spanned the last several decades. The nature of her data generally

¹⁴ We refer to these speakers using the shorthand subsequent generations.

¹⁵ For a complete list of works, see Bibliography section of this dissertation.

aligns with our own, that is, they are from natural spoken Spanish, as opposed to the experimental tasks and grammaticality judgments often utilized by other scholars in the field. One of her earliest studies (Silva-Corvalán 1994) is cited extensively in the literature, as well as in our own study. We consider this investigation first.

Silva-Corvalán's variationist study focused on the gradual loss of the indicative/subjunctive opposition in the Spanish grammar of bilinguals in Los Angeles, California. The conclusion proposed is that subsequent Spanish speakers in this area are gradually losing the subjunctive, while increasing their use of the indicative, due to the process of simplification, a term that the author uses "...to refer to a complex process involving the expansion of a form to a larger number of contexts (i.e., generalization) at the expense of a form undergoing simplification which is used with increasingly lower frequency" (1994: 257). According to the author, this is a naturally occurring evolution evidenced in the verb systems of Romance languages throughout history. That is, the subjunctive appears to be losing ground everywhere as a result of an internal change observable over the centuries. The situation of language contact, then, is not a direct reason for the gradual loss, although it most likely accelerates the change. Contact is merely one part of a more complex situation in which a subordinate language, in this case Spanish, is exposed to several other external factors, such as overall reduction in situations of use, the absence of normative pressures and education in Spanish, uneven bilingualism, and simplified usage based exclusively on communicational need.

The study shows that immigrant generation, as a predictor variable, is indeed statistically significant with regard to subjunctive usage. Subjunctive mood consistently diminishes from the first to the third generations, and does so in all syntactic and semantic contexts. Furthermore, the author observes that in the areas of the grammar where the subjunctive is categorical, there is

less loss. Where the subjunctive is an option, however, and the use of the indicative is not ungrammatical, more loss is prevalent.

Concerning the methodology of her investigation, data were collected and analyzed from the conversations of 17 Mexican-American consultants divided into three generations: born in Mexico (4); born in U.S. with parents from Mexico (6); and born in U.S. with at least one parent born in U.S. (7). A total of 44 hours were analyzed. The primary independent linguistic variables were:

- syntactic and semantic context
- degree of freedom of choice regardless of pragmatic factors
- adequacy of form chosen in context

The five main contexts identified for the study were:

- obligatory indicative use
- obligatory subjunctive use
- clear meaning differences
- medium meaning differences
- subjective meaning differences

A total of 19 syntactic and semantic contexts were identified in which either the subjunctive or indicative could manifest, but in order for a syntactic and semantic context to be eligible for the investigation, an occurrence of 30 or more tokens in the context was required. This restriction lowered the eligible contexts to a total of 14, which yielded 2,721 tokens of the indicative or the subjunctive. The data were then analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively.

The findings suggest that only four clause types favor consistent retention of the subjunctive in the simplified grammatical system of the subsequent generations:

- volitional (e.g. *quiero que cantes*)
- causative (e.g. *siempre hago que ella cante*)
- purpose (e.g. *para que cantemos*)
- concessive (e.g. *aunque canten*)

The other optional areas seem to undergo reduction of subjunctive use, being replaced by the indicative. That is, the data indicated that due to the closely related meaning between the indicative and subjunctive in optional contexts, the indicative tended to be the winning variant and the subjunctive the losing one.

Silva-Corvalán's 2001 book, *Sociolingüística y pragmática del español*, contains the culmination of her variationist studies in the Mexican-American bilingual community with respect to mood usage. A Los Angeles, California corpus was used to collect data, which were added to those from previous studies on the topic, making a total of 44 hours of conversation from three generations of Mexican-Americans. First-generation speakers' use of mood served as the comparative model for mood use by speakers of the second and third generations. The primary question, addressed within a variationist-sociolinguistic framework, was what linguistic factors promoted the loss, retention or the earlier acquisition of Spanish subjunctive morphology.

The independent linguistic variables for the 2001 study were:

- syntactic context
- level of liberty in selection of mood
- the appropriateness of the selected morphological form in terms of the bigger context in which it occurred

Six contexts were established in which the dependent variable could appear:

- obligatory indicative use

- obligatory subjunctive use
- variable/optional use with distinct changes in the significance according to the mood selected
- clear differences
- intermediate differences
- subjective differences

The results show a gradual decrease in subjunctive use across the generations. However, also noted was a general trend among the first generation for subjunctive loss, which Silva-Corvalán concludes may be a gradual internal process, but one which may be accelerated in contact settings, especially those void of normative standards on the subordinate language (i.e., Spanish).

1.2 Silvina Montrul

Unlike Silva-Corvalán's variationist model, Montrul (2009) works within a generative framework, researching mood selection by what she calls adult heritage speakers, compared to that of native speakers. Her findings show that the adult heritage speakers use mood differently than do the native speakers, an advancement that supports the Regression Hypothesis¹⁶ and the Interface Hypothesis¹⁷. The study analyzed oral and written data from 23 native speakers and 65 Spanish heritage speakers that were born in the U.S. to Mexican parents and were exposed to Spanish until at least age six, and to English thereafter.

¹⁶ Jakobson (1941) proposed this hypothesis regarding the relationship between order of language acquisition and order of language loss. The hypothesis suggests that language acquisition takes place in stages or in a specific order, and that the linguistic features learned later in said acquisition, are the first to undergo loss.

¹⁷ Tsimpli and Sorace (2006) use this hypothesis to address linguistic interface complexities. That is, interface properties between, for example, syntax/discourse, syntax/semantics, etc., and their seemingly vulnerable disposition to attrition, especially with regard to simultaneous bilingual development.

The experimental data for this investigation came from oral production, written elicitation and written interpretation. All groups produced subjunctive forms in the categorical areas, but subjunctive use diminished considerably in optional contexts among the heritage speakers. Montrul concludes that many of the heritage speakers are unstable in terms of their mood knowledge in Spanish, i.e., there is evidence of incomplete acquisition with regard to mood use. These bilinguals do not appear to command the contrast between indicative and subjunctive given the increased rate of indicative use and the general variability between the moods, that is, indicative use where subjunctive is expected and vice-versa. Montrul suggests this perhaps results from both loss and incomplete acquisition: complex grammatical features such as mood are not acquired until later in child development and, if not mastered, are also the first to recede. In other words, at a crucial developmental stage of grammar, the heritage speakers are being educated in English, thus disrupting the acquisition of command of mood choice. Furthermore, given the markedness of subjunctive verb morphology, i.e., its relative infrequent use, it begins to erode over time, being replaced by the much more frequent indicative. In sum, the subtle complexities of the mood interface are not complete in the heritage speaker's mood grammar and, therefore, collapse over time.

1.3 Andrew Lynch

Returning now to variationist studies like those by Silva-Corvalán, only this time centered on bilingual communities in Miami, Florida instead of Los Angeles, California, Andrew Lynch's work (1999) is by far the most extensive and comprehensive sociolinguistic investigation on mood selection and use by different immigrant generations in the U.S. His dissertation study presents the results from data collected from first-, second- and third-generation Cuban-American Miami residents and their use of the subjunctive in categorical and

variable contexts. The aim of the research is to demonstrate areas in which subsequent generations simplify the Spanish mood system. Lynch finds that the subjunctive, and all of its tenses, is in use across all three generations, but that particular contexts demonstrate higher variability between indicative and subjunctive use in the second and third generations. The contexts in which this variability was found statistically significant were:

- adjectival clauses (e.g. *una casa que tenga/tiene piscina*)
- comment clauses (e.g. *es bueno que la casa tenga/tiene piscina*)
- modal usage (e.g. *como quieras/quieres*)

Furthermore, indicative uses in contexts of uncertainty, as well as mood choice in volition clauses, were also discussed.

Based on his findings, Lynch proposes theories on pragmatic/semantic constraints for mood use as the principal conditioning factors for subjunctive usage across all three generations:

- semantic values associated to future (+/- FUTURE)
- reality (+/-IRREALIS)

That is, where the clause is (+FUTURE) or (+IRREALIS), the subjunctive is preferred across all generations; and when the clause is (-FUTURE) OR (-IRREALIS), the indicative is preferred, as seen in the following examples¹⁸.

- (a) Cuando tenga 40 años, voy a vivir en España. (+FUTURE)
- (b) No hay nadie aquí que pueda hacerlo. (+IRREALIS)
- (c) Cuando viene a mi casa, siempre trae comida. (-FUTURE)
- (d) Conozco a alguien que puede hacerlo. (-IRREALIS)

¹⁸ All of the examples in this review are of our own making.

For discourse contexts, he adds the factors of (+/-ARGUMENT) and (+/-RELEVANCE) to the constraint. For instance, in (+ARGUMENT) contexts, the subjunctive will be used if the speaker considers the proposition in the subordinate clause to be (-RELEVANT), as in:

(e) No creo que sea necesario (+ARGUMENT) (-RELEVANT)

Furthermore, when the proposition is (+RELEVANT), but present with (+FUTURE) and/or (+IRREALIS), the subjunctive is also used:

(f) No pienso que vayan a ir al concierto (+ARGUMENT) (+RELEVANT) (+FUTURE)

However, if the argument is (+RELEVANT), with (-FUTURE) and (-IRREALIS), the indicative is expected:

(g) No creo que hay problema. (+ARGUMENT) (+RELEVANT) (-FUTURE)
(-IRREALIS)

The author is careful to reiterate that subjunctive use is present throughout all three generations. There is evidence, however, of simplification in the mood grammar of subsequent generations, with a skewing toward use of the indicative in particular syntactic areas. Lynch points out that this increased indicative usage is not necessarily due to loss, or even attrition, as most of the literature has proposed. Contact with English is also disregarded as a contributing factor to the simplification. According to Lynch, the primary reason for this reduction in the subsequent generations is the weakening or absence of monolingual societal norms and the already present mood variability inherent to Spanish. Furthermore, the scholar insists that the subsequent generations do indeed speak the Spanish language with grammars capable of making mood distinction, but are perhaps more simplified and variable when compared to the mood grammars instantiated by monolingual varieties.

Concerning the study's methodology, it consisted of 30 participants, 10 first-generation, 10 second-generation, and 10 third-generation Cuban-Americans living in the Miami area of Florida. All three generations participated in recorded oral conversations with questions that aimed to trigger subjunctive use. Of the 20 second- and third-generation consultants, 13 were enrolled in Spanish for Heritage Speakers classes at a local university and therefore also took part in a written questionnaire on subjunctive use.

The data were analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively. The author recognizes and discusses the obvious shortcomings of the study, especially in that the majority of the consultants were from the same social class, which did not necessarily represent all Spanish-speakers of the Miami area. Also, the methodology of obtaining data could have been more naturalistic, i.e., from an open conversational setting. Nevertheless, the data certainly provides insight into the bilingual situation of the Miami area and possible linguistic areas in the process of change among subsequent generations.

1.4 Lourdes Torres

Situated in the same city as our research, NYC, Torres (1989) undertakes a variationist investigation centered on mood selection within the bilingual Puerto Rican community. This paper has had an impact on subsequent studies centered on mood choice not only in the City, but also throughout the entire U.S.

The study investigates generational mood selection in *El Barrio*, i.e., the East Harlem neighborhood of Manhattan. The object of the study was to compare the second generation's use of the subjunctive to that of the first generation. The author aimed to avoid an investigation based on prescriptive grammar, thus data were collected from naturalistic conversations, as opposed to through experimental tasks and grammaticality judgments.

The findings suggest that the two generations do not differ significantly in over-all subjunctive usage. Nevertheless, the following syntactic and semantic contexts showed mood variation across the generational groups:

- conditional (e.g. *si fuera rico, viajaría/viajara mucho*)
- doubt (e.g. *no creo que sea/es*)
- indefinite antecedents (e.g. *una persona que sea/es*)
- temporal (e.g. *antes de que vayas/vas*)
- volition (e.g. *quiero que tengas/tienes*)

The author did not attribute the increased use of the indicative by the second generation to language loss or attrition, but rather to pragmatic considerations in mood selection, also applicable to first-generation use. That is, the area of greatest difference with the second generation, the conditional clause, appeared to re-assign the use of the subjunctive only to the apodosis, and the indicative to the protasis (e.g. *si tengo hijos, no fuera de vacaciones*). The first generation, on the other hand, tended to use the subjunctive in both the apodosis and the protasis (e.g. *si tuviera hijos, no fuera de vacaciones*).

In short, while the author indeed validates a difference in subjunctive use by the second generation, the differences appear to be much less significant when compared to the findings from previous studies, which Torres attributes to possible methodological differences (studies not based on natural conversation), and/or an autonomous change in all Spanish varieties, irrespective of their contact with English. In order to study the concept of an autonomous change, the scholar suggests that an Apparent-Time study in a monolingual Spanish community to determine whether or not generational differences exist in mood selection, as compared to mood use in a contact situation (such as in NYC), would be necessary.

Regarding the study's methodology, beyond the aforementioned data gathering technique, the participants consisted of 10 adults from Puerto Rican families living in East Harlem (*El Barrio*). Four were considered first generation, that is, having arrived to NYC as teenagers, and were between 45-55 years of age at the time of the study. The other six consultants made up the second-generation group, all born in NYC and between the ages of 21-30 at the time of the study. Roughly three hours of oral conversation were collected, transcribed and analyzed for each participant, rendering a total of 30 hours. The first-generation group produced 7,006 verbs with 332 of them in the subjunctive (4.7 percent). The second-generation group had 4,951 verbs with 194 in the subjunctive (4 percent). A total of 10 syntactic-semantic contexts were defined for subjunctive use:

- volition (e.g. *quiero que vayas*)
- indirect commands (e.g. *que te vayas*)
- hope clauses (e.g. *ojalá puedas*)
- doubt clauses (e.g. *dudo que lo hagas*)
- emotion clauses (e.g. *me alegro de que vayas*)
- purpose clauses (e.g. *para que tengas*)
- temporal sequence (e.g. *después de que termines*)
- concession clauses (e.g. *aunque seas*)
- indefinite antecedents (e.g. *un coche que tenga*)
- condition clauses (e.g. *si hubiera sabido, no hubiera/habría ido*)

The first generation used the subjunctive over 90 percent of the time in nine out of 10 of the contexts (only 78 percent in doubt clauses). The second generation, however, used the subjunctive 90 percent of the time in only four out of the 10 contexts (indirect, emotion, purpose,

and concession). These findings lead Torres to conclude that the difference in subjunctive use by generation is seen in the reduction of syntactic/semantic contexts in which the subjunctive is used categorically, or at least over 90 percent of the time. In other words, and in line with Lynch's position, the subsequent generations still largely use the subjunctive mood as does the first generation, but their use is reduced, or simplified, in terms of its frequency and the specific contexts in which both moods are permitted.

1.5 James Lantolf

Another investigation based on bilingual Puerto Ricans in NY is Lantolf (1978). Although this piece is considered a dated study, the findings are relevant to our project.

The study was realized in 1976 on the use of the indicative and subjunctive moods in the Spanish of Puerto Rican Americans residing in Rochester, New York. The findings were compared to those of García & Terrell's (1974) investigation on Mexican-American subjunctive usage, as well as to 20 Spaniards from Seville. The aim of the investigation was to study the competence of the speakers' mood use and, through empirical evidence, present any factors that may condition mood selection. The author concludes that mood choice appears to be based on semantic factors. That is, the data show that subjunctive and indicative mood forms are not in complementary distribution; nor that the choice is syntactically determined. Lantolf proposes that mood use, therefore, must be meaningful.

The idea that mood choice is a matter of meaning, a now commonly accepted notion, was however an innovative theory at the time of this study in the seventies. Before this advancement, Spanish mood choice was believed to be exclusively syntactic in nature. That is, the theory postulated that the mood of the verb situated in the subordinate clause would be determined by the verb in the main, or matrix clause. Lantolf does not completely disregard this syntactic theory

on mood selection; rather, he expands on it, suggesting that mood choice is not only governed syntactically, but also by semantic and pragmatic properties of the sentence.

Regarding Lantolf's findings, the author found that due to diminished Spanish normative pressure in the U.S., mood distinctions seemed to be collapsing in certain linguistic contexts, but were still subject to certain linguistic constraints. The constraints were primarily the same as those found in García & Terrell, namely:

- a preference for the indicative in assertive propositions (e.g. *yo veo que estás lista*)
- subjunctive in volition clauses (e.g. *quiero que te despiertes*)
- variable mood in doubt contexts (e.g. *es posible que tenga/tiene las llaves*)

Tense was also a constraint. Both consultant groups used the indicative the most in the preterit, but the future was a constraint for the Mexican-American group. Finally, age was shown to be a considerable external linguistic constraint on mood choice. Younger speakers used the indicative much more, an indication that the mood system is changing in favor of the indicative. There is also mention of constructional variation, i.e., a preference for constructions that avoid the use of the subjunctive altogether (often referred to as Avoidance Strategy).

Concerning the methodology for this study, data collection was in the form of a questionnaire, which the author defended by stating that although a questionnaire may not serve as an accurate portrayal of the actual speech used in the community, it does offer insight into the competence of the system of the speakers, i.e., their knowledge/awareness of a particular grammatical feature. There were 188 informants and they were stratified by:

- age
- sex
- language spoken at home

- level of education
- number of years in U.S.
- place of birth
- social class

The task was to circle the mood of the verb in three different syntactic contexts (examples presented above): assertion, doubt, and volition.

As briefly mentioned earlier, the results showed a gradual preference of indicative the further away from the category of volition. The author also recognized the importance of larger external factors on mood choice such as: linguistic and social history; political and sociological factors involved in the formation of the norms of a speech community; and, as previously mentioned both here and in the other literature in this review, possible effects due to loss of contact with the norms of a Spanish monolingual society. The author contended that the Mexican-American varieties appeared to be experiencing a more intense change in their mood contrast, with a heavier skewing toward the indicative, than that of the Puerto Rican Americans, but that a general change in the direction of an indicative system was (is) in the making.

1.6 Recapitulation of Key Works

The above reviewed studies are of critical importance concerning the investigation of mood use in bilingual Spanish-English settings in the U.S. The majority of the investigations were realized within the variationist-sociolinguistic model, save Montrul and aspects of Lantolf who used experimental tasks and grammaticality judgments as instruments for data collection. Nevertheless, each work provides valuable insight into the problem at hand: generational distinctions in Spanish mood use in the U.S. The common aim of these investigations was to

look at how and where the subsequent generations of bilinguals used mood when compared to some sort of monolingual model.

The precise findings vary from one study to the next, but there is a general observation of reduction in the use of the subjunctive in particular syntactic and semantic contexts consistent throughout all of the investigations. The terms used to describe this finding, and the reasons postulated for it, differ according to the scholar. Montrul, for instance, speaks of attrition and incomplete acquisition as reasons for a reduced subjunctive output in her studies. Further, Montrul's stance is that mood selection by subsequent generations is unstable and, therefore, indicates the existence of a problem, for example incomplete acquisition. The other four linguists, however, posit a variable mood grammar, variability being considered normal for all grammars. They use the terms simplification and/or reduction to describe the subsequent generation's grammar. Furthermore, these four sociolinguists take into consideration external variables and factors in the interpretation of their data. One such common variable consistent throughout their works was the absence of monolingual societal normative pressures in the shaping of their mood grammar. In other words, for these linguists, the findings are not so much couched in terms of the incompleteness or attrition of the mood grammar of consultants, but rather the different, yet still intact, nuances of their mood grammar in a unique linguistic setting.

These five studies have played pivotal roles in the formation of our own research and methodology. They are not, however, the only studies centered on bilingual U.S. The following sections provide brief overviews and commentary on the other works that have investigated generational subjunctive use in bilingual U.S. cities and communities.

2. Other Noteworthy Investigations

The previous sections provided detailed reviews of the principal studies centered on subjunctive use in the U.S. Yet these are not the only investigations centered on our area of interest. The design for the remaining sections, therefore, is to present a general overview of other works situated directly within the study problem. In order to facilitate the review of these works, we will group together and briefly comment on studies based on their similarities in terms of the bilingual community under investigation. We begin with those focused on Spanish subjunctive use by Mexican-Americans, which is without a doubt the most investigated Spanish-speaking group in the U.S.A.

The state of California is no stranger to linguistic study given its notable bilingual situation and its massive population of peoples with Mexican origins. Indeed, Los Angeles (L.A.) tends to be a hot spot regarding linguistic phenomena and their resulting investigations, such as those realized by Silva-Corvalán (see above). Other such studies based on subjunctive use in L.A. are Zabaleta (2000), Salvi (1997), Gutiérrez (1990), and Ocampo (1990).

The findings from these four studies substantiate a reduction, or simplification, in the subjunctive mood grammar of the subsequent generations. That is, the output of the subjunctive mood decreased, while the indicative mood increased, the further away from the first generation. The investigations show that the subsequent generations do generate subjunctive uses, i.e., their mood grammar is still active, albeit at a reduced level when compared to the monolingual varieties of Spanish. Where these studies differ, however, is in their methodologies.

Ocampo and Gutiérrez used natural conversation for data analyses, whereas Zabaleta and Salvi used grammatical judgment tasks and controlled experiments to elicit mood use. Further, Ocampo used Silva-Corvalán's corpus, studying three generations of Mexican-Americans.

Gutiérrez also collected data from three generations, but had only 10 oral conversations. On the other hand, Zabaleta and Salvi's investigations had consultants from two generations, the first generation acting as the monolingual Spanish comparative model.

Moving away from California and into other bilingual regions of the U.S., we find subjunctive mood investigations throughout the country:

- Martínez-Mira (2006) in New Mexico and Illinois
- Puente-Schubeck (1991) in New Mexico
- Jorge Guitart (1982) in Miami and Texas
- García & Terrel (1977) in Texas
- Mikulski 2010a & b in the Northeast U.S.

The results from these studies support what we have been continually seeing: a reduced subjunctive usage the more removed from the monolingual generation. All of these studies were in a written and/or grammatical judgment tasks format and looked at two generations (second generation, also referred to as heritage speakers, and first generation or monolinguals), except Puente-Schubeck, who used both grammatical judgment tasks and natural oral conversation, as well as three generations of Mexican-American families.

We turn now to the final two investigations reviewed in this chapter, which concern Caribbean-American bilinguals in the U.S. Gragera (2009) deals with Spanish speakers of a Puerto Rican community situated in Western Massachusetts. Also centered on the Puerto Rican community, Pousada and Poplack (1982) study the Puerto Rican variety of Spanish spoken in NYC. Both studies confirmed a reduction of subjunctive mood use, i.e., simplification appeared salient. The question of whether or not English contributes directly to the reduction, a question addressed by several of the investigations, is answered in the negative: it would appear that

contact of the two grammar systems does not have a direct impact on subjunctive output. That is, English grammar is not causing reduction and simplification of the subjunctive – it is merely circumstantial and externally influential in that it is the dominant language used in the U.S.

Regarding the methodologies applied in these two investigations, like the other studies, these also differ. Gragera used questionnaires and grammatical judgments to collect data from 71 bilinguals and 16 speakers of Spanish as a second language. The scholar attempted to reveal a nexus between L1 & L2 acquisition in terms of markedness. This hypothesis, however, was not corroborated by the study. The author did, however, conclude that both internal (linguistic) and external (social) variables had an important role in language acquisition. Pousada and Poplack, on the other hand, took a comparative look at verb usage among several different groups:

- monolingual speakers of Spanish as spoken in Puerto Rico
- bilinguals in NYC
- monolingual English speakers
- fifteenth-century Peninsular Spanish
- modern Andalusia Spanish
- prescriptive grammars

Verbs were collected from all of these sources and were analyzed to empirically show where similarities and differences manifested. The authors' findings show that there is no quantitative sign of convergence of the bilingual variety with English in terms of the verb systems. That is, in order for convergence to be present, one verb feature in the Spanish of bilinguals would have to be similar to an English system's feature, but different from the standard Spanish system. This was not the case as the data showed that the verb system across all the Spanish corpora revealed no significant differences, but the verb usage in Spanish was significantly different than that of

English. Finally, there were signs of less subjunctive use in bilinguals' Spanish than in other Spanish sources, but it was not statistically significant.

Recapitulation

Bilingual Spanish subjunctive use in the U.S. has received considerable linguistic attention in recent years. In this chapter, we have outlined and reviewed the central investigations on this specific grammatical feature. Although the research methods and the specific findings of the studies fluctuate relative to the area in which the investigation took place, the data collection and analytical procedures, the general aim of the study, the community under investigation etc., the hypothesis of a simplification in the subjunctive mood grammar of subsequent bilingual generations in the U.S. is corroborated in each of the reviewed investigations. That is, the decline in subjunctive use and the consequent increase of indicative use is consistent throughout all of the studies, irrespective of their different methodological measures. We have also noted that Mexican-American bilinguals have received the most investigative attention, but that the same results are also present in the Spanish of bilinguals with origins in the Caribbean.

Concerning our own study, we model much of our methodology based on a combination of these previous studies. The investigative measures that used natural conversations and considered both internal and external variables serve as our primary models, although we certainly keep in mind the findings from all of these studies. There has not yet been an investigation, however, that deals with several different varieties in contact not only with English, but also with one another, and the resulting linguistic phenomena this contact situation manifests. This is precisely what our dissertation study deals with. By analyzing this grammatical feature in natural conversation from the six different Spanish-speaking groups in

NYC involved in our investigation, we contribute to the variationist-sociolinguistic field with our comprehensive findings of the unique bilingual situation present in NYC.

We move now to the methodology section of the dissertation in which we present the measures taken in order to realize our investigation. Several of the studies just reviewed will be revisited in our comparative analysis of our findings with theirs, in Chapter 5.

Chapter Three

Methodology

Introduction

This chapter presents the methods used to carry out this dissertation study. The first section describes the corpus and the consultants used for our project. Section two explains the data collection procedure, the envelope of variation and the principle of accountability and uses tables from our pilot study in order to illustrate the collection process¹⁹. Finally, in section three the steps taken in the analysis procedure are explained.

1. The Corpus

This study contributes to on-going work by a team of investigators at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York on Spanish in NYC. We analyze in the present study the transcribed oral conversations of a total of 52 first- and second-generation Spanish-speaking consultants, 26 from each immigrant generation, taken from the Otheguy-Zentella corpus: a stratified sample of Spanish speakers, all NYC residents, developed at the Graduate Center using funds from the National Science Foundation (NSF). Several publications have used the corpus as the basis for research, including the recently Oxford published book *Spanish in New York: Language Contact, Dialectal Leveling, and Structural Continuity* by Ricardo Otheguy and Ana Celia Zentella (2012). Our study, therefore, should be seen in the light of this larger investigative effort.

In an attempt to maintain as balanced a sample as possible, we use an equal number of consultants based on their country of origin in Latin America and categorize them into two primary regions: Caribbean (Puerto Rico, Dominican Republic and Cuba); and Mainland

¹⁹ For more on the pilot study, refer back to Chapter 1, section 2.

(Mexico, Ecuador and Colombia)²⁰. That is, for both the first-generation group, labeled LAR for ‘Latin American Raised’, and the second-generation group, labeled NYR for ‘New York Raised’, we analyze the following: 6 Puerto Ricans (total of 12); 4 Dominicans (total of 8); 4 Cubans (total of 8); 4 Mexicans (total of 8); 4 Ecuadorians (total of 8); and 4 Colombians (total of 8), which yields a final total of 52. Control for gender is possible for the NYR group (13 males and 13 females), but not for the LAR group (18 males and 8 females). The complete list of stratification guidelines for the entire corpus (but not necessarily balanced among our 52 consultants) included:

- gender
- national origin
- areal origin
- age of arrival
- years in NYC
- social class
- years of education
- English skills
- amount of Spanish use in different areas of everyday life

Following Otheguy & Zentella (2012), our first-generation informants are those who arrived to NYC at age 16 or older and had remained in the City less than six years at the time of the interview (LAR). The second-generation consultants are New Yorkers, having been born in NYC or brought there before age three (NYR). The notion backing these criteria is that the members of

²⁰ We recognize the problematic notion of these all-encompassing broad terms and our aim is not to argue these groupings as factual entities. Rather, we use these labels in order to facilitate analysis and discussion at the macro level.

the LAR group reflect the monolingual Latin-American variety, or the REFERENCE LECT²¹, from their respective countries. They arrived to NYC with a fully developed mood grammar and had spent an insufficient amount of time in contact with English to experience any serious contact effect. The NYR group, however, was raised in a bilingual setting, but one in which English is the dominant language, prompting the question of whether or not these consultants have acquired a full Spanish mood grammar, i.e., patterns of mood usage that approximate the LAR group, or if not, patterns that are full in terms of their own systematic usage. Our study focuses precisely on this problem, aiming to provide an answer to this question.

In previous studies centered on language acquisition, in both monolingual and bilingual settings, the consensus for ages of primary linguistic development is from birth until four years old; ages four to 13 are considered years of later language development, typically in pre-school and subsequent schooling²² (Mikulski 2010, Montrul 2009, & Blake 1980). Regarding the Spanish subjunctive, Montrul (2009) indicates that "...subjunctive morphology emerges before age 3 with commands and other temporal and purpose expressions...However, the full spectrum of uses and subtleties of subjunctive knowledge...are not acquired until much later, well after the age of 8 years both in production and comprehension" (247). These age frameworks coincide with the reasoning for our generation criteria, especially in terms of subjunctive grammar development. According to these acquisition concepts, our LAR group reflects the full command of Spanish subjunctive use, arriving to NYC at age 16 or older (i.e., far past age 8); whereas the NYR group's development and command of the subjunctive in the subordinate language,

²¹ We adopt this term from Otheguy & Zentella (2012:10).

²² This does not mean, however, that those without schooling do not command certain linguistic features. That is, formal education is not a requirement with regard to the general development of a grammar. What is highlighted here are the ages during which specific grammatical features have been shown to develop, although formal education most likely contributes to the stability of particular variable features, especially the more complex ones.

Spanish, are questionable given the bilingual setting in which they were born or brought to before age three. Indeed, although Spanish is certainly well fortified in the communities of these consultants (family, friends, local community etc.), English is still the dominant language, especially with regard to the schools these consultants have attended long before the ages of complete subjunctive development mentioned above.

Concerning quantity of data, our pilot study investigated only 24 consultants, 12 from each generational group, which provided over 18,000 inflected verb forms. By more than doubling the number of consultants (24 in the pilot, 52 for the current dissertation) and, therefore, the verbs (now over 43,000), both the quantity and the quality of data for this dissertation project have proven effective. Regarding inferential statistical analyses, we identify new internal syntactic independent variables and their individual factors that are particularly relevant to the study of the dependent variable, which is mood (subjunctive or indicative), but retain for the most part the external independent variables previously established in Otheguy & Zentella (2012). See Appendices II and III for a complete list and description of all variables and factors included in the statistical analysis of this dissertation study.

2. Collection Processes

Because the principal aim of this study is to show subjunctive usage patterns according to generation in NYC, quantitative and qualitative analyses of the data are necessary. Therefore, our collection method entails two different procedures: one descriptive in nature; the other inferential, framed by the criteria that we used to establish the envelope of variation for our study. We will describe each of these procedures separately, beginning with the descriptive procedure.

2.1 Descriptive Procedure

This process involves the attentive perusal of each of the 52 transcripts individually, tallying every inflected verb, irrespective of mood (i.e., all indicative, subjunctive and conditional forms). The goal of this task is to acquire a final count for each mood in order to determine over-all similarities and differences between generations. To demonstrate, we present the verbs collected for our pilot study in the following table²³.

Table 3.2a Verb Forms, by Generation	LAR N Verbs	% of Verb Form	NYR N Verbs	% of Verb Form
Subjunctive	722	8	437	5
Indicative	8265	91	8677	94
Conditional	114	1	88	1
Total	9101	100	9202	100

Table 3.2a, taken from the pilot study, shows, by generation, the numbers and percentages for all verbs found in the subjunctive, indicative and conditional (e.g., *tenga*, *tengo*, *tendría*, respectively). Because this step is exclusively descriptive, only mood was tallied, not taking into consideration the contexts in which the mood manifested. This information is germane with respect to a comprehensive picture of mood use by generation. This table indicates that the NYR group used the subjunctive less frequently than the LAR group (five percent vs. eight percent, respectively); the indicative more (94 percent vs. 91 percent, respectively); and the conditional the same (one percent & one percent).

Also tallied is the verb tense for each of the subjunctives produced by speakers from the two generations. Again we use the results from the pilot study (Table 3.2b below) in order to exemplify the reasoning for this procedure.

²³ Again, we use tables from our pilot study in this chapter for explanatory purposes only. We reserve discussion of the current study's findings for the following two chapters.

Table 3.2b Subjunctive Tense Distribution, by Generation	LAR N Verbs	% of Subjunctive Tense	NYR N Verbs	% of Subjunctive Tense
Present	605	84	377	86
Imperfect	97	13	49	11
Pluperfect	11	2	10	2
Present Perfect	9	1	1	1
Total	722	100	437	100

Looking at overall generational subjunctive tense distribution provides insight into the mood grammar of the consultants. For instance, the pilot study tally presented in Table 3.2b shows nearly identical subjunctive tense frequencies by both generations.

These same two descriptive procedures are also applied on an individual and a national origin level (i.e., at micro and macro levels, respectively) for all 52 consultants. To illustrate, Tables 3.2c and 3.2d show the complete mood distribution at a micro level for one random NYR consultant, 379C²⁴:

Table 3.2c Distribution of Mood for NYR Consultant 379C	N Verbs	% of Verb Form
Subjunctive	97	15
Indicative	550	84
Conditional	10	1
Total	657	100

²⁴ The letter attached to the consultant number represents their national origin. The codes are as follows: P for Puerto Rico, D for Dominican Republic, U for Cuba, M for Mexico, E for Ecuador and C for Colombia.

Table 3.2d Subjunctive Tense Distribution for NYR Consultant 379C	N Verbs	% of Subjunctive Tense
Present	93	96
Imperfect	4	4
Pluperfect	0	0
Present Perfect	0	0
Total	97	100

This specific consultant's inflected verb output was a total of 657 conjugated verbs: 97 in the subjunctive, 550 in the indicative and 10 in the conditional. Of the 97 subjunctive verb forms, 93 were used in the present tense and only four in the imperfect. This type of descriptive analysis allows a meticulous review of mood use on a case-by-case scale, a crucial step for qualitative analyses.

Finally, the same protocol was applied at a macro level, i.e., with the national origins within the generations (Mainland and Caribbean). The following two tables are examples of the totals for the Mainland NYR consultants only²⁵.

Table 3.2e Distribution of Mood for Mainland NYR Consultants	N Verbs	% of Verb Form
Subjunctive	582	5
Indicative	10262	94
Conditional	117	1
Total	10961	100

²⁵ These tables serve as an example only; we therefore do not present the other national origin now (Caribbean), retaining those findings for the following chapter.

Table 3.2f Subjunctive Tense Distribution for Mainland NYR Consultants	N Verbs	% of Subjunctive Tense
Present	510	88
Imperfect	53	9
Pluperfect	15	2
Present Perfect	4	1
Total	582	100

Table 3.2e shows the combined total of all inflected verbs produced by NYR consultants from Mexico, Ecuador and Colombia: 10,961. Table 3.2f presents the distribution of the 582 subjunctive forms in terms of tense. This procedure provides access to comparative measures both across generations and within the same generation. That is, by analyzing the consultants in terms of region, we are able to pinpoint variation within the groups for a more accurate interpretation of potential variation across generational groups.

2.2 Inferential Procedure: Envelope of Variation

Concerning the inferential procedure, we adhere to the notion of the ENVELOPE OF VARIATION (Bayley 2002, Labov 1972, Tagliamonte 2006, cited in Otheguy & Zentella 2012), which is described as “...the items that are legitimate candidates for coding and statistical treatment in the study of a linguistic variable” (2012:29). For our study, the linguistic variable (dependent variable) is mood choice, i.e., subjunctive or indicative morphology in finite verbs (and sometimes the conditional, which will be explained shortly). However, establishing what tokens qualify for statistical analysis, which is the crux of the present variationist study, is a task that requires detailed explanation.

Because this is a study centered on subjunctive use by generation, all finite verb tokens in the subjunctive form and their corresponding contexts are considered inside the envelope of variation, thus always included in the analysis. Indicative and conditional verbs, however, must be found in a variable environment in order to qualify. Examples will assist in clarifying this procedure²⁶.

(1) que Dios **haga** que él **pueda** venir antes de yo ir – LAR 381D

(2) aunque no te **voy** a negar – LAR 381D

(3) Bueno *hay* dos cosas que *son* ..., una *es* el idioma, y otra *es* – LAR 381D

(4) *Diría* yo, algo así, pero nada – LAR 381D

Example (1) demonstrates two subjunctive verb forms (*haga and pueda*) that automatically qualify as being inside the envelope of variation by virtue of simply containing subjunctive morphology. Example (2) is an example of a concessive clause, a context where either mood is plausible (e.g., *aunque no te vaya a negar*, with subjunctive *vaya*). The indicative verb, *voy*, is therefore inside the envelope of variation and included in the study because it alternates with a subjunctive. Example (3) demonstrates four verbs (*hay, son, es, and es*) that are outside of the envelope of variation. There is no logical syntactic, semantic or pragmatic reason to expect the use of a subjunctive verb form in these contexts. The same is the case with example (4), which shows the use of a conditional (*diría*) in a non-hypothetical context (i.e., not in the apodosis of a hypothetical sentence). The presence of a subjunctive verb form is not an option with the verbs in examples (3) and (4), therefore they are merely tallied to be included in the over-all verb count for the descriptive analysis, described above in section 2.1 of the present chapter.

²⁶ Qualifying verbs are in **bold** and underlined. *Italicized* verbs are outside of the envelope of variation and are tallied only.

A note on the rationale behind considering the conditional separately: most contemporary grammarians agree that the conditional is an indicative verb form. In general, we do not pretend to challenge this position by our separate treatment of conditionals. Rather, when analyzing hypothetical sentences containing a protasis and an apodosis, it becomes evident that a distinction between an indicative and a conditional verb form is necessary. Consider the following sentences produced by an LAR consultant and an NYR consultant, respectively:

(5) Si yo **hubiera** crecido, ¿quién **sería** yo? – LAR 317M

(6) Bueno, yo *puse* es... el idioma en español, pero no me lo *dieron* porque como yo *estuve* en clase de honores, no me *podieron* dar español, si **cogía** español, me **tuvieron** que quitar un curso de honor y *es* bueno estar en los cursos de honores porque... – NYR 201U

Both of these sentences are hypothetical, however there is a clear difference between the use of the conditional (*sería*) in example (5), and the indicative in example (6) (*tuvieron*). It is obvious that the use of the conditional in the apodosis has a distinct function when compared to the use of the indicative in the same context. That is, if we were to count the two as indicatives, we would be unable to differentiate between the use of indicative *tuvieron* and the more conventional conditional form *sería*. We have decided, therefore, to keep the two separate in contexts that fall inside the envelope of variation.

Regarding the process involved in determining the inclusion and exclusion of a token and the contexts in which to situate it, we comply with the PRINCIPLE OF ACCOUNTABILITY (Bayley 2002, Labov 1982, Tagliamonte 2006, cited in Otheguy & Zentella 2012), which states that the collection must be consistent, legitimate and as neutral as possible. In other words, the researcher is required to consider every instance of the token under study, irrespective of its

abnormality or unconventional usage. We apply this principle not only to the collection of data, but also to the syntactic and semantic contexts in which the data is situated, and for both consultant groups.

3. Analysis of Data

For the present study, the obligatory and optional syntactic and semantic contexts into which we divide our consultants' use of mood forms are based on the first-generation's selection and use of mood. We believe this to be an important approach because it permits the formation of obligatory and optional syntactic and semantic contexts for subjunctive use according to the actual subjunctive speech patterns produced by first-generation consultants, rather than taking an a priori approach where our own judgments would skew the collection and analysis of data. Additionally, in our description of subjunctive use across generations, we aim to avoid making statements such as "misuse in production", "non-native-like" and "errors" often found in this type of research literature (cf. Montrul 2009:260-67). That is, this dissertation study's objective does not include a prescriptive appraisal of the Spanish spoken by either generation, especially with regard to what may be considered "correct" within a normative framework. The intention of our study is to provide unbiased descriptions and findings based on natural Spanish language production in NYC.

Constructed from the findings of the pilot study, we work with 19 syntactic and semantic contexts. The categories obligatory and optional, as we just mentioned, are based on mood use by the first-generation consultants. For the present study, an obligatory context is one where, among the LAR consultants, a subjunctive was found in at least 90 percent of verb tokens occurring in that context. All other syntactic and semantic contexts, that is, those in which the

subjunctive is found in less than 90 percent of the verb forms by the first generation, make up the optional contexts²⁷. These contexts, and examples of each, are as follows.

3.1 Obligatory & Optional Subjunctive Contexts

OBLIGATORY SUBJUNCTIVE CONTEXTS

- Discourse Marker *sea* or *vaya*²⁸
- Purpose / Contingency Adverbial clause *para que vengan, a que vengan, con tal de que vengan* etc.
- Indirect Command *que vengan, dijo que vinieran, ha pedido que vengan* etc.
- Volitional / Influential Noun clause *quiere que vengan, espera que vengan, deseaba que vinieran* etc.
- Temporal Adverbial clause with Futurity *cuando vengan, hasta que vengan, antes de que vengan* etc.
- Imperative in subjunctive *vengan, no venga, no vengas*²⁹
- Protasis clause in Hypothetical conditional sentence *si vinieran, si hubieran venido*
- Hypothetical *como si* clause *como si vinieran*
- Causative clause *hace que vengan, hacía que vinieran* etc.

²⁷ It could be argued that a 90 percent usage rate does not indicate a true obligatory subjunctive use. The decision to consider this percentage restriction is based on the possibility of a margin of error. That is to say, although the dichotomy between subjunctive and indicative mood is grammatical, mood distinction is often based on a minimal phonological distinction, i.e., one vowel (e.g., indicative *habla* vs. subjunctive *hable*; indicative *hablaron* vs. subjunctive *hablaran* etc.). The possibility of a simple orthographical mistake in the transcription is, therefore, plausible. Nevertheless, the frequency of first-generation indicative verb forms situated in obligatory subjunctive syntactic and semantic contexts was extremely low and, therefore, inconsequential.

²⁸ These are the only two discourse markers found in our sample.

²⁹ All imperatives, except for affirmative *tú* ‘you’ (*habla* ‘talk’, *come* ‘eat’ etc.), are included. Affirmative *tú* commands were included in the indicative count. There were no instances of *vosotros* ‘you’ (plural informal) usage in our sample.

OPTIONAL SUBJUNCTIVE³⁰

- Modal clause *como quieran, lo que quieran, como que quieran, quisieran pedir* etc.
- Adjective clause of Nonexistent or Indefinite Antecedent *busco un hombre que quiera* etc.
- Comment clause *me gusta que quieran ir, es triste que quieran ir, era bueno que quisieran* etc.
- Apodosis clause in Hypothetical conditional sentence *si..., quisiera ir, si..., hubiera querido ir*
- Negated Noun clause *no es que no quieran, no digo que no quieran, no hay manera de que quieran* etc.
- Possibility clause *es posible que quieran, tal vez/quizá quieran, a lo mejor quieran* etc.
- Protasis clause in Concessive sentence *aunque quieran*
- Uncertainty clause *no creo que quieran, no sé si quieran* etc.
- Locative clause *una escuela donde quiera*
- Subordinate clause after *Depende depende de cómo quieran*

In view of the fact that the specific criterion of obligatory and optional is grounded on first-generation use of the subjunctive, these two categories are not as rigidly applicable to the second-generation consultants' mood grammar because, as we will see in the following chapter (Findings), their mood grammar is more variable. That is, second-generation speakers use indicatives in some first-generation obligatory contexts, thus, for them, the range of optional contexts has expanded.

³⁰ All of the examples in the optional category are presented with the subjunctive; however, the indicative is also found in each of the contexts here. Furthermore, for apodosis clauses, the conditional, the subjunctive and the indicative are all variables.

Regarding variation between subjunctive and indicative verb forms in an obligatory subjunctive context, the general possibility of an indicative verb form manifesting seems contradictory or illogical given the inherent meaning of the term obligatory. This is only true, however, with discourse markers (generally limited to *o sea* and *vaya*³¹) and imperatives³² (with subjunctive morphology), neither of which alternate with the indicative. Variation, although rare and nearly exclusively limited to the second generation, as mentioned above, is nevertheless observed in all of the other obligatory contexts. These two contexts of zero variation (discourse markers & imperatives) are included in the study because we are interested in genuine subjunctive use, as described above in section 2.1. The remaining 17 contexts, however, permit variation between the two verb forms (subjunctive & indicative). Because we are interested in HOW, WHERE and possibly WHY the subjunctive is used in particular contexts by the two generations, it is crucial to gather all instances of subjunctive use, regardless of the type of context in which it manifests.

Finally, in keeping with contemporary variationist study methods, our investigation will take both qualitative and quantitative measures for data analysis. For the former, we provide descriptive observations on a macro scale, such as those discussed above in section 2.1 and illustrated in the pilot study tables. Individual consultants of particular interest to our study are also examined, this at the level of micro description. The latter, quantitative analyses, is achieved through inferential examination of data included inside the envelope of variation (part of the inferential procedure explained above in sections 2.2 & 3). We use the computer program SPSS³³

³¹ *Vaya* is also the imperative form of the verb *ir*, but its use as a discourse marker is clear and could not be misinterpreted as a command, or vice-versa.

³² We consider *usted*, *ustedes* and negated *tú* commands, which are morphologically subjunctive forms.

³³ Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.

for the quantification of our data, a pivotal step in the presentation of sound findings within the sociolinguistic paradigm. The inferential analyses include two different approaches: data analysis of internal variables, and data analysis of external variables. For the internal analysis, the SPSS file is a verb file only, i.e., each individual verb token constitutes its own individual line and has a corresponding context line from which the token was originally located in the corpus. In order to realize accurate statistical analyses for external variables, however, we use an informant-level file that consists of percent averages of subjunctive use for each individual consultant in each category (obligatory and optional). In other words, a separate SPSS file is created with a total of 52 lines with two dependent variables: average of subjunctive in obligatory contexts and average of subjunctive in optional contexts; along with all of the external variables³⁴.

Given the thorough stratification of our sample, statistically significant findings can be seen as permitting valid projections of the results from the sample to the Latino NYC population, i.e., the findings from our sample are indicative of the situation holding in the universe (population) in Spanish-speaking NYC as a whole.

Recapitulation

Our variationist-sociolinguistic study aims at studying the Spanish subjunctive in second-generation NYC bilinguals (referred to as NYR). Their first-generation counterparts (referred to as LAR) serve as the reference model for mood selection and the resulting 19 syntactic and semantic contexts in which the subjunctive is used either obligatorily or optionally. We use the stratified Otheguy-Zentella corpus for data collection, generating for our investigation a balanced sample of 52 consultants (26 from each generation). In strict compliance with the study's envelope of variation and the principle of accountability, the data is gathered and analyzed using

³⁴ Appendices II and III present all variables considered for the present dissertation study.

both qualitative and quantitative measures. We use two methods in regard to data collection and statistical analysis, one descriptive in nature and one inferential. Tables from our pilot study were presented in this chapter to exemplify the descriptive procedure and to generate an idea of the findings to come. The pilot tables highlighted both differences and similarities across the two generations.

Lastly, for the inferential procedure we presented the 19 contexts used in this dissertation study, which are based on the LAR consultants' production of subjunctive and indicative verb forms, as well as the types of data files used for the internal and external examination of variables. The data is analyzed at comparative group and individual levels. The comparative analysis considers differences and similarities of the NYR mood grammar to that of the LAR group. The individual methods deal with variability within the NYR group exclusively. Because of its rigorous stratification, our sample can be regarded as representative of the community under study and the findings can, therefore, serve as valid representations of the actual speech communities in Latino NYC, thus acting as accurate predictors of mood use by the NYR population.

Chapter Four

Findings

Introduction

Following the procedures outlined in the previous chapter, Methodology, this chapter presents the findings for the current dissertation study. We begin with the results from our general descriptive procedure and then move to those generated by our inferential statistical analyses. This chapter aims to reveal how and where our consultants use the subjunctive and, ultimately, whether or not, in comparing the Latin American raised (LAR) and the New York raised (NYR), we are dealing with two different generational groups in terms of mood grammar.

1. Descriptive Findings

This section presents comparative observations on mood use by each generation. As we shall see, these findings help us in an overall understanding of subjunctive use in these two groups. Some of the observations highlight difference, while others seem to show a more consistent mood grammar across the generations. The results presented here are, however, purely descriptive, i.e., analyses of statistical significance were not performed for the findings in this section. Table 4.1a shows the totals for all finite verbs produced by each generation, and the corresponding percentages of those verbs generated in the subjunctive form. That is, the numbers represent every inflected verb in our corpus and the percent of them generated as a subjunctive verb form.

Table 4.1a Indicative and Subjunctive Verbs, by Generation	LAR	NYR
N of Indicative Verbs	22,146	18,358
N of Subjunctive Verbs	1615	1009
Total Finite Verbs	23,761	19,367
Subjunctive % of Total	6.8	5.2

The LAR group produced a total of 23,761 finite verbs, 1,615 of which were inflected with subjunctive verb morphology, with an occurrence rate of 6.8 percent of all finite verbs. The NYR consultants yielded fewer verbs with 19,367; 1009 in the subjunctive and a 5.2 percent subjunctive use. What is interesting here is the minimal difference between the two groups in regard to general subjunctive use: a difference of only 1.6 percentage points. This observation regarding the percentage of all verbs that occurs in the subjunctive appears to support the conception of a similar mood grammar more so than a different one.

In continuing with a thorough description of mood use, we now turn to overall usage by region. Tables 4.1b and 4.1c present all indicative and subjunctive verb forms by region and generation. Again, the number of indicative verb forms represents all indicatives, irrespective of their inclusion or exclusion in the envelope of variation.

Table 4.1b Indicative and Subjunctive Verbs, by Mainland & Generation	LAR Mainland	NYR Mainland
N of Indicative Verbs	9,570	10,379
N of Subjunctive Verbs	759	583
Total Finite Verbs	10,329	10,962
Subjunctive % of Total	7.3	5.3

Table 4.1c Indicative and Subjunctive Verbs, by Caribbean & Generation	LAR Caribbean	NYR Caribbean
N of Indicative Verbs	12,576	7,979
N of Subjunctive Verbs	856	426
Total Finite Verbs	13,432	8,405
Subjunctive % of Total	6.4	5.1

Within the same generation we see that the LAR group differs by a mere .09 of a percentage point (LAR Mainland at 7.3 percent, LAR Caribbean at 6.4 percent), and even less within the

NYR group with .02 of a percentage point (NYR Mainland at 5.3 percent, NYR Caribbean at 5.1 percent). When considered across generations, however, stronger differences surface. The Mainland speakers from the LAR generation had a 7.3 percent subjunctive output rate, the NYR Mainlanders a 5.3 percent rate, which is a difference of two percentage points, the widest spread in regard to region. The difference between the Caribbean speakers across generation is 1.3 percentage points (LAR 6.4 percent, NYR 5.1 percent). According to these findings, the greatest difference in subjunctive usage occurs between the Mainland speakers across generation, more so than when considered by generation only. That is, Table 4.1a above, which presented data by Generation only, showed a difference of 1.6 percentage points between the two generations, whereas here, in Table 4.1b, there is a difference of two percentage points between the Mainlanders from each of the two respective generations. It is important to remember, however, that these findings are observational only, i.e., there is no statistical evidence that what we see here is significant because the majority of the indicative verb forms presented in these tables did not qualify for inferential analyses.

Each tense for every subjunctive verb form was also tallied for descriptive purposes. The consultants produced four subjunctive tenses in our sample: present (e.g. *tenga*), imperfect (e.g. *tuviera* or *tuviese*), pluperfect (e.g. *hubiera* or *hubiese tenido*) and present perfect (e.g. *haya tenido*). Table 4.1d shows LAR and NYR distribution of subjunctive verb forms by tense.

Table 4.1d Distribution of Subjunctive, by Tense	LAR N Verbs	% of Subjunctive Tense	NYR N Verbs	% of Subjunctive Tense
Present	1330	82	825	82
Imperfect	234	15	162	16
Pluperfect	31	2	16	1
Present Perfect	20	1	6	1
Total	1615	100	1009	100

The numbers and percentages from this table show the distribution of the subjunctive into the four different possible tenses produced by the two groups. For example, the NYR consultants generated a total of 1009 subjunctive verb forms, 825 of which manifested in the present tense, 162 in the imperfect, 16 in the pluperfect and six in the present perfect. Next, in the column labeled % of Subjunctive Tense, the hierarchical distribution of the subjunctive into tense is displayed in terms of percentages, i.e., of the total 1009 NYR subjunctive verb forms, 82 percent were used in the present tense. The results for the LAR group show very similar distributional patterns of subjunctive forms into tenses. Thus, the table reveals near identical subjunctive tenses by both generations. Both produced the most subjunctive verb forms in the present tense, at a massive 82 percent. The imperfect was the second most used tense, but at a low 15 percent by the LAR and 16 percent by the NYR consultants. The last two tenses were used very little: the pluperfect at two percent (LAR) and 1 percent (NYR), followed by the present perfect at 1 percent for each group. The similarities between these two groups regarding the distribution of subjunctive verbs into tense is the closest finding observed in our research.

We now consider the distribution of mood for all qualifying verb tokens found inside the envelope of variation for our study. Tables 4.1e and 4.1f below show the numbers and percentages of verb tokens for each generation found within the two umbrella categories: obligatory and optional.

Table 4.1e Distribution of All Qualifying Tokens, by Category - LAR	LAR N Verbs		% in Subjunctive Mood	% in Indicative Mood
	Subjunctive	Indicative		
Obligatory	996	9	99	1
Optional	619	347	64	36
Total	1,615	356	N/A	

Table 4.1f Distribution of All Qualifying Tokens, by Category - NYR	NYR N Verbs		% in Subjunctive Mood	% in Indicative Mood
	Subjunctive	Indicative		
Obligatory	670	62	92	8
Optional	339	359	49	51
Total	1,009	421	N/A	

Generational differences in the use of mood begin to emerge once we look more closely at the obligatory and optional categories into which subjunctive verb forms are situated. Table 4.1e shows that the LAR group used a subjunctive verb form in 99 percent of the contexts in the obligatory category; no surprise given the fact that it was their subjunctive usage that determined these two categories³⁵. The second generation, however, drops seven percentage points within the obligatory category, to 92 percent. Another way to think of this difference is not in terms of the subjunctive, but rather the indicative. The LAR consultants used the indicative in only one percent of the contexts in the obligatory subjunctive category, with nine tokens. The NYR group, on the other hand, produced 62 indicative verb tokens in the obligatory subjunctive environments, which is eight percent of these tokens. Even more striking is the use of the indicative in the optional category. While the first generation produced 36 percent of their tokens in optional subjunctive environments in the indicative mood, the second generation generated over half of their tokens in the indicative within this optional category, at 51 percent (a difference of 15 percentage points between generations). Indeed, the primary difference between the two groups manifests itself in the NYR's increased use of the indicative in both the obligatory and optional subjunctive categories. That is, when compared to the first generation,

³⁵ For detailed explanation of obligatory and optional categories based on LAR use of the subjunctive, see Chapter 3, section 3.

the NYR consultants decrease in their output of subjunctive verb forms in both categories, thus permitting the use of the indicative more often than does the LAR group.

The findings presented above in Tables 4.1e and 4.1f took into consideration all tokens inside the envelope of variation, i.e., both indicative and subjunctive verb forms in syntactic environments that generated both forms. If we center on the distribution of the subjunctive only, however, the two groups appear fairly similar. The totals found in the following table are for subjunctive forms and their respective category only.

Table 4.1g Distribution of Subjunctive, by Category	LAR N Verbs	% of Distribution into Category	NYR N Verbs	% of Distribution into Category
Obligatory	996	62	670	66
Optional	619	38	339	34
Total	1615	100	1009	100

Table 4.1g shows that the distribution of the subjunctive by each generation into the categories of obligatory and optional is quite similar. The LAR group used 62 percent of all subjunctive verb forms in the obligatory category, with the remaining 38 percent in the optional category. The consultants from the NYR group used more of their subjunctive verb forms in the obligatory category than did the first generation, at 66 percent, a difference of four percentage points. On the other hand, the second generation used the subjunctive less often where it was optional, at 34 percent of the time, again with a difference of four percentage points compared to the LAR speakers.

The descriptive findings considered in this section have presented some basic ideas concerning not only differences, but also similarities between the LAR and NYR groups. First, overall subjunctive output between the two generations was shown to be fairly similar when all

finite verbs were considered. Furthermore, the distribution of subjunctives by tense was nearly identical between the two groups. Differences in the use of mood were noted between generations with respect to region, the Mainlanders with a larger subjunctive-output percentage spread. Finally, the distribution of the tokens under study into the two main subjunctive categories, obligatory and optional, was analyzed and the findings revealed that the NYR used the indicative verb form much more frequently in both of the categories than did the LAR generation, but that the distribution of the subjunctive between the two categories was comparable. While these general descriptive findings are indeed valuable with regard to a well-rounded comprehension of NYC's Spanish speaking population and their use of mood, many questions still remain. We move now to statistically analyzed findings with the aim of revealing an even clearer idea of these groups' mood grammar and a deeper understanding of the variables and factors that mold them.

2. LAR & NYR: Separate Groups

Before proceeding with inferential grammatical and social analyses based on the treatment of two distinct groups, it must be shown that the consultants involved in the study do indeed constitute separate autonomous generational groups. In order to realize accurate statistical analyses for external variables, average percentages of subjunctive use for each category (obligatory and optional) were analyzed. Two dependent variables were identified: average use of the subjunctive in obligatory contexts and average use of the subjunctive in optional contexts, expressed in percentages for each of the 52 individual consultants. External variables were then tested against the dependent variables. Tables 4.2a and 4.2b show the results from an analysis of variance (ANOVA) for the use of subjunctive verb forms within obligatory and optional contexts by generation.

Table 4.2a Obligatory Use of the Subjunctive, by Generation	Generation	N Speakers	Subjunctive Mean
Obligatory Subjunctive	LAR	26	98.2
	NYR	26	86
F = 13.7 p < .001	Total	52	92.15

Table 4.2b Optional Use of the Subjunctive, by Generation	Generation	N Speakers	Subjunctive Mean
Optional Subjunctive	LAR	26	66.3
	NYR	26	46.9
F = 13.5 p < .001	Total	52	56.62

These two tables present the mean subjunctive use by each generation in the two different categories, obligatory and optional. The tables show that the LAR group used the subjunctive on average 98.2 percent of the time in obligatory contexts and 66.3 percent of the time in optional contexts. The NYR group, on the other hand, had a subjunctive output mean of 86 percent in obligatory contexts and 46.9 in optional ones. The findings show that the two groups use the subjunctive to different extents in both obligatory and optional contexts. Moreover, the results are significant at $p < .001$, informing us that two distinct groups do exist in our corpus of 52 consultants: LAR with 26 speakers and NYR with 26 speakers. This finding is crucial because it permits us to move forward with inferential analyses of the consultants' subjunctive usage based on their particular generation.

The same analysis was applied based on region, i.e., Mainland and Caribbean, to determine further possible groupings within the generational groups. That is, having established two groups in terms of generation, we were also interested in the possibility of independent groups within these generations in terms of region. The results, however, tell us that there is no

statistically significant difference between regions (LAR $F = 2.7$, $p < .11$ for obligatory, $F = .98$, $p < .33$ for optional; NYR $F = 1.5$, $p < .23$ for obligatory, $F = .41$, $p < .52$ for optional). The next section presents findings stemming from inferential analyses of the internal variables identified for this dissertation study.

3. Inferential Findings: Internal Variables

We begin with the only statistically treatable internal variable for the current study: context of use. The reason context is the only internal variable suitable for computational analysis is because it is the only truly syntactic variable for which both moods are plausible, i.e., where the dependent variable is binary (indicative or subjunctive verb form) and analyzable by purely syntactic means within the language, irrespective of externals. This was not the case in the section presented above on general descriptive findings given either the absence of mood choice (only the subjunctive form considered, as with tense, for example), or an analysis by way of generation, an external variable and the crux of essentially all of the findings considered in that section. That is not to say that generation is not considered in this section; rather, because two separate groups have been established, this specific internal variable (context) can be analyzed for both groups individually and the findings can then be presented together so as to compare the two generations.

As discussed in Chapter 3 of this dissertation, there are a total of 19 syntactic and semantic contexts for subjunctive use, split into the two umbrella categories of obligatory and optional. Of the 19 contexts, nine fall into the former, 10 into the latter. Table 4.3a below presents the findings for the distribution of all subjunctive verb forms into their respective contexts for both groups. The left-hand column displays the syntactic and semantic contexts.

Moving to the right, the numbers for each verb form are shown for both groups, as well as the corresponding percentage in terms of their distribution into the various contexts³⁶.

Table 4.3a Distribution of Subjunctive, by Syntactic & Semantic Contexts	LAR N Verbs	% of Subjunctive Verb Forms	NYR N Verbs	% of Subjunctive Verb Forms
Discourse Marker	434	100	231	100
Purpose / Contingency Adverbial clause	134	100	80	90
Indirect Command	103	100	52	89
Imperative	77	100	105	100
Causative clause	9	100	3	100
Volitional / Influential Noun clause	86	99	97	94
Temporal Adverbial clause with Futurity	67	97	74	76
Hypothetical <i>como si</i> clause	29	97	42	88
Protasis clause in Hypothetical conditional sentence	66	92	48	60
Comment clause	135	88	77	65
Adjective clause of Nonexistent or Indefinite Antecedent	160	84	86	64
Subordinate clause after <i>Depende</i>	13	77	13	8
Apodosis clause in Hypothetical conditional sentence	34	77	28	39
Negated Noun clause	55	75	63	38
Locative clause	18	67	8	38
Modal clause	319	65	222	69
Protasis clause in Concessive sentence	58	45	45	36
Possibility clause	82	27	45	18
Uncertainty clause	92	24	111	15
Total	1971	N/A	1430	N/A

LAR $X^2 = 709$; NYR $X^2 = 526$; $p < .000$ (for both generations)

This table displays the distribution of all qualified verbs into the various syntactic and semantic contexts. The percentages are for the verbs in the subjunctive form within the given context. For

³⁶ The 19 contexts and examples for each are presented in Chapter 3, section 3, pp. 42-43.

example, in the context comment clause, which falls into the optional category, the LAR group used the subjunctive 119 times out of a total of 135 tokens, which was 88 percent. That is, of all verb forms used in this specific context and for this group, 88 percent of them manifested in the subjunctive and the remaining 12 percent were in the indicative. The contexts are presented in hierarchical order by percentage of subjunctive use as per LAR use, gradually decreasing down the list. The same is not the case, however, for the NYR consultants, who clearly do not follow the same distributional patterns as the first generation. We note that the LAR group has five contexts with 100 percent subjunctive use, whereas the NYR group shows only three. In fact, there are a total of nine contexts with 90 percent or above subjunctive use in the obligatory category for the LAR speakers, but only five for the second generation. The subjunctive is used less in every NYR context, with the exception of the modal clause context, where the subjunctive was used four percentage points more than that of the LAR group. These findings are statistically significant at $p < .000$ for both groups, meaning that syntactic and semantic context as an internal independent variable is relevant to mood choice in the grammars of both generations, i.e., the context where a verb form occurs is a significant predictor of whether the subjunctive will manifest.

Concerning the hierarchical order of the contexts by generation, Table 4.3b presents the percentages of the distribution of the subjunctive into the 19 syntactic and semantic contexts, thus denoting both difference and similarity among them. The double asterisk attached to particular contexts indicates a hierarchical match across the two generations.

Table 4.3b Hierarchy of Contexts, by Percentage of Subjunctive		** Where contexts align across both groups	
LAR	% of Subjunctive Verb Forms	NYR	% of Subjunctive Verb Forms
1. Discourse Marker	100	1. Discourse Marker **	100
2. Purpose / Contingency Adverbial clause	100	2. Imperative	100
3. Indirect Command	100	3. Causative clause	100
4. Imperative	100	4. Volitional / Influential Noun clause	94
5. Causative clause	100	5. Purpose / Contingency Adverbial clause	90
6. Volitional / Influential Noun clause	99	6. Indirect Command	89
7. Temporal Adverbial clause with Futurity	97	7. Hypothetical <i>como si</i> clause	88
8. Hypothetical <i>como si</i> clause	97	8. Temporal Adverbial clause with Futurity	76
9. Protasis clause in Hypothetical conditional sentence	92	9. Modal clause	69
10. Comment clause	88	10. Comment clause **	65
11. Adjective clause of Nonexistent or Indefinite Antecedent	84	11. Adjective clause of Nonexistent or Indefinite Antecedent **	64
12. Subordinate clause after <i>Depende</i>	77	12. Protasis clause in Hypothetical conditional sentence	60
13. Apodosis clause in Hypothetical conditional sentence	77	13. Apodosis clause in Hypothetical conditional sentence **	39
14. Negated Noun clause	75	14. Negated Noun clause **	38
15. Locative clause	67	15. Locative clause **	38
16. Modal clause	65	16. Protasis clause in Concessive sentence	36
17. Protasis clause in Concessive sentence	45	17. Possibility clause	18
18. Possibility clause	27	18. Uncertainty clause	15
19. Uncertainty clause	24	19. Subordinate clause after <i>Depende</i>	8

LAR $X^2 = 709$; NYR $X^2 = 526$; $p < .000$ (for both generations)

When viewed from this perspective, the two generations' contextual distributions of the subjunctive are quite opposing. Of the 19 possible syntactic and semantic contexts for subjunctive use, the two generations align with only six: discourse marker, comment clause, adjective clause of nonexistent or indefinite antecedent, apodosis clause in hypothetical conditional sentence, negated noun clause, and locative clause. Considered in terms of percent, the NYR generation is in alignment with the LAR generation 32 percent of the time regarding where and how frequently the subjunctive is used. This internal observation seems to corroborate the external finding of the existence of different groups with respect to subjunctive use patterns. That is, these findings support at an internal level that which was discovered at an external one: two distinct groups.

Table 4.3c Contexts by Largest Percentage-Point Difference	LAR % of Subjunctive Verb Forms	NYR % of Subjunctive Verb Forms	Percentage -Point Difference
Subordinate clause after <i>Depende</i>	77	8	69
Apodosis clause in Hypothetical conditional sentence	77	39	38
Negated Noun clause	75	38	37
Protasis clause in Hypothetical conditional sentence	92	60	32
Locative clause	67	38	29
Comment clause	88	65	23
Temporal Adverbial clause with Futurity	97	76	21
Adjective clause of Nonexistent or Indefinite Antecedent	84	64	20
Indirect Command	100	89	11
Purpose / Contingency Adverbial clause	100	90	10
Hypothetical <i>como si</i> clause	97	88	9
Protasis clause in Concessive sentence	45	36	9
Possibility clause	27	18	9
Uncertainty clause	24	15	9
Volitional / Influential Noun clause	99	94	5
Discourse Marker	100	100	0
Imperative	100	100	0
Causative clause	100	100	0
Modal clause	65	69	-4

We see from the table that the largest difference is found in the subordinate clause after *Depende* context, with 69 percentage points between the two generations. The percentage-point difference decreases from there, all the way down to -4 with modal clause. Eight of the 19 syntactic and semantic contexts have a percentage-point difference of 20 or more (subordinate clause after *depende*, apodosis clause in hypothetical conditional sentence, negated noun clause, protasis clause in hypothetical conditional sentence, locative clause, comment clause, temporal adverbial clause with futurity, adjective clause of nonexistent or indefinite antecedent), which is nearly half of all the possible contexts. The context apodosis clause in hypothetical conditional sentence shows a percentage-point difference of 38, but this context requires special consideration given the possibility of a conditional verb form manifesting instead of a subjunctive or an indicative. That is, the percentages shown for all of the tables above take into account subjunctive and indicative inflected verb forms only. Therefore, with respect to this particular context, the LAR group used the subjunctive in 77 percent and the indicative in the remaining 23 percent of the tokens. For the NYR, the subjunctive was used in 39 percent of these verbs, and the indicative in 61 percent. These percentages, however, are not completely accurate, as they do not factor in the use of the conditional. We close our presentation of internal results with a treatment of this specific context, but with the inclusion of the conditional.

Table 4.3d below shows the distribution of subjunctive, indicative and conditional verb forms exclusively in the apodosis clause of hypothetical conditional sentences³⁷. Again, this context allows for the manifestation of the three distinct verb forms just mentioned, which are located in the left-hand column of the table. The numbers for each verb form are shown for both

³⁷ For details on the analysis of the conditional form as separate from the indicative, see Chapter 3, section 2.2.

groups under N verbs, which are also expressed in terms of percentages regarding their distribution among the three verb-form options (under % of Verb Form).

Table 4.3d Apodosis Clause in Hypothetical Conditional Sentence	LAR N Verbs	% of Verb Form	NYR N Verbs	% of Verb Form
Subjunctive	26	25	11	18
Indicative	8	8	17	28
Conditional	69	67	33	54
Total	103	100	61	100

Most evident from the numbers and percentages shown in this table is the decrease in difference between the two groups' subjunctive use. In Table 4.3c we noted a difference of 38 percentage points regarding generational subjunctive usage. Here, in Table 4.3d, this difference lowers to seven percentage points. The NYR's use of the indicative is over double that of the LAR group, at 28 and eight percent, respectively. Conditional use is highest among the first generation at 67 percent, but is still used in over half of all verb forms (54 percent) by the second generation. It is clear that including the conditional in this particular context radically changes the distribution of mood for both groups and is therefore a necessary measure for an accurate analysis of mood use.

In this section we have internally analyzed subjunctive mood usage by first- and second-generation Spanish speakers. We presented findings of an inferential nature, examining the only statistically significant internal variable, which were the 19 syntactic and semantic contexts in which each group used the subjunctive mood. We highlighted differences and similarities regarding distributional patterns of use throughout these contexts by the LAR and NYR groups. It was noted that of the 19 contexts, the groups aligned in their distribution 32 percent of the time (across six semantic and syntactic contexts). Finally, contexts with the most difference in terms of percentage-point spread were presented and it was discovered that seven of the 19 contexts, or

37 percent, generated a difference of 20 percentage points or more. Indeed, initially the total was eight contexts, but once the conditional was taken into consideration for the hypothetical sentences, the number reduced to seven. We now move to our findings based on external variables and factors in order to better understand what components outside of the Spanish language (grammar) affect mood choice³⁸.

4. Inferential Findings: External Variables

We established a total of 31 external variables for the current dissertation study³⁹, split into two subsections as follows: 12 socio-demographic variables and factors that were used in the statistical analyses for both groups; and 19 Spanish-use variables and factors that were applicable exclusively to the NYR group. Our rationale for the latter is that the quantity and quality of use and exposure to Spanish in everyday life in NYC is really only pertinent to the second-generation bilinguals, given the first-generation's presupposed full command of Spanish prior to arrival to the U.S. Finally, as mentioned above in section 2, all of the results stemming from external variables were generated by the informant-level file for SPSS.

4.1 Socio-Demographic Variables & Factors

Before presenting the external socio-demographic variables found to be significant, for the sake of thoroughness, we begin with a brief recount of those shown to have little or no impact on mood use. The followings eight variables provided non-significant results ($p > .05$) for both groups: sex, age of arrival to the U.S., socioeconomic status (SES), national origin, region (Mainland vs. Caribbean, this was already shown above in section 2 of the present chapter),

³⁸ It should be noted that interpretation of the findings is reserved for the following chapter, Chapter 5. The current chapter presents findings and summaries only.

³⁹ As mentioned in Chapter 3, these variable and factors are based on the Otheguy-Zentella studies centered on pronoun use. See Appendices II and III for a complete list and description of all variables and factors.

years in U.S., informant age and, finally, social class. The remaining variables yielded statistical significance for the NYR group only. We consider those now.

The variable generation was shown above to be significant regarding mood choice (section 2 of the present chapter), thus establishing two distinct groups, indeed a critical discovery for our research. This variable was the only statistically significant external predictor for the LAR consultants, whereas four other socio-demographic variables showed significance for the NYR consultants. The following tables present the findings generated by ANOVA tests on these four external variables for the second-generation consultants. The number is consistent at 26, as there are 26 consultants in the NYR group. The mean is the average of the dependent variable, viz., the given mood and its relative context, situated in the far left column, according to the external socio-demographic variable (English skill, education, Spanish skill and areal origin).

Table 4.4a External Variable: English Skill - NYR	Skill Level	N Speakers	Mean
Indicative in Apodosis Clause F = 6.35 p < .006	Passable	2	80
	Good	4	0
	Excellent	20	15
	Total	26	17

Table 4.4a indicates that the consultants who self-identified as commanding only passable English skills are much more likely to produce an indicative form in the apodosis of a hypothetical sentence than are those who declared themselves as having good or excellent English skills.

Table 4.4b External Variable: Education - NYR	Education Level	N Speakers	Mean
Indicative in Apodosis Clause F = 5.36 p <.012	Secondary	7	47
	College	17	6
	Graduate	2	10
	Total	26	17

Table 4.4b presents the same context and a similar pattern, only its use appears to be conditioned by education, i.e., the lower the level of education, the higher the use of the indicative in this syntactic area.

Table 4.4c External Variable: Spanish Skill - NYR	Skill Level	N Speakers	Mean
Obligatory Subjunctive F = 4.08 p < .019	Poor	2	53
	Passable	10	88
	Good	11	90
	Excellent	3	88
	Total	26	86

Spanish skill, however, affects second-generation's subjunctive use in obligatory contexts in terms of self-perceived good and/or excellent skills. That is, Table 4.4c shows that the NYR bilinguals that indicated either of those skill levels used the subjunctive in obligatory contexts more than did those who had poor or passable Spanish skills.

Table 4.4d External Variable: Areal Origin - NYR	Areal Origin	N Speakers	Mean
Conditional in Apodosis Clause F = 4.68 p < .041	Low Lands	15	19
	Interior or High Lands	11	51
	Total	26	32

It is noted in Table 4.4d that second-generation consultants from interior or highland origins are more likely to use the conditional in apodosis clauses of hypothetical conditional sentences than

are those from low lands. Finally, two other socio-demographic variables approximated significance for the speaker groups and thus merit mentioning: English skill in obligatory subjunctive contexts at $p < .062$ for the NYR group; and Spanish skill with subjunctive use in apodosis clauses of hypothetical conditional sentences for the LAR consultants at $p < .064$.

4.2 Spanish-use Variables & Factors

Like the previous section, we begin with those external variables that were found to be non-significant. Again, these analyses were realized with the NYR consultants only. Of the 19 variables, 18 yielded statistically non-significant results. Those were: Spanish use with father, with mother, with siblings, with children, with friends, with boss, with classmates, with spouse, with other groups, with own group, with own country, at home, in domains, in school, in social activities, reading, listening to the radio, and watching television. In other words, our analytical measures revealed no correlations between any of those 18 Spanish-use situations and the subjunctive usage by the second generation. Spanish use in general, however, proved to be significant concerning the use of a subjunctive form in apodosis clauses of hypothetical conditional sentences. The following table presents the findings in the same format as the four socio-demographic variable tables above.

Table 4.4e External Variable: Spanish Use in General - NYR	Spanish Use	N Speakers	Mean
Subjunctive in Apodosis Clause F = 3.2 p < .042	None	8	41
	Low	11	0
	Mid	6	30
	High	1	0
	Total	26	20

Table 4.4e shows that NYR consultants who use Spanish at a general medium or none at all are more likely to produce a subjunctive verb form in the apodosis of a hypothetical sentence than

those with a higher general Spanish use. Although this finding is perhaps not as revealing as the six presented above, its value is nevertheless beneficial regarding a comprehensive understanding of these complex NYR mood grammars.

5. Regional External Variables

Region as an external variable did not show statistical significance regarding subjunctive usage. For the sake of thoroughness, however, we ran ANOVA tests for each region, using all of the external variables listed above. These analyses proved useful as some significant findings were discovered. The following tables summarize these results for each generation and their corresponding regions. The format follows those tables above, but this time only the region with significant results is presented, located above N by Mainland or Caribbean. We begin with the latter region.

Table 4.5a Regional External Variable: Spanish Skill - LAR	Skill Level	Caribbean N Speakers	Mean
Obligatory Subjunctive F = 11 p < .003	Passable	2	100
	Good	2	89
	Excellent	10	98
	Total	14	97

Table 4.5b Regional External Variable: Spanish Skill - LAR	Skill Level	Caribbean N Speakers	Mean
Subjunctive in Apodosis F = 4.25 p < .046	Passable	2	100
	Good	2	29
	Excellent	10	26
	Total	14	32

Table 4.5c Regional External Variable: Age of Arrival - NYR	Age of Arrival	Caribbean N Speakers	Mean
Subjunctive in Apodosis F = 4.6 p < .034	Born in U.S.	5	48
	Brought between ages 1-3	1 8	0 7
	Total	14	21

With respect to the Caribbean groups, Spanish skill shaped LAR subjunctive use in obligatory contexts and in the apodosis clause of a hypothetical sentence, as seen in Tables 4.5a and 4.5b, respectively. Regarding the obligatory contexts, the subjunctive mean of those who identified their Spanish skills as good was 89; those with self-assessed excellent skills had a subjunctive mean of 98, 10 points more than the good speakers. Those with passable skills show a mean of 100, which is difficult to interpret, but is likely an anomaly or is attributable to some ideological language beliefs that impact self-identity and language use, an interesting linguistic area of study, but beyond our scope of analysis in this dissertation. Concerning subjunctive use in the apodosis clause of a hypothetical sentence, we see a similar pattern with that of the obligatory contexts, only this time as a flip: those with excellent skills had a mean of 25; good 29; and passable 100. That is, the use of the subjunctive in apodosis clauses of hypothetical conditional sentences increases as it moves from excellent to passable self-assessed Spanish skill level. From the findings presented in these two tables, it appears that those with excellent Spanish skills use the subjunctive more in line with normative Spanish patterns, where subjunctive use is nearly categorical in obligatory contexts and low in apodosis clauses of hypothetical conditional sentences, where the standard norm would call for a conditional. Finally, within this same context (apodosis), age of arrival yielded significant results among the NYR consultants with Caribbean origins. Table 4.5c shows that those born in the U.S. produced the subjunctive in this

particular context more frequently, with a mean of 48, than those brought there between ages 1-3, with a mean of seven for eight of the consultant and one with zero subjunctive use in this particular context. We turn now to the Mainland groups.

Table 4.5d Regional External Variable: Sex - LAR	Sex	Mainland N Speakers	Mean
Obligatory Subjunctive F = 5.7 p < .047	Male	7	100
	Female	5	99
	Total	12	99

Table 4.5e Regional External Variable: Sex - NYR	Sex	Mainland N Speakers	Mean
Optional Subjunctive F = 6.5 p < .028	Male	5	23
	Female	7	14
	Total	12	18

A total of five external variables were found significant across the two generations, three for the LAR group and two for the NYR group, and sex was the only shared predictor for both generations, but significant in different syntactic and semantic contexts. That is, Table 4.5d shows that for the LAR mainlanders, sex was significant with respect to obligatory subjunctive use, the men using the subjunctive in obligatory contexts more than the women (100 percent mean and 99 percent mean respectively). Table 4.5e displays the NYR group's distribution of the subjunctive in option syntactic and semantic contexts by sex and, like the LAR group, men were also more frequent in their use of the subjunctive form (men, mean of 23; women, mean of 14), only in optional contexts for the second generation as opposed to LAR's obligatory ones. These findings are interesting because at the macro level, region did not yield any significant results. When considered at a micro level analysis, however, certain influential variables are discovered, such as sex, with regard to the region of the speaker groups.

Recapitulation

In this chapter we have presented the findings of our dissertation study, divided into descriptive and inferential statistics in order to show a contrast between findings based on descriptive statistics lacking a determination of significance and findings based on inferential statistics that give significance values. Depending on the measure taken, the groups are sometimes the same, sometimes similar, sometimes different, and sometimes very different. General descriptive findings such as over-all subjunctive output by generation and region, distribution of the subjunctive in four tenses, and category (obligatory and optional), were considered first, highlighting both differences and similarities. Next, statistical evidence that the consultants do in fact make up two distinct groups according to their use of the subjunctive in the obligatory subjunctive category and the optional subjunctive category was presented. We then looked at inferential findings through the lens of internal variables by way of the distribution of the subjunctive through the 19 syntactic and semantic possible contexts. Here we noted internal distributional differences of the subjunctive into distinct syntactic and semantic contexts that further support the key external finding that we are working with two separate groups. Our internal variable analysis closed with a focused examination of the apodosis context, taking into consideration the use of a conditional verb and consequently decreasing what initially appeared to be an area of high variation between the two groups.

We continued our inferential analysis with findings based on the 31 external variables identified for our study, which we divided into 12 socio-demographic and 19 Spanish-use variables. Interestingly, it was revealed that not one single socio-demographic variable was significant for the LAR consultants, and only four were for the NYR group, which were English skill, Spanish skill, level of education and areal origin. What is more, only one of the Spanish-

use variables was significant for the second generation, which was Spanish use in general. Finally, we looked at regional externals as well to see if certain variables would surface and we found five statistically significant external variables: two in the Caribbean and one in the Mainlander groups of the LAR consultants (Spanish skill and sex respectively); and one in the Caribbean and one on the Mainlander groups of the NYR bilinguals (age of arrival and sex respectively).

In sum, our analyses and the results they have produced indicate that our consultants can be treated as two separate groups with respect to their use of the subjunctive mood. This finding is supported by computational significance at both external (generation) and internal (distribution of subjunctive in syntactic and semantic contexts) levels of analysis. Beyond these two critical discoveries, we are faced with sporadic findings associated with statistically significant external variables for the NYR group. That is, it appears that the LAR group as a whole is essentially homogeneous in their use of the subjunctive with regard to external variables given the absence of any p values equated to significance, aside from generation of course. The second generation is influenced by a total of five out of the 31 other possible externals (four socio-demographic variables and one Spanish-use variable), indicating more variability among the 26 consultants in that group. Nevertheless, the NYR speakers are affected by only 23 percent of the external variables, thus not extremely removed from the LAR group. We leave further treatment of these problems, and our research question, for the following and final chapter, Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusions.

Chapter Five

Discussion & Conclusions

Introduction

The present chapter discusses this dissertation study's results. There are four objectives divided into four separate sections: to compare our findings to the other key studies on subjunctive use U.S.⁴⁰, answer research questions and validate or refute hypotheses, discuss qualitative observations, and conclude.

1. Comparative Analysis of Key Works

In Torres' 1989 study on Puerto Rican mood selection in New York, she differentiated her study from others by stating, "... it does not compare a contact Spanish variety to a traditional Spanish variety but is rather an intergenerational study of a U.S. Spanish variety. Second, the data were gathered from participant observer conversations, rather than from more formal means" (68-69). Indeed, we take the same approach in our study, although we refrain from terminology such as 'U.S. Spanish variety', opting for the more descriptive 'Spanish spoken in NYC'.

With respect to overall subjunctive use, Silva-Corvalán (1995) found that her first-generation consultants used the subjunctive in 42 percent of the contexts identified for her study, the second generation 26 percent and the third generation 17 percent. Her total overall subjunctive rate was 28 percent, the indicative occurring the remaining 72 percent. These percentages, however, do not take into consideration all inflected verbs, but rather only those found in the syntactic and semantic contexts where either mood (subjunctive & indicative) was an option. Torres (1989), on the other hand, realized a similar comparison to our own study,

⁴⁰ These key works are presented and reviewed in section 1 of Chapter 2.

counting all inflected verb forms and determining an exact percentage of subjunctive use among all verbs. She found that 4.7 percent of all first-generation inflected verbs were produced in the subjunctive, and 4 percent for the second generation- a seemingly minimal difference in usage between the two groups. Our findings showed a higher percentage-point difference between the generations, the LAR group with a 6.8 percent overall subjunctive output, and the NYR group with 5.2 percent. Torres, however, included only Puerto Ricans in her study, whereas our investigation included six different nationalities, a possible reason for this discrepancy.

The different syntactic and semantic contexts found statistically significant with regard to mood variation are another area where studies have conflicted in their findings. Our investigation highlighted seven areas where the NYR group's diminished use of the subjunctive differed by 20 percentage points or more from that of the first generation⁴¹. Those contexts were, in order from greatest difference at 69 percent, down to the smallest difference at 20 percent:

- subordinate clause after *depende* (e.g. *depende de a qué hora regrese*): LAR 77 percent subjunctive, NYR 8 percent subjunctive; difference of 69 percentage points
- negated reality negated noun clause (e.g. *no es que no quiera*): LAR 75 percent subjunctive, NYR 38 percent subjunctive; difference of 37 percentage points
- protasis clause in hypothetical conditional sentence (e.g. *si fuera rico...*): LAR 92 percent subjunctive, NYR 60 percent subjunctive; difference of 32 percentage points
- locative clause (e.g. *donde haya una escuela buena*): LAR 67 percent subjunctive, NYR 38 percent subjunctive; difference of 29 percentage points
- comment clause (e.g. *me gusta que cantes bien*): LAR 88 percent subjunctive, NYR 65 percent subjunctive; difference of 23 percentage points

⁴¹ We exclude apodosis clause in hypothetical conditional sentence, which initially produced a difference of 38 percentage points, for reasons explained in Table 4.3c from Chapter 4.

- temporal adverbial clause with futurity (e.g. *cuando tenga hijos*): LAR 97 percent subjunctive, NYR 76 percent subjunctive; difference of 21 percentage points
- adjective clause of nonexistent or indefinite antecedent (e.g. *busco una casa que tenga piscina*): LAR 84 percent subjunctive, NYR 64 percent subjunctive; difference of 20 percentage points

Lynch (1999), on the other hand, found the following four contexts to be areas of greatest difference in subjunctive use⁴²:

- adjective (e.g. *busco una casa que tenga piscina*)
- comment clause (e.g. *me gusta que cantes bien*)
- modal clause (e.g. *como quiera*)
- uncertainty clause (e.g. *no creo que venga*)

Silva-Corvalán (1995) identified six contexts as statistically significant with respect to generational differences in subjunctive usage:

- volitional (e.g. *quiero que cante*)
- purpose clause (e.g. *para que cante*)
- temporal clause (e.g. *cuando tenga hijos*)
- apodosis (e.g. *si..., fuera a la fiesta*)
- protasis (e.g. *si fuera rico...*)
- uncertainty (e.g. *no creo que venga*)

Finally, Torres (1989) determined that the following five contexts were environments where subjunctive use differed the most between the Puerto Rican generations:

⁴² We present the names of the contexts here as the authors in the individual studies use them. Although there are slight differences in the terminology, the contexts under question should be deducible.

- conditional clauses (e.g. *si fuera rico...*)
- doubt clauses (e.g. *no creo que venga*)
- indefinite antecedents (e.g. *busco una casa que tenga piscina*)
- temporal sequence relaters (e.g. *cuando tenga hijos*)
- volition clauses

Regarding the contexts that show the most generational subjunctive-use differences, there is no consensus among these different studies. Nevertheless, in the subsections that follow we examine six notable syntactic environments identified across the studies:

- temporal adverbial clauses with futurity
- volitional / influential noun clause
- comment clauses
- protasis clause in hypothetical conditional sentence
- apodosis clause in hypothetical conditional sentence
- protasis clause in concessive sentence

1.1 Temporal Adverbial Clause

The environment that consistently shows the most cross-generational variability among these studies is the context we refer to as temporal adverbial clause with futurity, present in three out of four of the investigations. The context is listed by Silva-Corvalán, Torres and our own study as a seemingly near-obligatory subjunctive area according to first-generation usage, but one in which notable indicative use is found among the second-generation bilinguals.

Conversely, Lynch found 100 percent subjunctive use by all three of his groups in this context.

We provide two examples of indicative use in this environment from our data.

(7) mírate cuando **tienes** cuarenta años. – NYR 365E

(8) en el futuro, porque cuando **voy** a buscar un trabajo, si ven... – NYR 201U

The adverbial clauses of these two examples are both set in an uncertain future, which, according to first-generation use of mood, should present a subjunctive verb form (97 percent of all tokens in this context were in the subjunctive for the LAR group). In fact, the majority of the second generation from our study also produced the subjunctive in this context (76 percent of the tokens). Nevertheless, the usage difference between the two generations is statistically significant, as was established in our findings presented in the previous chapter. Lastly, the percentage-point difference between the two generations for this context was 21 points, which is ranked as the sixth context for areas of greatest difference for our study.

1.2 Volitional / Influential Noun Clause

Among the various other contexts under consideration for each study, we note that the volitional / influential noun clause context appears in both Torres' and Silva-Corvalán's investigations as a statistically significant environment. The former noted an 11 percent indicative use by second-generation participants, the latter also an 11 percent indicative usage amongst her second-generation bilinguals, as well as 27 percent by the third generation. From his oral conversation data, Lynch found relatively similar results of indicative use in volitional contexts across his three generations: zero percent, 11 percent and 19 percent, respectively. Our investigation, on the other hand, yielded quite different results, the second-generation consultants using the subjunctive in 94 percent of the verbs in this specific syntactic environment. In fact, there were only six instances of indicative use out of a total of 97 tokens in this particular context. We include several of them here to demonstrate what we mean by indicative usage in a volitional / influential noun clause context.

(9) siempre quiero que mi hija **puede** decir a los hijos ...– NYR 417P

(10) espero eso **se realiza** pronto... – NYR 317M

(11) prefiero que me **corrigen** ahora... – NYR 086P

(12) querían que religión **era** una cosa grande... – NYR 233U

These second-generation bilinguals presented the subordinate clause verbs in the indicative (*puede, realiza, corrigen* and *era*), a clear difference from first-generation usage. It should be noted, however, that there was one instance of an indicative, out of a total of 86 tokens, by an LAR consultant in this context, hence the 99 percent subjunctive use in this particular environment found in our study. Example 11 shows this instance.

(13) espero que **es**, ojalá **coja** por lo menos una clase... – LAR 198P

This utterance is interesting because the consultant uses the third-person singular indicative form of the Spanish verb *ser*, which we see is *es*, after the verb *esperar*, which is typically a trigger for the subjunctive, but then switches over to the use of *ojalá* followed by the expected subjunctive form of the verb *coger*, which is *coja*. The verb *esperar* is followed by an indicative when the speaker wishes to communicate expectation, i.e., when the English verb equivalent is ‘to expect’. In this example, however, it seems more likely that the speaker used *esperar* with the intention to communicate hope, i.e., ‘to hope’, given the immediate switch to *ojalá*, which also means ‘to hope’. It is not clear where the speaker was going with the initial use of indicative *es*, but because the verb was inflected in the indicative form in a volitional / influential noun clause, it qualified as a token inside the envelope of variation. Is this one example perhaps a sign that this particular context is gradually transforming into a context of variation between the indicative and the subjunctive in Spanish grammar? This seems unlikely. There is only one occurrence of an indicative in this context produced by one LAR consultant; it would therefore be precarious to propose such a theory this early on.

1.3 Comment Clause

Comment clauses were found to be significant in Lynch's study, as was the case in our investigation. The percentage-point difference between our two generations for this context was 23 points, which is ranked as the fifth context for areas of greatest difference for our study. Lynch's second-generation group used the subjunctive in 92 percent and the third generation in 52 percent of the verbs situated in this context. Our NYR group produced a total of 77 tokens in this context, 50 of which were in the subjunctive, or 65 percent. It would appear that our second-generation consultants use the subjunctive in comment clauses in a manner more similar to Lynch's third-generation bilinguals than to that of his second generation. Below is an example of mood variation in this particular context by an NYR consultant.

(14) ...no me gusta que **me regañen** en el trabajo... – NYR 310C

(15) ...yo tenía miedo que me lo **iban** a quitarme... – NYR 310C

Example (14) shows the use of a subjunctive verb (*regañen*) in the subordinate clause of a comment clause, whereas example 15 presents an indicative in the subordinate clause of the same type of context. That is, in the latter, the consultant used the indicative verb form *iban* in the subordinate clause after the comment clause *tenía miedo que*, which could have produced the subjunctive form *fuera* in the subordinate clause. These two examples come from the same consultant, an NYR consultant with Colombian origins, thus demonstrating internal variation on an individual basis, which is also symptomatic of group level linguistic patterns. Individual variation is an important point and will be discussed more explicitly and carefully in section three of the present chapter.

1.4 Protasis Clause

The protasis clause of hypothetical discourse is another context of interest with regard to mood choice. Torres referred to this as conditional clause and reported a 47 percent indicative usage by the second-generation bilinguals. Lynch, on the other hand, noted slightly less indicative use:

Lynch

- 28 percent by the second generation
- 23 percent by the third generation

Our findings are more similar to those of Torres. The NYR group presented a total of 48 tokens in the protasis clause of a hypothetical conditional sentence:

NYR

- 29 in the imperfect subjunctive (60 percent)
- 19 in the indicative (40 percent)

Let us consider two examples of indicative use by NYR consultants in this area.

(16) ¿Y si tuvieras que divorciarte, lo harías o aguantarías? – Interviewer

Si no **tengo**... si yo no **tengo** hijos, lo hago – NYR 206U

(17) a veces cogen los muchachos y le quitan la droga, o le quitan la plata que tienen encima y ... good bye Charlye, como nada pasó. Y para un muchacho así vale la pena, porque yo digo para... si yo **estaba haciendo** eso y a mí me **agarraron** con, pongamos, una onza y con plata, mil pesos, y me **dicen** “deme la plata”, yo, “tenga”, para yo no... para no estar adentro yo me... dizque deme mi paliza, hhh, deme mi paliza, le doy la plata, la coca y ya good night Charlye.

– NYR 311C

These examples exhibit indicative mood usage in hypothetical discourse, not uncommon for second-generation bilinguals. Example (16) is especially interesting because the interviewer used the subjunctive in the protasis of the question posed to the consultant (*tuvieras*), yet the consultant responded using the indicative mood (*tengo*). Moreover, this consultant does in fact have children, thus furthering the fictitious nature of the circumstances. Example (17) is a clear hypothetical situation, which, if based on LAR usage, would require the imperfect subjunctive, i.e., the verbs would have been *estuviera haciendo*, *agarraran*, and *dijeran*, respectively. The second-generation consultant, however, used the indicative in this hypothetical situation (*estaba haciendo*, *agarraron* and *dicen*). Finally, the percentage-point difference between our two generations for this context was 32 points, which is ranked as the third context for areas of greatest difference for our study.

1.5 Apodosis Clause

Regarding the apodosis of hypothetical situations, our findings seem to contradict those of both Lynch and Silva-Corvalán. Their studies found a steady increase in subjunctive use in the apodosis by generation. Lynch observed the following:

Lynch

- 14 percent subjunctive usage by the first-generation group
- 32 percent subjunctive use by the second-generation group
- 44 percent subjunctive usage by the third-generation group

Similarly, Silva-Corvalán recorded the following percentage-point subjunctive use increase from first to third generations, respectively:

Silva-Corvalán

- 21 percent subjunctive usage

- 28 percent subjunctive usage
- 30 percent subjunctive usage

Our study, on the other hand, saw a decrease in subjunctive use, an increase in indicative use, and a comparable conditional use by generation. The LAR group produced the following:

LAR

- 25 percent in the subjunctive
- 8 percent in the indicative
- 67 percent in the conditional

The NYR group generated:

NYR

- 18 percent subjunctive
- 28 percent indicative
- 54 percent conditional

The following three examples from our sample illustrate the use of indicative, subjunctive and conditional verb forms in the apodosis clause of hypothetical situations.

(18) si fuera ahora, no lo **iba** hacer. – NYR 403P

(19) si ...todos los hispanos vinieran a este país solamente hablaran inglés, después el lenguaje hispano **se muriera**. – NYR 228D

(20) si yo fuera nacida en un país hispano y viniera para acá, **me gustaría** que me pusieran... – NYR 228D

Concerning the first example, number (18), this NYR Puerto Rican bilingual used indicative *iban* in the apodosis of an obvious hypothetical situation, signaled by the use of the imperfect subjunctive in the protasis, *si fuera*. Mood preference based on percentage trends consistent

between both generation groups would anticipate the presence of a conditional form in this example, as in *no lo iría [a] hacer*, or simply *no lo haría*. Example (19) shows the use of the subjunctive in the apodosis (*mueriera*), which statistically speaking is found more often than the indicative within both generations and is thus more acceptable than the indicative form.

Nonetheless, the data show that the preferred form would have been the conditional (*moriría*).

Silva-Corvalán attributes heightened subjunctive usage in this context to the complete absence of the conditional in second- and third-generations' grammar, an argument clearly not corroborated by our dissertation study's findings given the similar frequencies of conditional use by both generations, as seen in example (20) with the use of conditional *me gustaría* in the apodosis. That is, one of Silva-Corvalán's most prominent arguments is that her studies show empirical evidence that the conditional form is eroding and nearly extinct in the speech, and therefore grammar, of her second- and third-generation bilinguals. She states "[t]he absence of Conditional morphology in the Spanish of Groups 2 and 3, therefore, may account for the more frequent use of Sub in the apodosis" (1994:266). Our findings, however, show that the conditional verb form is present and active in the grammar of the second generation, and is not limited to the protasis of hypotheticals. In fact, our comprehensive study counted each conditional verb form for the two generations:

- LAR = 411 conditionals
- NYR = 193 conditionals

The second generation did generate fewer conditionals than did the LAR group, but to propose that this verb form is nearly extinct does not stand according to our findings.

1.6 Concessive Clause

The final syntactic and semantic context comparison that we will make is the concessive clause. Silva-Corvalán listed this environment as the third highest-ranking context in which the subjunctive was used by her consultants, at 74 percent. Martínez (2009), inspired by Silva-Corvalán's findings, corroborated overall preference of a subjunctive verb form in the concessive clause in her mood-choice study centered on New Mexican heritage speakers. Torres, on the other hand, noted a 100 percent subjunctive usage by her second-generation bilinguals. Lynch's second-generation participants produced 78 percent of the verbs located in a concessive clause in the subjunctive. The third generation of the Lynch study, though, produced only 36 percent of the verbs found in this context in the subjunctive. The percentage of subjunctive verb forms produced by our second-generation bilinguals in this context was identical to that of Lynch's third generation. Below are two examples of this clause with indicative and subjunctive use by two NYR consultants.

(21) aunque no te ... no **estoy** hablando para ellos... – NYR 370M

(22) aunque no **vaya** nadie conmigo... – NYR 367E

Our second generation yielded a total of 45 tokens similar to those seen in examples (21) and (22) in regard to variation between indicative and subjunctive use. Of the total number of tokens situated in this specific context, 16 were generated in the subjunctive (36 percent), and the remaining 29 in the indicative mood (64 percent). These numbers are strikingly different from past studies, namely Torres with 100 percent subjunctive output, Lynch with 78 percent (second generation), and Silva-Corvalán and Martínez with 74 percent. Our consultants generated the subjunctive far less often (36 percent of all inflected verbs in this context) than did the consultants involved in those other investigations.

1.7 Summary

Above we noted that the most common context where mood variation is found to be statistically significant is the temporal adverbial clause, as established in three of the four studies. From there we looked at five other syntactic and semantic contexts of interest, noting more differences in the findings than similarities. That is, there do not appear to be many trends with respect to the specific contexts in which mood variation manifests across the generations. From a macro description, however, we can substantiate from these key studies that contexts where the subjunctive is considered optional tend to generate higher levels of variation between the indicative and subjunctive by the subsequent generations than those considered obligatory subjunctive environments. Indeed, the use of indicative verb forms in optional subjunctive contexts is shown to increase by second and third generations across all of the studies. Furthermore, we noted that some contexts, such as the concessive clause, yielded a higher indicative percentage in our dissertation study than was the case in the other studies under consideration here.

It is unclear, however, why these investigations have returned varying results concerning percentages and statistical significance, but differences in the data collection and analyses, generational stratification, envelope of variation, etc. likely contribute to such inconsistencies. A strong example of this was shown with the conditional verb form, where Silva-Corvalán posits its complete absence, and the present study, which shows beyond a doubt that this form is very much still in use among the second-generation bilinguals. The point is, although each study produced different specific results, the general objective of them, which was to determine differences in subjunctive use across generations, is compatible, showing that second-generation bilinguals use the subjunctive less frequently than their first-generation counterparts. We now

turn to this dissertation's specific research questions in an effort to solve our generational mood problem.

2. Answers to Research Questions & Hypotheses

In this section we provide an answer to each research question based on this dissertation's findings. Furthermore, in conjunction with the questions, the corresponding hypotheses are addressed. The questions and answers appear in the same order as they were initially presented in Chapter 1; the hypotheses, however, are not in order of their original arrangement, but rather are coupled with their relative questions.

Q.a) Does the subjunctive use of second-generation NYC bilinguals differ from that of their first-generation NYC counterparts?

Answer: Yes. This was the first, and arguably the most important inferential finding we presented in the previous chapter: statistical significance showing that the consultants make up two separate groups regarding their use of the subjunctive. The answer to this broad question appears to be extremely clear and is evidenced by our statistical analysis. Further descriptive findings showed that, overall, the second generation used the subjunctive less and the indicative more than the first generation. Equally important is the non-significant ANOVA results concerning region. Our dissertation study is the first variationist-sociolinguistic investigation centered on mood that considers not only Spanish in contact with English, but also Spanish in contact with other varieties of Spanish in the same linguistic community. The non-significance of this variable (region) is a vital finding with respect to research in Spanish-speaking NYC because it indicates that subjunctive and indicative use is similar across the two regions, Mainland and Caribbean, for both of the generational groups.

Q.b) What are the syntactic and communicative contexts in which the subjunctive is used in the first and second generations? Where is the subjunctive obligatory and where does it alternate with the indicative (and in certain cases, with the conditional as well)?

H.2) Subjunctive use decreases, while indicative use increases, in all syntactic and communicative contexts of the second generation.

Answer: A total of 19 syntactic and semantic contexts were identified based on LAR usage of mood. Regarding obligatory and optional contexts, the first generation used the subjunctive in 90 percent or more of the tokens in a total of nine syntactic and semantic contexts, whereas the second-generation consultants used the subjunctive in 90 percent or more of the verbs in a total of only five contexts. The following table recaps these specific contexts, which were presented in the previous chapter.

Table 5.2a Hierarchy of Contexts with 90% or More Subjunctive Use, by Generation			
LAR	% of Subjunctive Verb Forms	NYR	% of Subjunctive Verb Forms
1. Discourse Marker	100	1. Discourse Marker	100
2. Purpose / Contingency Adverbial clause	100	2. Imperative	100
3. Indirect Command	100	3. Causative clause	100
4. Imperative	100	4. Volitional / Influential Noun clause	94
5. Causative clause	100	5. Purpose / Contingency Adverbial clause	90
6. Volitional / Influential Noun clause	99		
7. Temporal Adverbial clause with Futurity	97		
8. Hypothetical <i>como si</i> clause	97		
9. Protasis clause in Hypothetical conditional sentence	92		

Contrasting the contexts of the LAR group with those of the NYR group shows a clear reduction in the number of contexts where the subjunctive is used obligatorily. Furthermore, the three NYR contexts that retained 100 percent subjunctive use are essentially environments of little plausible variation. That is, as was explained in Chapter 3, section 3, we collected all instances of subjunctive verb forms, including discourse markers and imperatives (for the latter, only subjunctive command forms, i.e., only for *usted*, *ustedes* and negated *tú*), which, because of our determined procedure, never alternate with an indicative verb form. We provide below examples of these two contexts.

(23) ...hay subdivisiones ahí, **o sea** por ejemplo para nosotros... – NYR 092P

(24) Ay, **cállese** – NYR 181C

Example number 23 shows what we refer to as a discourse marker⁴³, which also happens to be the context that produced the highest number of subjunctive forms for both generational groups (LAR, 434 tokens; NYR, 231 tokens). Number 24 is an example of the subjunctive form used as a formal imperative, i.e., in the *usted* command form. The nature of these two contexts does not permit an indicative form, hence the 100 percent subjunctive use in them is a given⁴⁴. Finally, all tokens located in causative clauses, albeit few (LAR, 9 tokens; NYR, 3 tokens), were found in the subjunctive form. Example 25 below illustrates this particular environment.

(25) ...lo hice que se lo **comiera** – NYR 228D

Considered from this perspective, the NYR really only had one true obligatory context, the causative clause, because the other two mentioned above are de facto areas of zero variation.

⁴³ Other linguists, such as Andrew Lynch, refer to this context as Idiomatic Usage.

⁴⁴ Although an *usted* command with an indicative verb form could exist, as in *cállase usted*, thus making this context an area of variation, we found not one single instance of this in our corpus for either generation.

That is, because the NYR group permits variation in certain contexts where the LAR group allows none, such as with purpose/contingency adverbial clauses (LAR, 100 percent subjunctive use; NYR, 90 percent subjunctive use), in theory the same could be true in these causative clauses. We find, however, zero variation in this clause. What is more, Silva-Corvalán also found 100 percent subjunctive use in this context by all her generations, but it was also used very little at a mere 15 instances total. Thus it is plausible that this particular syntactic environment, in spite of being of little use, has become a sort of crystallized subjunctive-only environment for both generations, similar to discourse markers and formal imperatives. That is, the use of the subjunctive in these three contexts may be something akin to complete lexical usage where the speakers are not constructing the utterances through their grammar, but rather they are a type of memorized prefabs, similar to how one memorizes the form of lexical items.

Returning now to the research question and hypothesis, the remaining contexts were areas of alternation between subjunctive and indicative mood forms, i.e., syntactic and semantic contexts where the subjunctive is used optionally:

- 10 optional contexts for the LAR
- 14 optional contexts for the NYR

The corresponding hypothesis is mainly supported by our findings, with the exception of the three contexts discussed above where both groups had 100 percent subjunctive use (discourse marker, imperative and causative clause) and one context, modal clause, where, for unexplained but seemingly unimportant reasons, the NYR group had a higher percentage of subjunctive forms (69 percent for NYR, 65 percent for LAR). The remaining 15 contexts, however, follow suit, as it were, regarding diminished NYR subjunctive use and increased indicative use.

Q.c) What internal and external independent variables condition mood choice in both immigrant generational groups?

H.3) Immigrant generation conditions mood choice more so than does any other variable.

Answer: Concerning internal independent variables, our findings indicate that the distributional hierarchy of the subjunctive throughout the 19 syntactic and semantic contexts is an internal independent variable that conditions mood choice for each generation. That is, the environment in which each group used subjunctive verb forms is statistically significant. Further, the contexts that made up the two umbrella categories, obligatory and optional, differed according to the given generation. Within those two categories, each particular syntactic and semantic context determined mood choice. The hierarchical order of the contexts, based on subjunctive distribution within the given context, played a statistically significant role in mood choice for each generation, i.e., the frequency of subjunctive use in specific contexts was different across the two groups, aligning only six times out of 19 possibilities (32 percent of the time). Tense was also considered, but our findings show that the two groups distribute their subjunctive forms nearly identically with respect to tense.

With regard to external variables, the hypothesis associated with this question is corroborated. As previously mentioned, the ANOVA test told us that immigrant generation was the only external variable that shaped both groups' mood use. Post-hoc tests revealed other scattered externals that seemed to randomly show significance for the NYR group, but these findings make it difficult to propose any concrete evidence of mood-choice conditioning⁴⁵. What is interesting, however, is that there appear to be far more external independent variables

⁴⁵ In an effort to avoid redundancy, we do not list here all of the external variables that yielded significant results. For a complete presentation of these externals, see Chapter 4, sections 4 and 5.

conditioning the NYR group than the LAR group. In other words, based on the inferential analyses, the first generation gives the impression of being more homogeneous in regard to their use of mood because the vast majority of the external variables tested for them produced non-significant results. The second generation, on the other hand, appears seemingly more heterogeneous in nature given the much higher number of external variables with significant results.

Q.d) Is the second generation's use of mood such that, when compared to that of their first-generation counterparts, grammatical command of mood appears developed and systematic? Or is there evidence of an incomplete or unsystematic mood grammar?

H.1) Second-generation bilinguals command mood choice in Spanish, but the underlying grammar appears to be simplified when compared to that of the first generation.

Answer: Fundamentally, the answer to the first part of this question is yes. The question, however, is essentially the culmination of all of the prior questions and the complete answer lies in a combination of all of their answers. That is to say, as this question's hypothesis puts forward, the NYR use the subjunctive in the same contexts as the LAR, have similar patterns of usage regarding both overall output and tense, and appear to largely command the pragmatics involved in mood choice. On the other hand, the findings presented in this investigation, as well as those from previous studies, show that second-generation bilinguals use the subjunctive less frequently throughout nearly all syntactic and semantic contexts when compared to their first-generation complements. To be sure, our study shows that the NYR group generated fewer subjunctive forms in 15 out of 19 of the possible contexts. But does this remission in subjunctive frequency indicate a simplified, attrited, or incomplete subjunctive grammar?

Both Lynch (1999) and Silva-Corvalán (1995) propose a simplified subjunctive grammar as evidenced by their studies. Expanding on Silva-Corvalán's definition of the term simplification, Lynch offers the following in his conclusions:

'Simplification' is attested in cases of reduction in which the **system** of language **X** determining the usage of form **A** by a particular speaker or group of speakers is **simplified**, to the end that a specified context of usage for form **A** is eliminated at the same time that other contexts of usage for form **A** remain. (184, bold his emphasis)

He then mentions attrition:

I would further suggest that if a **form A** in language **X** is systematically evident in the discourse of a particular speaker or group of speakers in a specified time frame (or a specified generation of speakers in apparent time), and then **unsystematically evident** in the discourse of the same speaker or group of speakers in a subsequent specified time frame ... (or in a subsequent generation of speakers in apparent time), the term **'attrition'** seems more appropriate than 'loss'. (185, bold his emphasis)

It would appear, then, that Silva-Corvalán thinks of U.S. Spanish-English bilinguals in terms of simplification that eventually leads to loss of the form(s). Lynch, however, attributes both simplification and attrition to the subjunctive grammar of subsequent bilingual speakers, similar to what Montrul (2009) has presented in her studies, a decade after Lynch.

Regarding our findings, neither of these notions seems fully accurate in describing the NYR group's subjunctive use. The bilinguals used the subjunctive in all of the same contexts as the LAR group, albeit at a lower frequency. Furthermore, our findings showed that the NYR group used the subjunctive in the same tenses, and at nearly the same rate in each tense, as the first-generation consultants. This finding can be contrasted to Silva-Corvalán's (1995)

investigation, which reported the nearly exclusive use of the present subjunctive tense by the bilingual groups. Nevertheless, the LAR consultants of our study did use the subjunctive more often, and in more obligatory contexts, than did the NYR group, but this point should not overshadow the fact that the subjunctive use was still very active throughout these bilingual consultants' conversations. They demonstrated command of complex sentence structures with subjunctive use, hypothetical discourse, and at least some pragmatic knowledge of the subtleties of mood choice in contexts that allow for both mood. Take, for example, the apparent command of the pragmatics involved in mood choice by an NYR Ecuadorian consultant in the following possibility clauses.

(26) Entonces, la tradición, quizás sea... esa sea la... you know, como... vuelvo y te digo, no soy... por lo menos, quizás mi forma de pensar no es tan tra... tradicional, entonces chocaría con las cosas. – NYR 322E

This consultant used the subjunctive *sea* after the adverb *quizás*, which permits the use of either the indicative or the subjunctive, depending on what the speaker wishes to communicate. Use of the subjunctive is seemingly less assertive or less factual – the speaker expresses some degree of doubt or uncertainty regarding the subject at hand. In this example the consultant is speaking about a tradition in which she may or may not be very knowledgeable, or believes to be an unimportant tradition, hence the use of the subjunctive when referring to it. When she turns the conversation to her own personality, her 'way of thinking', she opts for the indicative mood, *es*, after the same adverb, *quizás*. Now she is expressing a more assertive and authoritative view because she certainly knows herself better than some distant tradition. She seems capable of expressing these pragmatic differences by her choice of mood, which, in turn, appears to demonstrate command of a complex subjunctive grammar. What's more, the findings indicate

that this is not an isolated incident; the NYR group generated 8 tokens in the subjunctive and 36 in the indicative in the possibility clause.

We observe this same mood variation in among a first-generation Spanish speaker⁴⁶.

(27) a lo mejor **pueda** ser que... – LAR 316E

(28) a lo mejor **se ha de haber ido** a España. – LAR 316E

A lo mejor is similar to *quizás* because both express possibility and, therefore, depending upon the assertiveness that the speaker wishes to express, can be followed by either the subjunctive (less assertive) or the indicative (more assertive). The LAR group generated 22 tokens in the subjunctive and 60 in the indicative in this context. It appears, then, that the second-generation bilingual used the subjunctive and indicative mood distinction in the same manner as did the first-generation consultant.

Regarding attrition as an explanation for subsequent generations' grammar behaviors, this concept would require longitudinal observation of individuals in order to determine that particular grammatical features erode over time. That is, attrition means that something has gradually worn down, which suggests that the grammatical feature under study was once complete. This would indicate that at some point the feature was whole in the grammar of the subsequent generation(s), an assertion that seems difficult to substantiate. It may perhaps be more logical that the feature was simply never fully formed, or at least when compared to that of the first generation.

In Ocampo's (1990) discussion of his findings, he mentions the term MECHANICAL REPRODUCTION in which the second-generation bilinguals merely reproduce subjunctive structures that they have been exposed to throughout their lives. He attributes this notion

⁴⁶ Note too that both of these consultants share the same national origins, Ecuadorian.

primarily to obligatory subjunctive contexts, which did in fact statistically favor subjunctive use by both generational groups, as opposed to those contexts where mood was optional, where indicative usage was considerably higher among the subsequent generations. Silva-Corvalán discusses subjunctive loss “...in optional contexts...where the choice between competing forms does not cause ungrammaticality” (1995:266), reasoning that this is why the subjunctive is highest in obligatory subjunctive contexts, and declines in optional subjunctive ones. Both of these notions seem plausible and our own findings seem to substantiate that subjunctive usage does indeed decrease more so in optional syntactic and semantic contexts than in obligatory ones. Nevertheless, as has been shown by the present investigation’s findings, the NYR bilinguals produce the subjunctive in complex sentences with semantic and pragmatic nuances, which requires far more than mere mimicking of previous discourse exposure. That is to say, although we agree that the formation of our NYR consultant’s Spanish grammar is contingent on their exposure to Spanish spoken in their NYC communities by other first- and second- (possibly even third-) generation Spanish speakers, our findings indicate that most of the second-generation consultants are capable of generating original discourse that requires mood distinction in their expression of opinions, stories, etc. Therefore, while the initial grammatical framework involved in the use of mood was certainly based on input from an early age, it is clear that these bilinguals go beyond simple mimicry with respect to producing one mood form or the other.

Furthermore, we reiterate that the primary difference regarding NYR subjunctive use is that it occurs less frequently when compared to the LAR consultants. The form is still very much in use by the second generation, just as it is with the first-generation Spanish speakers. Both consultant groups used indicative verb forms throughout all of the optional contexts, albeit less often in the LAR group than the NYR group, and even produced some indicative forms in the

obligatory contexts. That is, although the instances of LAR indicative tokens located in obligatory subjunctive contexts are few and may in fact be attributed to a possible margin of error, as mentioned in footnote 27 of Chapter 3, it is also plausible that the presence of these indicative verb forms is symptomatic of the early stages of the indicative encroaching on obligatory subjunctive use in spoken Spanish in general. In other words, the heightened use of the indicative by the NYR consultants could possibly be a phenomenon associated with the lack of monolingual or dominant Spanish normative influences and pressures because they live in an English dominant linguistic setting, but one which is also taking place in monolingual Spanish societies around the world, only at a much slower pace. Most of the recent investigations on Spanish spoken in the U.S. would agree that the absence of the linguistic influences and norms surrounding Spanish monolingual societies is directly related to the linguistic differences observed in the Spanish spoken in the U.S. (Otheguy & Zentella 2012, Lynch 2009, Silva-Corvalán 1995 & 1994, Ocampo 1990, Torres 1989 etc.). Silva-Corvalán ascribes generational reductions in subjunctive use to "...reduced access or lack of access to formal varieties of the language or to those institutions that maintain conservative and prescriptive language norms" (1994:268). Moreover, in the same study by Silva-Corvalán, she attributes the gradual loss of the subjunctive mood in subsequent bilinguals to an internally motivated change, inherent to Spanish grammar, and accelerated in language contact settings. This could be interpreted as an internal variable (reduction of subjunctive morphology) triggered by an external variable (lack of normative Spanish contact). This is not, however, due to contact with the English language system per se, but rather to the lack of normative monolingual Spanish societal pressures in an English dominant society.

According to this theory, the Spanish spoken by subsequent generations in the U.S. would be reflective of an already occurring reduction of subjunctive usage in the Spanish language as a whole, but even more widespread and apparent given the absence of Spanish monolingual societal pressures. English grammar, and direct contact with it, then, would not have a firsthand impact on the distinct subjunctive usage of U.S. Spanish-English bilinguals, but rather an indirect one, due to its status as the socially superior language and Spanish as the subordinate one (Silva-Corvalán 1994, Dorian 1978). This concept, in part, seems consistent with Ocampo's idea of mechanical reproduction, and to a degree with our own findings: the bilinguals reproduce what they hear from the monolingual speakers, whose subjunctive usage is already inherently variable in several areas (primarily in optional contexts). It thus seems plausible that mood variation between subjunctive and indicated verb forms in an essentially normative-free setting would accelerate, reflecting an already present and gradual change in the Spanish language system, albeit minimal, as has been observed in LAR obligatory subjunctive contexts with less than 100 percent subjunctive use.

Be that as it may, we do not pretend to propose any actual change taking place in the Spanish grammar of U.S. bilinguals because, and in alignment with the concept of a type of mechanical reproduction through which subjunctive grammar is acquired (see above), the Spanish spoken by these bilinguals will not be passed on to a third generation and, therefore, the lifespan of any 'changes' that took place in these particular second-generation speakers' subjunctive grammar ends with that generation. Otheguy summarizes this idea:

In Latin America and Spain we naturally find at least three, and sometimes four, contemporaneous generations of speaker of Spanish. By contrast, in the USA we generally find only two generations. In spite of the language's widespread presence and

the continuous flow of immigrants who speak it, intergenerational transmission of Spanish within the USA is limited. As with other immigrant languages in North America, economic and political conditions tend to reduce the use of the language as generations succeed each other, so that Spanish disappears in many families within three, and sometimes two generations. (2010:87)

In other words, the existence of Spanish spoken in the U.S. is contingent on the steady influx of immigration by Spanish speaking natives. In turn, the Spanish spoken by their children will reflect the grammar that these immigrants initially brought with them, but with particular differences, such as frequency of subjunctive use and syntactic and semantic context hierarchy rearrangements, such as those observed in our findings. We think of this phenomenon as a type of CIRCULAR LANGUAGE REPRODUCTION, in which particular grammatical features, such as mood, can be traced back to, and observed in, the grammar of their first-generation counterparts. That is, while it is not our aim to predict the future of Spanish subjunctive use, from our data and analyses it appears that subjunctive usage by the second generation, dependent upon the constant immigration of first-generation Spanish speakers, is reflective of the first generation's use of mood, differing only in frequency and context organization, which, in theory, could be a possible insight into what is taking place in the Spanish subjunctive mood grammar in general.

2.1 Different Mood Grammars

Equally possible is to conceive of the two generational groups as using separate and, therefore, different mood grammars. Our data tells us that subjunctive and indicative use throughout obligatory and optional contexts is determined by generation, i.e., frequencies of mood usage are different for the two groups. We have been analyzing and interpreting these data

through a comparative scope, which is the framework of our dissertation study. If, however, we temporarily set aside comparisons and simply consider the two generations individually, we are faced with two unique, yet equally complete and systematic, mood grammars. That is, both groups merely have their own approach to, and use of, mood. For instance, the NYR generation's mood grammar produces the subjunctive in 90 percent or more of the tokens throughout five contexts (refer back to Table 5.2a, p. 85); the LAR, nine. Nonetheless, just as the LAR group produced 65 percent of the verbs situated in modal clauses in the subjunctive, for example, the NYR produced 65 percent of their verbs in comment clauses in the subjunctive; and 67 percent subjunctive verb forms in locative clauses for the LAR is close to the NYR's 69 percent subjunctive use in their modal clauses, etc. These percentages are not meant to be comparative, at the moment; rather, they are intended to highlight the autonomous use of the subjunctive by the two different groups. This purely descriptive approach, void of any and all prescriptive nature that could potentially surface in any comparative study, emphasizes second-generation command of their mood grammar. Be that as it may, for reasons discussed above, particularly with regard to our notion of circular language reproduction, the present study is constructed by comparative means, thus centering on descriptive and inferential analyses across the two generations. We turn now to the qualitative segment of this dissertation.

3. Qualitative Considerations

The above discussion concerns findings and their subsequent interpretation when based on the consultants as two autonomous groups. This is scientifically sound for two reasons:

- the thorough stratification of the corpus used for data collection
- the significant one-way ANOVA results telling us that there are overall difference between the two groups

These two facts permit the treatment of these two generations as representatives of the rest of the Spanish speakers in NYC as a whole. That is, the observations and conclusions drawn based on these two generational groups can be extrapolated to Spanish speaking first- and second-generation New York residents. On an individual basis, however, not all of these observations and conclusions seem apropos. We will now take a qualitative look at some of the more interesting grammatical characteristics of the NYR consultants and their use of mood.

Perhaps the most sensible area to begin a discussion on the second generation's mood usage is in the subjunctive contexts considered obligatory as per LAR usage. The nine contexts situated within the obligatory subjunctive category have the potential to provide extremely transparent examples of mood variability and/or command of mood choice among the NYR bilingual group. That is, in the optional subjunctive category, the presence of both subjunctive and indicative forms is expected; but because there may be several semantic and pragmatic factors involved with mood choice in optional contexts, analyzing the presence of one mood or the other is much more problematic. The obligatory subjunctive category seems, therefore, more accessible regarding command of mood choice because it is essentially black and white, i.e., higher frequencies of indicative verb forms in obligatory subjunctive contexts demonstrate a potentially weaker command of mood.

Of the 26 NYR consultants, five of them used the subjunctive in 100 percent of the verbs located in the obligatory subjunctive contexts. These were:

- NYR 228D with 16 subjunctive verb forms
- NYR 331.2D with 12 subjunctive verb forms
- NYR 367E with 22 subjunctive verb forms
- NYR 340M with 14 subjunctive verb forms

- NYR 310C with 52 subjunctive verb forms

Expressed in terms of percentage, 19 percent of the NYR consultants used the subjunctive in obligatory contexts in the same fashion as the LAR group, where 16 LAR consultants generated the subjunctive in 100 percent of the verbs situated in the obligatory subjunctive category.

Concerning variability, i.e., use of the indicative in the obligatory subjunctive contexts, the majority of the NYR consultants (19, to be exact) produced four or less indicative verb forms each. Of the 10 LAR consultants that generated an indicative verb form here, eight had only one occurrence each, and the other two produced two indicatives each. The two remaining NYR consultants, however, produced several more indicative verb forms in these obligatory contexts:

- NYR 311C with 11 indicative verb forms
- NYR 417P with nine indicatives verb forms

Thus, it appears that as a generational group, the majority of the NYR consultants share similar usage patterns (19 with four or less indicatives) regarding verb choice in obligatory subjunctive contexts. These last two consultants, however, with their high indicative outputs, skew the overall findings for the NYR group as a whole and therefore warrant individual examination.

3.1 Obligatory Subjunctive Contexts: NYR 417P & NYR 311C

We start with the numerical distribution of mood forms in obligatory subjunctive contexts for NYR consultant 417P, presented below in Table 5.3a.

Table 5.3a Mood Distribution in Obligatory Subjunctive Contexts for NYR 417P	Subjunctive N	Indicative N
Discourse Marker	0	0
Purpose / Contingency Adverbial clause	0	0
Indirect Command	0	0
Imperative	3	0
Causative clause	0	0
Volitional / Influential Noun clause	0	1
Temporal Adverbial clause with Futurity	1	8
Hypothetical <i>como si</i> clause	0	0
Protasis clause in Hypothetical conditional sentence	0	0
Total	4	9

The table shows that this consultant produced very few tokens overall. The subjunctive was used in only two contexts, imperative and temporal adverbial clause with futurity, totaling a mere four instances. The indicative verb form was used more, with a total of nine, but again there were only two contexts into which they were categorized, volitional and temporal. Nevertheless, the indicative output is of interest here because it is higher than the subjunctive output for this particular consultant. Before we analyze any further, however, let us first look at two examples of the indicative used in the temporal context produced by this NYR bilingual⁴⁷.

(29) yo siempre dije que... cuando... **me casaré**... – NYR 417P

(30) la próxima vez cuando **yo me pongo** bravo con una... – NYR 417P

The discourse present in these two examples is set in an unknown future as indicated by the use of the conjunction *cuando* and the contextual reference to futurity, which, according to our findings, statistically favors the use of the subjunctive for both generations. This consultant,

⁴⁷ The indicative verb form in the volitional context was already used in example (9) above in section 1.2 (p. 75) of the present chapter; refer back to that example for that particular context.

however, used indicative verb forms to address future events, *me casaré* and *me pongo* (the subjunctive counterparts would be *me case* and *me ponga*, respectively), but why? The fact is any grammatically pragmatic reason we may propose would be entirely conjectural given the insufficient number of examples in the subjunctive form produced by NYR 417P with which to compare this specific context. There was only one instance of the subjunctive in a future context, and its use appears atypical. This example requires further discourse contextualization in order to understand our questioning of the use of a subjunctive verb form.

(31) En la verdad es que, un señor que...van a decir oh porque trabaja por John , para John Jay pero la verdad es que um... el presidente... um... Lynch... no sé porqué... pero siempre cuando yo, yo lo veo, eh... siempre luchando con todo el trabajo que él tiene y siempre cuando uno lo ve tiene tanta, tanta energía, tanta, nunca, una, nunca la, la ha visto con los, you know, uh... doblado o sin sonrisa, sin siempre tiene una ...energía de um... cuando hace el trabajo de siempre de uh... el siempre de uh... su energía completo y cuando uno le, le **hable** también, uh... siempre él está em... how do you say, la palabra em... intent on what your saying? – NYR 417P

This example is ripe with several examples of discourse based on habitual events using the conjunction *cuando*, but presented with the expected indicative verb form:

- *siempre cuando yo lo veo*
- *siempre cuando uno lo ve*
- *cuando hace el trabajo*

Then, without any clear indication of a change in the discourse topic, the consultant slips a subjunctive verb form in the exact same syntactic environment:

- *cuando uno le hable*

The use of the subjunctive appears to be unintentional, i.e., does not appear to be used for any semantic or pragmatic reason. The bilingual is discussing this Lynch person and the habitual events surrounding him, such as being seen, working etc., all the while using the indicative, but then switches to the subjunctive to describe the same events, i.e., when one speaks to him (Lynch). Of course it is impossible for us to get inside the mind of this consultant and determine precisely what was meant here and if the subjunctive use was intentional. We must therefore consider other observations and possibilities in order to propose any sort of explanation. Before centering on that task, however, we will first look at the other consultant to expand on our comprehension of what might be taking place at a micro level. Table 5.3b below presents NYR 311C's use of mood distributed throughout the nine obligatory contexts.

Table 5.3b Mood Distribution in Obligatory Subjunctive Contexts for NYR 311C	Subjunctive N	Indicative N
Discourse Marker	5	0
Purpose / Contingency Adverbial clause	9	2
Indirect Command	2	1
Imperative	45	0
Causative clause	0	0
Volitional / Influential Noun clause	12	2
Temporal Adverbial clause with Futurity	0	2
Hypothetical <i>como si</i> clause	0	1
Protasis clause in Hypothetical conditional sentence	0	3
Total	73	11

The table shows that this consultant produced considerably more tokens than did NYR 417P. There is also much more mood variation within these contexts. That is, where the previous bilingual produced different mood forms in only two contexts, this consultant used the two moods in eight different contexts. What's more, of those eight, three contexts were sights of

mood variation proper, i.e., had instances of both the subjunctive and the indicative. These three contexts were:

- purpose / contingency adverbial clause
- indirect command
- volitional / influential noun clause

Examples pulled from these areas of variation should suffice for our treatment of this particular consultant.

(32) a mí me gustaría bastante para que ellos **enseñen** los niños... (purpose / contingency adverbial clause) – NYR 311C

(33) y para que la gente no **crea** que la gente hispana son brutos... (purpose / contingency adverbial clause) – NYR 311C

(34) Exacto, nada, que **tenga** todo eso limpio porque... (indirect command)
– NYR 311C

(35) si viene un muchacho, que le **compra**, si quiere, un trago... (indirect command) –
NYR 311C

(36) yo le digo que no **coma** eso... (volitional / influential noun clause)
– NYR 311C

(37) ...le digo a ella que no... no **come** dulces... (volitional / influential noun clause) –
NYR 311C

These six sentences represent the crux of our dissertation study, as they are quintessential examples of mood variation. For each of the three contexts mentioned above we have provided two examples, one with the use of a subjunctive verb form and one with the use of an indicative verb form in the same syntactic environment. Like bilingual NYR consultant 417P, use of the

unanticipated mood, which in these examples is the indicative verb form, does not appear to be deliberate. There is no evidence of any subtle change in the communication due to an intentional selection of an indicative form in the same context where a subjunctive was previously used and, in fact, expected. In other words, neither indicative *crea* in the purpose adverbial clause (example 33), nor *compra* (example 35) and *come* (example 37) in the indirect command and volitional clause, respectively, seem to communicate anything different than their counterparts in which the expected subjunctive was produced (namely, *enseñen*, *tenga* and *coma*). From what can be seen in these examples, in purely grammatical terms, it might appear that this consultant, as well as perhaps the other, uses the subjunctive and the indicative in some sort of free variation. This explanation, however, may not be as simple as that.

Firstly, from the examples we have seen by these two consultants, NYR 311C seems to have an overall stronger command of the Spanish language. This observation is based on complexity and variety of sentence structures, grammar and vocabulary. Secondly, with respect to mood variation, 311C appears to be more representative of the NYR group as a whole, although both consultants certainly share several common characteristics. We make this statement because 311C produced considerably more tokens for analysis than did 417P, and the quality of the tokens from the former were more in line with those stemming from the majority of the other NYR consultants. Lastly, it was important to select the two consultants with the highest number of indicative verb form tokens in the obligatory subjunctive category, but also two that differed from one another in their own use in order to highlight variability at the micro level (individually). In other words, these two consultants do not represent homogenous mood usage. Therefore, the final words on these two bilinguals are not necessarily attributable to both.

We have discussed the notion of simplification as being applicable to the NYR group as a whole. This conception could perhaps be a reasonable description of 417P's use of mood given the more frequent use of the indicative. That is, it is possible that this speaker's mood grammar is simplified in that the indicative is used in nearly all contexts, irrespective of what is deemed an obligatory subjunctive context by the LAR group. After all, one mood form used in nearly all contexts certainly appears "simpler" than having to select between two mood forms. In order to corroborate this idea, however, the optional contexts must also be considered.

3.2 Optional Subjunctive Contexts: NYR 417P & NYR 311C

The following table shows the distribution of subjunctive and indicative verb forms throughout the ten optional subjunctive syntactic and semantic contexts for NYR consultant 417P.

Table 5.3c Mood Distribution in Optional Subjunctive Contexts for NYR 417P	Subjunctive N	Indicative N
Comment clause	0	0
Adjective clause of Nonexistent or Indefinite Antecedent	0	2
Subordinate clause after <i>Depende</i>	0	0
Apodosis clause in Hypothetical conditional sentence	0	0
Negated Reality Negated Noun clause	0	1
Locative clause	0	2
Modal clause	2	3
Protasis clause in Concessive sentence	0	0
Possibility clause	0	5
Uncertainty clause	0	3
Total	2	16

The high number of indicative forms (16 total) and nearly non-existent number of subjunctives (2 total) presented in Table 5.3c seem to support a simplified mood grammar for NYR 417P.

Expressed in terms of percentage, this NYR consultant used the indicative in 89 percent of the

verbs in contexts where both moods were possible (optional contexts), an unquestionable skewing toward a strong indicative preference and perhaps simplification. When both categories are looked at, i.e., obligatory and optional subjunctive contexts together, we see that this bilingual produced a total of 31 tokens inside the envelope of variation, 25 of which were indicatives, and the remaining six, subjunctives. In other words, the NYR consultant used the indicative for 81 percent of the tokens inside the envelope of variation. Indeed, once we take into consideration mood forms produced in optional contexts by consultant NYR 311C as well, mood simplification may be more apparent. The table below presents this consultant's use of the two different moods throughout the optional subjunctive contexts.

Table 5.3d Mood Distribution in Optional Subjunctive Contexts for NYR 311C	Subjunctive N	Indicative N
Comment clause	2	3
Adjective clause of Nonexistent or Indefinite Antecedent	1	1
Subordinate clause after <i>Depende</i>	0	3
Apodosis clause in Hypothetical conditional sentence	0	4
Negated Reality Negated Noun clause	0	2
Locative clause	0	0
Modal clause	23	19
Protasis clause in Concessive sentence	0	0
Possibility clause	0	1
Uncertainty clause	2	10
Total	28	43

Table 5.3d shows that consultant NYR 311C produced more indicative forms than subjunctive ones in the optional syntactic and semantic contexts, with a total of 43 tokens of the former and 28 tokens of the latter. The apparent preference of the indicative mood for this consultant is not as drastic as is seen for NYR 417P, but there certainly appears to be a general skewing toward indicative usage. Whereas the other consultant used the indicative in 89 percent of the verbs in

these optional subjunctive contexts and in 81 percent of the inflected verbs overall, this bilingual's indicative verb form output was at 61 percent in optional contexts, but only 35 percent for both categories. Thus, referring to this consultant's mood grammar, whose subjunctive use was frequent and manifested in diverse syntactic and semantic contexts, as being simplified is, perhaps, more of a simplified explanation than a thorough one.

3.3 Fragmented and/or Simplified Mood Grammar

When compared exclusively to LAR subjunctive use in obligatory contexts, it becomes plausible to think of these two specific consultants' mood-use behaviors as representing opposing ends of a spectrum of two different possible types of mood grammars:

- simplified

and/or

- fragmented

The notion of a simplified grammar has already been discussed throughout this dissertation, but the latter is only now surfacing for the first time. The idea of a FRAGMENTED MOOD GRAMMAR, a descriptive title we have coined in this dissertation study, is similar, but not identical to, the concept known as incomplete acquisition. We use the term fragmented with respect to the second generation because we believe it more accurately describes a mood grammar in which both moods are still present, as is the case for these two consultants as well as the rest of the NYR group, but one in which the mood grammar never reached full development in all syntactic and semantic areas. In other words, a fragmented mood grammar would generally exhibit a higher degree of variability, wherein some syntactic and semantic contexts would be under strong command by the speakers, while other contexts would show more inconsistent alteration between indicative and subjunctive verb forms. Indeed, because this variability appears

void of any true semantic value, it does not render the communicated message incomprehensible or ambiguous. The idea of an incomplete grammar, however, alludes to the idea that there somehow exists a complete grammar *de facto*; a conception framed by an ideological projection of what embodies completeness. Any grammar from which communication is achieved is, in its own respect, complete. It is only when we begin comparing grammars that the need of terms such as fragmented, simplified and incomplete, necessarily begin to emerge. We are, however, making comparisons in this dissertation study and it is for that precise reason that we use fragmented in order to describe these grammars because, although these NYR consultants certainly achieve successful communication with their use of mood, it is clearly somewhat different from that of the LAR consultants.

Concerning our concept of a spectrum, as mentioned above, NYR 417P would be situated at the extreme end of a simplified and fragmented mood grammar, whereas NYR 311C would represent a more moderate version of this. For 417P, the proposal of a simplified mood grammar is supported by the fact that this consultant uses the indicative extensively, irrespective of the context at hand. Indeed, the indicative mood is used far more often than is the subjunctive in the Spanish language period; thus the expansion of the indicative mood to areas typically reserved for the subjunctive, such as those situated in obligatory subjunctive contexts, appears to simplify the mood dichotomy, leaning toward a reduced mood grammar in which only one form would eventually exist, which in this case would clearly be the indicative. This end result would be something like complete simplification. NYR 417P did, however, produce a few subjunctive forms, thus representing an advanced simplification of mood grammar rather than a complete simplification. NYR 311C, on the other hand, represents the early stages of a simplified grammar in which both moods are still presently active in the optional subjunctive contexts, but one in

which the more frequent form, the indicative, is beginning its ascent into obligatory subjunctive contexts. In fact, we noted that this consultant was already using the indicative verb form side by side with the subjunctive in three of the obligatory subjunctive contexts.

Consultant NYR 417P would also be situated at the extreme end of the spectrum in regard to our concept of a fragmented mood grammar. Given the use of the indicative in contexts where the subjunctive was expected, and even more notable, the use of the subjunctive where an indicative was expected as was shown in example (31) above, this consultant's command of mood distinction does not appear strong. Furthermore, the minimal tokens produced in the contexts where both moods were an option may be indicative of an altogether weak command of mood or a type of AVOIDANCE STRATEGY wherein the speaker simply evades complex sentences in which mood distinction would be necessary. In fact, the data obtained from this consultant places his/her general bilingual abilities in question. It is certainly a difficult task to determine what constitutes actual bilingualism, especially in the sense that the Spanish of a given English-Spanish bilingual is under command. That is, how is individual bilingualism designated and delineated? At what point is the speaker deemed not bilingual, approximating that of a second-language learner? Unfortunately, answering these questions is beyond the scope of this study. What we aim to achieve by presenting the questions is the acknowledgment that this particularly complex grammatical feature, mood, might be at least one of several indications as to the level of bilingualism of an individual.

This idea of an avoidance strategy, however, does not seem to accurately describe the linguistic behavior of NYR consultant 311C given the high number of tokens produced throughout the obligatory subjunctive contexts (a total of 84) and the notable syntactic and semantic complexities of the sentences. On the other hand, a fragmented mood grammar, albeit

less extreme than that of NYR 417P, could be a likely explanation for NYC 311C's linguistic patterns concerning subjunctive and indicative use. If this were the case, this bilingual would again, like simplification, be an example of an early mood grammar fragmentation, in which high levels of mood variability manifested throughout all contexts, both optional and obligatory. Indeed, equality conceivable is that both of these concepts are applicable to one type of mood grammar, i.e., a simplified and fragmented mood grammar. Or perhaps, as the title of this dissertation postulates, simply put, we are dealing with a VARIABLE MOOD GRAMMAR. That is, if we take the comparison of generational mood grammar out of the analysis and focus solely on the NYR group's use of mood, we observe a grammar that is capable of producing both moods throughout several syntactic and semantic contexts, but one in which the categories of these contexts, i.e., obligatory and optional, are flexible and permit variation between the subjunctive and the indicative. The indicative is the preferred mood simply because spoken Spanish uses it in over 90 percent of all inflected verbs, hence the NYR mood grammar merely allows this usage to permeate all through it.

3.4 External Variables: NYR 417P & NYR 311C

On a final note, up until this moment we have only been considering internal variables for these two consultants, i.e., the syntactic and semantic environments where subjunctive or indicative verb forms were generated. A few external variables, however, may help us better understand the linguistic patterns of these two NYR bilinguals, namely assessment of their own language use. On the questionnaire concerning external variables and factors, consultant NYR 417P self-evaluated as having:

- excellent English skills
- poor Spanish skills

- a low degree of general Spanish use

NYR 311C indicated:

- excellent English skills
- good Spanish skills
- a low degree of general Spanish use⁴⁸

The external variable that stands out is Spanish skills, where the former marked poor and the latter, good. While it is beyond our objective to discuss what constitutes “good” and “poor” Spanish, especially with respect to these specific consultants and their own personal linguistic ideologies, it is interesting to take note of these self-evaluations and the subsequent data they produced. That is, “poor Spanish skills” (NYR 417P) was found to be further removed from LAR mood-use patterns, whereas “good Spanish skills” (NYR 311C) was much closer to the first generation’s use of the subjunctive. These are, however, mere observations, as they did not yield statistical significance at the group level, as mentioned earlier. Further sociolinguistic investigation would need to be performed in order to aptly explore any nexus between self-evaluation and grammar, which we leave for future research.

Recapitulation

In this dissertation study we postulated that consultants from the LAR group represent first-generation native speakers of Spanish with fully developed Spanish subjunctive grammars. The NYR consultants make up the second generation of Spanish-English bilinguals, having been raised in either an environment of simultaneous bilingualism (NY born), or sequential bilingualism (NY raised) (Montrul 2009). The extent of the NYR group’s grammatical command of subjunctive use has been the focus of our study, initially introduced and explored in Chapter 1.

⁴⁸ There are several other possibly relevant external variables, but these are the only three for which both consultants provided information.

Literature surrounding subjunctive use in the U.S. was reviewed in the second chapter in order to provide a solid platform and point of departure for our own investigation. In Chapter 3, Methodology, we explained the envelope of variation and the collection procedure for our study, considering and exemplifying eligible data and how we collected tokens of use. We presented the two categories for subjunctive use (obligatory and optional), with a total of 19 syntactic and semantic contexts that emerged from the LAR consultants' usage of the subjunctive.

Chapter 4 presented the findings of our investigation to see how the generations not only differed from one another in subjunctive use, but also how they resembled one another. Through one-way ANOVA tests we established evidence of two distinct groups regarding their subjunctive usage. Also discovered was that neither national nor regional origin was statistically significant, telling us that patterns of mood use are essentially homogenous throughout the six nationalities represented in our study, as well as the grouping of them into Mainland and Caribbean. We noted an overall reduction in subjunctive usage by the bilinguals, but a still strong presence of the subjunctive throughout the two umbrella categories and all of their corresponding syntactic and semantic contexts, as well as a near identical distribution of the subjunctive into tense. Differences in the hierarchical arrangement of the syntactic and semantic contexts also showed significance for each generation, a fundamental finding with respect to internal variables, thus corroborating external variables. That is to say, these statistically significant results support the external finding of the existence of two different speaker groups by showing internal differences between those two groups. Evidence at both external and internal levels is critical in sound variationist-sociolinguistic studies.

With respect to the present chapter, first the findings from previous studies centered on generational subjunctive grammar in the U.S. were compared to our own and it was noted that

the only consistency across these studies was that subsequent generations use the subjunctive less frequently than the first generation. The results for significant internal variables were generally inconsistent across all the studies. Next we addressed this study's research questions and hypotheses individually, tackling concepts associated with bilingual settings such as simplification, attrition and mechanical reproduction. Of those three theoretical frameworks, we determined that simplification seems to be the most accurate description regarding a possible explanation for the reduction of second-generational subjunctive use, followed by perhaps portions of the idea of mechanical reproduction. Also touched on were the ideas surrounding the absence of Spanish normative pressures in the U.S., circular language reproduction contingent on immigration influxes, and the possible inherent change of mood in the Spanish language itself. Finally, we briefly presented a purely descriptive view of autonomous generational mood grammars, different from one another, yet entirely under command and systematic for both groups.

The qualitative treatment of two NYR consultants was undertaken to expand on these concepts, as well as to introduce our own, which we call fragmented mood grammar. Our term rivals that of incomplete acquisition because it is our stance that the idea of "completeness" is highly problematic, whereas the notion of a fragmented mood grammar indicates possible underdevelopment in certain syntactic areas of the mood grammar; but even that description is only pertinent when we are comparing usage to a first-generation Spanish speaker. Essentially, from our handling of the bilingual mood grammar, simplification and fragmentation appear to be the most accurate theories regarding the description of the NYR bilingual population. There is of course a spectrum involved with these concepts as to the severity of each. Our two consultants used for the qualitative analysis represented either end of the spectrum.

Finally, we concluded the section with observations on the possible link between self-evaluation of Spanish skills and actual production, which we are currently unable to substantiate. We leave that task, as well as further research into the bilingual situation in the U.S., not only with regard to mood, but also with all other internal and external linguistic considerations, to future variationist-sociolinguistic investigation.

Appendix I

In Spanish, the subjunctive mood is expressed in the verb morphology by inflection according to tense. Modern Spanish has two primary tense categories, with three distinct tenses within each, for the subjunctive mood: simple (present, imperfect and future); compound (present perfect, pluperfect and future perfect). The two future tenses listed here, however, are extremely uncommon in modern speech and appear to be facing extinction even in literature.

For most verbs, the present subjunctive is formed by taking the first-person indicative form, dropping the first-person marker (morpheme ‘-o’), and adding either an ‘-a’ or an ‘-e’, depending on the infinitive form. Verbs ending in ‘-ar’ (*hablar* ‘to talk’) take morpheme ‘-e’, whereas verbs ending in ‘-er’ and ‘-ir’ take morpheme ‘-a’. For example,

Hablar ‘to talk’ → *hable, hables, hable, hablemos, habléis, hablen*

Tener ‘to have’ → *tenga, tengas, tenga, tengamos, tengáis, tengan*

Dormir ‘to sleep’ → *duerma, duermas, duerma, durmamos, durmáis, duerman*

There are also a number of irregular subjunctive verb forms in the present, such as:

Ser ‘to be’ → *sea, seas, sea, seamos, seais, sean*

Ir ‘to go’ → *vaya, vayas, vaya, vayamos, vayais, vayan*

Saber ‘to know’ → *sepa, sepa, sepa, sepamos, sepaís, sepan*

The imperfect subjunctive is formed by taking the third-person plural preterit indicative conjugation, dropping the ‘-ron’ ending, and adding either ‘-ra’ or ‘-se’.

Decir ‘to say’ → *dijera/dijese, dijeras/dijeses etc.*

The future subjunctive is formed by again taking the third-person plural preterit indicative, dropping this time only the ‘-on’ ending, and replacing it with ‘-e’.

Estar ‘to be’ → *estuviere, estuvieres etc.*

Concerning compound tenses in the subjunctive, *haber* ‘to have’ is the auxiliary verb, presented with a past participle, and is inflected as follows (*hablar* ‘to talk’ acting as the participle):

Present perfect → *haya hablado, hayas hablado etc.*

Pluperfect → *hubiera/hubiese hablado, hubieras/hubieses hablado etc.*

Future perfect → *hubiere hablado, hubieres hablado etc.*

The following two appendices (II & III) present the variables and factors utilized in the statistical analyses of the dissertation study. Appendix II lists the variables only. Appendix III presents the factors associated with each variable. Numbers 1-7 are the Internal Variables identified for our study, i.e., the linguistic variables. The remaining variables (8-41) are the External Variables, i.e., the sociolinguistic variables. Number one is identified as the Dependent Variable for the study; the remaining are Independent Variables. The data is placed in an Excel Spreadsheet, hence the term “columns” in Appendix III. Finally, the Excel Spreadsheets are entered in the SPSS computer program in order to perform Logistic Regression measures.

Appendix II

Variables

- a Number of the tape
- b Number of the verb

Internal Variables

1. Mood & Context (Dependent Variable)
2. Clause type of mood
3. Tense of Subjunctive
4. Total of subjunctive verbs, in figures
5. Total of indicative verbs, in figures
6. Total of conditional verbs, in figures
7. Total finite verb count, all moods, in figures

External Variables

8. Informant's identity number
9. Generation, in categories
10. National origin
11. Areal origin
12. Sex
13. Age, in categories
14. Age, in figures
15. Age of arrival, in figures
16. Years in the U.S., in categories
17. Years in the U.S., in figures
18. Class
19. SES

20. Education
21. English Skills
22. Spanish Skills
23. Degree of Spanish use, in general
24. Degree of Spanish use w father
25. Degree of Spanish use w mother
26. Degree of Spanish use w siblings
27. Degree of Spanish use w children
28. Degree of Spanish use w friends
29. Degree of Spanish use w boss
30. Degree of Spanish use classmates & workmates
31. Degree of Spanish w spouse/partner
32. Spanish use in domains, in categories
33. Spanish at home
34. Spanish in school
35. Spanish in social activities
36. Spanish in reading
37. Spanish in listening to radio
38. Spanish in watching TV
39. Spanish w other groups, in categories
40. Spanish w own group, in categories
41. Spanish w own country

Appendix III

Factors

Common values

In one-column variables:

- 7 = Cannot decide
- 8 = Not applicable
- 9 = Missing data

In two-column variables:

- 97 = Cannot decide
- 98 = Not applicable
- 99 = Missing data

a. Tape number

Enter the informant's number, with no letters and no left zeros, e.g., 003U = 3, 024C = 24.

This column contains the same information as in variable 17.

This is the left-most column in the Excel and SPSS files.

b. Verb number

Enter the verb number.

Do not use letters.

Inserted verbs take decimals, e.g. 230, 230.1, not 230a.

If verb has no number, leave blank.

Internal Variables

1. Mood & Context (Dependent Variable)

- 1 = Subjunctive in an Obligatory Subjunctive context
- 2 = Indicative in an Obligatory Subjunctive context
- 3 = Subjunctive in an Optional context
- 4 = Indicative in an Optional context
- 5 = Conditional

In the Excel file, this is the left-most column after the column with the verb written out.

In the SPSS file, this is column three.

2. Clause Type in which Mood used

- 0 = Discourse Marker
- 1 = Purpose / Contingency Adverbial clause
- 2 = Indirect Command
- 3 = Volitional / Influential Noun clause
- 4 = Temporal Adverbial clause with Futurity
- 5 = Imperative in subjunctive
- 6 = Protasis clause in Hypothetical conditional sentence
- 7 = Hypothetical *como si* clause
- 8 = Causative clause
- 9 = Modal clause
- 10 = Adjective clause of Nonexistent or Indefinite Antecedent
- 11 = Comment clause
- 12 = Apodosis clause in Hypothetical conditional sentence
- 13 = Negated Reality Negated Noun clause
- 14 = Possibility clause
- 15 = Protasis clause in Concessive sentence
- 16 = Uncertainty clause
- 17 = Locative clause
- 18 = Subordinate clause after *Depende*

3. Tense of Subjunctive

- 0 = Indicative or conditional N/A
- 1 = Present
- 2 = Imperfect
- 3 = Present perfect
- 4 = Pluperfect

4. Total of subjunctive verbs, in figures

Give total number of subjunctive verb forms in figures

5. Total of indicative verbs, in figures

Give total number of indicative verb forms in figures

6. Total of conditional verbs, in figures

Give total number of conditional verb forms in figures

7. Total finite verb count, all moods, in figures

Give total of ALL verbs, irrespective of mood in figures

External Variables8. Informant's identity number

Enter number, without zeros or national letter,
e.g. 003U = 3

9. Generation, in categories

1 = LAR, Latin American Raised, first generation. Arrived to NYC at age 16 or older & remained less than six years.

2 = NYR, New York Raised, second generation. Born in U.S., or came at or before age 3.

10. National origin

11 = Colombia

12 = Dominican Republic

13 = Ecuador

14 = Mexico

15 = Puerto Rico

16 = Cuba

11. Areal origin

0 = Low lands

1 = Interior or high lands

12. Sex

0 = Male

1 = Female

13. Age, expressed in categories

1 = 13 - 19 Teenager

2 = 20 - 39 Young

3 = 40 - 59 Middle aged

4 = Informant is 60+

14. Age, expressed in figures

Give age in figures

15. Age of arrival, in figures

Give age of arrival in figures.

Informants born in U.S have Age of arrival = 0

16. Years in the US, expressed in categories

- 1 = Recent = 0-2 years in US
- 2 = Longer = 3-15 years in US
- 3 = Established = 16+ years in US
- 4 = Native = Had any 5 of first 8 yrs of education in the US
that is, had 5 years in US between K and 7th grade

17. Years in the US, expressed in figures

Give years in the US in figures

18. Class

- 1 = High
- 2 = Middle
- 3 = Working

19. SES

- 1 = Level A: Informant scored 1-2 points
- 2 = Level B: Informant scored 3-4 points
- 3 = Level C: Informant scored 5-6 points
- 4 = Level D: Informant scored 7-8 points

20. Education

- 1 = Elementary
- 2 = Secondary
- 3 = College
- 4 = Graduate

21. English skills

- 0 = Poor
- 1 = Passable
- 2 = Good
- 3 = Excellent

22. Spanish skills

- 0 = Poor
- 1 = Passable
- 2 = Good
- 3 = Excellent

23. Degree of Spanish use in general (spgen)

- 1 = None
- 2 = Low
- 3 = Mid
- 4 = High

24. Spanish with father

- 1 = In English
- 2 = In both
- 3 = In Spanish

25. Spanish with mother

- 1 = In English
- 2 = In both
- 3 = In Spanish

26. Spanish with siblings

- 1 = In English
- 2 = In both
- 3 = In Spanish

27. Spanish with children

- 1 = In English
- 2 = In both
- 3 = In Spanish

28. Spanish with friends

- 1 = In English
- 2 = In both
- 3 = In Spanish

29. Spanish with boss

- 1 = In English
- 2 = In both
- 3 = In Spanish

30. Spanish with classmates & workmates

- 1 = In English
- 2 = In both
- 3 = In Spanish

31. Degree of Spanish w spouse/partner

- 1 = In English
- 2 = In both
- 3 = In Spanish

32. Spanish use in domains, in categories

- 1 = None
- 2 = Low
- 3 = Mid
- 4 = High

33. Spanish at home

- 0 = A little (*poco*)
- 1 = A lot (*mucho*)

34. Spanish in school

- 0 = A little (*poco*)
- 1 = A lot (*mucho*)

35. Spanish in social activities

- 0 = A little (*poco*)
- 1 = A lot (*mucho*)

36. Spanish in reading

- 0 = A little (*poco*)
- 1 = A lot (*mucho*)

37. Spanish in listening to radio

0 = A little (*poco*)

1 = A lot (*mucho*)

38. Spanish in watching TV

0 = A little (*poco*)

1 = A lot (*mucho*)

39. Spanish w other groups, in categories

1 = None

2 = Low

3 = Mid

4 = High

40. Spanish w own group, in categories

1 = None

2 = Low

3 = Mid

4 = High

41. Spanish with own country

1 = None

2 = Low

3 = Mid

4 = High

Bibliography

- Aaron, Jessi Elana & José Esteban Hernández. 2007. Quantitative evidence for contact-induced accommodation: Shifts in /s/ reduction patterns in Salvadoran Spanish in Houston. In Kim Potowski & Richard Cameron (eds.), *Spanish in contact: Policy, social, and linguistic inquiries*, 329-344. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Acevedo, Rebeca. 2000. Perspectiva histórica del paradigma verbal en el español de California. In Ana Roca (ed.), *Research on Spanish in the United States: Linguistic Issues and Challenges*, 110-120. Somerville: Cascadilla Press.
- Baranowski, Edward. 2007. The Spanish Future Perfect habré cantado: From Subjunctive to Indicative? *Bulletin of Spanish Studies* LXXXIV.1.
- Barlow, Michael and Suzanne Kemmer (eds). 2000. *Usage-based models on language*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Bayley, Robert. 2002. The quantitative paradigm. In J.K. Chambers, Peter Trudgill, & Natalie Schilling-Estes (eds.), *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change*, 117-141. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Bentivoglio, Paola and Mercedes Sedano. 2000. El sujeto liviano: una restricción de tipo funcional. *BFU Ch XXXVIII*. 9-22.
- Blake, Robert. 1980. The Acquisition of Mood Among Spanish-Speaking Children: Ages 4 to 12. University of Texas at Austin. *Doctoral dissertation*.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1933. *Language*. New York: Henry Holt & Co.
- Bybee, Joan. 2006. From Usage to Grammar: The Mind's Response to Repetition. *Language* 82-4. 711-33.
- 2001. *Phonology and language use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cameron, Richard. 1996. A community-based test of a linguistic hypothesis. *Language in Society* 25. 61-111.
- Carreira, María. 2004. Seeking explanatory adequacy: A dual approach to understanding the term 'Heritage Language Learner'. *Heritage Language Journal* 2. 1-25.
- Cedergren, Henrietta J., and David Sankoff. 1974. Variable rules: performance as a statistical reflection of competence. *Language* 50. 333-55.
- Chambers, J.K. 2002. Language variation: An informal epistemology. In J.K. Chambers, Peter Trudgill, & Natalie Schilling-Estes (eds.), *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change*, 3-14. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Company Company, Concepción. 2005. Frecuencia de uso y contacto lingüístico en sintaxis: Artículo indefinido + posesivo en el español americano. *Spanish in Context* 2:2. 131-56.
- 2003. ¿Qué es un cambio lingüístico? In Fulvia Colombo Airoidi & María Ángelse Soler Arechalde (eds.), *Cambio lingüístico y normatividad*, 13-32. México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- Dorian, Nancy. 1989. Maintenance and loss of same-meaning structures in language death. *Word* 31. 39-45.
- Dunlap, Carolyn. 2006. Dialectal variation in mood choice in Spanish journalistic prose. *Language Variation and Change* 18. 35-53.
- Dvorak, Trisha. 1983. Subject-object reversals in the use of gustar among New York Hispanics. In Lucía Elías Olivares (ed.), *Spanish in the U.S. setting: Beyond the Southwest*, 21-36. Rosslyn, Va: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

- Ferguson, C.A. 1982. Simplified registers and linguistic theory. In Lariane Obler & Lise Menn (eds.), *Exceptional language and linguistics*, 141-150. Cambridge University Press.
- Flores-Ferrán, Nydia. 2004. Spanish subject personal pronoun use in New York City Puerto Ricans: Can we rest the case for English contact. *Language Variation and Change* 16. 49-73.
- García, Erica. 1985. Shifting variation. *Lingua* 67. 189-224.
- García, Ofelia and Milagros Cuevas. 1995. Spanish Ability and Use Among Second-Generation Nuyoricans. In Carmen Silva-Corvalán (ed.), *Spanish in four continents: studies in language contact and bilingualism*, 184-95. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- García, Mary Ellen. 1982. Syntactic variation in verb phrases of motion in U.S.-Mexican Spanish. In Jon Amastae & Lucía Elías-Olivares (eds.), *Spanish In the United States: Sociolinguistic Aspects*, 82-92. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- García, Mary Ellen, & Terrel, Tracy. 1977. Is the use of mood in Spanish subject to variable constraints? In M.P. Hagiwara Rowley (ed.), *Studies in Romance linguistics*, 214-26. MA: Newbury.
- Givón, Talmy. 1979. *On understanding grammar*. New York: Academic Press.
- Gragera, Antonio. 2009. *L1 attrition and L2 acquisition of Spanish subjunctive. A functionalist approach*. Universitas Castellae.
- Gregory, Amy. 2007. The Spanish mood/subordination/reference interface. *IJES* 7(1). 47-64.
- Greenberg, Joseph. 1966. *Language universals: With special reference to feature hierarchies*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Guitart, Jorge M. 1982. On the use of the Subjunctive among Spanish-English bilinguals. *Word* 33. 59-67.
- Gutiérrez, Manuel. 2003. Simplification and innovation in U.S. Spanish. *Multilingua* 22. 169-84.
- 1990. Sobre el mantenimiento de las cláusulas subordinadas en el español de Los Ángeles. In John Bergen (ed.), *Spanish in the United States: Sociolinguistic issues*, 31-38. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Gutiérrez, Manuel & Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 1993. Spanish clitics in a contact situation. In Ana Roca & John M. Lipski (eds.), *Spanish in the United States: Linguistic contact and diversity*, 75-89. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Guy, Gregory R. 2005. Grammar and usage: a variationist response. *Language* 81. 561-63.
- Haugen, Einar. 1950 [1972]. The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language* 26. 210-231. Reprinted in *The ecology of language*. Stanford University Press, 1972.
- Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2005. *Language contact and grammatical change*. Cambridge University Press.
- Henry, Alison. 2002. Variation and syntactic theory. In J.K. Chambers, Peter Trudgill, & Natalie Schilling-Estes (eds.), *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change*, 267-82. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Hopper, Paul J and Sandra A. Thompson. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56. 251-99.
- Jacobson, Sven. 1989. Some approaches to syntactic variation. In Ralph Fasold & Deborah Schifffrin (eds.), *Language change and variation*, 381-94. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1941. *Kindersprache, Aphasie, und allgemeine Lautgesetze*. Uppsala, Almqvist & Wiksell.

- Kerswill, Paul. 2002. Koineization and accommodation. In J.K. Chambers, Peter Trudgill, & Natalie Schilling-Estes (eds.), *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change*, 669-703. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Klee, Carol y Andrew Lynch. 2009. *El español en contacto con otras lenguas*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Labov, William. 1972. *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- 1969. Contraction, deletion, and inherent variability of the English copula. *Language* 45. 715-762.
- Lantolf, James. 1978. The variable constraints on mood in Puerto Rican-American Spanish. In Margarita Suñer (ed.), *Contemporary studies in Romance linguistics*, 193-217. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald. 2000. A dynamic usage-based model. In Michael Barlow & Suzanne Kemmer (eds.), *Usage Based Models of Language*, 1-63. Stanford, California: CSLI Publications.
- Lapidus, Naomi, and Ricardo Otheguy. 2005. Overt nonspecific ellos in Spanish in New York. *Spanish in Context* 2. 157-74.
- Lipski, John M. 1996. Patterns of pronominal evolution in Cuban-American bilinguals. In Ana Roca & John B. Jensen (eds.), *Spanish in contact: issues in bilingualism*, 159-86. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- 1993. Creoloid phenomena in the Spanish of transitional bilinguals. In Ana Roca & John M. Lipski (eds.), *Spanish in the United States: Linguistic contact and diversity*, 155-82. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lynch, Andrew. 2008. The Linguistic Similarities of Spanish Heritage and Second Language Learners. *Foreign Language Annals* 41.2.
- 1999. The subjunctive in Miami Cuban Spanish: Bilingualism, contact, and language variability. University of Minnesota. *Doctoral dissertation*.
- Martínez Mira, María Isabel. 2009. Spanish heritage speakers in the Southwest: Factors contributing to the maintenance of the subjunctive in concessive clauses. *Spanish in Context*. 6:1. 105-126.
- 2006. Mood Simplification: Adverbial Clauses in Heritage Spanish. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. *Doctoral Dissertation*.
- Mikulski, Ariana. 2010a. Age of Onset of Bilingualism, Language Use, and the Volitional Subjunctive in Heritage Learners of Spanish. *Heritage Language Journal*, 7(1). 28-46.
- 2010b. Receptive Volitional Subjunctive Abilities in Heritage and Traditional Foreign Language Learners of Spanish. *The Modern Language Journal*, 94ii.
- Milán, William G. 1982. Spanish in the Inner City: Puerto Rican Speech in New York. In Joshua A. Fishman & Gary D. Keller (eds.), *Bilingual Education for Hispanic Students in the United States*, 191-206. New York and London: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Montrul, Silvina. 2009. Knowledge of tense-aspect and mood in Spanish heritage speakers. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 13:2. 239-69.
- 2002. Incomplete acquisition and attrition of Spanish tense/aspect distinctions in adult bilinguals. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 5. 39-68.
- Muntendam, Antje. 2010. The Syntax and Pragmatics of Language Contact: a Case Study of Andean Spanish. Middlebury College.
- Ocampo, Francisco. 1990. El subjuntivo en tres generaciones de hablantes bilingües. In John Bergen (ed.), *Spanish in the United States: Sociolinguistic issues*, 39-48. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Otheguy, Ricardo and Ana Celia Zentella. 2012. *Spanish in New York: Language contact, dialectal leveling and structural continuity*. Oxford University Press.

- Otheguy, Ricardo & Nancy Stern. 2011. On so-called Spanglish. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 15. 85-100.
- Otheguy, Ricardo, Ana Celia Zentella & David Livert. 2010. Generational differences in pronominal usage in Spanish reflecting language and dialect contact in a bilingual setting. In Muriel Norde, Bob de Jonge & Cornelius Hasselblatt (eds.), *Language contact: New perspectives*, 45-62. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Otheguy, Ricardo, Ana Celia Zentella & David Livert. 2007. Language and dialect contact in Spanish in New York: Toward the formation of a speech community. *Language* 83. 770-802.
- Otheguy, Ricardo, and Ana Celia Zentella. 2007. Apuntes preliminares sobre el contacto lingüístico y dialectal en el uso pronominal del español en Nueva York. In Richard Cameron & Kim Potowski (eds.), *Spanish in contact: educational, social and linguistic inquiries*, 275-96. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Otheguy, Ricardo, and Lapidus, Naomi. 2005. Matización de la teoría de la simplificación en las lenguas en contacto: El concepto de la adaptación en el español de Nueva York. In Ortiz López, L. & Lacorte, M. (eds.), *Contactos y contextos lingüísticos: El español en los Estados Unidos y en contacto con otras lengua*, 143-60. Madrid/Frankfurt: Iberoamericana/Vervuert.
- Otheguy, Ricardo, Rodríguez-Bachiller, Betsy, & Canals, Eulalia. 2004. Length of the extra-information phrase as a predictor of word order: A cross-language comparison. In Ellen Contini-Morava, Robert S. Kirsner, & Betsy Rodríguez-Bachiller (eds.), *Cognitive and Communicative Approaches to Linguistic Analysis*, 325-40. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Otheguy, Ricardo, and Naomi Lapidus. 2003. An adaptive approach to noun gender in New York contact Spanish. In Rafael Núñez-Cedeño, Luis López, & Richard Cameron (eds.), *A Romance perspective on language knowledge and use*, 209-29. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Otheguy, Ricardo, and Stern, Nancy. 2000. The Acategorical Lexicon and the Pairing Strategies: A Critical Account of Inherent Gender in Spanish. In Contini-Morava, Ellen, & Yishai Tobin (eds.), *Between Grammar and Lexicon*, 123-57. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishers.
- Otheguy, Ricardo y Garcia, O. 1993. Convergent conceptualizations as predictors of degree of contact in U.S. Spanish. In A. Roca & J.M. Lipski (eds.), *Spanish in the United States: Linguistic contact and diversity*, 135-54. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Otheguy, Ricardo. 2011. Functional Adaptation and Conceptual Convergence in the Analysis of Language Contact in the Spanish of Bilingual Communities in New York. In Manuel Díaz-Campos (ed.), *The Handbook of Hispanic Sociolinguistics*, 504-29. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- 2009. El llamado espanglish. In Humberto López-Morales (ed.), *Enciclopedia del español en los EEUU*, 222-47. Madrid: Instituto Cervantes & Editorial Santillana.
- 2008. Affirming Differences, Valuing Variation and Dismissing Dialects in Modern Linguistics. *Studies in Hispanic and Lusophone Linguistics* 1. 223-233.
- 2004. Single-language and code-switching strategies in immigrant and heritage varieties: Spanish subject personal pronouns in Toribio's cross-modal hypothesis. *Bilingualism: Language & Cognition* 7. 175-177.
- 2001. Simplificación y adaptación en el español de Nueva York. *Ponencias del II Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española*. Madrid: Centro Virtual Cervantes
<http://cvc.cervantes.es/obref/congreso/valladolid/unidad/otheguy_r.htm>
- 1993. A reconsideration of the notion of loan translation in the analysis of U.S. Spanish. In Ana Roca & John M. Lipski (eds.), *Spanish in the United States: Linguistic contact and diversity*, 21-41. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- 1995. When contact speakers talk, linguistic theory listens. In Ellen Contini-Morava & Barbara Sussman Goldberg (eds.), *Meaning as explanation: Advances in linguistic sign theory*. 213-42. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Pedersen, Johan. 2006. The Spanish connective and verbal mood. Changes in the mood selection of *de ahí/aquí que*. In Kerstin Eksell et al (eds.), *Explanatory models on language change within the verbal system*, 161-75. Hamburg: Peter Lang Publishers.
- Pousada, Alicia and Shana Poplack. 1982. No Case for Convergence: The Puerto Rican Spanish Verb System in a Language-Contact Situation. in Joshua A. Fishman & Gary D. Keller (eds.), *Bilingual Education for Hispanic Students in the United States*, 207-37. New York and London: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Puente-Schubeck, Else de. 1991. La pérdida del modo subjuntivo en el español chicano de nuevo México. The University of New Mexico. *Doctorial Dissertation*.
- Salvi, Viviana. 1997. The Subjunctive Mood in Spanish: A Case of Linguistic Interference. California State University Dominguez Hills. *Masters in Arts project*.
- Sankoff, David. 1988. Sociolinguistics and syntactic variation. In Frederick Newmeyer (ed.), *Linguistics: The Cambridge Survey, Volume IV*, 140-61. Cambridge University Press.
- Sankoff, Gillian. 2002. Linguistic outcomes of language contact. In J. K. Chambers, Peter Trudgill, & Natalie Schilling-Estes (eds.), *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change*, 638-68. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Schwenter, Scott. 1994. "Hot news" and the grammaticalization of perfects. *Linguistics* 32. 995-1028.
- Serrano, María José. 1995. Sobre un cambio sintáctico en el español canario: del indicativo al subjuntivo y condicional. *Hispania* 78. 178-189.
- Shin, Naomi Lapidus & Ricardo Otheguy. 2009. Shifting sensitivity to continuity of reference. In Manel Lacorte & Jennifer Leeman (eds.), *Español en Estados Unidos y otros contextos de contacto: Sociolingüística, ideología y pedagogía*, 111-36. Madrid / Frankfurt: Iberoamericana / Vervuert.
- Silva-Corvalán, Carmen and Andrés Enrique-Arias. 2001. *Sociolingüística y pragmática del español*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 1998. On borrowing as a mechanism of syntactic change. In Armin Schwegler, Bernard Tranel & Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria (eds.), *Romance linguistics: theoretical perspectives*, 225-46. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- 1997. Variación sintáctica en el discurso oral: Problemas metodológicos. In Francisco Moreno Fernández (ed.), *Trabajos de sociolingüística hispánica*, 115-35. Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá.
- 1995. The study of language contact: an overview of the issues. In Carmen Silva-Corvalán (ed.), *Spanish in four continents: studies in language contact and bilingualism*, 3-14. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- 1994a. *Language contact and change: Spanish in Los Angeles*. Oxford University Press.
- 1994b. The gradual loss of mood distinctions in Los Angeles Spanish. *Language Variation and Change* 6.255-72
- 1991. Spanish language attrition in a contact situation with English. In Herbert W. Seliger & Robert M. Vago (eds.), *First language attrition*, 151-71. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- 1986. Bilingualism and language change: The extension of *estar* in Los Angeles Spanish. *Language* 62. 587-609.

- 1981. Extending the sociolinguistic variable to syntax: The case of pleonastic clitics in Spanish. In David Sankoff & Henrietta Cedergren (eds.), *Variation Omnibus*, 335-42. Edmonton, Alberta, Canada: Linguistic Research.
- Smith, Daniel. 2007. Spanish/English Bilingual Children in the Southeastern USA: Convergence and Codeswitching. *Bilingual Review* 28. 99-108.
- Thomason, Sarah G. 1995. Language mixture: Ordinary processes, extraordinary results. In Carmen Silva-Corvalán (ed.), *Spanish in four continents: Studies in language contact and bilingualism*, 15-34. Georgetown University Press.
- Tagliamonte, Sali. 2002. Comparative sociolinguistics. In J.K. Chambers, Peter Trudgill & Natalie Schilling-Estes (eds.), *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change*, 729-63. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- 2006. *Analysing Sociolinguistic Variation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Toribio, Almeida Jacqueline. 2004. Convergence as an optimization strategy in bilingual speech: evidence from code-switching. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 7. 165-73.
- Torres, Lourdes. 1989. Mood selection among New York Puerto Ricans. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 79. 67-77. (Special issue in Irene Wherritt & Ofelia Garcia (eds.), *U.S. Spanish: The Language of Latinos*).
- Travis, Catherine. 2003. The semantics of the Spanish subjunctive: Its use in the natural semantic metalanguage. *Cognitive Linguistics* 14-1. 47-69.
- Trudgill, Peter. 1983. *On dialect*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Tsimpli, Ianthi Maria and Antonella Sorace. 2006. Differentiating Interfaces: L2 performances in syntax-semantics and syntax-discourse phenomena. In D. Bamman, T. Magnitskaia & C. Zaller (eds.), *Proceedings of the 30th Boston University Conference on Language Development*, 653-664. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Zabaleta, Francisco. 2000. Aspectos morfosintácticos del español como lengua materna entre universitarios californianos. In Ana Roca (ed.), *Research on Spanish in the United States: Linguistic Issues and Challenges*. 360-76. Somerville: Cascadilla Press.
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1953. *Languages in contact*. Linguistic Circle of New York. [Reprint, The Hague: Mouton, 1974.]
- Winford, Donald. 2003. Contact-induced changes – Classification and processes. *OSUWPL* 57 Summer 2003. 129-50.
- Zapata, Gabriela C., Liliana Sánchez, Almeida Jacqueline Toribio. 2005. Contact and contracting Spanish. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 9. 377-395.
- Zentella, Ana Celia. 1997. *Growing up bilingual: Puerto Rican children in New York*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- 1990. Lexical leveling in four New York City Spanish dialects: Linguistic and social factors. *Hispania* 73. 1094-105.