VARIABLE FUTURE TENSE EXPRESSION IN ANDALUSIAN SPANISH

by

SAMANTHA D. OSBORNE

(Under the Direction of Diana L. Ranson)

ABSTRACT

There are currently three manners of expressing futurity in spoken Spanish: the simple future, the periphrastic future, and the futurate present. The distribution of the future tenses in spoken Spanish seems to be undergoing a change, in that the simple future is being used less, and the periphrastic future and futurate present are being used more. This thesis includes a statistical analysis of these three future variants in a corpus of spoken Spanish from the town of Puente Genil in the Andalusian region of Spain to determine their frequency and the linguistic and social factors that influence their use. Factors analyzed include temporal distance, adverbial specification, grammatical person, subject animacy, verb frequency, lexical type of verb, speaker age, and negation.

INDEX WORDS: Variation, Futurate present, Simple future, Periphrastic future, Temporal distance, Adverb, Person, Frequency, Age, Negation, Lexical type, Animacy, Goldvarb

VARIABLE FUTURE TENSE EXPRESSION IN ANDALUSIAN SPANISH

by

SAMANTHA D. OSBORNE

A.B., The University of Georgia, 2002

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2008

VARIABLE FUTURE TENSE EXPRESSION IN ANDALUSIAN SPANISH

by

SAMANTHA D. OSBORNE

Major Professor: Diana L. Ranson

Committee: Lewis C. Howe
    Gary K. Baker

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2008

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank my family members for their support during my entire academic career thus far, and especially during the last few years in my MA program. Without the support and encouragement from them and some wonderful friends, this would simply not have been possible.

I would also like to thank the members of my committee: Dr. Ranson for her wisdom and patience over the last few years, and for suggesting that I start something that actually can be finished; Dr. Howe for his insight into statistical analysis, which accounts in great part for the structure of the study and the thesis itself; and Dr. Baker for his flexibility and for asking questions that made me really think. I thank all three members of my committee for their willingness to help and for their opinions, suggestions, and corrections. It is an arduous task, but the end result is truly something to be proud of thanks to their efforts!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Variable future tense expression in Spanish

1.1.1. The current study

Speakers of Andalusian Spanish, like speakers of other dialects of Spanish, choose among three different verb forms to refer to future time, that is, any time following the moment when the verb is pronounced. The synthetic or inflected future (henceforth IF), for example *cantaré* 'I will sing', is also called the *futuro simple* 'simple future,' (Hernández Alonso 1984:338) the *futuro gramatical* 'grammatical future' (Matte Bon 2006:2) or the *futuro morfológico* 'morphological future' (Orozco 2005:56). The analytic or periphrastic future (PF), such as *voy a cantar* 'I am going to sing', is formed using the verb *ir* 'to go' followed by *a* plus the infinitive of the verb. This tense is often referred to as *ir a + infinitivo*, but has also been called *futuro próximo* 'near future' (Bauhr 1992:72). The third tense is the futurate present (FP) or *praesens pro futuro* (Fleischman 1982:17), which is simply the use of a present tense form to refer to future time, as in *canto mañana* 'I sing tomorrow' (Gili y Gaya 1955:122, Real Academia Española 1973:464, Fernández Ramírez 1985:223). The goal of the present study is to determine the factors that influence a speaker's choice of one of these three variants for future expression in a corpus of Andalusian Spanish by performing a variationist analysis of the 442 tokens of verbs in this corpus referring to future time. The working hypothesis is that the IF is decreasing in use and that this reduction correlates with several linguistic and social factors, as will be seen in Chapter 2 of the thesis.

1

The hypothesis that the IF is decreasing in use is based in part on the fact that the IF is an older variant than the PF and is experiencing changes in its use which have allowed the newer PF to become a common manner of future temporal reference. The IF derives from an analytical construction in Spoken Latin, *cantare habeo* or 'I have to sing', which originally expressed obligation, in the same way that English *I have to sing* does. Then its meaning changed from obligation to futurity. As Lathrop (2003:61) states, "Since anything one *has to do* must be done in the future, the semantic transfer was relatively simple." Over the course of time, not only did the meaning of the construction change from obligation to futurity, but its form changed as well. The analytical construction *cantare habeo* with separable morphemes became synthesized and phonetically reduced as *cantaré* 'I will sing' when its morphemes became inseparable. Furthermore, the IF is sometimes used in Modern Spanish to express meanings other than future time, such as the conjectural future (Fernández Ramírez 1985:295). An example of the conjectural future from the corpus is *Natalia estará adentro* 'Natalia is [probably] inside' (Juana 53F t7p12)[1]. It may be that the PF is gaining ground in expressing futurity as the IF is used more often to express these specialized modal meanings. The current study will not address the epistemic uses of the IF, though, since only the occurrences of the IF that refer to future time are included in the envelope of variation.

The analytical origin of the PF in Spanish is still apparent in Modern Spanish. The construction *ir* 'to go' plus *a* plus the infinitive, as in *voy a cantar* 'I am going to sing', originally indicated "movement towards a goal" (Poplack and Turpin 1999:134), but today simply implies future temporal reference. A search of the *Corpus del español* (Davies 2002-) reveals that the PF

---

[1] Examples from the corpus will be followed by the informant's pseudonym, age, and gender; and the location of the example in the corpus, indicated by the tape (t) and page (p) number.

did not appear until the sixteenth century, a claim made also by Berschin (1986:301), whereas the IF has been extremely frequent since the thirteenth century, the first century for which information is available. In her study of the IF and PF in 16 texts written in Peninsular Spanish and one text of spoken twentieth century Peninsular Spanish, Aaron (2006:268) found an abundance of IF tokens beginning in the thirteenth century whereas 12 examples of the PF date from the fifteenth century. The PF increases in frequency in writing from 2% of the total number of tokens in IF and PF in the fifteenth century to 27% of the total in the twentieth century. It is only in the spoken text that the percentage of tokens in the PF (66%) exceeds that of the IF. Berschin (1986:301) states that the PF is used even more in Latin America than in Spain and it has in fact been reported as the preferred future variant in the Spanish of the following areas: the Caribbean and Chile (Silva-Corvalán and Terrell 1989:206), Colombia (Orozco 2005:57), Mexico and Madrid, Spain (Gómez Manzano 1988:73), New Mexico (Urrea and Gradoville 2006:3), and Venezuela (Iuliano and De Stefano 1979:108). The one exception to the predominance of the PF in speech is the study by Blas Arroyo (2008) of the speech of Castellón on the Eastern coast of Spain in which the PF accounts for 45% of the 2,045 tokens and the IF for 55%. In the corpus for the present study the IF is by far the minority variant, as shown in Table 1, which presents the total number of tokens in each of three variants. The percentage of PF verbs is very similar to that reported by Orozco (2005:57) in whose corpus of Colombian Spanish the IF accounted for only 18% of 1,483 verbs compared to 46% for the PF and 36% for the FP. If the IF declines in frequency and the PF increases, then the eventual replacement of the IF by the PF could be another step in the cycle of alternation between synthetic and analytical constructions for expressing future time (Lyons 1978:226, Fleischman 1982:103, Gutiérrez 1995:214, Lathrop 2003:61, Blas Arroyo 2008:85). In the same way that synthetic forms have

3

been replaced by analytical forms, as for example in the replacement of the Latin future *cantabo* by the analytical construction *cantare habeo*, the resulting synthetic construction in Modern Spanish *cantaré* may eventually be replaced by the analytical construction *voy a cantar*.

Table 1. Distribution of future variants in the corpus

Form	Number	Percentage
Inflected Future	65	14.7%
Periphrastic Future	197	44.6%
Futurate Present	180	40.7%
Total	442	100%

While it seems certain that the IF is an older form than the PF, it is more difficult to determine when the present tense began to be used to refer to future time. A search of expressions such as *voy mañana* and *voy luego* in the *Corpus del español* (Davies 2002-) indicates that the PF was used as a future variant at least as early as the sixteenth century. Of the studies dealing with the variable expression of future time in Spanish, only those by Silva-Corvalán and Terrell (1989) on Caribbean Spanish, Almeida and Díaz (1998) on Canarian Spanish, and Orozco (2005) on Colombian Spanish included the FP as a variant. Gómez Manzano (1988) discusses the use of the FP in both Madrid and Mexico City, but without conducting a variationist analysis of spoken data. The present study offers the original contribution of performing a variationist analysis of three variants of future time in a dialect of spoken Peninsular Spanish.

Previous studies on future expression in Modern Spanish have analyzed the distribution of its variants in Latin America (Iuliano and de Stefano 1979, Silva-Corvalán and Terrell 1989, Sedano 1994, Orozco 2005, Urrea and Gradoville 2006), the Canary Islands (Almeida and Díaz 1998, López Morales 2006), or Spain (Gómez Manzano 1988, Blas Arroyo 2008). The current

study investigates the distribution of the three future variants in Andalusian Spanish, as spoken in Puente Genil in the province of Córdoba. The results of this study will of course be compared to the results of previous studies and in so doing will provide information on dialectal differences in future expression.

The goal of this study then is to determine the relative weight of various factors on a speaker's choice of verb form used to refer to future time in a corpus of Andalusian Spanish. These factors were selected based on their inclusion in previous studies and on their relevance to the overall hypothesis that speakers are tending to use the IF less. The factors selected are temporal distance, adverbial specification, grammatical person, subject animacy, verb frequency, lexical type of verb, age of speaker, and negation.

Temporal distance refers to the distance of the future event referred to from the moment of speech. Silva-Corvalán's (1990:172) principle of distance states that more frequently used forms are preserved for longer than less frequent forms, and that speakers tend to speak about themselves and their immediate surroundings, both spatially and temporally. In accordance with this principle, I hypothesize that events occurring closest to the speech moment will favor the FP, and that those occurring close to the speech moment, but slightly farther away, will favor PF. Both these contexts will disfavor the IF and more distant or uncertain events will favor the IF. The basic idea is that the PF will be used more often than the less frequent IF to refer to events occurring sooner after the speech moment, that is to events that are closer to the speaker temporally, due in part to the immediacy expressed by the auxiliary verb *ir* that occurs in the PF.

Adverbial specification refers simply to the presence of a temporal adverb with the future variant which a speaker might choose to include in order to provide a clear marker that the variant refers to future time. I predict that this would be more likely to occur with the IF than

with the PF, given the non-temporal uses of the IF, such as the conjectural future, and also with the FP than with either of the other two variants, since the present tense form can refer to either present or future time. It also follows that the PF is the variant that will occur most often with no temporal adverb. A temporal adverb could also mark the event as more or less likely to occur, as suggested by Fernández Ramírez (1985:299-305) for adverbs such as *jamás* 'never,' *ahora* 'now,' or *luego* 'later'. Given the tendency of speakers to use the IF in uncertain contexts (Almeida and Díaz 1998, Poplack and Turpin 1999, King and Nadasdi 2003, Orozco 2005, Matte Bon 2006), one assumes that the IF will be favored by a non-specific adverb, such as *luego*, or *algún día* and that the PF and FP will be favored by the two specific adverb categories, "specific hour" and "day or time of day". The basic assumption is that the presence of a time-specific adverb can mark an action as more certain to occur than a non-specific adverb.

The grammatical person of the verb may correlate with a particular variant, since the speaker will feel more connected to the action when speaking about him or herself than when speaking about a second or third person (Silva-Corvalán 1990, Orozco 2005). Therefore, I predict that both first person subjects (Persons 1 and 4) will favor the PF or the FP, tenses that are morphologically connected to the present, which is always the moment of speech. I predict also that the IF, which has no morphological connection to the present, will thus be favored by second or third person subjects. The IF will also be favored by third person inanimate subjects, as these subjects are not human and thus have less of a connection to the speaker than an animate subject (Orozco 2005).

Verb frequency refers to the number of times each verb appears in the corpus. In the case of the current study, verb frequency was determined by the number of appearances of each infinitive in its various forms within the envelope of variation. That is, only the forms that refer

to future time have been included when counting frequency. None of the previous studies have included this factor as a potential influence on a speaker's choice of future tense. Silva-Corvalán's (1990:172) principle of distance suggests that more frequent forms are retained for longer in speech than less frequent ones. Therefore, if the IF is falling from use, one would expect the more frequent forms to occur more often in the IF, and so I hypothesize that frequency will favor the IF.

The lexical type of the verb may also correlate with the future variant favored for a particular verb (Almeida and Díaz 1998:2, Blas Arroyo 2008:94). Almeida and Díaz (1998:2) coded their verb tokens for lexical type, including verbs of action and diction, stative and psychological verbs, and "other" verbs in order to determine whether a particular type of verb influenced a speaker's choice of future variant. Blas Arroyo (2008:94) included the same categories as Almeida and Díaz (1998:2) for verb type, with additional categories for periphrases, modals, and for verbs of sensory perception. I predict that lexical type will have an effect on tense choice, specifically that action verbs will favor the PF or FP. I predict that the IF will be favored by verbs of sensory perception, due largely to the frequent occurrence of *ver* 'to see' in the IF. All the hypotheses regarding lexical type are based in part on the frequency of future variants in the current corpus, as shown above in Table 1.

If the IF's decrease in frequency of use is in fact a change in progress, then one would expect older speakers to use this variant more frequently and younger speakers to use it less often and to produce a correspondingly larger proportion of verbs in the PF and FP. Therefore, I have included speaker age as a factor that may influence the speaker's choice of future variant. The final factor tested is negation, that is whether the verb is negated, as in *no cantaré* 'I will not sing' or *no voy a cantar* 'I am not going to sing'. Aaron (2006:270) found that the PF "is used

7

increasingly in negated contexts" in Peninsular Spanish as opposed to the IF, which, until relatively recently, was more commonly used in these contexts. Negation was also found to favor the IF significantly in Canadian French (Poplack and Turpin 1999:154, Emirkinian and Sankoff 1985:200).

1.1.2. Previous studies

Studies on the distribution of the future tenses in Spanish have been conducted on several different dialects of Spanish. North American dialects of Spanish that have been studied include general southwestern Spanish (Gutiérrez 1995) and New Mexican Spanish (Urrea and Gradoville 2006). Gutiérrez (1995:214) conducted a comparative study of the Spanish spoken by 20 bilingual speakers born in the United States and seven monolingual speakers born in Mexico based on "twenty 30-minute interviews" in the Southwestern American cities of San Marcos, Texas; Mora, New Mexico; Tucson, Arizona; and San Jose, California along with "seven 60-minute interviews between the author and seven speakers of the popular variety of Spanish of Morelia, Michoacán (Mexico)" (Gutiérrez 1995:215). The results from a previous study of the Spanish spoken in Mexico City were included for further comparison (Gutiérrez 1995:215). This study considered first the total of all forms used to refer to future time, including those that are not morphologically future tenses (Gutiérrez 1995:215). The second part of the study was a comparative analysis focused on the IF and the PF in temporal, modal, and motion contexts, and included the FP in the temporal contexts (Gutiérrez 1995:214). Gutiérrez (1995:215) did not conduct a statistical analysis of his data. Instead, he compared the number of occurrences in each tense and in each dialect to determine differences in the use of future variants by bilingual and monolingual speakers (Gutiérrez 1995:217). Gutiérrez (1995:224) found that bilingual speakers favor the PF over the IF even more than monolingual speakers. Furthermore, temporal uses of

8

the IF have decreased "in favor of the extension of its modal use" (Gutiérrez 1995:224) among bilingual speakers.

Urrea and Gradoville (2006) conducted a variationist analysis on the Spanish spoken in New Mexico. Theirs was a corpus of "approximately 250,000 words from 36 interviews" from the New Mexico-Colorado Spanish Survey (Urrea and Gradoville 2006:2-3). The informants were from either rural or urban areas and almost all were bilingual (Urrea and Gradoville 2006:3). The informants "were between 36 and 96 years of age, had an education level between two years and university level, and included 18 women and 15 men" (Urrea and Gradoville 2006:3). The temporal and modal uses of the IF and the PF were included in their analysis, with the PF occurring in 76.5% of tokens and the IF in 23.5% (Urrea and Gradoville 2006:3). The factors that were found to be significant in this corpus were meaning (i.e. futurity or modality), speaker age, and adverbial specification. The PF, which was the application value in their analysis, was favored in contexts of futurity with a factor weight of .72, by younger speakers with a factor weight of .76, and in contexts that included a temporal adverb with a factor weight of .78. The IF, on the other hand, was favored in modal contexts with a factor weight of .97, by older speakers with a factor weight of .65, and in contexts that lacked a temporal adverb with a factor weight of .68.

The use of the future tenses in Mexico has also been compared with that of Madrid, Spain in a study conducted by Gómez Manzano (1988). Gómez Manzano (1988:71) used data compiled for a previous study on the Spanish of Mexico City to compare the uses of the IF, PF, and FP in that dialect with the uses of these variants in the Spanish spoken in Madrid. Temporal and non-temporal uses of the future variants were included and the results are presented throughout the article in the form of percentages of each variant (Gómez Manzano 1988). Gómez

9

Manzano (1988:75) did not analyze how certain linguistic or social factors influenced the choice of future variant, but rather investigated the frequency with which each variant appeared in different types of sentences. The different types of sentences analyzed were: independent or principal, i.e. *mañana vamos al cine* 'tomorrow we're going to the movies" (Gómez Manzano 1988:76); "oraciones yuxtapuestas objectivas" 'objective juxtaposed sentences', such as *mañana voy contigo y esa faena lo arreglo* 'tomorrow I'll go with you and I'll sort this out' (Gómez Manzano 1988:77); coordinated sentences, as in *ahora está aquí, pero se va otra vez a Paris* 'right now he/she is here, but he/she is leaving for Paris again' (Gómez Manzano 1988:78); substantive subordinate sentences, such as *no sé qué quantidad van a tomar* 'I don't know what quantity they're going to take' (Gómez Manzano 1988:79); adjectival and adnominal subordinate sentences, for example, *ese es otro problema que tampoco se resolverá* 'this is another problem that won't be solved either' (Gómez Manzano 1988:81); and finally adverbial subordinate sentences, as in *si llegas a la verdad absoluta, será por pura casualidad* 'if you arrive at the absolute truth, it will be purely by chance' (Gómez Manzano 1988:82). There were more total tokens in the PF (37.57% in Madrid, 51.00% in Mexico) than in either of the other two variants (Gómez Manzano 1988:73). The IF was the most frequent variant in both dialects only in cases of coordinated sentences (38.53% in Madrid, 50.90% in Mexico) (Gómez Manzano 1988:77). The PF was the most frequent variant in both dialects in independent or principal sentences (34.49% in Madrid, 57.18% in Mexico) (Gómez Manzano 1988:76), in 50.00% of cases in the Mexican dialect in objective juxtaposed sentences (Gómez Manzano 1988:77), in both dialects in substantive subordinate sentences (45.85% in Madrid, 53.60% in Mexico) (Gómez Manzano 1988:79), and in both dialects in adjectival and adnominal subordinate sentences (50.00% in Madrid, 66.30% in Mexico) (Gómez Manzano 1988:81). The FP was the most frequent variant

10

in the Madrid dialect in objective juxtaposed sentences with 43.56% (Gómez Manzano 1988:77), and in both dialects in adverbial subordinate sentences (56.43% in Madrid, 81.20% in Mexico) (Gómez Manzano 1988:82).

Another study that compared different dialects is that of Silva-Corvalán and Terrell (1989). They compared interviews from three Caribbean dialects of Spanish, those spoken in the capital cities of Puerto Rico, Venezuela, and the Dominican Republic with the Spanish spoken in the capital city of Chile. The interviews from Puerto Rico and Venezuela were borrowed from a previous study by Lope Blanch (1977). The Puerto Rico corpus was made up of interviews with 24 informants, 12 men and 12 women, between the ages of 25 and 75 and all with a complete college education. The Venezuela corpus included ten informants of both genders of unspecified age and of an education level similar to that of the Puerto Rican informants. The Dominican corpus consisted of 20 informants all under the age of 30, ten of which were university students and ten of which had completed, at most, a primary school education. The Chilean corpus included only six informants between the ages of 16 and 70. The two youngest informants were in middle school at the time of the interviews, and the older four had a college education. Like Gómez Manzano's (1988) study of Mexican and Madrid Spanish, Silva-Corvalán and Terrell (1989) included temporal and modal uses of all three future variants in their study, and analyzed the frequency of each variant in several different types of sentences. The sentence types analyzed included: modals, such as *tal vez puedo seguir* 'maybe I can continue' (Silva-Corvalán and Terrell 1989:194); infinitives in prepositional phrases, as in *ya lo tienen arreglado para ir mañana al cine* 'they have it worked out to go to the movies tomorrow' (Silva-Corvalán and Terrell 1989:194); direct and indirect commands, as in *tráigame el pan* 'bring me the bread' (direct) or *quiero que me lo traigas* 'I want you to bring it to me' (indirect) (Silva-Corvalán and

11

Terrell 1989:195); the subjunctive used in subordinate adverbial clauses, such as *lo hago sin que lo sepan* 'I do it without them knowing' (Silva-Corvalán and Terrell 1989:195); the subjunctive used in nominal complements, as in *dudo que llegue a tiempo* 'I doubt that I/he/she will arrive on time' (Silva-Corvalán and Terrell 1989:196); and sentences with *ir* as a verb of movement, as in *los domingos voy a visitor a mis abuelitos* 'on Sundays I go to visit my grandparents' (Silva-Corvalán and Terrell 1989:196). They found that the PF was used more frequently than the IF in temporal contexts in all four of the dialects studied, and the IF was the only variant used in modal contexts (Silva-Corvalán and Terrell 1989:206).

Two of the studies consulted investigated the state of the future tenses in Venezuela (Iuliano and De Stefano 1979, Sedano 1994). Iuliano and De Stefano (1979) conducted a sociolinguistic analysis of the different uses of the future in the Spanish spoken in Caracas, the capital city of Venezuela (Iuliano and De Stefano 1979:101). They analyzed the temporal and various modal uses of the future variants, as well as the effect that certain social factors have on these uses (Iuliano and De Stefano 1979:101). The corpus for this study consisted of 36 30-minute interviews with 36 informants, 18 women and 18 men, from Caracas (Iuliano and De Stefano 1979:101). The informants were divided into three socioeconomic groups—lower, middle, and upper-class—and two age groups—14-29 years of age, and 30-45 years of age (Iuliano and De Stefano 1979:101). They found that out of 85 examples of IF in the corpus, 53 (62%) were modal uses and 32 (38%) were temporal uses (Iuliano and De Stefano 1979:107). All of the 342 examples of the PF were used temporally (Iuliano and De Stefano 1979:108). The lower class was responsible for producing the greatest number of modal uses of the IF, and also produced the greatest total of IF tokens (Iuliano and De Stefano 1979:101-02). This class also produced the greatest number of tokens in the PF (Iuliano and De Stefano 1979:108). To the

contrary, the upper class used the PF the least of all three socioeconomic groups (Iuliano and De Stefano 1979:108). The middle class produced the greatest number of temporal uses of the IF (Iuliano and De Stefano 1979:108).

Sedano (1994) also conducted a study on the future tenses in the Spanish spoken in Venezuela. She investigated the frequency of the IF and the PF variants in her study, and she included temporal distance and modality as factors that may influence variation between the two (Sedano 1994:232-34). Sedano (1994:232-34) presented her results in the form of number of tokens and percentages. The PF was more frequent than the IF in all temporal distance categories: immediate posteriority, relatively near posteriority, and remote posteriority (Sedano 1994:232). In the modality categories, the PF was more frequent in contexts with verbs of certainty, while the IF was more frequent in the other two categories: contexts with verbs of uncertainty, and interrogative uncertain contexts (Sedano 1994:234).

Orozco conducted two studies on Colombian Spanish (2005, 2007). The first of these was a variationist analysis of the distribution of three future variants in Northern Colombia (Orozco 2005:103). The corpus for this study was made up of "roughly 30 hours of tape-recorded speech" and included "10 female and 10 male individuals born between 1912 and 1984" (Orozco 2005:57). All the informants were residents of "Barranquilla, the fourth largest city in Colombia with a population of roughly one million people" (Orozco 2005:57). The speakers were from middle and working class communities and had an education level ranging from middle school to graduate school (Orozco 2005:57). Orozco (2005:59-60) included imminence of future event, grammatical number of subject, length of IF inflection, animacy of the subject, presence of an adverbial time marker, clause length, and type of clause as factors that might influence the variation of the three future variants. He subjected the variants and factors to a statistical analysis

13

to determine which factors increased the likelihood of one factor appearing instead of another. There were 1,483 total tokens in the corpus, the majority of which were in the PF (681, or 45.9%), followed by the FP (533 tokens, or 35.9%) and the IF (269 tokens, or 18.2%). The IF was favored in contexts in the distant and unbounded future with a factor weight of .639; by plural grammatical subjects, with a factor weight of .590; by the verbs *ser* and *ver* with a factor weight of .739, and by the verb *ir* with a factor weight of .536 (Orozco 2005:59). The IF was also favored by non-human subjects with a factor weight of .604, in contexts that included an adverbial time marker with a factor weight of .605, in clauses less than 6 words long with a factor weight of .513, and in declarative or conditional clauses with a factor weight of .502 (Orozco 2005:60). In these last two, however, the factors did not reach statistical significance (Orozco 2005:60). The PF was favored by near future contexts with a factor weight of .550, by plural grammatical subjects with a factor weight of .537 (although this factor was not significant for the PF), by the verbs *ser* and *ver* with a factor weight of .549, by multisyllabic inflections with a factor weight of .579, and by the verb *dar* with a factor weight of .563 (Orozco 2005:59). The PF was also favored by human subjects with a factor weight of .542, in the absence of an adverbial time marker with a factor weight of .561, in clauses of 6 or more words with a factor weight of .525, and in interrogative or negative clauses with a factor weight of .581 (Orozco 2005:60). The FP was favored in near future contexts with a factor weight of .543, by singular grammatical subjects with a factor weight of .535, by disyllabic inflections with a factor weight of .652, and by the verb *ir* with a factor weight of .698 (Orozco 2005:59). The FP was also favored by non-human subjects with a factor weight of .508 (though this was not a significant factor for the FP), contexts with an adverbial time marker with a factor weight of .600, in clauses

of less than 6 words with a factor weight of .553, and in declarative or conditional clauses with a factor weight of .520 (Orozco 2005:60).

In his 2007 study, Orozco compared the results of his 2005 study of Northern Colombian Spanish with a similar study he conducted on the Spanish spoken by Colombian natives living in New York City in 2006. He conducted a statistical analysis of several social factors to determine which ones promoted or constrained the three future variants (Orozco 2007:107-09). The factors and the subcategories included were gender, whether male or female; social status combined with age, whether working class, middle class born before 1960 or middle class born after 1960; and interview conditions, whether others participated, others were present but did not participate, or a one-on-one conversation in which no others were even present. In the Colombian corpus, the IF was favored by female speakers, by members of the middle class born after 1960, and in interviews in which others were present but did not participate (Orozco 2007:107). The PF was favored by male speakers, working class speakers, speakers in the middle class born after 1960, and in interviews in which others were involved and in one-on-one conversations (Orozco 2007:107). The FP was favored by speakers in the middle class born before 1960, but the results for gender and interview conditions failed to reach statistical significance (Orozco 2007:107). In the New York City corpus, Orozco (2007:109) analyzed different factors: gender; speaker's age. whether born before 1950, born in the 1950s, born in the 1960s, and born after 1970; speaker's education, whether they did not complete high school, they completed high school, they completed college in Colombia, or whether they undertook higher education in the U.S.; and arrival age/length of U.S. residency, whether pre-teen >10 years, teen or adult >10 years, and teen or adult <10 years. In the New York corpus, the IF was favored by male speakers with a factor weight of .572, by speakers who either did not complete high school or who attended

college in Colombia with factor weights of .727 and .559 respectively, and by speakers who arrived in the United States as a teenager or an adult and had lived less than 10 years here, with a factor weight of .629 (Orozco 2007:109). The results for the IF for speaker's age were not statistically significant. The PF was favored by female speakers with a factor weight of .539, speakers born in the 1950s and after 1970 with factor weights of .576 and .586, respectively, speakers who had undertaken higher education in the United States with a factor weight of .597, and by speakers who had lived more than ten years in the United States, with factor weights of .509 and .589 respective to those two categories (Orozco 2007:109). The FP was favored by speakers born before 1950 and by those born in the 1960s with factor weights of .618 and .585, respectively, and by speakers who had completed high school or had attended college in Colombia with factor weights of .597 and .515 respectively (Orozco 2007:109). Two factors, gender and arrival age and length of U.S. residency, were not significant for the FP (Orozco 2007:109).

One study consulted investigated the use of the future tenses in the Canary Islands (Almeida and Díaz 2006). The corpus for this study was a written test given to 47 participants in which they were given a series of sentences and were asked to choose between the IF and PF in each sentence (Almeida and Díaz 2006:2). The results of these tests were then analyzed to determine how various social and linguistic factors influenced the speaker's choice of future variant (Almeida and Díaz 2006:2). The factors considered included speaker gender (male or female), generation (first age, second age, or third age), socioeconomic level (upper class, upper-middle class, lower-middle class, or lower class), verb type (action, stative, diction, psychological, or other), subject type (implicit, pronominal, or syntactic), and clause type (subordinate or other) (Almeida and Díaz 2006:3). In the statistical analysis, the IF was favored

equally by men and women with factor weights of .60, by speakers in the first age group (younger speakers) with a factor weight of .58, by speakers belonging to the upper and upper-middle classes with factor weights of .54 and .62 respectively, in contexts with verbs of action and stative verbs with factor weights of .52 and .58 respectively, in contexts with implicit subjects and syntactic subjects with factor weights of .58 and .53 respectively, and in "other" clauses with a factor weight of .66 (Almeida and Díaz 2006:3). The PF was correspondingly disfavored in all these contexts, and favored in the remaining ones. The PF was favored by speakers of the third age (older speakers) with a factor weight of .58, by speakers belonging to the lower-middle and lower classes with factor weights of .56 and .62 respectively, in contexts with verbs of diction, psychological verbs, and other verbs with factor weights of .52, .58, and .52 respectively, in contexts with pronominal subjects with a factor weight of .61, and in subordinate clauses with a factor weight of .66 (Almeida and Díaz 2006:3).

Two of the previous studies consulted were variationist analyses of different dialects of Peninsular Spanish. The first, conducted by Aaron (2006) was based on a corpus of written and spoken Spanish (Aaron 2006:266). The written portion of the corpus was extracted from various Peninsular literary works, and the spoken portion of the corpus comes from the *Corpus de Referencia de la Lengua Española Contemporánea: Corpus Oral Peninsular* (Marcos Marín 1992). The size of the combined written and spoken corpora was "approximately 935,500 words, and produced a total of 5,579 occurrences of AF and SF, with 1,072 occurrences of the former and 4,507 of the latter" (Aaron 2006:266). The exclusions from this corpus included instances of *haber* followed by a past participle, discourse markers or nominalizations, non-future (modal) uses, and truncated utterances or those with unclear meanings, for a total of 464 excluded forms (Aaron 2006:267). The factors that Aaron (2006:167) considered for her variable rule analysis

included presence or lack of a temporal adverb; sentence type, whether interrogative or declarative; polarity, whether affirmative or negative; clause type, main or subordinate; verb class, whether "other, dynamic," motion, *ir* or stative/perception/psychological; and animacy, whether singular and animate, or "other" (Aaron 2006:267). The PF was shown to be generally increasing in use across the centuries (Aaron 2007:267). In the twentieth century spoken corpus, the PF was favored where there was no adverb with a factor weight of .57, in interrogative sentences with a factor weight of .77, by "other" verbs with a factor weight of .58, by motion verbs with a factor weight of .56, and by singular and animate subjects with a factor weight of .56 (Aaron 2006:269). The results for the PF for polarity and clause type were not significant. Because PF was the application value, everything that favored the PF correspondingly disfavored the IF. Thus, the IF was favored in contexts with specific adverbs and with nonspecific adverbs with factor weights of .57 and .78 respectively, in declarative sentences with a factor weight of .54, by the verb *ir* with a factor weight of .51, and by stative/perception/psychological verbs with a factor weight of .62 (Aaron 2006:269). As was true for the PF, the results for the IF for polarity and clause type were not significant.

The second study conducted on spoken Peninsular Spanish was that of Blas Arroyo (2008) whose study of the Castellón dialect of Peninsular Spanish was based on interviews taken from the *Corpus sociolingüístico de Castellón y sus comarcas* (Blas Arroyo 2008:89). Blas Arroyo considered the use of the IF and the PF in 191 interviews from this macrocorpus, or "approximately 143 hours of recordings" (Blas Arroyo 2008:89). The factorgroups included in the statistical analysis, followed by the specific factors in parentheses, were temporal proximity (closeness [day], intermediate distance, attenuated distance, indefinite distance, or maximum distance), sentence modality (affirmative, negative, interrogative, indirect interrogative, or

exclamatory-exhortatory), speaker's attitude (certainty, intention, opinion, uncertainty-contingency), type of adverbial specification (no specification, precise specification, imprecise specification, or specification using quantifiers), type of verb (periphrasis, modals, movement, sensory perception, psychological, stative, language, or others), semantic category of subject (human, human [generic], or nonhuman), type of clause (subordinate or others), type of text (argumentative or expositive), place of origin (Province, Castellón town, or immigrants), social status (upper-middle, lower-middle, or low), and age (under 40 years of age or over 41 years of age) (Blas Arroyo 2008:94-95). Blas Arroyo (2008) conducted a statistical analysis to determine which factors favored or disfavored the use of the IF in Castellón. The IF was favored in contexts of maximum distance with a factor weight of .73, by affirmative sentences with a factor weight of .56, by uncertainty-contingency with a factor weight of .62, and by "specification using quantifiers" with a factor weight of .78 (Blas Arroyo 2008:94). Five verb type categories favored the IF: periphrasis with a factor weight of .64, modals with a factor weight of .75, verbs of movement with a factor weight of .63, verbs of sensory perception with a factor weight of .66, and psychological verbs with a factor weight of .55 (Blas Arroyo 2008:94). Nonhuman subjects favored the IF more than human, with a factor weight of .57, and "other" clauses favored this variant over subordinate clauses, also with a factor weight of .57 (Blas Arroyo 2008:94). Expositive texts favored the IF with a factor weight of .57 as well, and a speaker origin of province favored the IF with a factor weight of .53 (Blas Arroyo 2008:95). Finally, lower-middle class speakers favored the IF with a factor weight of .55, and speakers over 41 years of age favored this variant with a factor weight of .55 as well (Blas Arroyo 2008:95). These factors all correspondingly disfavored the PF. The PF was thus favored by the temporal proximity factors of closeness (day), intermediate distance, attenuated distance, and indefinite distance with factor

weights of .66, .53, .59, and .56 respectively (Blas Arroyo 2008:94). The PF was also favored by negative, interrogative, indirect interrogative, and exclamatory-exhortatory sentence modality factors with weights of .60, .65, .57, and .73 respectively (Blas Arroyo 2008:94). Also favoring the PF were the speaker attitude factors of certainty, intention, and opinion with factor weights of .60, .51, and .56 respectively (Blas Arroyo 2008:94). The types of adverbial specification that favored the PF were no specification, precise specification, and imprecise specification with factor weights of .55, .51, and .44 respectively (Blas Arroyo 2008:94). Three verb types favored the PF: stative, language, and other verbs, with factor weights of .53, .55, and .57 respectively (Blas Arroyo 2008:94). The factor human (generic) subject favored the PF with a factor weight of .65, subordinate clauses favored this variant with a factor weight of .62, and argumentative texts favored the PF with a factor weight of .57 (Blas Arroyo 2008:94). Speaker origin from Castellón or elsewhere in the world favored the PF with factor weights of .51 and .63 respectively, and the PF was favored by speakers belonging to the upper-middle class with a factor weight of .60 (Blas Arroyo 2008:95). Finally, speakers under the age of 40 favored the PF over the IF with a factor weight of .59 (Blas Arroyo 2008:95).

1.2. Methods

1.2.1. Corpus

The data for the present study come from nine conversations with 15 informants recorded in June and July of 1987 by Diana Ranson with native Spanish speakers from the town of Puente Genil in the province of Córdoba in Southern Spain. The informants, who range in age from 13 to 62 years old, were natives of Puente Genil of working class background. They had all lived in Puente Genil their entire lives, with the exception of Enrique, an ice cream salesman from Valencia who had lived in Puente Genil for 14 years at the time of the recording. Furthermore,

all the informants, with the exception of Enrique, were members of the same social network, since the mothers in three of the families were sisters and since the son of a fourth family was the fiancé of the daughter in one of the first three families. The informants are identified in Table 2 and throughout the thesis by a pseudonym followed by their age and gender. The aforementioned ice cream salesman, for example, is listed as Enrique 45M, a male informant who was 45 years

Table 2. Informants presented according to age and the number and percentage of future tokens produced

Name of informant	No. of tokens produced	% of tokens produced
Older speakers (age 50+)		
Juana 53F	85	19.2
Adela 59F	66	14.9
Mario 57M	55	12.4
Inma 50F	45	10.2
Raquel 55F	37	8.4
Sergio 62M	19	4.3
Carmen 58F	9	2.0
Marcos 52M	8	1.8
Ricardo 51M	2	0.5
Subtotal	326	73.8
Younger speakers (age ≤46)		
Graciela 25F	37	8.4
Natalia 25F	27	6.1
Enrique 45M	26	5.9
Jorge 30M	10	2.3
Rodolfo 14M	11	2.5
Mónica 13F	5	1.1
Subtotal	116	26.2
Total	442	100.0

old at the time of recording, and Adela 59F refers to a female speaker who was 59 years old. It is important to note that the recorded conversations do not follow an interview format but rather reflect daily events in the lives of the speakers. The interviewer recorded the speakers in the course of their lives over a two-week period of time. The informants knew that they were being recorded at times, but they never knew exactly when the tape recorder was on. The interviews

were transcribed by hand in the month following their recording by native Spanish speakers from Málaga, a city some 65 miles south of Puente Genil. These transcriptions were then keyed into a word processing program by Katie Griffith, an undergraduate student assistant, and then verified by Diana Ranson, who also set up a database of all the verbs in the corpus with animate subjects which were coded according to person and tense. My task of identifying the verbs to include in the present analysis consisted of adding to the database the verbs with inanimate subjects that referred to future time and of excluding the verbs which did not refer to future time, as discussed in the next section.

1.2.2. Envelope of variation

Included in the analysis of future expression for this study are all verbs in the IF, PF and FP that refer to future time, whether their subjects were animate or inanimate. For the IF verbs, two types of exclusions were taken. First I examined the context of the conversation in order to exclude the "conjectural" uses of the IF (Fernández Ramírez 1985:295), which are also called the *futuro de probabilidad* (Berschin 1986:302) or the *presente hipotético* (Silva-Corvalán and Terrell 1989:198). Certain verbs, although they are morphologically in the IF, refer to events that are already known or suspected to be in progress, rather than to future time, as seen in (1):

(1) *…ya se habrá levantado para irse…*(Natalia 25F t9p17)

…by now he must have gotten up to leave…

In spite of their conjugation, these conjectural future verb tokens, which often, but certainly not always, appear in the form of the future perfect, as in (1), were not included in the analysis because they do not actually refer to future events. Authors who have chosen to include the modal forms in their corpora have done so in order to determine how the IF and the PF forms are used, whether they actually refer to future time or not. This study considers only forms that refer

22

to future time, and thus the conjectural future and other modal uses of future forms are not included here. These non-futurate IF verbs are examples of the modal quality that the IF has assumed in recent times, as discussed in previous studies (Iuliano and De Stefano 1979, Sedano 1994, Aaron 2006, Matte Bon 2006, Urrea and Gradoville 2006, and Blas Arroyo 2008). Iuliano and De Stefano (1979) determined in their study of modal and temporal futures in the speech of Caracas, which included IF and PF, that social factors such as socioeconomic status, gender, and age, influenced the frequency of use of modal and temporal futures (Iuliano and De Stefano 1979). Sedano (1994) included modal and temporal uses of the IF in her investigation of the distribution of the IF and PF in Venezuelan Spanish. Urrea and Gradoville (2006) included modal uses of the future in their corpus of New Mexican Spanish, and found that both the IF and the PF may be used modally, though the IF was very strongly favored over the PF by modality. Blas Arroyo (2008:103) included sentence modality as a factor in his analysis, and found that modal uses of the future in affirmative sentences only slightly favored the IF. Aaron (2006) discussed modality in her study, but these non-temporal uses of the future were not included in her analysis, yet she doesn't state her criteria for distinguishing between modal and temporal uses of the future.. The modal uses of the IF are also mentioned, at times prominently, in some Spanish grammars (Gili y Gaya 1955:146-47, Real Academia Española 1973:470-72, Fernández Ramírez 1985:295), but are of course not subjected to any quantitative analysis.

The second exclusion for the IF were the 69 examples of *verás* used as a discourse marker, roughly translated in English as 'you see' or 'you'll see'. Any tokens of *verás* that did refer to future time were of course included. Syntactic criteria proved to be useful in distinguishing *verás* as a future variant from its use as a discourse marker. Generally, any case of *verás* that appeared as the last word of a sentence, as in (2), or that was not followed by a

23

subordinate clause, as in (3), was classified as a discourse marker. There were of course other examples of *verás* as a discourse marker that did not meet these syntactic criteria, as in (4). However, when *verás* was followed by mention of a future event, as in (5), it was classified as a future variant and included in the analysis for the present study.

(2) *Nosotros somos católicos cristianos, verás* (Adela 59F t1p17)

We're Christian Catholics, you see.

(3) *...bueno, verás, mi hermana la que vive en Barcelona...*(Adela 59F t1p15)

... well, you see, my sister the one who lives in Barcelona...

(4) *Veras tú, no caigo en falta...*(Adela 59F t2p22)

You see, I don't slip up …

(5) *...verás lo bien que lo pasamos aquí.*(Juana 53F t7p17)

You will see what a good time we have here.

Of the 91 occurrences of *verás* in the corpus, 69 were classified as discourse markers and excluded from the analysis, while 22 were included as examples of the IF.

The PF tokens, like the IF ones, were easily identified by their form. The only exclusion, shown in (6), was taken because here the verb *va* retained its literal meaning of going and thereby referred to the present moment, albeit in a past narrative, rather than to future time:

(6) *…va a comprar mantequilla con sé...*(Adela 59F t1p14)

…she goes to buy butter with salt…

For the FP it is perhaps more appropriate to talk about inclusions rather than exclusions, since the majority of occurrences of the present tense in the corpus do not refer to future time. If a verb clearly referred to the present moment, as in (7), or to a general or habitual action, as in (8), then it was not included. Also excluded were verbs in the present tense functioning as

24

imperatives, as in (9), many of which occurred when three speakers were giving the interviewer driving directions.

(7) *Sí arriba ella está a gusto.* (Adela 59F t2p26)

Yes, upstairs she is happy.

(8) *...viene Miguel todos los días cansado...* (Mario 57M t3p8)

Miguel comes in tired every day...

(9) *Aquí sigues para adelante...* (Marcos 52M t6p17)

Here keep going straight…

These directions did appear to refer to future time, since the interviewer had not yet carried out the directions she was being given, but the appearance of the imperative *haz* 'do' in this set of directions led to the interpretation of all the verbs as imperatives, regardless of whether they were morphologically present tense or imperative forms. It is also worth noting that in Puente Genil Spanish that the present tense forms of *tú* and of the imperative are identical for most verbs since speakers almost always delete word-final /s/. In order to identify the verbs that did refer to future time, I tried to determine whether the event it represented would occur after the moment of speech. Temporal adverbs, whenever present, provided an important clue. Tokens occurring with the adverbs *luego* 'later'*, mañana* 'tomorrow'*,* or other words that referred to a time of day or another day, such as *esta noche* 'tonight' or *el viernes* 'Friday' were easily classified as FP. For many other cases, I consulted Dr. Ranson because, as a participant in the conversations, she was aware of the temporal sequencing of the events referred to.

1.2.3. Analysis

Once I had identified the tokens to include in the analysis, I classified each of these 442 tokens according to the factors under analysis in the seven factor groups: temporal distance,

adverbial specification, grammatical person (including subject animacy), verb frequency, lexical type, age of speaker, and negation. The specific criteria used for these classifications will be presented in Chapter 2 under the heading for each factor.

In order to calculate the probability weights for each factor, I used Goldvarb X for Windows (Sankoff, Tagliamonte and Smith 2005). Goldvarb may be used calculate percentages for several variants, but it will calculate probability weights for only two variants at a time. Therefore, I first calculated the percentages for all three future variants together, and then for each of the three Goldvarb pairings of variants. I paired PF and IF for the first statistical run, IF and FP for the second, and FP and PF for the third. In order to cross check the weights, I also entered the tenses in the opposite orders from the above, or PF/IF, FP/IF, and PF/FP. In this second set of opposite pairings, the resulting weights were equal to the weights from the first runs subtracted from 1.00, which confirmed that they had been calculated accurately. The best stepping up run for the first pairing between PF and IF indicated that the most important factor groups for these two variants were temporal distance, adverbial specification, grammatical person, and lexical type. In the pairing of IF and FP, the factors selected as significant were temporal distance, grammatical person, lexical type, and speaker age. In the third pairing of FP and PF, the significant factors were temporal distance and adverbial specification. The results for these three pairings are presented in Tables 3, 4, and 5 in Chapter 2, and in Table 13 in the Appendix.

In Chapter 2 of the thesis, I will discuss in greater detail the factors that proved to be significant to the choice of future variant, as well as the factors that favored or disfavored the use of each variant. Occasionally, adjustments had to be made to the classification of the data in order to make them compatible with Goldvarb and these will be explained in Chapter 2 as well.

Tables 3, 4, and 5 in Chapter 2, and Table 13 in the Appendix show all factors as well as the factor weights, percentages, and total number of tokens for each of the three pairings.

The remainder of the thesis is laid out as follows. Chapter 2 of the thesis presents the seven factor groups analyzed in this study: temporal distance, adverbial specification, grammatical person and subject animacy, verb frequency, lexical type of verb, speaker age, and negative polarity. The results of the Goldvarb analysis for each factor group from this study and the comparison to the results of previous studies will lead to a more thorough understanding of what motivates Spanish speakers to choose one future variant over another in a given context.

Chapter 3 closes the thesis with a summary of the results of this study and previous studies along with possible explanations for the support or refutation of the hypotheses presented above by the results of the variable rule analysis. Also included in the final chapter of the thesis are directions for further investigations into this topic. The results of the analysis, compared with previous research conducted on the future variants in Spanish, shapes these suggestions for possible future studies.

CHAPTER 2

FACTORS INFLUENCING THE CHOICE OF FUTURE VARIANT

2.1. Overview of factors

This chapter presents the results for each of the seven factor groups selected as having a possible influence on the speaker's choice of future variant in the corpus of Puente Genil Spanish. Following the definition and illustration of each factor group and its individual factors, the results for this factor group in the present study are presented to see whether they support or refute the original hypothesis and then they are then compared to the results of previous studies. The seven factor groups include temporal distance, or distance of the event from the moment of speech, which has been found to be an important factor in determining the choice of future variant in various dialects of Spanish (Sedano 1994, Orozco 2005, Urrea and Gradoville 2006, Blas Arroyo 2008). A second factor considered was adverbial specification, or whether the verb was modified by an adverb, found to be significant in studies by Orozco (2005), Aaron (2006), Urrea and Gradoville (2006) and Blas Arroyo (2008). A third factor group is grammatical person of the verb, found to be significant by Orozco (2005), Urrea and Gradoville (2006), and Aaron (2006), which is considered along with subject animacy, as in the studies of Orozco (2005) and Blas Arroyo (2008). The fourth factor is verb frequency whose inclusion was prompted by Silva-Corvalán's (1990:172) principle of distance, which suggests that more frequently used forms are more likely to be preserved in speech than less frequent forms. The fifth factor is the lexical category of the verb, since Almeida and Díaz (2006) and Blas Arroyo (2008) found that some categories of verbs, such as verbs of motion or stative verbs, favored one future variant over the

other. The sixth factor is speaker age, the only social factor included in this study and which was also included in the studies conducted by Urrea and Gradoville (1998), Orozco (2007) and Blas Arroyo (2008). The seventh and final factor is negative polarity, which was considered for Spanish by Aaron (2006) and Urrea and Gradoville (2006) and which was found to be an important factor in choice of future variants in Canadian French as well (Poplack and Turpin 1999, Emirkinian and Sankoff 1985).

For the numerical results regarding the comparison of the PF to the IF, see Table 3. Included are factor groups in descending order of range, the factor weights within each factor group in descending order, and the percentage and number of tokens. The same format applies to the comparison of the IF to the FP in Table 4, and the FP to the PF in Table 5. The analysis of these seven factor groups will provide an explanation of a the speaker's choice of future variant which in turn will offer evidence of whether the IF is indeed on the way to being lost and, if so, how this process unfolds.

Table 3. Factors contributing to the choice of the PF over the IF in Spoken Andalusian Spanish

Factor	Factor weight	%	N
Grammatical person			
4 nosotros	.95	16	42
6 ellos/ellas	.68	7	19
5 vosotros	.63	5	12
1 yo	.47	19	51
2 tu	.30	24	62
3 él/ella/usted	.26	19	51
0 inanimate	.18	10	25
Range	*77*		
Lexical Type			
Action	.72	56	146
Stative	.55	10	26
Psychological	.43	6	17
Diction	.25	9	23
Other	.12	3	9

Sensory	.09	16	41
Range	*63*		
Temporal distance			
Same week	.76	3	8
Immediate	.61	45	118
Same day	.57	10	26
Indefinite/uncertain	.42	31	82
More distant than same week	.17	11	28
Range	*59*		
Adverbial specification			
No adverb	.57	81	212
Day or time of day	.53	4	10
Specific hour	.26	5	14
Non-specific	.16	10	26
Range	*41*		
Verb frequency			
1-2 appearances	[.64]	26	67
3-9 appearances	[.41]	27	71
10-20 appearances	[.35]	18	48
20+ appearances	[.56]	29	76
Speaker age			
50+ years	[.44]	73	190
≤45 years	[.66]	27	72
Negation			
Not negative	[.51]	92	242
Negative	[.34]	8	20

Table 4. Factors contributing to the choice of the IF over the FP in Spoken Andalusian Spanish

Factor	Factor weight	%	N
Temporal distance			
Indefinite/uncertain	.88	22	53
Immediate	.58	24	59
Same day	.45	11	28
More distant than same week	.36	33	80
Same week	.06	10	25
Range	*82*		
Grammatical person			
0 inanimate (41)	.74	9	23
3 él/ella/usted (82)	.71	19	47
6 ellos/ellas (32)	.61	7	16

2 tú (103)	.57	29	71
5 vosotros (27)	.56	7	17
1 yo (87)	.36	17	42
4 nosotros (70)	.07	12	29
Range	*67*		
Lexical Type			
Sensory	.96	11	28
Diction	.86	6	14
Psychological	.79	5	12
Other	.51	6	15
Stative	.51	11	26
Action	.30	61	150
Range	*66*		
Speaker age			
50+ years	.57	77	189
≤45 years	.28	23	56
Range	*29*		
Adverbial specification			
No adverb	.55	55	134
Non-specific	.57	21	53
Specific hour	.41	9	21
Day or time of day	.29	15	37
Range	*28*		
Verb frequency			
1-2 appearances	[.23]	18	43
3-9 appearances	[.66]	25	61
10-20 appearances	[.56]	26	65
20+ appearances	[.49]	31	76
Negation			
Not negative	[.46]	95	233
Negative	[.94]	5	12

Table 5. Factors contributing to the choice of the FP over the PF in Spoken Andalusian Spanish

Factor	Factor weight	%	N
Temporal distance			
More distant than same week	.82	22	82
Same week	.71	8	31
Same day	.40	10	38
Immediate	.36	39	147
Indefinite/uncertain	.35	21	79

Range	*42*		
Adverbial specification			
Day or time of day	.78	10	39
Non-specific	.75	13	49
Specific hour	.74	6	23
No adverb	.38	71	266
Range	*40*		
Grammatical person			
1 yo (87)	[.60]	21	81
2 tú (103)	[.55]	19	73
5 vosotros (27)	[.53]	7	25
4 nosotros (70)	[.51]	18	69
3 él/ella/usted (82)	[.43]	18	66
0 inanimate (41)	[.42]	9	34
6 ellos/ellas (32)	[.31]	8	29
Lexical Type			
Other	[.71]	4	16
Stative	[.53]	10	38
Action	[.53]	69	262
Psychological	[.43]	5	17
Diction	[.29]	6	21
Sensory	[.23]	6	23
Speaker age			
50+ years	[.50]	71	267
≤45 years	[.50]	29	110
Verb frequency			
1-2 appearances	[.50]	24	92
3-9 appearances	[.44]	27	102
10-20 appearances	[.56]	22	83
20+ appearances	[.52]	27	100
Negation			
Not negative	[.50]	94	355
Negative	[.44]	6	22

If range is used as a gauge of the relative importance of the different factor groups, then we can conclude that the most important factors groups in the PF/IF Goldvarb pairing, listed in decreasing order of importance, are grammatical person, lexical type, temporal distance, and

adverbial specification. For the IF/FP Goldvarb pairing the most important factor groups are temporal distance, grammatical person and lexical type, whereas the most important factor groups in the FP/PF Goldvarb pairing are temporal distance and adverbial specification. It is interesting to note that temporal distance is the only factor group that is among the three most important factor groups for all three pairings.

2.2. Temporal distance

Temporal distance refers to the amount of time that will pass between the moment of speech and the realization of the action referred to. If a speaker says, for example, *voy a ir con el coche ahora* 'I'm going to go with the car right now' (Mario 57M t3p25) then the temporal distance is very short, since the action will be realized almost immediately. On the other end of the spectrum, one might say *nunca jamás me emborracharé* 'never again will I get drunk' (Mario 57M t3p14), in which case the action is indeed at maximum distance from the speech moment.

The name sometimes given to the PF in Spanish, the *futuro próximo*, implies that the temporal distance between this verb and its realization is shorter than for the IF or perhaps the FP. This assumption has not been supported by studies of these variants in actual speech. Sedano (1994:236) found in her study of Venezuelan Spanish that the PF was the preferred tense for describing future events, whether they were to occur soon after the speech moment or in the more distant future. In his study on Northern Colombian Spanish, Orozco (2005:59) also found that the PF is used far more frequently than the IF in both the near and distant futures. Aaron (2006:265) found in her corpus that the "[IF] can also be found to be used to refer to events that are [to occur] soon or that are relevant to the present." It is my hypothesis that, respective to increasing temporal distance, the FP will be favored by closer temporal contexts, followed by the PF and finally by the IF being favored in more distant or indefinite temporal contexts.

33

In order to test the importance of temporal distance for the speaker's choice of future variant, I coded the temporal distance for each verb in the corpus into one of five categories: immediate, within a day, within a week, more distant than a week, uncertain or indefinite, and never. Immediate actions were those that were to take place right away or within a period of one to two hours, such as (10) below. The "within a day" category comprised events that would take place within 24 hours of the moment of speech, as in (11) The temporal distance was coded as within a week when the action was expected to take place between one and seven days after the moment of speech, such as (12). An event that was to take place at a future moment more distant than a week was coded as "more distant than a week", as in (13). Any event for which the moment of realization could not be determined, as in (14), was coded as "uncertain or indefinite".

(10) ...te _voy a contar_ un chiste. (Jorge 30M t4p2bis)

...I am going to tell you a joke.

(11) ...a las ocho _os bajáis_... (Adela 59F t4p11)

...at eight o'clock you [will] come down...

(12) ...no los _van a asesorar_ a cualquier persona... (Mario 57M t8p12)

They are not going to entrust them to just anybody.

(13) _Paco cuando llegue octubre_ _tiene_ _veintidós._ (Mario 57M t8p16)

In October, Paco will be 22.

(14) ...si yo voy alguna vez a América, entonces _me llevo_ unas fotos...

...if I ever go to America, then I will carry some photos... (Mario 57M t3p18)

Finally, actions that would never occur were categorized as "never". These categories were adapted from previous studies on French (Poplack and Turpin 1999, King and Nadasdi 2003,

Wales 1983) and Spanish (Orozco 2005, Blas Arroyo 2008). To determine the temporal distance of the action discussed, I first looked to see whether an adverb, such as *ahora, mañana,* or *el miércoles*, indicated the temporal distance. If not, then I looked for other verbs in the sentence that might indicate the distance, as in *te voy a limpiar la boquita, que <u>estás</u> sucia* 'I'm going to clean your mouth, you're all dirty' (Mario 57M t8p2) . In this sentence, the second verb shows that the action of cleaning the child's mouth will be immediate, because the child is dirty right now. Mention of locations in the sentence may also offer clues to the temporal distance, as in *de camino te sirve también* 'en route this will help you too' (Graciela 25F t8p2). Temporal distance is implied because the speaker knows when her interlocutor will be travelling. If there were no indications immediately surrounding the verb, I then examined the overall context of the conversation to look for clues about the time at which the event being discussed would occur. For example, one of the informants, Natalia 25F, was to be married soon after the interviews were conducted, so knowing the date of her wedding made it possible to determine the temporal distance for these references.

Table 6 summarizes the results for the effect of temporal distance on the three future variants. First of all, we see from the number in parentheses after the heading for each category that the majority of future events were to occur almost immediately after they were mentioned with 146 events or one-third of the total being classified as immediate. These are followed by the uncertain category with 107 tokens and then by the events that would take place more than a week away with 95 tokens. The category "never" was found to be a "knockout," or a case in which "there is a 0 percent value or a 100 percent value in one of the cells of [the] analysis" (Tagliamonte 2006:152). A variable rule analysis is impossible in cases where there is no variation, as in a knockout. Since the only two examples of a temporal distance of "never"

occurred in the IF, the solution to this problem was to recode these tokens as belonging to another category, as suggested by Tagliamonte (2003:152). I chose to recode them as "uncertain or indefinite", since this temporal distance seemed to be the most compatible with their never occurring.

Table 6. Temporal Distance: factor weights, percentages and number of tokens for three future variants in binomial pairings

	IF				PF				FP			
	PF	FP	%	N	IF	FP	%	N	IF	PF	%	N
Immediate (162)	.39	**.58**	9.3	15	**.61**	**.64**	**63.6**	103	.42	.36	27.2	44
Within a day (46)	.43	.45	**17.4**	8	**.57**	**.60**	39.1	18	**.55**	.40	**43.5**	20
Within a week (32)	..24	.06	3.1	1	**.76**	.29	21.9	7	**.94**	**.71**	**75.0**	24
More distant than a week (95)	**.83**	.36	13.7	13	.17	.18	15.8	15	**.64**	**.82**	**70.5**	67
Indefinite/ Uncertain (107)	**.58**	**.88**	**26.2**	28	.42	**.65**	**50.5**	54	.12	.35	23.4	25

In addition to showing the total number of verbs classified for each type of temporal distance, Table 6 also shows the factor weights, percentages, and total number of tokens for each category of temporal distance for each of the three variants. Since Goldvarb can calculate factor weights for only two variants at a time, two factors weights are shown for each variant, one for each of its pairings with the other two variants. The factor weights for statistically significant factors are taken from the "best stepping-up run" as calculated by Goldvarb. As Goldvarb adds in factors, or "steps up" to determine which ones will "[increase] the likelihood as significantly as possible" (Tagliamonte 2006:140), it retains the factors that successfully do so. This combination of factors represents the best run and produces the highest likelihood of the appearance of the

application value. For example, in Table 6, considering IF as the application value, in the immediate category the factor weight for the IF is .39 when compared to the PF and .58 when compared to the FP. A factor weight of .50 or higher is considered to favor a variant whereas a factor weight lower than .50 disfavors the variant. After all factors have been tested in steps up, Goldvarb then begins a step-down analysis in which insignificant factors are eliminated (Tagliamonte 2006:143). Factor weights that do not achieve statistical significance are taken from "the first iteration of the step-down analysis where all factors are forced into regression" (Tagliamonte 2006:252). The factor weights are followed by the percentage of tokens for a variant, determined by the total number of tokens for that variant divided by the total number of tokens for that category and this column is followed by the number of tokens for that variant. For example, the 15 tokens of IF in the immediate category represent 9.3% of the 162 verbs classified as immediate. In order to facilitate reading the table, any factor weight over .50 has been boldfaced as well as any percentage that exceeds the overall percentage for this variant, as shown in Table 1 in Chapter 1. Factor weights that are not statistically significant are indicated by brackets, but there are no such factor weights in Table 6. The tables for the remaining factors will also follow this format.

The results presented in Table 6 show that the indefinite/uncertain category favors the use of the IF over either of the other variants. Even though a higher percentage of indefinite/ uncertain verbs occur in the PF (50.5% compared to 26.2% in IF), the statistical analysis shows a higher factor weight for the IF (.58) over the PF (.42) when the two variants are compared. This is similar to Orozco's (2005:59) finding that the IF is favored over the PF and the FP for "distant and unbounded future" with a factor weight of .639. Blas Arroyo (2008:94) finds, however, that the PF is favored over the IF (with a factor weight of .44) for indefinite distance. As he suggests,

"the time criterion is not univocal and may therefore be reinterpreted by speakers according to their … motivations" (Blas Arroyo 2008:95-96). This may explain the discrepancy between the results of his study and the present one regarding indefinite temporal distance. His results agree with the current results, though, that the IF is favored over the PF for events in the distant future. He reports a factor weight of .73 for the IF in cases of "maximum distance" (Blas Arroyo 2008:94), whereas the factor weight for the IF in the present corpus is .83 for events more distant than a week when compared only to the PF. Sedano (1994:236) also equates the IF with temporal distance and uncertainty when she states that "el [IF] se asocia a la lejanía temporal, o bien a modalidades epistémicas de duda… por parte del hablante…"

In the analysis of temporal distance, the PF was most strongly favored by tokens in the "immediate" category, as can be seen by the factor weights of .61 and .64 and the high percentage of 63.6% of these verbs in the PF. The PF was also favored for future events that will occur within a day, yet not quite as strongly as by immediate events. These results are generally corroborated by previous studies. Sedano (1994:232) found that events that were to occur immediately favored the PF when compared to the IF, as did Blas Arroyo (2008:94). Orozco (2005:59) found that events that were to occur in the "near future" favored the PF most strongly of the three variants, with a factor weight of .55 and 52% of these cases occurring in the PF. Berschin (1986:303) suggests that the PF may be favored for events in the immediate future because in this construction *ir* is conjugated in the present tense and thereby provides a morphological link between the present and the future. Bauhr (1992:72) also suggests that "*ir a + infinitivo* es, en cierto sentido, una 'prolongación del presente.'"

The FP was strongly favored for future events occurring "within a week" and at a time "more distant than a week". Orozco (2005) was the only one of the previous studies to include

the FP as a future variant and temporal distance as a factor. His results disagree with those presented here, since the FP was slightly disfavored for "distant and unbounded future" events with a factor weight of .466 and somewhat favored for events in the "near future" with a factor weight of .543. Orozco (2005:58) offers an explanation regarding the favoring of FP in near future contexts: "statements in the near future favor the [FP] for the obvious reason of providing the link of present-tense marking to near-present." This is similar to the suggestions of Berschin (1986:303) and Bauhr (1992:72) regarding the appearance of the PF in proximal temporal contexts. The results of the present study and those of Orozco (2005) are clearly in conflict for the effect of temporal distance for the FP. An analysis of the effect of temporal distance on the variation of all three future variants would be a significant contribution of a future study given the scarcity of research of this type thus far.

The favoring of the IF by the indefinite/uncertain temporal distance category confirms my hypothesis, since I predicted that events which were to occur at an indefinite future time would be favored by IF. My hypotheses regarding the FP and the PF, however, were refuted by the results. I expected the FP to be favored by more proximal temporal contexts, and the PF to be favored by more distal ones. I assumed that because the FP is morphologically the most related to the present that it would be favored by the events that were to occur the soonest after the moment of speech. Because the PF contains an auxiliary verb in the present tense, but the action to be realized is in the infinitive form, this made the PF seem to me to be slightly less connected to the present. My hypothesis was that the morphological distance in the PF would be reflected in a favoring of the PF by tokens in the categories "within a week" and "more distant than a week". There were few previous studies of this type that included the FP as a variant, and Orozco's (2005) was the only one of these that also included temporal distance as a factor.

Therefore, I had little besides intuition on which to base my hypothesis regarding FP and it turned out that my intuition in this case was not confirmed by the actual results.

2.3. Adverbial specification

Adverbial specification in this study refers to the presence, or lack, of a temporal adverb modifying the verb in one of the three future variants. Fernández Ramírez (1985:299) states that "los adverbios de tiempo condicionan poderosamente el significado de los tiempos verbales." If a speaker were to say, for example, *voy a la modista* 'I'm going to the seamstress,' this sentence could be indicative of an action that is occurring at the present speech moment or that will occur at a later time. However, with the addition of a temporal adverb, it becomes clear that this action will occur later: *luego voy a la modista* 'later I will go to the seamstress' (Inma 50F t5p1). My hypothesis is that the PF will be favored in contexts with no adverb, because the IF and the FP used without temporal adverbs lend themselves to ambiguity. The IF will be favored by contexts with non-specific adverbs, and the FP will be favored in contexts with more specific adverbs.

Orozco (2005:60) coded his tokens for presence or lack of an adverb; however, he did not distinguish between different types of adverbs. Like Orozco (2005), Urrea and Gradoville (2006:4) coded for only two categories of adverbial specification: adverbial and not adverbial. Aaron (2006:267), on the other hand, coded her tokens of written and spoken Peninsular Spanish for no adverb, specific adverb, and nonspecific adverb (Aaron 2006:267). Blas Arroyo (2008:99-100) coded this factor into four categories: no specification, precise specification, such as *mañana* 'tomorrow' or *esta noche* 'tonight', imprecise specification, such as *un año* 'one year' or *cuando lo pruebe* 'once I try it', and specification using quantifiers as in *siempre* 'always' or *nunca* 'never'. Blas Arroyo (2008:100) further describes the fourth category as "a subtype of

adverbial expressions in which temporal and aspectual values go hand in hand… [and] have an unspecific scope that tends to extend ad infinitum" (Blas Arroyo 2008:100).

To determine whether adverbs are as influential in the present study as suggested by Fernández Ramírez (1985:299), I followed the models of some previous studies (Poplack and Turpin 1999:149, Aaron 2006:269, Blas Arroyo 2008:94) and coded each token for one of four types of adverbial specification: no adverb, as in (15), a non-specific adverb, as in (16), "day or time of day", as in (17), which includes any mention of a specific day, such as *el viernes* 'Friday', or a time of day, such as *esta noche* 'tonight', and finally "specific hour" as in (18), which also includes adverbs such as *ahora mismo* 'right now'.

(15) *¿Te <u>vas a meter</u> en el agua, o no?* (Natalia 25F t5p37)

<u>Are</u> you <u>going to get in</u> the water, or not?

(16) *…<u>luego</u> <u>voy</u> a la modista…* (Inma 50F t5p1)

…<u>later</u> I <u>am going</u> to the seamstress…

(17) *<u>Esta noche</u> <u>os quedáis</u> aquí...* (Mario 57M t6p11)

<u>Tonight</u> you (pl.) <u>are staying</u> here…

(18) *<u>A las nueve</u> se <u>va a llevar</u> a la niña.* (Natalia 25F t9p32)

<u>At nine o'clock</u> she <u>is going to take</u> the girl [somewhere].

Table 7 shows the results of the Goldvarb analysis of adverbial specification. First we notice that 306 of the verb tokens in the corpus, over 69%, occur without an adverb. This category is followed in frequency by non-specific adverbs, day or time of day, and finally specific hour. Also of note is that this factor was not significant in the binomial comparison of the IF with the FP.

41

Table 7. Adverbial Specification: factor weights, percentages and number of tokens for three future variants in binomial pairings

	IF				PF				FP			
	PF	FP	%	N	IF	FP	%	N	IF	PF	%	N
No adverb (306)	.43	**[.55]**	13.1	40	**.57**	**.62**	**56.2**	172	[.45]	.38	30.7	94
Non-specific (64)	**.84**	**[.57]**	**23.4**	15	.16	.25	17.2	11	[.43]	**.75**	**59.4**	38
Specific hour (29)	**.74**	[.41]	**20.7**	6	.26	.26	27.6	8	**[.59]**	**.74**	**51.7**	15
Day or time of day (43)	.47	[.29]	9.3	4	**.53**	.22	14.0	6	**[.71]**	**.78**	**76.7**	33

Although this factor did not consistently achieve statistical significance, the factor weights and percentages still show that that certain variants are favored by certain types of adverbs. The IF is strongly statistically favored by non-specific adverbs when compared to the PF where its factor weight is .84, although in frequency, the FP is favored with over half of these tokens occurring in this variant. This finding coincides with the results of Aaron (2006:269) and Blas Arroyo (2008:94). Aaron (2006:269) found that occurrences of non-specific temporal adverbs favored the IF over the PF most strongly, especially in twentieth century spoken texts where its factor weight was .78. Blas Arroyo (2008:94) found that two of his adverbial specification categories favored the IF: imprecise specification with a factor weight of .56, and specification using quantifiers with a factor weight of .78. Both of these categories correspond with the present study's non-specific category. The results of the current analysis of adverbial specification are in conflict with the findings of Urrea and Gradoville (2006). They found that in New Mexican Spanish the IF was favored in contexts that contained no adverbial specification (Urrea and Gradoville 2006:4). They tie this result to the fact that the IF has taken on a largely

modal role in the language, occurrences of which were included in their corpus, while the PF has become the unmarked future tense. It is because "temporal adverbs tend to occur in contexts where a temporal meaning is implied" (Urrea and Gradoville 2006:6) that the PF, and not the more modal IF, is favored here by adverbial specification.

Adverbial specification was always found to be statistically significant in the analyses that included the PF, and over half of the tokens without an adverb (56.2%) occurred in the PF. As seen in Table 7, the PF is most strongly favored in contexts with no adverb. These results correspond with the findings of Orozco (2005:60), Aaron (2006:269), and Blas Arroyo (2008:94). Orozco (2005:60) found that the PF was the only one of the three future variants favored in contexts with no adverb with a factor weight of .561. As was the case in the current corpus, over half, or 51%, of the tokens in Orozco's (2005:60) study with no temporal adverb occurred in the PF. Aaron (2006:269) also found that in the spoken texts for verbs where there is no temporal adverb, the PF is favored, with a probability of .57. Blas Arroyo's (2008:94) found that the IF was slightly disfavored in contexts with no adverb with a factor weight of .45, from which one may conclude that the PF is favored when no temporal adverb is present. As seen in the above paragraph, these findings are in conflict with Urrea and Gradoville (2006:4), because of the strong modality of the IF in New Mexican Spanish.

The prominence of the PF where no temporal adverb is present may be explained by the potential ambiguity of the other two variants in these contexts. As has been frequently mentioned, the IF can express modal meanings in addition to its reference to future time (Gili y Gaya 1955:146, Real Academia Española 1973:471, Iuliano and De Stefano 1979, Hernández Alonso 1984:339, Fernández Ramírez 1985:295, Berschin 1986:302, Silva-Corvalán and Terrell 1989:198, Sedano 1994:233, Gutiérrez 1995:219, Orozco 2005:64, Aaron 2006:267, Matte Bon

2006:4, Urrea and Gradoville 2006:1, Blas Arroyo 2008:86). The lack of a temporal adverb with an IF verb could lead an interlocutor to misinterpret the meaning of an IF verb form as conjectural, even when it is intended as future. IF verbs used as conjecture, as in (19), have an almost present-tense meaning, as they describe actions that are already taking place at the moment of speech. Therefore, a temporal adverb can be used to distinguish conjectural from future meanings of the IF. A temporal adverb can also serve to distinguish the present time or habitual meanings of the FP from its future time references (Poplack and Turpin 1999:152, Orozco 2005:62). If the FP is employed without a temporal adverb, the listener may not know whether the speaker is discussing a habitual action, something that is occurring at the moment of speech, or whether he or she is actually referring to future time. Example (20) illustrates this sort of possible ambiguity with the FP in a sentence that refers to present time. The PF, however, carries no such ambiguity, and it is perhaps for this reason that it is favored over the IF and FP in contexts with no adverb.

(19) *¿Qué estará haciendo, cantando?* (Adela 59F t2p24)

What is she doing, singing?

(20) *Vienen todos a Puente Genil..*(Mario 57M t3p21)

Everyone comes to Puente Genil.

In the analysis of adverbial specification, the FP is favored by two categories when compared to the PF: specific hour, and day or time of day. Table 7 shows that the percentage of verbs in these categories that occur in the FP are at least 11% higher than the total percentage of FP verbs in the corpus, and not only in these two categories, but also the non-specific category, over half of the tokens occur in the FP. As discussed above, the FP "needs overt time markers to

express futurity" (Orozco 2005:62), which is why the FP is favored in contexts where specific adverbial specification is present.

In the analysis of adverbial specification as an influencing factor in a Spanish speaker's choice of future variant, adverbial specification was consistently significant for the PF. This variant is favored in contexts where no adverb is present, which coincides with the results of Orozco (2005:59), Aaron (2006:267), and Blas Arroyo (2008:94). The results for the other two variants, the IF and the FP, achieved statistical significance when paired with the PF but not with each other. The results for the IF supported my hypothesis. I predicted that the IF would be favored in the non-specific adverb category, and in spite of the low frequency of these tokens in the IF, this hypothesis turned out to be true statistically, with the caveat that in the Goldvarb pairing with the FP this factor did not achieve statistical significance. The PF is favored in contexts in which no adverb appears. This confirms the results of the studies conducted by Orozco (2005:59), in which all three future variants were included, as well as those of Aaron (2006:269), and Blas Arroyo (2008:94), who compared only the IF and the PF. Urrea and Gradoville (2006:4) had the opposite results regarding the IF and the FP. They suggest that the favoring of the IF by non-adverbial contexts is due to the strong modal quality of this variant in New Mexican Spanish (Urrea and Gradoville 2006:6). The results regarding the PF fully support my hypothesis, in which I stated that this variant would be favored in contexts that lack a temporal adverb. The PF is the only one of the three future variants that does not lend itself to ambiguity when used without a temporal adverb, which likely explains why it is favored by this factor. Regarding the FP, my hypothesis was that this variant would be favored in contexts that include specific temporal adverbs. This hypothesis was supported by the results of the binomial pairing between the FP and the PF.

2.4. Grammatical person and subject animacy

It has been suggested that the PF is used in more subjective contexts and that the IF, conversely, is employed in more objective contexts (Fleischman 1983:190, Poplack and Turpin 1999:154, King and Nadasdi 2003:330). Silva-Corvalán's (1990:172) principle of distance suggests that speakers tend to speak about themselves and their immediate surroundings, both spatially and temporally. Thus, it seems possible that grammatical person could affect a speaker's choice of future tense. Because of this principle of distance combined with knowledge of previous studies, I hypothesize that the IF will be favored by second- and third-person subjects, and also by inanimate subjects (Persons 2, 3, 5, 6, and 0). My hypothesis is also that the PF and the FP will be favored more by first person subjects (Persons 1 and 4). In coding grammatical person, I set up separate categories for animate *yo, tú, él/ella, Usted, nosotros, vosotros, ellos/ellas* and *Ustedes.* It turned out that there were only two tokens of *Usted* referring to future time and there were no such tokens of *Ustedes*. The two *Usted* tokens were knockouts according to Goldvarb, so these were combined with *él/ella*. Verbs with inanimate subjects, all morphologically persons 3 or 6, were coded separately to determine whether subject animacy was an important factor in the present corpus.

Orozco (2005:59) coded his corpus according to grammatical number of subject, including categories for singular subjects (*yo, tú,* and *él/ella/Usted*) and plural subjects (*nosotros/as, vosotros/as,* and *ellos/ellas/Ustedes*). Aaron (2006:269) also investigated grammatical person as a possible factor influencing the choice of IF or PF. She divided the

subjects in her corpus into two categories: singular animate subjects, which included *yo*, *tú*, and *él/ella/Usted*, and "other".

Table 5 summarizes the results of the effect of grammatical person on the choice of future variant. The greatest number of tokens referring to future time, 103, have a subject of person 2 *tú*, followed by person 1 *yo* with 87 tokens and person 3 *él/ella/Usted* with 82 tokens. Next in order of frequency are person 4 *nosotros*, person 0 inanimate, person 6 *ellos/ellas*, and finally person 5 *vosotros/as*. As can be seen in the table, this factor was not significant in the FP/PF Goldvarb pairing.

Three of the grammatical person categories favored the IF in this analysis. According to the factor weights, Person 0, an inanimate subject, favors the IF the most strongly of the three,

Table 8. Grammatical Person: factor weights, percentages and number of tokens for three future variants in binomial pairings

	IF				PF				FP			
	PF	FP	%	N	IF	FP	%	N	IF	PF	%	N
Person 1, *yo* (87)	**.53**	.36	6.9	6	.47	[.40]	**51.7**	45	.47	**[.60]**	**41.4**	36
Person 2, *tú* (103)	**.70**	**.57**	**29.1**	30	.30	[.45]	31.1	32	.43	**[.55]**	39.8	41
Person 3, *él/ella/Ud.* (82)	**.74**	**.71**	**19.5**	16	.26	**[.51]**	42.7	35	.29	[.43]	37.8	31
Person 4, *nosotros/as* (70)	.05	.07	1.4	1	**.95**	[.49]	**58.6**	41	**.93**	**[.51]**	40.0	28
Person 5, *vosotros/as* (27)	.37	**.56**	7.4	2	**.63**	[.47]	37.0	10	.44	**[.53]**	**55.6**	15
Person 6, *ellos/ellas* (32)	.32	**.61**	9.4	3	**.68**	**[.69]**	**50.0**	16	.39	[.31]	40.6	13
Person 0, inanimate (41)	**.82**	**.74**	**17.1**	7	.18	**[.58]**	43.9	18	.26	[.42]	39.0	16

47

followed by Person 3 *él/ella/Usted* and then by Person 2 *tú*. In his study of Northern Colombian Spanish, Orozco (2005:60) found that the IF was favored in contexts in which the subject was inanimate, and the PF was distinctly disfavored by these subjects. Animate subjects in his study revealed the opposite results, favoring the PF and disfavoring the IF, which led Orozco to propose a correlation between animacy and grammatical person. The results of the present analysis regarding inanimate subjects agree with Orozco's (2005:60) finding of a factor weight of .604 for the IF with a non-human subject. However, where Orozco (2005:60) found 140 verbs in the IF with a non-human subject, for 26% of the total of verbs with non-human subjects, I found only 41 (17%) in the present corpus. Blas Arroyo (2008:107) also coded for subject animacy, dividing his corpus into tokens with human subjects, generic human subjects, and nonhuman subjects. Generic human subjects are defined as second- or third-person subjects that "do not refer directly to the participants in the communicative act, but instead to… an undefined entity" (Blas Arroyo 2008:107). An example of this type of subject is *metéis el coche en el barco* 'you (pl.) put the car on the boat' (Adela 59F t2p13B). In this sentence, it is not only the interlocutors who put their car on the boat, but rather everyone who travels on it puts his or her car on the boat. Blas Arroyo's (2008:94) inanimate (nonhuman) subjects category, which contained 253 tokens, also favored the IF compared to the PF with a factor weight of .57. The favoring of the IF by Persons 2 and 3 supports the idea put forth by some researchers that speakers will tend to use the IF to talk about persons other than themselves (Fleischman 1983:190, Poplack and Turpin 1999:154, King and Nadasdi 2003:330). This is based on the idea that a speaker who is speaking about someone other than him or herself is farther removed from the action being described and thus more objective and so will use the IF. Blas Arroyo's (2008:94) category of human (generic) subjects did not favor the IF, but the idea that second and

third person subjects may refer to "an undefined entity" as opposed to a specific person may explain why the IF is favored by Persons 2 and 3 in the corpus for the current study.

In this analysis the PF was favored fairly strongly by Person 6 *ellos/ellas* when compared with the IF, with a factor weight of .68, a result which runs counter to the assumed subjectivity of the PF (Fleischman 1983:190, Poplack and Turpin 1999:154, King and Nadasdi 2003:330). In fact, of the 32 tokens with Person 6 subjects, it turns out that exactly half of them occur in the PF. Furthermore, neither of the first persons, Person 1 or Person 4, favors the PF over both of the other variants. Person 4 strongly favors the PF, but only in its Goldvarb pairing with the IF, and Person 1 favors the IF but only over the PF. Aaron's (2006:269) finding that singular animate subjects favored the PF is not true for persons 1, 2, and 3 in the Puente Genil corpus. Upon examining the corpus and cross-referencing the Person 6 tokens occurring in the PF with the other factors analyzed, no explanation can be reached as to why Person 6 would favor the PF when other scholars have had different findings.

The FP is strongly favored by Person 4 *nosotros/as* when compared to the IF, with a factor weight of .93.Person 1 favors the FP over the PF, but it also slightly favors the IF over the FP. Because of the FP's morphological connection to the present time, it is not surprising that a first person subject would favor this tense. The fact that the FP is favored much more strongly over the IF is perhaps accounted for by the complexity of the IF Person 4 forms. Between the FP form *cantamos* 'we sing' and *cantaremos* 'we will sing,' there is a difference of one syllable and one morpheme, the [re] which indicates the IF. In irregular verbs, there is an additional sound change present. Consider the verb *poner* 'to put.' The Person 4 form of this in the FP is *ponemos* 'we put' versus the IF form which is *pondremos* 'we will put.' Here we see a difference of one syllable and of the morpheme [re] which indicates the IF, but the phoneme [d] has also been

introduced. These examples demonstrate that Person 4 may disfavor the IF for reasons of morphological and phonological complexity, and thereby favor the PF and FP. Person 4 is also a first-person subject, which further explains why this grammatical person would favor the FP, one of the more subjective variants.

The IF was the only variant whose results were not compromised by statistical insignificance in the analysis of this factor. According to the factor weights for this variant, it was favored most strongly by Person 0, followed by Persons 3 and 2. These persons are consistent with the supposed objectivity of the IF, in that none of them is a first person subject. The IF results are in agreement with my hypothesis that inanimate subjects would favor this variant, although I must concede that an analysis with a greater number of tokens would be desirable to determine with greater certainty whether these subjects favor the IF. I also predicted that the IF would be favored by second and third persons, a hypothesis which is supported in part by these results, although the results for Persons 5 and 6 conflict with this hypothesis.

The PF was favored by Person 6 which runs counter to my hypothesis that the PF would be favored by first person subjects. The FP was favored only by Person 4. I predicted that Persons 1 and 4 would favor either the FP or the PF. Person 4 did strongly favor both of these over the IF, thereby supporting this prediction, but Person 1 slightly favored the IF over the PF. Person 5, the person with the fewest number of tokens, did not clearly favor any future variant.

2.5. Verb frequency and lexical type

Verb frequency, as its name suggests, refers to the number of times a verb appears in the corpus. Silva-Corvalán (1990:172) says that more frequently used forms are retained longer in speech. If the IF is falling from use, then one would expect that verbs with a higher frequency in spoken Spanish would be the ones more commonly used in the IF. The opposite would also be

true; that is, that verbs with lower frequency will be used more in the PF and FP, as these forms are not decreasing in use in the spoken language. These last two statements are, in fact, my hypothesis for the verb frequency factor. To determine to what extent verb frequency influences a speaker's choice of future variant, each verb was coded according to its frequency of occurrence in the corpus of verbs that refer to future time: 1 = verbs that appear once or twice, 2 = verbs that appear three to nine times, 3 = verbs that appear ten to 20 times, and 4 = verbs that appear over 20 times.

Table 9 shows the results of the analysis of verb frequency. We can see from the abundance of brackets that this factor turned out to be statistically insignificant in all binomial analyses.

Table 9. Verb Frequency: factor weights, percentages and number of tokens for three future variants in binomial pairings

	IF				PF				FP			
	PF	FP	%	N	IF	FP	%	N	IF	PF	%	N
1-2 tokens (101 total, 75 infinitives)	[.36]	[.23]	8.9	9	**[.64]**	[.50]	**57.4**	58	**[.77]**	[.50]	33.7	34
3-9 tokens (117 total, 27 infinitives)	**[.59]**	**[.66]**	12.8	15	[.41]	**[.56]**	**47.9**	56	[.34]	[.44]	39.3	46
10-20 tokens (98 total, 6 infinitives)	**[.65]**	**[.56]**	**15.3**	15	[.35]	[.44]	33.7	33	[.44]	**[.56]**	**51.0**	50
Over 20 tokens (126 total, 4 infinitives)	[.44]	[.49]	**20.6**	26	**[.56]**	[.48]	39.7	50	**[.51]**	**[.52]**	39.7	50

Lexical type of verb refers to the category to which a verb belongs. Almeida and Díaz (1998:3) provide examples of each type of verb used in this study, and their examples will serve as explanation and definition of each of the categories in the present analysis. In their study of the Spanish spoken in Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Almeida and Díaz (1998:3) included

categories for stative verbs, such as *estar* 'to be' and *quedar* 'to stay', verbs of diction, such as *decir* 'to say' and *contar* 'to tell [a story]', action verbs, such as *ir* 'to go' and *caminar* 'to walk', psychological verbs, such as *pensar* 'to think' and *notar* 'to notice', and "other" verbs, such as *haber* 'to be' or 'to have' and *tener* 'to have' (Almeida and Díaz 1998:3). In his study, Blas Arroyo (2008:94) coded for all the same lexical categories as Almeida and Díaz (1998:3) and also included categories for periphrases such as *nos volveremos a ver* 'we'll see each other again' (Blas Arroyo 2008:110), modals such as *querer* 'to want' or *deber* 'to be obligated', and verbs of sensory perception such as *ver* 'to see' or *oír* 'to hear' (Blas Arroyo 2008:109-10). My hypothesis is that action verbs will favor the PF or the FP, and that sensory verbs will favor the IF, largely due to the high frequency of *verás* in the corpus, which is an IF form of the sensory verb *ver*.

I coded the verbs in my corpus following the classifications used in Almeida and Díaz's (1998:3) and Blas Arroyo's (2008:94) studies where 1 = verbs of action, 2 = stative verbs, 3 = verbs of diction, 4 = psychological verbs, 5 = sensory verbs, and 6 = other verbs.

Table 10. Lexical type: factor weights, percentages and number of tokens for three future variants in binomial pairings

	IF				PF				FP			
	PF	FP	%	N	IF	FP	%	N	IF	PF	%	N
Action verbs (279)	.28	.30	6.1	17	**.72**	[.47]	**46.2**	129	**.70**	**[.53]**	**47.7**	133
Stative verbs (45)	.45	**.51**	**15.6**	7	**.55**	[.47]	42.2	19	.49	**[.53]**	42.2	19
Verbs of diction (29)	**.75**	**.86**	**27.6**	8	.25	**[.71]**	**51.7**	15	.14	[.29]	20.7	6
Psychological verbs (23)	**.57**	**.79**	**26.1**	6	.43	**[.57]**	**47.8**	11	.21	[.43]	26.1	6

| Sensory verbs (46) | **.91** | **.96** | **50.0** | 23 | .09 | **[.77]** | 39.1 | 18 | .04 | [.23] | 10.9 | 5 |
| Other verbs (20) | **.88** | **.51** | **20.0** | 4 | .12 | [.29] | 25.0 | 5 | .49 | **[.71]** | **55.0** | 11 |

In Table 10 we see that most of the verb categories favored the IF, except action verbs which favored the FP, and stative verbs, which did not strongly favor any of the variants. We also see that this factor did not achieve statistical significance in the FP/PF Goldvarb pairing. Verbs of action accounted for approximately 63%, or nearly two-thirds, of all the tokens in the corpus, so that there are relatively few tokens, from 20-46, in each of the other five categories. This may help explain why the results for all these other categories appear to favor the IF so strongly, even though very few tokens occur in the IF for these verbs. It is also important to note that the only sensory verb in the corpus is *ver*, which happens to strongly favor the IF in this corpus, as noted above in this section.

Almeida and Díaz (1998:3) found that stative verbs favored the IF most strongly, followed by action verbs. This study has found that stative verbs do not clearly favor any variant. In Blas Arroyo's (2008:110) results, verbs of motion, for example *ir* 'to go,' *llevar* 'to take,' *salir* 'to go out,' and *entrar* 'to enter' and also verbs of perception strongly favored the IF. The results of the present study concur with Blas Arroyo's (2008:110) findings regarding verbs of perception, but conflict with his results in the category "verbs of motion." The category in the current analysis that most closely corresponds with this one is "action verbs," and these do not favor the IF in the present corpus. My hypothesis regarding the IF has been confirmed, in part, by these results. I predicted that the sensory perception category would favor the IF, due largely to the high frequency of *verás*, although given that this is the only verb in this category in the corpus, these results do not give as thorough a description of the effect these verbs may have on

future variant distribution as in previous studies. My hypothesis regarding verbs of action has also been confirmed by this analysis, as I predicted that these verbs would favor either the FP or the PF.

2.6. Speaker age

If the disappearance of the IF tense and its replacement by the PF and FP is a change in progress, then it stands to reason that older speakers would preserve the IF in their speech more often than younger speakers. This, along with the prediction that younger generations will favor either the PF or the FP, is my hypothesis regarding speaker age. To determine whether age is a factor in my study, I divided the informants from my corpus into two age groups: 1 = speakers aged 50 years and older, 2 = speakers aged 45 years and under. Originally I had coded for three age groups, the third group having included speakers under the age of 25. However, the youngest age group had produced the fewest number of tokens, so I recoded the tokens so as to combine the two younger groups.

Table 11 shows the results of the analysis for speaker age. The speakers in the first group, aged 50 years and older, produced nearly three times the tokens of the younger group, and produced over six times more tokens in the IF than the younger group. This factor was insignificant in two of the Goldvarb pairings, and appears to be entirely insignificant to the PF. The only statistically significant results indicate that the IF is favored over the FP by the older group of speakers and the FP is favored over the IF by the younger group. I hypothesized that the PF would be favored by the younger generation, but the results for the PF are statistically insignificant. My hypothesis that the older speakers would favor the IF is supported statistically only in its Goldvarb pairing with the FP. These results are consistent with those of Blas Arroyo (2008:112) who found, after restructuring the analysis of age groups by recoding his tokens from

four age categories to two, speakers under 40 and speakers over 41, that older speakers favored the IF over the PF. Contrary to those results, Almeida and Díaz (1998:3) found in their variable rule analysis of Spanish in the Canary Islands that the younger generation was more likely to use the IF than the older generations, but their two age groups were very different from those of Blas Arroyo (2008:112). Their younger group included speakers 67 and younger and their older group 70 and older (Almeida and Díaz 1998:3). Their justification for this division was that many speakers 70 years of age and older will have retired, while speakers in "the younger group [are] largely still in the workforce" (Almeida and Díaz 1998:4). Orozco (2007:107) presents some interesting and slightly more complex findings regarding speaker age. He seems to have cross-referenced socioeconomic status with age, and in so doing discovered that the only informants that favored the IF were middle class speakers who were born before 1960. Any member of the middle class born after 1960 disfavored the IF, and all members of the working class disfavored it (Orozco 2007:107).

Table 11. Speaker Age: factor weights, percentages and number of tokens for three future variants in binomial pairings

	IF				PF				FP			
	PF	FP	%	N	IF	FP	%	N	IF	PF	%	N
Aged 50 and older (326)	**[.56]**	**.57**	**17.3**	57	[.44]	[.50]	41.5	135	.43	[.50]	**41.2**	134
Aged 45 and under (116)	[.34]	.28	7.6	9	**[.66]**	[.50]	**52.9**	64	**.72**	[.50]	39.5	46

2.7. Negation

Historically, in written contexts, the IF has been the favored variant in negative contexts (Aaron 2006:269). Only in the twentieth century has the PF begun to increase dramatically in these contexts (Aaron 2006:269). Aaron (2006) and Urrea and Gradoville (2006) coded their

spoken corpora for negative polarity, but this factor did not reach statistical significance in their analyses. Aaron (2006:270) did, however, mention that there has been a "loss of a polarity constraint" that has allowed the PF to appear "increasingly in negated contexts." For this reason, and because negation was such an important factor in some previous studies on Canadian French (Poplack and Turpin 1999:154, Emirkinian and Sankoff 1985:200), I decided to code my tokens for negative polarity.

As may be inferred from the absence of this factor in most previous Spanish variationist studies, negation did not prove statistically significant in any of the three Goldvarb pairings, as shown in Table 12.

Table 12. Negation: factor weights, percentages and number of tokens for three future variants in binomial pairings

	IF				PF				FP			
	PF	FP	%	N	IF	FP	%	N	IF	PF	%	N
Not negative (415)	[.49]	[.46]	14.5	60	[.51]	[.50]	43.9	182	[.54]	[.50]	41.7	173
Negative (27)	[.66]	[.94]	18.5	5	[.34]	[.56]	55.6	15	[.06]	[.44]	25.9	7

2.8. Summary of results.

Of all of the factors tested as potentially influencing a speaker's choice of future variant in Puente Genil Spanish, temporal distance is the only one of the factors tested that reached statistical significance in all of three of the Goldvarb pairings and the only factor that was among the top three most important factor groups for each pairing based on range. Indefinite and uncertain future realization favored the IF, immediate realization and realization within a day favored the PF, and realization farther away than the next day favored the FP. Adverbial specification was statistically significant in two out of three binomial runs, as was grammatical person. These results were thus slightly less influential in the speaker's choice of future variant.

In general, a non-specific adverb favored the IF, lack of adverb favored the PF, and a more specific adverb, whether a specific hour, time of day, or specific day, favored the FP. The clearest result for grammatical person was that an inanimate subject favored the IF, but it would have been preferable to have more tokens in this category. The next factor tested, verb frequency, did not achieve statistical significance in this study in any of the Goldvarb pairings. Lexical type, however, was significant in two of the three Goldvarb pairings, both of which included the IF, such that all verb types except action and stative verbs, favored the IF. Speaker age reached statistical significance in only one of three Goldvarb pairings, that which compared IF and FP, which indicated that older speakers favored the IF whereas younger speakers favored the FP. The final factor investigated, negation, was insignificant in all analyses in this study.

CHAPTER 3

CONCLUSIONS

3.1. Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of several linguistic and social factors on the choice of future variant among Spanish speakers from Puente Genil, a town in southern Spain in the province of Cordoba. This topic is of special interest because previous studies have indicated that the inflectional or synthetic future variant or IF is decreasing in use in the spoken language and that the periphrastic or analytic future variant or PF is taking its place as the unmarked future variant (Gómez Manzano 1988, Silva-Corvalán and Terrell 1989:207, Sedano 1994:238, Orozco 2005:63, Aaron 2006:271, López Morales 2006:785, Urrea and Gradoville 2006:9, Blas Arroyo 2008:120). The futurate present or FP was also included as a variant in this study, since future time can also be expressed in Spanish through the morphologically present tense. The seven factor groups were selected for the insight they might offer into the process of replacement, and several factors have been shown to be statistically significant in the selection of one of three variants for future time on the part of the Spanish speakers in this corpus.

Temporal distance, shown to be an important factor in previous studies, (Sedano 1994:232, Orozco 2005:58, Blas Arroyo 2008:93), was an important factor in the present study as well, since it consistently reached statistical significance and whose range showed it to be important in all three Goldvarb pairings. The IF was favored by events that were to occur at an indefinite or uncertain time, the PF was favored by actions that were to occur immediately after

58

the speech moment, and the FP was favored by two categories: events that would occur within a week and those that would occur at a time more distant than a week from the speech moment. My hypothesis regarding the IF was supported by the results in this case; however, the results for the PF and the FP were in fact the reverse of my hypothesis. I predicted that the FP, given that it is morphologically present, would be favored by more proximal temporal distances, and that the PF, because its auxiliary verb is in the present but is followed by the preposition *a* 'to' which may indicate forward motion, and then by an infinitive, would be favored by events that were to occur farther into the future, but not at maximum distance. I must conclude that the morphology of the FP and the PF is not linked to actual usage in the way I had assumed.

Adverbial specification, a factor that was included in the studies conducted by Orozco (2005:62), Aaron (2006:267), and Blas Arroyo (2008:99), was statistically significant in two of the statistical pairings in Goldvarb and thus was slightly less important to the likelihood of one variant being favored over the other. In terms of range, it was the second most important factor in the FP/PF Goldvarb pairing and the fourth most important in the PF/IF Goldvarb pairing. The IF was favored in contexts that included a non-specific adverb, although the results for IF were not significant when this variant was compared with the FP. The PF was favored by contexts with no adverb. The FP was favored by both contexts that included a specific adverb, that is the specific hour and day or time of day categories, however this factor was insignificant when the FP was compared with the IF. My hypotheses for the effect of this factor on all three variants were generally supported by the results of this study, even though adverbial specification proved insignificant in the IF/FP Goldvarb pairing. The PF was strongly favored by contexts with no adverb when compared to the IF and the FP which were strongly favored, when compared to the PF, by contexts that did contain an adverb.

59

Grammatical person was the most important factor group, according to its range, for the PF/IF Goldvarb pairing and the second most important factor group for the IF/FP Goldvarb pairing, even though it proved to be statistically insignificant in the PF/FP Goldvarb pairing. Previous researchers who coded for grammatical person, Orozco (2005:61) and Aaron (2006:267), found it to be a significant factor group in some of their statistical analyses. The IF was favored first by inanimate subjects (although the low number of tokens in this category somewhat compromises the results), followed by Person 3 *él/ella/Usted* and finally by Person 2 *tú*. The PF was unexpectedly favored first by Person 6 *ellos/ellas;* however, in the PF/FP Goldvarb pairing, these results were insignificant. The PF was also favored in one of the statistical analyses by Person 4 *nosotros/as.* The factor weights show that the FP was favored by Person 4 as well in its Goldvarb pairing with the IF, Orozco (2005:61) and Blas Arroyo (2008:107) found that subject animacy was a significant factor in their studies, and while the analysis of the same factor in this study appears to have reached significance as mentioned above, a far greater number of tokens would have been necessary to determine more confidently that animacy was an important factor in the present corpus. My hypothesis on the effect of grammatical person on the selection of the IF was supported by the favoring of this variant by Persons 2 and 3, and by inanimate subjects, keeping in mind the aforementioned remark regarding the need for more IF tokens. Regarding the FP, my hypothesis was somewhat supported by Person 4 favoring this variant, since Person 4 is a first-person subject. However, I predicted that the PF would be favored by first-person subjects as well, but this hypothesis was entirely refuted by the statistical results. Person 1 did not strongly favor any variant according to the factor weights, although the majority of Person 1 tokens (58, or 57.4%) occurred in the PF.

Instead, the PF was favored by Person 6. Even further examination of the Person 6 tokens in the corpus has yielded no satisfactory explanation for why it favors the PF.

The fact that the IF seems to be declining in use, combined with Silva-Corvalán's (1990:172) suggestion that more frequent forms are the last to be lost from the spoken language, prompted the inclusion of verb frequency as a factor in this study. This was not a factor that had been analyzed in the previous studies consulted. Verb frequency did not achieve statistical significance in any of the Goldvarb analyses and therefore both my hypothesis and the principle of distance (Silva-Corvalán 1990:172) failed to find support. Lexical type, however, was significant in two of the three Goldvarb pairings, the two which included the IF. In terms of its range, it was the second most important factor group in the PF/IF Goldvarb pairing and the third most important in the IF/FP Goldvarb pairing. The IF was favored by four of the six lexical type categories: first by sensory verbs, then "other" verbs, verbs of diction, and finally by psychological verbs. Lexical type was included in the studies conducted by Almeida and Díaz (1998:2) and Blas Arroyo (2008:109) and proved significant in their analyses. The results of the present study confirmed my hypothesis that the IF would be favored by verbs of sensory perception due to the frequent presence of *verás* in the corpus. However, a corpus which included more examples of different verbs of sensory perception would be necessary to solidify this finding.

Speaker age, included as a factor by Almeida and Díaz (1998:2), Orozco (2007:107), and Blas Arroyo (2008:112), was significant in all their studies. In the present study, however, this factor reached statistical significance only in the IF/FP Goldvarb pairing. It was, surprisingly, entirely insignificant to the likelihood of the appearance of the PF variant and its range did not rank it among the most important factor groups for any Goldvarb pairing. According to the factor

weights, the older generation favored the IF over the FP and the younger speakers favored the FP over the IF. My hypotheses regarding speaker age were that the IF would be favored by older speakers, and that younger speakers would favor either the FP or the PF. My prediction was supported for the IF and the FP but the results for the PF turned out to be statistically insignificant.

Finally, as mentioned above, negation was entirely insignificant to this study. It was tested by Aaron (2006:267) and Urrea and Gradoville (2006:3) and was found to be insignificant in their studies as well, but was highly significant in two studies of Canadian French (Poplack and Turpin 1999:154, Emirkinian and Sankoff 1985:200). It appears then that negative polarity items in Spanish do not favor the IF in the way that they do in Canadian French.

The fact that younger speakers are using the PF more than the IF in many dialects of Spanish suggests that there is a change in progress occurring in Spanish, as stated by Urrea and Gradoville (2006:9). That the speakers of some of the dialects studied strongly prefer the PF to the IF confirms this change (Gómez Manzano 1988, Silva-Corvalán and Terrell 1989:207, Sedano 1994:238, Orozco 2005:63, Aaron 2006:271, López Morales 2006:785, Urrea and Gradoville 2006:9, Blas Arroyo 2008:120). As the Romance languages have evolved from Latin, their respective verb systems have undergone several changes. Fleischman (1982:103) suggests a pattern of shifting between analytic and synthetic constructions that is perhaps repeating itself as the IF decreases in use and the PF increases to take the place of IF in some contexts. Hopper (1991:22, cited by Aaron 2006:265) describes the changing and at times interchangeable uses of the future tenses as "*layering*, which is found when a form develops new meanings without immediately (or ever) replacing other forms within the same functional domain". The IF has developed a modal usage, which is discussed at length in Fernández Ramírez (1985:295) as well

as in Berschin (1986:302) and Almeida and Díaz (2006:7). This means that verbs that are morphologically IF are being used in non-temporal ways to refer to hypothetical situations or situations that are already in progress. The example that has been cited in this study is that of the conjectural future, in which an IF verb is used to discuss what is already known or suspected by the speaker. That the IF is used modally and temporally is an example of the layering that Aaron (2006:265) discusses. Another example of this is the occasional residual use of PF as referring to actual movement in addition to its current status as a verb tense.

3.2. Future directions

A variety of changes and adjustments could be made to the present study in the interest of more accurate statistical analyses and overall results. An analysis of a much larger corpus, or at least one that contains more future tokens, would yield more reliable results and perhaps even slightly different ones. Grammatical person is an example of a factor group that had very few tokens in some of its factors and so would have benefited from a larger corpus. Speaker age, which was significant only in the IF/FP Goldvarb pairings. could also have benefited from a greater number of tokens and a better balance of tokens produced by the older and younger age groups. Regarding lexical type of verb, verbs of sensory perception favored the IF based on the high occurrence of the forms of only one verb, namely *ver*. It would have been preferable then to have a larger corpus that included tokens of the future in other verbs of sensory perception. It might turn out, though, that certain future variants occur only rarely in certain grammatical persons or verbs and that the same poor distribution of some tokens might persist even in a larger corpus.

There are some factors included in this study whose analyses may benefit from different coding of the tokens. For example, grammatical person could be recoded into fewer categories,

such as singular versus plural subjects, or first- second- and third- person subjects. This sort of recoding would spread the tokens across fewer categories, resulting in more tokens per category, and a different statistical result. A recoding of this sort might help to explain why Person 6 favored the PF in the absence of previous findings to this effect. Adverbial specification is another factor group which could be recoded from four factors into only three, "no adverb," "non-specific adverb," and "specific adverb". Temporal distance could also be organized into only three factors, a close distance (immediate or with a day) which favored the PF, a farther away than one day (within a week or more distant than a week) which favored the FP, and an indefinite or uncertain distance which favored the IF.

Because the interviews used in the corpus for the current study were conducted 21 years ago, it would be interesting to repeat the current study by comparing the 1987 corpus with a new more recent corpus. A comparison between the two would show which changes are progressing in the language, and which factors are more or less significant now as opposed to their status in 1987. Orozco (2007) conducted a study in which he cross-referenced different social categories to determine how they affect a speaker's verb choice. He found that social class combined with age influenced the distribution of the IF, the PF and the FP in both Northern Colombian Spanish and New York Spanish (Orozco 2007:107). It would also be interesting to do a similar analysis of a much larger corpus, or of one in which the use of future tenses was encouraged through use of more specific questioning, which was the method of choice of Wales (1983). While the corpus resulting from such questioning would obviously be less natural and spontaneous, it would most likely produce far more verb tokens referring to future time.

An interesting potential future study would be to compare spoken corpora from Spain with those from Latin American countries. Gómez Manzano (1988) conducted this type of study,

64

employing written corpora, but the spoken language seems to evolve much more readily than the written language. Sedano (1994), who conducted an analysis of the distribution of the IF and PF in the spoken language in Venezuela, suggested that a study of a written corpus be conducted. Because the PF is gaining strength, especially in Latin America, it would be interesting to see whether the written language is following suit, or maintaining a more even distribution of the IF and PF. As a contemporary example of the evolution of the spoken language, and in support of her theories on the synthetic-analytic cycle, Fleischman (1982:86) suggests that in what we know as the Spanish PF, the auxiliary verb is being neutralized and synthesized into the following infinitive in Mexican Spanish. In this emerging synthetic version of *ir a + infinitivo*, Fleischman cites examples of Mexican Spanish speakers saying, for example, *yo vadormir* 'I'm going to sleep' or *ella vadormir* 'she's going to sleep' instead of the current written forms *voy a dormir* and *va a dormir*, respectively (Fleischman 1982:86). In this tense, the forms of the auxiliary verb *ir* are neutralized and an explicit subject becomes obligatory (Fleischman 1982:86). This could be the next step in the pattern of change in the Spanish verb system. Only time and close observation of native speakers and their linguistic behavior when speaking will pinpoint the paths that the Romance languages are taking.

REFERENCES

Aaron, Jessi Elana. 2006. *Me voy a tener que ir yendo*: A Corpus-Based Study of the Grammaticization of the *ir a* + INF Construction in Spanish. Selected Proceedings of the 9th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium, ed. by Nuria Sagarra and Almeida Jacqueline Toribio, 263-72. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Almeida, Manuel, and Marina Díaz. 1998. Aspectos sociolingüísticos de un cambio gramatical: la expresión del futuro. Estudios Filológicos 33.7-22.

Bauhr, Gerhard. 1992. Sobre el futuro *cantaré* y la forma compuesta *voy a cantar* en español moderno. Moderna Språk 86.1.69-79.

Berschin, Helmut. 1986. Futuro analítico y futuro sintético en el español peninsular y americano. Revista de Filológia Románica IV.301-08.

Blas Arroyo, José Luis. 2008. The variable expression of future tense in Peninsular Spanish: The present (and future) of inflectional forms in the Spanish spoken in a bilingual region. Language Variation and Change 20.85-126.

Davies, Mark. 2002-. Corpus del Español (100+ million words, 1200s-1900s). <http://www.corpusdelespanol.org>

Emirkinian, Louisette, and David Sankoff. 1985. Le futur simple et le futur périphrastique. Langues et société, ed. by Monique Lemieux and Henrietta Cedegren, 189-201. Québec City: Gouvernement de Québec.

Fernández Ramírez, Salvador. 1985. Gramática española. 2nd ed. Vol. 4: El verbo y la oración. Madrid: Arco/Libros.

Fleischman, Suzanne. 1982. The future in thought and language. Cambridge: Cambridge
    University Press.

Fleischman, Suzanne. 1983. From Pragmatics to Grammar: Diachronic reflections on complex
    pasts and futures in Romance. Lingua 60.183-214.

Gili y Gaya, Samuel. 1955. Curso superior de sintaxis española. 5th ed. Barcelona: Publicaciones
    y Ediciones Spes.

Gómez Manzano, Pilar. 1988. La expresión del futuro absoluto en el español hablado en Madrid
    y en México. Anuario de Letras 26.67-86. México: Universidad Autónoma de México.

Gutiérrez, Manuel J. 1995. On the Future of the Future Tense in the Spanish of the Southwest.
    Spanish in Four Continents: Studies in Language Contact and Bilingualism, ed. by
    Carmen Silva-Corvalán, 214-26. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Hernández Alonso, César. 1984. Gramática funcional del español. Madrid: Editorial Gredos.

Hopper, Paul. 1991. On some principles of grammaticization. Approaches to grammaticalization,
    ed. by Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Bernd Heine, 17-35. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Iuliano, Rosalba, and Luciana De Stefano. 1979. Un análisis sociolingüístico del habla de
    Caracas: Los valores del futuro. Boletín de la Academia Puertorriqueña de la lengua
    española 7.101-09.

King, Ruth and Terry Nadasdi. 2003. Back to the Future in Acadian French. French Language
    Studies 13.323-37.

Lathrop, Tom. 2003. The Evolution of Spanish. 4th ed. Newark, Delaware: Cervantes & Co.

Lope Blanch, Juan M. (ed.) 1977. Estudios sobre el español hablado en las principales ciudades
    de América. México: Universidad Autónoma de México.

López Morales, Humberto. 2006. El estudio de la variación sintáctica: precisiones

    metodológicas. Haciendo Lingüística: Homenaje a Paola Bentivoglia, ed. by Mercedes

    Sedano, Adriana Bolívar, and Martha Shiro, 779-95. Caracas: Universidad Central de

    Venezuela.

Lyons, Christopher G. 1978. A Look into the Spanish Future. Lingua 46.225-44.

Marcos Marín, Francisco (dir.). 1992. COREC: Corpus de Referencia de la Lengua Española

    Contemporánea: Corpus Oral Peninsular.

    <http:// www.lllf.uam.es/~fmarcos/informes/corpus/corpusix.html>

Matte Bon, Francisco. 2006. Maneras de hablar del futuro en español entre gramática y

    pragmática: Futuro, *ir a* + infinitivo, y presente de indicativo: análisis, usos y valor

    profundo. Revista electrónica de didáctica del español como lengua extranjera.

    <http://www.mec.es/redele/revista.shtml>

Orozco, Rafael. 2005. Distribution of Future Time Forms in Northern Colombian Spanish.

    Selected Proceedings of the 7th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium, ed. by David

    Eddington, 56-65. Somerville: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Orozco, Rafael. 2007. Social Constraints on the Expression of Futurity in Spanish-Speaking

    Urban Communities. Selected Proceedings of the Third Workshop on Spanish

    Sociolinguistics, ed. by Jonathan Holmquist, 103-12. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla

    Proceedings Project.

Poplack, Shana, and Danielle Turpin. 1999. Does the *futur* have a future in (Canadian) French?

    Probus 11.133-64.

Real Academia Española. 1973. Esbozo de una nueva gramática de la lengua española. Madrid:

    Espasa-Calpe.

Sankoff, David, Sali Tagliamonte, and Eric Smith. 2005. Goldvarb X: a variable rule application for Macintosh and Windows. Toronto: University of Toronto Department of Linguistics. <http://individual.utoronto.ca/tagliamonte/Goldvarb/GV_index.htm>

Sedano, Mercedes. 1994. El futuro morfológico y la expresión *ir a* + infinitivo en el español hablado de Venezuela. Verba 21.225-40.

Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 1990. Current Issues in Studies of Language Contact. Hispania 73.163-76.

Silva-Corvalán, Carmen, and Tracy David Terrell. 1989. Notas sobre la expresión de futuridad en el español del Caribe. Hispanic Linguistics 2.2.191-208.

Tagliamonte, Sali A. 2006. Analysing Sociolinguistic Variation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Urrea, Evelyn Durán, and Michael Gradoville. 2006. Variation in the Future Tense of New Mexican Spanish. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico.

Wales, M. L. 1983. The Semantic Distribution of *aller* + Infinitive and the future tense in spoken French. General Linguistics 23.1.19-28.

APPENDIX

Table 13 presents the whole set of results produced by Goldvarb for all three future variants and all the factor groups analyzed. Each factor group and its factors appear in the left-hand column followed by the number of future tokens for that category in the corpus. The factor weight column shows the weight of one future variant, set as the application value, relative to another variant in a binomial analysis. Since three future variants are considered in this study and since Goldvarb can compare only two variants at a time, it was necessary to perform three separate binomial analyses, one for each pairing of variants. For example, the column titled "PF/IF" shows the weight of the PF when compared to the IF only. The IF is compared to the FP and finally the FP is compared to the PF. In order to facilitate reading the table, all factor weights of .50 or above have been boldfaced, and all factor weights for factors that did not reach statistical significance are in brackets. The next column indicates the percentage of tokens for each category for each variant compared to one other variant. The rightmost column shows the actual number of tokens of each variant when compared to only one other variant. Since each variant is compared to each of the other two variants, the total of these numbers actual yields twice the actual number of tokens for each variant, hence the heading "N x 2" for this column.

Table 13. Factor weights, percentages and total number of tokens for binomial pairings of three future variants.

Factor	Factor Weight			%			N x 2		
	PF/ IF	IF/ FP	FP/ PF	PF/ IF	IF/ FP	FP/ PF	PF/ IF	IF/ FP	FP/ PF
Temporal distance (442)									
Immediate (162)	**.61**	**.58**	.36	45	24	39	118	59	147
Same day (46)	**.57**	.45	.40	10	11	10	26	28	38
Same week (32)	**.76**	.06	**.71**	3	10	8	8	25	31
More distant than same week (95)	.17	.36	**.82**	11	33	22	28	80	82
Indefinite/uncertain (107)	.42	**.88**	.35	31	22	21	82	53	79
Adverbial specification (442)									
No adverb (306)	**.57**	**.55**	.38	81	55	71	212	134	266
Non-specific (64)	.16	**.57**	**.75**	10	21	13	26	53	49
Specific hour (29)	.26	.41	**.74**	5	9	6	14	21	23
Day or time of day (43)	**.53**	.29	**.78**	4	15	10	10	37	39
Grammatical person (442)									
1 yo (87)	**.47**	.36	**[.60]**	19	17	21	51	42	81
2 tú (103)	.30	**.57**	**[.55]**	24	29	19	62	71	73
3 él/ella/usted (82)	.26	**.71**	[.43]	19	19	18	51	47	66
4 nosotros (70)	**.95**	.07	**[.51]**	16	12	18	42	29	69
5 vosotros (27)	**.63**	**.56**	**[.53]**	5	7	7	12	17	25
6 ellos/ellas (32)	**.68**	**.61**	[.31]	7	7	8	19	16	29

0 inanimate (41)	.18	**.74**	[.42]	10	9	9	25	23	34
Verb frequency (442)									
1-2 appearances (101)	**[.64]**	[.23]	[.50]	26	18	24	67	43	92
3-9 appearances (117)	[.41]	**[.66]**	[.44]	27	25	27	71	61	102
10-20 appearances (98)	[.35]	**[.56]**	**[.56]**	18	26	22	48	65	83
20+ appearances (126)	**[.56]**	[.49]	**[.52]**	29	31	27	76	76	100
Lexical Type (442)									
Action (279)	**.72**	.30	**[.53]**	56	61	69	146	150	262
Stative (45)	**.55**	**.51**	**[.53]**	10	11	10	26	26	38
Diction (29)	.25	**.86**	[.29]	9	6	6	23	14	21
Psychological (23)	.43	**.79**	[.43]	6	5	5	17	12	17
Sensory (46)	.09	**.96**	[.23]	16	11	6	41	28	23
Other (20)	.12	**.51**	**[.71]**	3	6	4	9	15	16
Speaker age (442)									
50+ (323)	[.44]	**.57**	[.50]	73	77	71	190	189	267
≤49 (119)	**[.66]**	.28	[.50]	27	23	29	72	56	110
Negation (442)									
Not negative (415)	**[.51]**	[.46]	[.50]	92	95	94	242	233	355
Negative (27)	[.34]	**[.94]**	[.44]	8	5	6	20	12	22

Table 14 lists the infinitive form of each verb that appears in the corpus, along with the number of times it appears under each variant and the percentage of the total number of tokens per variant. The total number of times the verb appears is in the right hand column. The verbs are listed in descending order of total number of occurrences.

Table 14. Number of occurrences and percentage of total occurrences of each variant for each verb in the corpus presented in descending order of total number of occurrences

verb	FP	%	PF	%	IF	%	TOTAL
ver	4	9.09	17	38.64	23	52.27	44
venir	25	73.53	8	23.53	1	2.94	34
dar	15	53.57	11	39.29	2	7.14	28
ir	6	27.27	16	72.73	0	0.00	22
llevar	8	47.06	9	52.94	0	0.00	17
decir	5	31.25	5	31.25	6	37.50	16
tener	8	50.00	4	25.00	4	25.00	16
hacer	7	53.85	6	46.15	0	0.00	13
traer	8	66.67	4	33.33	0	0.00	12
quedarse	8	66.67	3	25.00	1	8.33	12
estar	4	44.44	1	11.11	4	44.44	9
irse	7	77.78	2	22.22	0	0.00	9
poner	0	0.00	7	87.50	1	12.50	8
dejar	5	71.43	2	28.57	0	0.00	7
ser	3	42.86	3	42.86	1	14.29	7
comer	1	16.67	3	50.00	2	33.33	6
ponerse	0	0.00	5	83.33	1	16.67	6
poder	2	40.00	2	40.00	1	20.00	5
limpiar	0	0.00	5	100.00	0	0.00	5
pasar	0	0.00	4	100.00	0	0.00	4
pagar	3	75.00	0	0.00	1	25.00	4
casarse	1	25.00	3	75.00	0	0.00	4
llegar	3	75.00	0	0.00	1	25.00	4
volver	4	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	4
mandar	2	50.00	1	25.00	1	25.00	4
venirse	3	75.00	0	0.00	1	25.00	4
sacar	2	50.00	1	25.00	1	25.00	4
coger	1	25.00	3	75.00	0	0.00	4
pedir	2	66.67	0	0.00	1	33.33	3
comprar	2	66.67	1	33.33	0	0.00	3
hablar	0	0.00	3	100.00	0	0.00	3
meter	1	33.33	2	66.67	0	0.00	3
conocer	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	100.00	3

contar	0	0.00	3	100.00	0	0.00	3
vestirse	2	66.67	1	33.33	0	0.00	3
salir	1	33.33	2	66.67	0	0.00	3
acordarse	0	0.00	3	100.00	0	0.00	3
recoger	2	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2
pegar	0	0.00	2	100.00	0	0.00	2
apuntar	0	0.00	2	100.00	0	0.00	2
haber	2	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2
hincharse	2	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2
explicar	0	0.00	1	50.00	1	50.00	2
saber	1	50.00	1	50.00	0	0.00	2
leer	1	50.00	1	50.00	0	0.00	2
continuar	1	50.00	1	50.00	0	0.00	2
tomar	0	0.00	2	100.00	0	0.00	2
enterarse	2	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2
engordar	0	0.00	2	100.00	0	0.00	2
vivir	0	0.00	2	100.00	0	0.00	2
acostarse	1	50.00	1	50.00	0	0.00	2
encontrar	0	0.00	2	100.00	0	0.00	2
echar	1	50.00	1	50.00	0	0.00	2
consumir	2	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2
bajarse	1	50.00	1	50.00	0	0.00	2
regalar	0	0.00	2	100.00	0	0.00	2
arrancar	2	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2
brindar	0	0.00	2	100.00	0	0.00	2
olvidar	0	0.00	1	50.00	1	50.00	2
pararse	1	50.00	1	50.00	0	0.00	2
notar	0	0.00	2	100.00	0	0.00	2
tirar	1	50.00	1	50.00	0	0.00	2
pillar	0	0.00	2	100.00	0	0.00	2
quedar	1	50.00	1	50.00	0	0.00	2
tardar	0	0.00	2	100.00	0	0.00	2
deletrear	0	0.00	1	100.00	0	0.00	1
bailar	0	0.00	1	100.00	0	0.00	1
descongelarse	1	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1
costar	0	0.00	1	100.00	0	0.00	1
beber	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	100.00	1
gustar	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	100.00	1
asesorar	0	0.00	1	100.00	0	0.00	1
despedirse	0	0.00	1	100.00	0	0.00	1

arreglarse	1	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1
conseguir	1	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1
apestar	1	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1
aprender	0	0.00	1	100.00	0	0.00	1
cambiar	1	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1
cobrar	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	100.00	1
caerse	1	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1
probar	0	0.00	1	100.00	0	0.00	1
fumar	0	0.00	1	100.00	0	0.00	1
morirse	0	0.00	1	100.00	0	0.00	1
ordenar	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	100.00	1
parar	0	0.00	1	100.00	0	0.00	1
parecer	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	100.00	1
llevarse	1	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1
preparar	0	0.00	1	100.00	0	0.00	1
llamar	1	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1
quitar	0	0.00	1	100.00	0	0.00	1
referirse	0	0.00	1	100.00	0	0.00	1
renover	0	0.00	1	100.00	0	0.00	1
repartirse	1	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1
sentarse	1	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1
servir	1	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1
pincharse	0	0.00	1	100.00	0	0.00	1
escoger	1	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1
durar	1	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1
elegir	0	0.00	1	100.00	0	0.00	1
emborracharse	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	100.00	1
enfermar	0	0.00	1	100.00	0	0.00	1
enfriar	0	0.00	1	100.00	0	0.00	1
mirar	1	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1
entrar	0	0.00	1	100.00	0	0.00	1
dormir	1	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1
escribir	0	0.00	1	100.00	0	0.00	1
gastar	0	0.00	1	100.00	0	0.00	1
subir	0	0.00	1	100.00	0	0.00	1
trabajar	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	100.00	1
aclarar	0	0.00	1	100.00	0	0.00	1
levantar	1	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1
enseñar	0	0.00	1	100.00	0	0.00	1
TOTAL	180	40.72	197	44.57	65	14.71	442